

Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chryster
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frist
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren

Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecicka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Solomon
Souders
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tausz
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)

Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Goodlatte
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souders
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tausz
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)

Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield

Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn

Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—101

Abercrombie
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cummings
DeLauro
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—5

Flake
Ford

Gundersen
McDade

Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Miller
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Nadler

Young (FL)

□ 1710

Mr. SCHUMER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the conference report on H.R. 3734.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARMEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3603, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-730) on the resolution (H. Res. 496) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3603) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies pro-

grams for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3517, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-731) on the resolution (H. Res. 497) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3517) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-732) on the resolution (H. Res. 498) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3230) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1715

INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM ACT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 489 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 489

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2823) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record

and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. That amendment shall be considered as read. No other amendment shall be in order except a further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules to accompany this resolution, which may be offered only by Representative Miller of California or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING) The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee last week found itself in an unusual situation: A request for modified closed rule on a bill reported from the Resources Committee—although the Ways and Means Committee also had jurisdiction over a portion. As you know, bills reported from the Resources Committee are traditionally considered under open rules. So what's different about H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act? Most importantly, this bill would essentially codify an international agreement between 12 nations known as the Declaration of Panama. Any significant changes to the language of H.R. 2823 and that agreement is lost. It is worth mentioning that the negotiations that produced this agreement could serve as a model for environmental policymaking because just about every viewpoint in the tuna/dolphin debate was represented at the table. These negotiations not only involved the governments of 12 nations, but they also included representatives from the environmental community and the fishing industry. The result is a package that enjoys unusually broad support: From the administration and Vice President AL GORE to the Resources Committee Chairman DON YOUNG. From Greenpeace to the tuna fishermen.

In recognition of the fragile nature of this agreement, the Rules Committee has reported a modified closed rule that allows for a vote on the bill, preceded by an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr.

MILLER] or his designee, and one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. It had originally been the intention of the Rules Committee to allow a vote on a full substitute, but the minority specifically requested that the Miller amendment be made in order instead. The rule was agreed to in committee with voice vote without dissent.

Mr. Speaker, if you cherish the dolphin populations of the eastern Pacific, as I do, then you will agree it is vital that we move forward with this legislation. During the coming debate, you will hear differing viewpoints on how this legislation may impact dolphins—the administration's experts, the Resources Committee, and the Center for Marine Conservation all happen to believe that this bill will save dolphins' lives, and do so more effectively than current law—I think that's pretty good credentials. H.R. 2823 backs up that claim by mandating that every tuna boat operating in the eastern Pacific carry an observer to certify that not a single dolphin was killed when the tuna nets were hauled up. Even one dolphin death would prevent the entire catch from being sold in the United States as Dolphin safe. Under today's standards American consumers do not have this kind of guarantee. However, this proposal is not just about saving dolphins; it's about preserving endangered marine species like the sea turtles, as well as billfish and juvenile tunas. In Florida, we certainly treasure our dolphins—but we also take special care to protect other marine populations, and I am pleased that H.R. 2823 will address the eastern Pacific ecosystem as a whole, not just one aspect of it. You will hear the argument that one of the techniques allowed under this agreement, encirclement—with divers that release any dolphins before they are caught in the net, is harmful. But those who put forth this argument might not mention the enormous damage done by so-called safe fishing methods such as log sets and school sets. As the Resources Committee's report says:

The bycatch of other marine species associated with these two fishing techniques is significantly higher than the bycatch associated with the encirclement technique. School sets generate approximately 10 times the amount of bycatch and log sets generate approximately 100 times the bycatch of juvenile tunas and other marine species.

So the message should be clear: If you want to protect dolphins, turtles, and other marine life, you should support this rule and vote for the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding the customary half hour debate time to me; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida has explained, this is a modi-

fied closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act.

Even though we do not prefer rules that are this restrictive, and of course our colleagues who are now in the majority always railed bitterly against them when we were in the majority, it appears that the nature of this debate probably does not require a completely open rule.

On the other hand, it is also proper to point out that with a bill so narrow in scope as this one, it is difficult to understand why we need a rule with such strict limits.

In any case, we should support this rule. It should provide for adequate discussion of the principal controversy at issue here.

Mr. Speaker, the dolphin protection bill has created a great deal of controversy within the environmental community which was, after all, responsible for calling our attention to the serious problem of the slaughter of dolphins by the tuna fishing industry in the first place. If it had not been for several environmental organizations, the public would not have known about the way the dolphins were routinely trapped and killed by the giant nets used by tuna fleets.

But thanks to many organizations that are deeply concerned about the fate of our entire marine ecosystem, Congress passed legislation embargoing all tuna caught by that method, known as encirclement.

Because of that embargo, other big tuna-fishing countries felt the economic pressure, and after meeting with U.S. officials to develop a voluntary international agreement, pledged to adopt safer fishing methods. These new techniques have been dramatically successful. The result is that dolphin mortality has declined from over 100,000 in 1991 to a little bit more than 3,000 in 1995.

Because of that success, the United States, several environmental groups and 11 other nations met in Panama last year to develop a binding international agreement, the terms of which are reflected in H.R. 2823, that rewards these efforts by lifting the United States embargo. The agreement and the bill would also reward any batch of tuna caught without a single dolphin death, to be verified by on-board observers, with the dolphin-safe label that is so important commercially.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2823 has bipartisan support in the Congress. It has been endorsed by the Clinton administration, which helped negotiate the binding international agreement to lock in the dramatic reductions in dolphin deaths that have been achieved and to protect other marine species that are unfortunately threatened by alternative tuna fishing practices.

That so-called Declaration of Panama was signed by 12 nations in October 1995. Environmentalists believe, some environmentalists, not all, that this enforceable international agreement is the only way to protect marine

resources for the long term. We cannot, they believe, continue to act alone. It would be impossible to protect dolphins and other species if we did.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a modified closed rule and one that might better have been somewhat less restrictive or limited. But we hope the terms of the rule will not prevent us from hearing all of the arguments about this legislation. We are supportive of the rule. We think it is a fair rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from greater San Dimas, CA [Mr. DREIER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Sanibel, FL, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who enjoys consuming seafood but I am not particularly fond of tuna. But I am very supportive of this measure because it has been a long time in coming.

We have just had a great deal of excitement around here over the last several hours as we have brought about with, I think, 328 votes a bipartisan agreement on welfare reform, but the bipartisanship that exists on that, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] implied, pales in comparison when we look at the parties who are involved in this very important agreement who have disagreed on many, many issues in the past.

The fact of the matter is while my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], said that we in the past would rail about rules that are like this, this rule is very clear in that we are dealing with 12 nations who were part of this negotiating process and as he knows under fast track negotiating authority, which this Congress has had in the past but does not have now, we have seen agreement struck where there would be simply an up-or-down vote on measures, and that is the direction in which we are headed with this rule, because we do have, I think, an important environmental concern that is being addressed here and also for other friends of ours in Latin America.

I was talking with some people at the Mexican Embassy and they have been very anxious about this because they want to see us move ahead and proceed with what is a very important agreement not only for the consumers in the United States and Mexico but also for those in the tuna industry and those who are concerned, as we all are, about the safety of dolphins. So when we look at the World Wildlife Federation, at DON YOUNG, I know they do not always come together on issues, I believe that this is a great day as we continue the bipartisan spirit that was in evidence just a few minutes ago. About 6 hours ago the bipartisan spirit was not

as in evidence here in the House of Representatives, but I am convinced that when we move to final passage on this rule and the measure that that great bipartisan spirit will be alive and well.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this legislation that we have begun debating here today, H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, I believe, is a declaration of surrender by this Congress to those who insist that American environmental and labor standards must be destroyed on the altar of free trade.

□ 1730

H.R. 2823 is a complete capitulation to those who believe that U.S. consumers have no rights and our trade competitors must have all the rights when it comes to product disclosure.

This is a bad bill: bad environmental policy, bad trade policy, and bad foreign policy. It does precisely what we were told NAFTA and GATT would not do. It demands that our own laws governing the environment, worker safety, species protection, and a consumer's right to know be sacrificed.

Less than a decade ago, millions of American consumers, led by schoolchildren of this Nation, demanded the creation of dolphin protection programs because of the needless slaughter of hundreds of thousands of marine mammals by tuna fishermen. We passed the Dolphin Protection Act. We required that tuna sold in the United States be dolphin safe.

The U.S. tuna industry, at enormous expense, complied with those requirements, relocated their ships and processing plants, and produced dolphin safe tuna. Those efforts have had a dramatic success. Dolphin deaths last year were a little less than 3,600, compared to 100,000 or more a few years ago.

The dolphin protection law has worked, but the bill before us today would renounce the very program that has achieved the goals we sought when the dolphin protection law was enacted.

Why on Earth would we so grievously weaken the very law that has worked so well? Not on behalf of American consumers, not on behalf of dolphin protection, not on behalf of those interests, but rather on behalf of Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and other nations who are trying a little environmental blackmail, and to date it seems to be working.

Those very countries that have continued to fish in violation of the dolphin safe law now demand of this Nation that we weaken our laws so they can sell dolphin unsafe tuna in U.S. supermarkets under a label that the

consumer has come to understand as meaning dolphin safe, a label that was enacted by this Congress. This Congress should not now become a party to this deception of that label, and a deception that this act would bring about with respect to the American consumer.

H.R. 2823 implements an international agreement, the Panama Agreement, which was negotiated behind closed doors by five Washington-based environmental organizations and the government of Mexico. This agreement makes major changes to longstanding laws protecting dolphins and informing our consumers.

But let us remember it was negotiated without the knowledge of any elected Member of Congress or other interested parties with a decades-long history on this issue.

It was negotiated without consideration of the American tuna canning companies who in 1990 responded to the demands from our schoolchildren, their parents, and consumers nationwide, and some of the same environmental groups who secretly negotiated this deal. They did it by voluntarily announcing that they would no longer purchase and sell tuna caught by harming dolphins.

It was negotiated without the participation and approval of dozens of environmental organizations with millions of members nationwide who vigorously disagree that this is the best way to protect dolphins, and who strongly support the Studds amendment that will be offered later to retain the current dolphin safe label.

The legislation was drafted with the help of lobbyists hired by the Mexican Government, and presented to the Committee on Resources with the caveat that no amendments could be accepted if they were unacceptable to Mexico. Since when did we start negotiating in this fashion? Since when did we start negotiating in a fashion where privately negotiated agreements are now brought to the Congress and we are told that somehow they are the same as a treaty or an agreement between this Nation and other nations, but this Congress cannot be engaged in the process of amendment?

There are some very serious problems with this legislation. The most important is that it would do exactly what proponents of the trade agreement pledged these pacts would not do: drive down American environmental standards through pressure from countries that do not want to meet those same standards. That is the goal, pure and simple.

Let us be clear. The driving force behind this legislation is Mexico, which does not want to meet the standards of the dolphin safe label that is on every can of tuna sold in this country. Mexico wants to open the floodgates to nonsafe tuna and to desecrate the integrity of the label that has led through consumer preferences.

If we do not accede to this undermining effort, Mexico and other nations

tell us that they will abandon their commitment to this agreement, to fishing dolphin safe, and deliberately resume the slaughter of dolphins. These nations, and many other trading partners, are waiting to see how the U.S. Congress responds to this threat.

This legislation responds by capitulation. We are going to hear a lot of assertions about this legislation, how sensitive it is to dolphins, how it would not allow damage to be done to dolphins. Before Members vote I urge them to consider the following:

This legislation, as currently written, the supporters will tell us that this bill does not allow more dolphins to be killed; that it reduces the number of dolphin deaths. But the fact is, H.R. 2823 allows the number of dolphin deaths to rise by almost 30 percent. There is nothing in this bill about keeping dolphin deaths at today's historic low level. This bill is about allowing more dolphin deaths.

They say that their bill does not allow dolphins to be hurt. Under H.R. 2823, dolphins may be regularly encircled, harassed, and injured. The bill imposes no limit on the amount of injury that could be imposed on dolphins, as long as the dolphins do not actually die in the nets.

We will hear the proponents say that the environmentalists support this legislation. The fact of the matter is that over 80 grassroots environmental organizations vigorously oppose this bill and support the Studds amendment. By contrast, what we have are five Washington-based environmental groups that secretly negotiated this agreement with Mexico who are now supporting it.

Since when is this Congress obligated to accept, unamended, the products of negotiation by environmental organizations and foreign governments?

Lastly, the supporters of this legislation argue that we cannot change the bill because to do so would be to renounce international agreements and damage American credibility. The fact is, there is no international agreement. There is no treaty. This is about going to the negotiations on a possible treaty. This bill requires that we change U.S. law as a condition of going to those negotiations.

It is worth noting that the United States is the only country that is required to make these kinds of changes, to change domestic consumer protection laws to conform with this agreement.

I would hope that the Members of this Congress would see through this effort by Mexico to essentially abolish the dolphin safe protection that we currently have on the books, and would support the Studds amendment that will allow for the protection of the label, the protection of consumer knowledge, and provide for the protection of the dolphins.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON],

chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank and commend the Committee on Rules, led by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], for bringing this rule to the floor. Let me also commend my friend from Maryland, Mr. GILCHREST, who was the author of this bill, who I think did a very fine job.

Mr. Speaker, when I was sitting in my office of the first day of this session, press reporters called and said, "How do you think it is going to be serving with a Democrat President, because in your term of being here you have always been able to communicate with and serve with Republican Presidents?" I said, "It will be my goal to find places and issues upon which the President the Democrat President, and I can agree."

This is one of those issues. This is President Clinton's initiative. And as chairman, of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, I am pleased to have been able to support a Clinton administration initiative.

I would also just like to point out to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who used some fairly harsh phrases, phrases like capitulation, and phrases like weakening the law, environmental blackmail, dolphin unsafe tuna, deception, secret negotiations, lobbyists hired by Mexico, I would just say to my friend from California those characterizations of this bill are misleading, untrue, and patently false.

There is not any truth to any of those assertions and that is why I rise in support of this rule and its granting of a modified closed rule to govern debate on H.R. 2823. I realize the Committee on Resources has traditionally requested open rules, but in this case it provides for a total, including the rule, of 4 hours of debate. I believe it is certainly a rule which merits our support.

Let me just in closing say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is supported by the following organizations. Listen to this. Greenpeace, the Center for Marine Conservation, the Environmental Defense Fund, the World Wildlife Fund, the National Wildlife Federation, and the American Sports Fishing Association, to say nothing of the Clinton administration, and the AFL-CIO.

This is a good rule, it is a good bill, and I urge passage of the rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I have two remaining speakers, which I will call on. I have admonished them that this is the rule and they are going to focus on the rule and the merits of the rule and how it might affect the substance. Once we get through that, I hope we can get to a quick oral vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the author of this bill.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say very quickly that I appreciate the Committee on Rules understanding the nature of this international agreement to bring forth this type of rule that does allow for one opposing view, but the importance of the agreement underscores the fact that we, as the basic author of the agreement, the United States is the basic author of the agreement, we have not given up any sovereignty whatsoever. We have encouraged other nations, other international nations to better manage the marine ecosystem.

In response to the gentleman from California, I want to make three quick points. As far as his statement in reference to this bill being, this legislation being debated and formulated behind closed doors by people who are fanatics about open trade, well, first, labor groups that are supporting this legislation, environmental groups that are supporting this legislation opposed NAFTA and GATT.

This legislation was created in the full light of day at public hearings in this U.S. Congress. Legislation that was adopted that we are now dealing with was not created by extreme environmental groups without any background in the marine biological sciences. We tapped the best scientists in this country to come up with the best management scheme so that we could not only, as an individual country, the United States, manage our marine ecosystem, but so that we preserved it for generations to come and, by the way, ensure that dolphin deaths were down, hopefully, in a few years, to zero.

We tapped marine biologists with some of the best background that this country has ever seen, and they are the ones that have come to this unanimous consensus that if we are going to deal on this tiny little planet, that by the year 2096 is going to have a population of 17 billion people, and we have 5.5 billion people right now, we had better begin to learn how to get along with our neighbors.

If we are going to deal with a much more complicated regime as global climate change, and we have to deal with our neighbors and create international agreements, we had better understand that the best way to do that is not demagoging an issue but dealing with the matters that people are concerned about, such as dolphin safe tuna. We know that.

We are going to ensure that those dolphin safe labels on every one of those tuna cans reflect that no dolphins were killed or hurt. We are going to ensure that we as a Nation can work with other countries about environmental issues.

□ 1745

So I know that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] says that this is a

debate about the rule, and I support the rule 1,000 percent, and I would urge the entire Congress to support this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who is an author of this bill in its original version and was also, interestingly enough, the most fierce representative for his tuna fishermen of anyone I have ever met. Out of that has come this good legislation, and I congratulate him for that.

Mr. CUMMINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was characterized that some fly-by-night groups got together and put this thing together. At the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, the IATTC, a La Jolla, CA-based organization, 35 scientists got together and developed the most effective bycatch reduction program ever implemented. It saved dolphin and brought down the numbers. The "dolphin safe" label now used in U.S. markets takes a much higher ecological toll on marine life.

Those who read their Congressional Monitor read that tuna fisherman cannot label their tuna "dolphin safe." That is not the case. Many American consumers still mistakenly believe that the Nation's "dolphin safe" policies and product labels worked. U.S. fishermen have to have observers on board. None of these other Nations do.

If the Studds-Miller agreement goes back, all of the other Nations that have signed aboard this agreement will no longer be required to have observers. They are going to go on and kill dolphin. Why not? They can sell it abroad. This ties other Nations that the United States has no control over to a "dolphin safe" policy.

This is going to save dolphin. And why? Fish from sets of nets where 100 percent of encircled dolphins are released unharmed will qualify as "dolphin safe." No tuna will be labeled safe unless absolutely no dolphins are killed. It has to have 100 percent verification on site as the fish are caught.

Trying to comply with current law, the no-encirclement policy, some skipper have to fish immature tuna. That is killing our future. And that is why we have such broad support in this. It actually enhances the tuna and the crop for later years.

The amendment being offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will destroy the most effective dolphin bycatch resolution. That is why I support this rule, Vice President GORE, and who are the other people who have supported this? The AFL-CIO.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] said it is destroying our legal policy. If we look at President Clinton, Vice President GORE, five of the administration groups and all five major environmental groups support this because it is going to help save dolphin; and we support that. And when we can come together as a body and throw out

the extremes on both sides and arrive somewhere in the middle, work with industry, work with environmental groups, that is good.

Why is the Panama agreement important? Because it does tie those 12 nations to the same observation, the same requirements that the United States has to go through today.

This Congress must support dolphin conservation, the fishermen who perfected their fishing techniques, and the scientists who worked with them to achieve these many accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for their hard work in the face of a lot of lobbying from groups with misinformation. And I would like to thank them for sticking to principle and believing in what they are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the President of the United States supporting this legislation, and I would like to submit it for the RECORD.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, American Samoa is in the middle of the South Pacific Ocean, and fishing has been the life blood of Samoans for thousands of years. While today's commercial canning operations bear little resemblance to my father's subsistence fishing, we continue to use the same resource, the Pacific Ocean.

The Samoans are also known as the voyagers, and countless generations ago, my forefathers, using Samoa and Tonga as a base, expanded the known world to include the island groups now known as French Polynesia, which includes the Island of Tahiti, the Cook Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and many of the smaller islands in between. We learned well the ways of the ocean, including who our friends are.

In my lifetime, I have had the opportunity over the years to share the experiences of my ancestors. As a youth I traveled extensively on the waters of the Pacific in vessels voyaging between Tokelau and the Manu's islands. I have even traveled on a purse seiner for 400 miles from Samoa to the southern Tongan Islands. I was also invited to sail on the famous *Hokule'a*, a historical Polynesian sailing canoe built by native Hawaiians and constructed so as to be the same in size and configuration as the ancient sailing canoes. With Nainoa Thompson as our first Polynesian navigator in 200 years, we voyaged on the *Hokule'a* from the Island of Rangi-roa in French Polynesia to Hawaii, utilizing noninstrument navigational methods, sailing by the movement of the stars, the ocean waves, and the flight of birds.

During this voyage, I had the opportunity to experience firsthand the interaction among those who live in

the sea and those who live on and above it. I developed a greater appreciation for all living things, and confirmed the gentle, helpful nature of dolphins.

In fact, the experience I got from being at sea for weeks at a time is that the dolphins were always there, and I can share with my colleagues that the dolphins are just like humans. Dolphins have been sacred to the Polynesians as far back as our legends recount our history. Ancient Polynesians would rather starve than kill a dolphin.

When people are at sea under sail for weeks, dolphins are of tremendous psychological benefit. I have experienced lack of movement in the doldrums and the intense heat of the tropics, and I can understand how the dolphins would have given early Polynesian travelers a sense of hope. My voyage on the *Hokule'a* gave me an opportunity to contemplate that perhaps the reason God created dolphins was to provide psychological support for sailors at sea.

Samoan legend and modern news reporting all confirm today's common knowledge about dolphins: They are of no threat to mankind, and have on occasions saved the lives of their fellow mammals. In return mankind has hunted them down, killing over 100,000 per year, not for sustenance, but because tuna swim under them.

When this was brought to the attention of the U.S. public, we rose in outrage and put enough economic pressure on the tuna industry to change its methods of fishing. And you have already heard, dolphin deaths have dropped from over 100,000 per year to 3,300 in 1995. This is a significant achievement, and we consumers are to be commended.

Congress did its part as well, placing an embargo on tuna that is caught by methods which harm dolphins, and by enacting legislation which permits the use of the all-familiar "dolphin safe" label.

Part of the underlying problem is that tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean swim under schools of dolphin, and one easy, quick way to catch tuna in the eastern Pacific is to chase dolphins until they are too exhausted to swim any further. Then the dolphins, and the tuna under them, are encircled in a net. It is this chasing and netting procedure that causes the harm to the dolphins.

In the western Pacific Ocean, the tuna do not always swim under schools of dolphin, and tuna are found through the use of modern techniques, including helicopters and sonar. By netting schools of tuna which are not swimming under dolphins, the problem is solved: Consumers get their canned tuna, and no dolphins are killed in the process.

Now, under pressure from foreign governments, it is being proposed that the current statutory and regulatory system be changed. My colleagues will

recall that when we debated the implementing legislation for GATT and the proposed World Trade Organization, many of us pointed out the economic and policy difficulties which passage of the legislation would create. This is an example of the kind of problems we knew we would encounter under regulations of the World Trade Organization, or the WTO.

Today we are being told that our dolphin safe embargo is in violation of the WTO rules, and that if we do not remove our embargo, the United States will be forced to pay significant fines. Today we are being asked to forget a sound fisheries management policy that has reduced dolphin kills by 96 percent; we are being asked to forget the sound policy of using the attraction of the consumer market in the United States to alter the behavior of nations less concerned with the preservation of life; and instead we are being asked to give in to the foreign interests.

H.R. 2823 is a bad idea because it rewards those who have the worst record in the killing of dolphins. This bill is nothing more than giving in to blackmail. What the foreign governments are saying is that unless we lift the embargo on canned tuna, they will allow the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of dolphins to resume. If this isn't blackmail—I don't know what is!

Lifting the embargo constitutes only part of the bill. This will also perpetrate a fraud on the American consumer. H.R. 2823 changes the definition of dolphin safe to allow chasing, injury, harassment, encirclement, and capture of dolphins as long as no dolphins are observed dead in the nets. This definition allows tuna which have been caught by encirclement to be sold as dolphin safe in the U.S. market. This, Mr. Speaker, constitutes consumer fraud.

This canneries in American Samoa were the first to announce they would no longer purchase tuna caught in association with dolphin. In large measure, this decision resulted in a marked decrease in the killing of dolphins worldwide—from a high of 115,000 in 1986 to less than 4,000 in 1995. Lifting the tuna embargo on Mexico and changing the definition of dolphin safe will confuse American consumers and undermine the integrity of an American industry which is currently struggling to survive.

Lifting the embargo will also encourage what is left of the U.S. tuna industry to move to foreign countries in which businesses do not have to comply with any of the regulations that apply to U.S. companies located in our States and territories. U.S.-flagged purse seiners and tuna canning facilities in the United States must comply with the higher U.S. standards placed on U.S. companies by Federal law. Most foreign countries do not require the same high environmental and labor standards as the United States, and this works to the disadvantage of U.S.

citizens and businesses because it puts pressure on U.S. companies to move overseas to be more competitive. There is proof that this movement to overseas locations is occurring. As a matter of policy, we should be encouraging businesses to locate and expand in the United States, not move to foreign soil.

In 1983, 28.3 million pounds of foreign canned tuna entered the U.S. market above the quota. By 1991, this amount had increased to 237.2 million pounds—a more than eight-fold increase. In 1991, canned tuna from U.S. plants accounted for approximately 50 percent of the U.S. market. By 1993, our market share had been reduced to approximately 39 percent.

Mr. Speaker, lifting the embargo on tuna caught by foreign nations will drive the last nail into the coffin of what remains of the U.S. tuna industry. Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Taiwan, Sri Lanka, and other countries are already able to export their canned tuna to the United States without having to comply with any of the safety, health, or environmental regulations that apply to U.S. companies.

Adding additional countries to this list will have a devastating effect on the largest industry in American Samoa. It is believed that approximately 80 percent of our private-sector employment is associated with the catching, cleaning, canning, and shipping of tuna. Needless to say, closure of these plants would devastate the economy of American Samoa.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to turn back the clock. Dolphin deaths worldwide have been reduced by 96 percent because of tough dolphin safe laws in the United States and Europe. The foreign businesses which are behind this harmful bill insist the U.S. change its law to unload their hard-to-market dolphin unsafe tuna in the lucrative U.S. dolphin safe market. This makes a mockery of the term dolphin safe.

Unfortunately, the dolphins cannot be here to make a case for themselves. A few of us are here in the Chamber today to speak on their behalf, and I want to say on behalf of the millions of dolphins at risk, the day will come when mankind will be held accountable for its actions.

This should be an easy vote. By voting against this bill, you will be voting for the dolphins, for U.S. fishermen, for the U.S. boat owners, for the U.S. tuna canners, and against foreign interests. Let us not be governed by foreign interests. Save the dolphins and kill the Gilchrest legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

BOGUS CLAIMS ABOUT TUNA-DOLPHIN BILL

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As the House prepares to debate H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Act, you should know the truth behind several misimpressions frequently conveyed by supporters of the legislation. A careful examination of the facts provides overwhelming justification for the Studts "Truth in Dolphin-Safe Labelling Amendment."

H.R. 2823 supporters say: "This bill doesn't allow more dolphins to be killed. It will reduce the number of dolphin deaths."

But the fact is: H.R. 2823 allows the number of dolphin deaths to rise by over 30 percent!

H.R. 2823 supporters say: "Our bill doesn't allow dolphins to be hurt."

But the fact is: dolphins may be regularly encircled, harassed and injured under the provisions of the bill!

H.R. 2823 supporters say: "Environmentalists support this bill."

The fact is: over 80 grassroots environmental organizations vigorously oppose this bill and support the Studts amendment. By contrast, only the five environmental groups that secretly negotiated this agreement with Mexico support the bill.

H.R. 2823 supporters say: "We must support this bill, and we can't change this bill, because we would renounce an international treaty and damage American credibility."

The fact is: no treaty has yet been negotiated, just an agreement to negotiate a treaty! This bill requires that we change U.S. law as a condition of negotiating the international agreement. The U.S. is the only country required to change its domestic consumer protection laws to conform to the pre-treaty agreement.

Congress must not perpetuate a fraud on American consumers. "Dolphin Safe" must mean that dolphins are not injured or killed in the hunt for tuna, which is what our constituents believe it means. H.R. 2823 allows an increase in dolphin deaths and the unlimited injuring and harassment of dolphins. That is not "Dolphin Safe."

Support the Studts amendment to keep the "Dolphin Safe" label honest for American consumers.

□ 1800

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter supporting this legislation from the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, the Vice President of the United States that supports this legislation, and a list of scientists that had concern about the tuna-dolphin issue. I would like to submit these for the RECORD.

Very quickly, the gentleman from American Samoa said we were pressured into this legislation by foreign powers. I want to say that we were pressured into this legislation by the marine ecosystem that needs our help in managing those scarce resources.

The ancient Polynesians had values that we should reflect today. The world is much different today than it was during the ancient Polynesians' courageous efforts across the high seas. We want to retain the values of the ancient Polynesians. That is why we are trying to manage the ecosystem on an international basis.

The last point, 10,000 to 40,000 dolphins are killed now in the western tropical Pacific. We are trying to eliminate that down to zero with our legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the correspondence to which I referred:

[From the Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO]

H.R. 2823 WOULD GIVE U.S. TUNA INDUSTRY A LEVEL PLAYING FIELD

Shortly the House of Representatives will take up H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act of 1996, legislation designed to provide a level playing field for the American tuna fishing industry. The Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO (MTD), representing affiliates that include fishermen and tuna cannery workers among their ranks, urges Congress to adopt this measure without amendment.

American tuna fishermen have been disadvantaged by amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act. Since 1992, they have been singularly barred from encircling dolphins during tuna harvesting. This restriction has had the paradoxical effect of forcing off the high seas American boats and crews, who were responsible for developing dolphin saving techniques in the harvesting process. As a result, many American-flag tuna vessels have been sold and placed under convenience registries with less experienced foreign crews that don't share similar environmental concerns. Domestic tuna canneries have been denied sufficient product to operate economically and have experienced periodic shutdowns.

Enactment of H.R. 2823 would help generate conditions conducive to increased participation of American tuna vessels in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. It also provides adequate supplies of quality tuna to enable domestic tuna canneries in California and Puerto Rico to operate full-time. In the process, hundreds of American fishing and related canning jobs will be restored and maintained.

The bill, introduced by Congressman Wayne Gilchrest, also provides strong environmental benefits that underscore longtime congressional interest in eliminating dolphin mortality resulting from tuna harvesting. H.R. 2823 accomplishes this goal through an international regime for protecting dolphins, including observers and other monitoring, verification and tracking of catch, research and enforcement. Moreover, the bill requires reductions in the allowable dolphin mortality rate to a level that guarantees recovery of dolphin stocks. The act also calls for shipboard observers to be responsible for monitoring bycatch of all species, with the goal of reducing total bycatch.

On balance, H.R. 2823 creates an environment that will enhance opportunities for American tuna industry workers, while enhancing international efforts to make tuna harvesting safe for dolphin and other fish species. The MTD urges your support for this legislation.

—
THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1996.

Hon. WAYNE T. GILCHREST,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GILCHREST: I am writing to thank you for your leadership on the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, H.R. 2823. As you know, the Administration strongly supports this legislation, which is essential to the protection of dolphins and other marine life in the Eastern Tropical Pacific.

In recent years, we have reduced dolphin mortality in the Eastern Tropical Pacific tuna fishery far below historic levels. Your legislation will codify an international agreement to lock these gains in place, further reduce dolphin mortality, and protect other marine life in the region. This agreement was signed last year by the United

States and 11 other nations, but will not take effect unless your legislation is enacted into law.

As you know, H.R. 2823 is supported by major environmental groups, including Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund, the National Wildlife Federation, the Center for Marine Conservation, and the Environmental Defense Fund. The legislation is also supported by the U.S. fishing industry, which has been barred from the Eastern Tropical Pacific tuna fishery.

Opponents of this legislation promote alternative fishing methods, such as "log fishing" and "school fishing," but these are environmentally unsound. These fishing methods involve unacceptably high by-catch of juvenile tunas, billfish, sharks, endangered sea turtles and other species, and pose long-term threats to the marine ecosystem.

I urge your colleagues to support this legislation. Passage of this legislation this session is integral to ensure implementation of an important international agreement that protects dolphins and other marine life in the Eastern Tropical Pacific.

Sincerely,

AL GORE.

—
LETTER FROM CONCERNED SCIENTISTS ON THE TUNA/DOLPHIN PROBLEM

We the undersigned scientists recognize the achievements made over the last twenty years to reduce dolphin mortality in the Eastern Tropical Pacific purse seine fishery for yellowfin tuna as well as efforts by U.S. and international scientists to improve the data and estimates of abundance and recruitment for dolphin stocks incidentally taken in this fishery. Specifically, dolphin mortality in this fishery has declined dramatically from 423,678 in 1972 to 4,095 in 1994.

We support efforts domestically and internationally to continue progress to reduce and eliminate dolphin mortality in this fishery. Further, we strongly believe that sound resource management and conservation depend upon reliable science and take into consideration the conservation and management of the ecosystem as a whole. The Declaration of Panama signed, on October 4, by the United States and eleven other nations takes significant steps in this regard. The scientific merits of the Panama Declaration are notable.

First, the Panama Declaration establishes conservative species/stock specific annual dolphin mortality limits at 0.2% to 0.1% of the minimum population estimate (N_{min}) up to 2001 and less than 0.1% of N_{min} thereafter. One way to approach the question of how much mortality dolphin populations can sustain and remain stable or increase is to express harvest as a proportion of net recruitment (i.e. as a proportion of the number of animals added to the population each year minus those that died). Recent estimates of recruitment are 2-6% per year. The Panama Declaration's annual species/stock specific mortality limits are set such a low level as to probably result in substantial increases in dolphin populations in the Eastern Pacific Ocean.

Second, the Panama Declaration establishes for the first time measures aimed at protecting other marine life caught incidentally in the eastern Pacific tuna fishery, and represents an important first step towards efforts to reduce bycatch in commercial fisheries and sound ecosystem management.

Third, the Panama Declaration places greater emphasis on science-based management and conservation of tuna, dolphin, and other marine life in the Eastern Tropical Pacific through provisions that strengthen the existing scientific review process; promotes greater interaction between the scientific

communities of the nations participating in the eastern Pacific tuna fishery; and places greater reliance on scientific data to inform the conservation and management of the fishery and the incidental take of dolphins and marine life in the fishery.

As scientists, we fully support these scientific principles which provide the basis for the Panama Declaration, and believe that they represent a scientifically sound approach to the management of the tuna fishery and conservation of dolphins.

Sincerely,

Ken Norris, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, University of California Santa Cruz.

John H. Prescott, Director Emeritus, New England Aquarium, former Chair, Committee of Scientific Advisors, U.S. Marine Mammal Commission.

Lloyd F. Lowry, Ph.D., Marine Mammal Scientist, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

William E. Evans, Ph.D., President of the Texas Institute of Oceanography, Professor of Wildlife and Fishery of Sciences, Texas A & M University.

David Challinor, Ph.D., Science Advisor National Zoo, Smithsonian Institution.

J. Lawrence Dunn, VMD, Staff Veterinarian, Mystic Marineline Aquarium.

Daniel P. Costa, Ph.D., Professor of Biology, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Dayton L. Alverson, Ph.D., Natural Resource Consultants.

Terry Samansky, Director of Marine Mammals, Marine World Africa USA.

Edwin S. Skoch, Professor of Biology, John Carroll University, Ecotoxicology & Marine Animal Research Lab.

Brad Fenwick, Professor, Kansas State University, College of Veterinary Medicine.

Wendy Blanshard, Veterinarian, Sea World Enterprises, Surfer's Paradise, Australia.

Sarah Lister, DVM, Johns Hopkins University.

Kathryn J. Frost, Ph.D., Marine Mammal Scientist, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Graham Worthy, Ph.D., Professor of Marine Biology, Texas A & M University.

George Woodwell, Ph.D., Past President, Ecological Society of America, Woods Hole Research Center.

David St. Aubin, Ph.D., Researcher, Mystic Marineline Aquarium.

Jeff Boehm, Vice President Research and Veterinarian Services, Shedd Aquarium.

William Y. Brown, Ph.D., Researcher, Hagler Bailly.

Sarah Paynter, Ph.D., Lecturer, Johns Hopkins University and National Aquarium in Baltimore.

Gwen Griffith, DVM, President, Alliance of Veterinarians for the Environment.

Cecile Gaspar, DVM, Dolphin Quest, Moorea-French Polynesia.

Scott Nachbar, DVM, Aquarium of Niagara Falls.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sentiments expressed by my good friend from Maryland concerning the legislation. But I think as a point of observation that I would like to share with the gentleman about the movement of tuna, not only as a migratory fish, but the fact that the way tuna is being caught in the eastern Pacific is quite different than the problems that we face in the western Pacific, the problems we have along the coastlines, the Latin American countries where the tuna tend to come up closer to the dolphins.

I do not know if it is because of the current or the warmth of the water, whatever it is, that causes this difference in how the tuna survives when it moves, quite different than from the way that we catch tuna in the western Pacific.

The fact is that the tuna tends to go lower in depth and so that when we do the purse seining, the dolphins are not as much affected as opposed to the problems we face in the eastern Pacific.

This is the predicament that we find ourselves under. The fact that because of the differences in temperature, whatever it is, that causes the tuna, the eastern Pacific tuna to go up a little closer to the dolphins so we obviously end up with a very difficult problem there, where our friends from Mexico and other countries that have the tendency, when they do catch the tuna under the dolphins, the dolphins definitely are more affected by it as compared to the problems that we have in the western Pacific.

I say to my good friend while I can appreciate his observations of how my forefathers have given a real sense of appreciation not only for the ocean environment, but the fact that here one of the most beautiful mammals in the world that we see and putting them on a sacrificial altar for the name of expediency and saying that tuna is more important than dolphins, I submit to the gentleman from Maryland, I could not disagree with him more on this issue.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I understand the nature of the difference between the way in which tuna and dolphins act in the eastern tropical Pacific. We have reduced the dolphin kill in the eastern tropical Pacific to a little over 3000. We have not reduced the kill of dolphins in the western tropical Pacific where we have no management ability.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. speaker, the Gilchrest approach offers the dolphin a better chance than the alternatives. Let me say that the Studts approach is also in my judgment a good alternative, but this one is much better because we would not be going it alone. Internationally we would be supported by many countries using the approach of WAYNE GILCHREST.

Mr. Speaker, the argument is very simple. If fleets do not receive some reward for their changed behavior soon, they will revert to their old and easier ways of fishing. Dolphin casualties are

going to rise. Under this proposal, we are going to keep international monitoring programs all in effect. This legislation is critical for both the environmental and international communities. I hope my colleagues will support this bill that is fair, is necessary. It is moderate and has broad support.

Mr. Speaker, who can be greener than AL GORE, the Vice President of the United States who supports this bill?

This bill is the next step in the process of minimizing the impact of tuna fishing on dolphin populations in the marine ecosystem. In 1972, over 400,000 dolphins died in tuna nets. Last year that number was just over 3,000. The Saxton-Gilchrest bill, of which I am a cosponsor, locks into a place a 99 percent improvement in environmental protection.

Dolphin protection in international waters cannot be carried out by the United States alone. If we go the alternative route, everyone will say, there goes the United States, on its own again. We have to rely upon commitments of several fishing nations to cooperate with us to protect dolphins. With Mexico we have worked very well on this issue. There is a lot of progress. We cannot risk losing this important international coalition. If we do, the United States runs the risk of never being a leader in dolphin protection. then what would happen would be anarchy and more whaling deaths and there would be a whole upsurge of commercialism rather than environmentalism dictating what we should do.

The changes promoted by this bill will give incentives to make tuna fishing less wasteful of nontarget fish and as safe as ever for dolphins. This bill guarantees through the best observer program in the world that every time a net is deployed only tuna that is truly dolphin safe will receive this label. This dolphin-safe certification would be given to any haul of tuna in which no dolphins were killed or seriously injured.

Although there are reasonable concerns from my colleagues that dolphins will be stressed by this fishing technique, this bill that we are supporting, the Saxton-Gilchrest bill, calls for a study on dolphin stress so that we can finally make some solid conclusions about this issue.

The United States must continue to hold the firm line on compliance with sound fishing. This is why this bill will use the same tough trade measures that push countries to improve their fishing methods in the first place.

It is important that we implement the Panama Declaration to reward the efforts taken by our trading partners. if we fail to implement this agreement, there is reason to fear that our trading partners will return to their old ways of fishing. If this happens, dolphin mortality levels will rise.

This bill again is supported by the Clinton administration, National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense

Fund, World Wildlife Fund, Greenpeace, and 12 nations have agreed to an unprecedented level of marine life protection. I think this is a good bill. It is a good, appropriate step in the interest of sustainable fishing, dolphin protection and the marine ecosystem. I think it has already been stressed that the maritime trade unions of the AFL-CIO support this bill. They have issued a statement.

Mr. Speaker, let us support this bill, but let us say that the approach that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] has proposed I think is a good approach, but not hardly as good as this one that we are pursuing today. Let us give bipartisanship and environmental protection a very strong vote.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to point out that this has been an almost full hour debate on the rule. I think we have come to the conclusion that this is a very good rule and it is going to lead to some very fine debate, when we get to the debate on this subject, which we are all looking forward to.

I am personally pleased that we have made such great progress in dolphin protection. Six years ago, when there was a merchant marine and fisheries committee, there was some disagreement that led to a better solution. Further disagreements have led to better solutions. This shows that democracy works, this Congress works, and I am proud to be part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to House Resolution 489 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2823.

□ 1811

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2823) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for making in order the consideration of this bill, H.R. 2823, which would codify the Panama Declaration. This bill has been the subject of scrutiny by several committees: The Committee on Resources and, of course, our Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the Committee on Commerce.

Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alaska, DON YOUNG, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, GERRY STUDDS, have both expressed their reluctance to reopen the dolphin-safe tuna issue. They remember the rhetorical battle of the merchant marine and fisheries committee on which we all served, and I remember that battle as well.

The Gilchrest bill will lead 12 nations that currently fish in the eastern tropical Pacific or the ETC to a binding agreement to conserve and protect the entire ecosystem, including dolphins.

The alternative is an increase in school and log sets which result in killing sharks, endangered sea turtles, billfish, and baby tunas.

These pictures exemplify what it is that we are trying to protect. We have endangered Olive Ridley turtles. We have sharks. We have wahoo and billfish and, of course, juvenile or baby tuna. These are all species that we are trying to protect pursuant to this act.

Opponents of the Gilchrest bill will make several arguments. First, they will argue that the change in the status quo will lead to the wholesale slaughter of dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific. We will show that that is not true.

□ 1815

Second, Mr. Chairman, opponents of the Gilchrest bill will also argue that the status quo will serve the purpose of saving the dolphins. We believe that is not true. Opponents will also claim that this bill will somehow undermine NAFTA, which we also believe is untrue.

So let me just start with the first issue. The first issue with regard to the Gilchrest bill will be that it is a change in the status quo and it will lead to the wholesale slaughter of dolphins. To me this is a disingenuous argument.

In fact, other nations are currently setting on dolphins; in other words, fishing for tuna under dolphins, in the eastern tropical Pacific, as the regular tuna harvesting method. That is going on today, and there is a large-scale slaughter of dolphins today by other countries.

These fishermen have refined their harvesting techniques so that a sizable reduction, however, in dolphin mortality has resulted from hundreds of thousands of dolphin deaths annually to just about 4,500 dolphin deaths today. Scientists say that this is about 4,500 out of a total of more than 9 million dolphin deaths.

These 11 nations, Belize, Columbia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, France, Hon-

duras, Mexico, Panama, Spain, Vanuatu, and Venezuela have all negotiated with the Clinton administration in good faith to set up the framework for a binding agreement to cap dolphin mortality in the eastern tropical Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, the result of these negotiations is the Panama Declaration, and the enactment of this bill is the enactment of our promises under that declaration. The linchpin to the Panama Declaration, on which neither our State Department nor other nations will compromise, is the change in the dolphin safe definition. Without this change, the Panama Declaration, the international treaty, falls apart and so does our chance for a binding international marine conservation agreement to protect dolphins and other marine life.

The opponents also will argue that the Gilchrest bill, that the status quo will better serve the same purpose. Actually that is false. The status quo will no longer exist if the Panama Declaration is scuttled, and other countries will revert to their old practices.

The current agreement under which these nations, known as the LaJolla Agreement, is 100 percent voluntary on the part of all nations. These nations have shown that they will walk away from the voluntary conservation measures outlined in LaJolla without this agreement.

As a matter of fact, in fairness to the opponents, I delayed the subcommittee markup to ensure that all members had an opportunity to express their concerns and have them addressed. The international community expressed its determined disagreement, and I had to personally spend hours meeting with representatives of Latin American countries who threatened to walk away from this process.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] has an amendment that he will offer at the appropriate time. When we begin debate on the Studts amendment, I will discuss in detail why it will cause the demise of many more dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific, also known as the ETP, than currently occurs.

Third, as I pointed out, the opponents will also suggest that this somehow is related to NAFTA. They will further claim that if this bill is approved, the United States is telling the world that we will weaken our own environmental laws to avoid violating NAFTA. I voted against NAFTA, and I can assure my colleagues that this bill is not related to NAFTA at all. That assertion is way off the mark. We are changing the law, yes; but we are not, we are not in any way, weakening it. We are strengthening it by enticing other countries already setting on dolphins or fishing on dolphins to participate in this binding international agreement that will reduce dolphin mortality even further.

Let me just repeat. A binding agreement will reduce dolphin mortality

even further. Remember the current agreement is voluntary, not binding, and these countries can walk away from it at any time. The NAFTA agreement does not wash, the NAFTA argument does not wash, and neither does the assertion that we are weakening our environmental laws. I cannot fathom how a binding agreement to reduce dolphin mortalities in the ETP can be portrayed as anything, anything but a stunning environmental accomplishment.

At the close of general debate I will be offering a managers amendment that, like the Gilchrest bill, is wholeheartedly supported by the Clinton administration. It is also supported by Green Peace, the American Tuna Owners Association, the Center for Marine Conservation, the Environmental Defense Fund, the World Wildlife Fund, the National Wildlife Federation, the Seafarers International Union, and the American Sportfishing Association.

I will explain the substitute further at that time and urge all Members to do the right thing for all marine creatures in the eastern tropical Pacific and to vote yes.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, in an effort to make concessions to foreign fishing interests, the Clinton administration and other proponents of H.R. 2823 are tampering with the standards set under the authority of one of our most fundamental and successful environmental laws, the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. This bill permits the number of dolphin deaths to actually increase up to 5,000 annually and has no provisions, in my opinion, to enforce this limit or specify how this number should decrease over time. I believe it leaves a gaping loophole, with no limitations on injuring or harassing dolphins so long as there are no observed mortalities.

I think also the American people have the right to know that this bill, in my opinion, has not been subject to proper debate and consideration. I know that my colleague from New Jersey talked about the action that took place in the Committee on Resources, but the bill was not referred to the Committee on Commerce which has in the past considered numerous bills relating to the labeling of tuna. Also, I am skeptical that adequate observer coverage can occur on a set by set basis as proposed by this bill, much less that a single observer could monitor nets that are up to a mile long and a hundred feet deep for potential dolphin fatalities.

Proponents are suggesting that bycatch is an important consideration, and I strongly support the need to address bycatch issues for tuna fishing, but by means other than a shifting of fishing effort to practices which place

dolphins at risk. This bill provides no alternative to dolphin sets with a failure to ensure that bycatch mitigation research is done. Setting on logs and debris under which tuna aggregate will continue as two other major commercial tuna species, the skipjack and big-eye tunas are traditionally caught under logs and debris and are not typically found with dolphins. Setting on dolphins is not a real solution to the bycatch issue, and H.R. 2823 does address this.

This bill is yet another rollback of environmentalist legislation, and the threat this bill poses to dolphins is very real in my opinion.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the author of the bill.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

What I would like to explain to the Members that will be voting here in the next hour or so is that we have a piece of legislation that has been put together in the light of day by numerous interested parties, by the fishermen who want to catch their fair share of fish, by scientists who understand the complexity of the nature of the marine ecosystem, by elected officials in the United States that want to ensure jobs and ensure environmental quality and ensure the sovereignty of the United States. This bill has absolutely nothing to do with reneging on our environmental policies, this bill has nothing to do with violating the label so consumers understand that they are eating dolphin safe tuna.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that puts the best of American together, to join us with 11 other nations to understand the nature of limited resources and a bulging population. This bill understands the nature of trying to get international agreement on sensitive environmental issues. This bill is a first step to understand the nature of complex environmental issues such as global warming that we will have to sit down at the table and find agreements on.

Now the issue here is encirclement, the issue here is encirclement that deals with purse seine nets, and yes, those purse seine nets since the 1950's have killed hundreds and thousands of dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific, and yes, the United States placed an embargo on that type of encirclement, the United States placed a gear restriction so that we would not import tuna where dolphins were killed. But there are still not only dolphins being killed in the pursuit of tuna, there are tens of thousands of sharks as bycatch. There are immature tuna being caught in other methods that will never stand the chance to spawn, and so the tuna population will continue to diminish.

So we have gotten together in the light of day in LaJolla, CA some years ago to try to figure out, we, as intel-

ligent human beings, trying to figure out how we can manage our resources, feed the world and sustain the environmental marine ecosystem for generations to come.

Now a speaker earlier talked about the Polynesians and their values for life, both human and animal, fish species, mammals and so on. Those same values of respecting life on planet Earth are an inherent part of this piece of legislation, and so encircling dolphins the way it used to be, encircling tuna the way it used to be, killed tens of thousands of dolphins.

In this new method, which is not an end-all to this scheme of things, we are not going to adopt this legislation and have this agreement with 12 other countries and not continue to pursue to understand the nature of how to catch tuna without killing one dolphin. We are continuing to study this issue. We encircle the dolphins.

I say to my colleagues, Now imagine a boat with a circle around the back of that boat, and you have encircled the tuna fish that are swimming underneath these dolphins. The boat stops with a licensed observer on board, and then the back of the net drops down. Into that circle, into that net, go members of that tuna boat to chase the dolphins and the other marine mammals out of that net, and the net drops down below the surface of the water. And until all the dolphins are out of the net, that net does not get pulled and the tuna do not get processed on board ship.

This is not a perfect solution. There is no utopia on planet Earth. We must manage our limited resources with the technology that is available to us at this moment, and in my judgment the technology to reduce dolphin deaths, the technology to ensure the honesty of labeling dolphin safe tuna is this legislation.

So I will encourage my colleagues, as painful as it is to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from California, and I very rarely vote against these two gentlemen when it comes to environmental issues, but I would encourage my colleagues to vote against the Miller-Studds amendment and vote for this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, at some point in time in this debate the gentleman from Massachusetts, I know, will be offering an amendment to the pending legislation, and for that reason I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] which will continue the meaningful standard of current Federal law on the use of the dolphin safe label.

Mr. Chairman, it was through a public outcry beginning over a decade ago that Congress responded in 1990 with the dolphin safe label we see on all tuna sold in the United States. Amer-

ican consumers wanted to purchase canned tuna, but they were not willing to do so if it meant killing over 100,000 dolphins per year. It was through a grass roots belief that dolphins should be protected that the dolphin safe label was born.

□ 1830

Throughout this period, Mr. Chairman, Mexican fishermen have wanted to catch tuna by encircling dolphins and selling it to consumers in the United States. The Gilchrest bill would give foreign interests greater access to our markets and remove the incentives to the tuna industry to stay in the United States. That is not good policy for anyone but the foreign fishing fleets and foreign canners.

Mr. Chairman, today, in a misplaced effort to comply with the foreign trade agreement, supporters of this bill propose changing the definition of dolphin-safe so dolphins can be chased and encircled in the catching of tuna, and the tuna can still be sold in the United States under the dolphin-safe label.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation and, quite frankly, even with the Studds amendment, but I do not believe that the bill adequately protects the dolphin stocks. Without the Studds amendment, Mr. Chairman, the consumers will not have that choice because they will not be able to tell dolphin-safe tuna from dolphin-unsafe tuna.

H.R. 2823 is not the solution, Mr. Chairman, to the dolphin issue I would choose, but the Studds amendment is the tolerable option. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Studds amendment when it is brought before the floor for consideration.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] for all his hard work on it, for the thoroughness with which he took this challenging assignment on, for the openness of the process, for the methodical manner in which this final product was developed. WAYNE GILCHREST is a class act.

The choice we face in this debate is between ideological purity and practical impact. The purists want to push an approach to fishing in which no dolphins will ever become entangled in tuna nets. That sounds good, and we would all feel good voting for it, having demonstrated our purity. There is only one problem: that is, the practical impact that vote would have.

If we vote down this bill or amend it, we walk away from an international agreement that has been enormously successful in saving dolphins. Dolphin deaths have dropped from over 400,000 in the 1970's to less than 4,000 last year. The agreement will continue to move

us toward reducing mortality to zero. The agreement would fall apart. Other countries would go back to their old means of fishing, and dolphin mortality would increase again if we voted other than for the Gilchrest bill.

Not only that, bycatch of other species such as sea turtles would increase. So our choice is to vote for this bill and accept a small and declining level of dolphin mortality, or to pretend to purity and cause the death of dolphins and other sea creatures.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST], as one would expect, has taken the moderate approach. It has won the support of even such immoderate groups as Greenpeace.

Some of my friends are for this bill. People ask me, what about your friends? I point out some of my friends are for this bill, and some of my friends are not so enthusiastic. But let me tell the Members about my friends that are for this bill: The National Wildlife Federation, the Environmental Defense Fund, Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, Center for Marine Conservation, our good friends in the maritime trades department of the AFL-CIO, the American Sport Fishing Association, the American Tuna Boat Owners. The Washington Post twice has editorialized in support of this Gilchrest bill, and so has the New York Times and the Houston Chronicle.

Seasoned observers who care deeply about this process have all examined very carefully the Gilchrest proposal, and they have urged us, the Representatives of the American people, to vote for it. I proudly identify with my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST], and I enthusiastically support this bill and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to a couple of things that have been said here. The suggestion is that somehow, if we engage the legislation as it is currently written, that somehow that will lead to a reduction in the dolphin death rate from what we have today. The fact of the matter is the legislation allows for almost a 30 percent increase in dolphin deaths under this bill.

It also does not address and in fact would allow for the first time, under the guise of being dolphin-safe, the harassment, the hunting, capture, and killing, the attempt to harass, hunt, capture, or kill, marine mammals. We would not allow this, and this is not allowed for any other mammal, any other kind of fisheries under the law. But the fact of the matter is that is what happens.

What we do know, and one of the reasons that we have this legislation, is because the encirclement, the harassing, and the stress on the dolphins has taken a toll on them. Yet somehow we condone that, and we suggest that that is in fact dolphin-safe,

when in fact all the scientists agreed when we wrote this law that that was not dolphin-safe. In fact, Greenpeace, which is supporting the Gilchrest approach here, I believe has never changed their position, that there should be an end to the encirclement of dolphins. But in fact, that is sanctioned under this legislation.

My colleagues keep referring to their friends who are supporting this legislation. I would like to point out that the Sierra Club, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Earth Island Institute, the Humane Society of the United States, Friends of the Earth, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the American Humane Association, those organizations that have dedicated their entire existence to the humane treatment of animals, to ending the slaughter of animals, mammals and wildlife, oppose this legislation.

Again, by denigrating the label, by suggesting that these activities will be allowed, that the increased killing of dolphins will be allowed, and somehow trying to present to the same American consumer that has now been making a decision for many, many years that when they buy a can of tuna that is sold in the United States, that in fact the label of dolphin-safe means dolphin-safe, now we are going to pull a trick on them. We are going to pull a trick. We are going to tell them that dolphin-safe means dolphin-safe, but it does not. It means we can encircle, and we can harass, and we can maim, and we can injure, and we can in fact increase the number of dolphins that are killed.

The current system, with all of these bandits out there fishing the way they want, the current system has dramatically reduced the measured kill in dolphins some 95, 97 percent. Yet we are told now under the new regime what we have to do is allow these people to kill more dolphins.

Then we are going to kid the schoolchildren that led the crusade in this country for dolphin-safe tuna, for the consumers, for the packaging companies that complied with this and made a decision, made an investment, we are going to con all of them that now somehow this legislation is really dolphin-safe and better for the dolphins, in spite of the language in the legislation that allows the dolphins to be put under much more stress, to be injured, and to be maimed, in direct contradiction of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

These are exactly the acts that are prohibited and for which these mammals are protected, but in the case of the dolphin, they will no longer have that protection. I am sure my colleagues on the other side, the colleagues supporting this legislation, would not suggest that we do away with that protection for marine mammals. But somehow, because of the insistence of Mexico that they need to do this, and I do not see Mexico volunteer-

ing not to take juvenile tuna in their coastal waters. They did not put that in this agreement. The only thing we put in this agreement is changing how American consumers are going to be able to depend upon a label and what this label means.

My colleagues say we have to change the method in which we fish for dolphins because it has an impact on juvenile tuna. But most of the juvenile tuna is taken within the coastal waters of Mexico, and it is exempt from this agreement.

Our trade negotiators, our State Department, constantly continue to sell the American market cheap. In one agreement after another, we constantly give away the integrity of the market, and, in this case, the integrity of our consumer protection, the integrity of our environmental laws, the integrity of our workplace, the integrity of the jobs for our workers.

Somehow we do not appreciate the real value of this market. The reason they are banging on the door for this agreement, and this is not a treaty, as people on the other side have suggested. This is about an agreement to go forward to negotiations for an agreement. But what we have is America unilaterally agreeing to change its basic consumer protection laws.

Mexico, however, is free to continue to take all the juvenile tuna they want, probably far in excess of anything that will be dealt with by the current system. So I would just hope that our colleagues would understand that there are a lot of suggestions about what this bill will do, but the language of the bill itself simply is contradictory to those representations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I love the dolphin. I am privileged to, when I go home in Florida, wake up every morning and watch the dolphin frolic in my front yard. Fortunately, commercial fishing in my area of the world does not include the capture or the harassment of dolphin, so maybe I should stay out of this fight.

But I do love the species, and I think it is important that we begin to get an international agreement on the preservation of that species. I wish there were a perfect way to solve this problem, but there is not. I think the Gilchrest bill is a realistic bill and does the proper type of conservation of this particular species.

There is, as I say, with the technology that we have now and the knowledge that we have now, and the fact that we do not have an international agreement on the preservation of the dolphin, it leads me to believe that the Gilchrest bill goes in the right direction. Quite often we strike out in our attempts to do good by taking unilateral action. I believe we can do even better if we take international

action, because these are international waters we are dealing with. This is a migratory species that moves about quite rapidly.

I think, attacking this conservation matter, and the fact that such people as Greenpeace, whose credentials are beyond dispute as far as the species is concerned, are endorsing it, I think it is the wisest action to take. I say that, having great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and their position. But I find that it is best in my judgment to go for the Gilchrest proposal.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, why support this bill? First of all, the United States has fallen under an encumbrance of having to have observers on a boat. This is in light of they have actually reduced the number of thousands of dolphins killed down to 4,000. My colleague, the gentleman from California, says first of all the number increased 20 percent. Then just a minute ago he said it increased 30 percent, which we need to know what it is. I can tell the Members what it is. It goes from 4,000 to 5,000. Let me tell the Members why.

Currently, currently the other nations that are involved or have the restrictions on them can go out and kill thousands of dolphin at will. But because of this agreement, the Panama Agreement, they fall under the same umbrella that we do. Fishermen have gone down to 4,000. Dolphin-safe does not have to be dolphin-safe under this current law.

Under this bill, we will know that 100 percent of the tuna under as dolphin-safe label will be dolphin-safe, because every single boat will have an observer, not just U.S. boats, but all 12 of the other nations. Why would my friends oppose that? The gentleman from New York, Mr. SHERRY BOEHLERT, called it "ideological purity." We have some of those on our side. I recognize that. I think both groups need to moderate their positions.

□ 1845

I think that has been done by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], people that are known for their environmental record, and on your side as well, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

I do not apply any motive to this. I think the gentleman has a purely intensive feeling about his support of his own amendment.

Let us take a look at the groups that support this. Earth Island. They have made millions of dollars managing the dolphin-safe label, managing the dolphin-safe label from Starkist.

Fact. Earth Island, who makes millions of dollars from this, is generating

fundraising dollars for their efforts. It is an economical issue for them. But yet on the other side we have the Vice President of the United States; AL GORE, who is your champion for the environment. If we have any radical group on our side, it is the AFL-CIO. They endorse this. But on the other side we have the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], and many others who normally vote with a green vote. Because they feel that this is an honest effort to protect a resource that under the current conditions, you catch turtles because you fish for immature tuna, and you catch swordfish and the rest of it, and all that bycatch is wasted; killed. This method prevents that. It also saves the resource for future generations. That is why the President and AL GORE and many Members on your side of the aisle support this bill, as well as on our side.

I would ask the gentleman in good faith, and I think he knows I am sincere in this. I truly believe that this will save dolphins. I think it will help our fishermen. I think it will move Mexico in not just this but in other ways. Already Mexico has worked very closely with us on our sports fishermen's rights and moved in that generation. Unless we adopt international agreements and enforce them, and I will work with the gentleman to make sure that these are enforced, then I think that we have slipped backwards.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, just to say that the AFL-CIO does not support this legislation. We just spoke to them.

We have member unions of the AFL-CIO that support this legislation and we in fact have members of the AFL-CIO that support our version, the Studds amendment, of that same legislation. We just got off the phone to their representative. We both have constituents, just as you have environmental organizations on both sides.

The point is that these same nations that are now making this threat in fact today are not going out and killing tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of dolphins, but they are threatening to. They are threatening to go out and act in a completely irresponsible fashion unless the U.S. Congress goes along with this attempt to get us to dupe the American consumers about the nature of the dolphin-safe label and the tuna which they buy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. I believe its enactment is necessary if we are going to continue to make progress in reducing dolphin mortality associated with fishing for tuna.

I, like many of my colleagues, always have cause to pause for a moment be-

fore challenging the position of my friends and colleagues from Massachusetts and California on an issue like this. Certainly it is disconcerting to have words like "conned" and "duped" thrown into the debate. I think everybody here is in agreement about our basic objective, which is reducing dolphin mortality. It is evident that opinions are divided about how to pursue that objective, and so there is a division of opinion about this bill.

I respect those that question the bill's approach, because I know that what they are primarily seeking here is what I am seeking, and that is reducing to the minimum, as efficiently as we can, the deaths of dolphins. We all remember the horrifying pictures of dolphins dying in fishermen's nets. That brought the public clamor that got us the very major progress that we have made to date in this issue.

The improvement that has been made is largely the result of the La Jolla Agreement. That agreement has brought much reduction in dolphin mortality. But last year, as has been discussed, a dozen tuna fishing nations, including the United States, met to try to build on that agreement and put together a binding international agreement to replace the strictly voluntary La Jolla Agreement.

The result of those talks was the framework agreement known as the Panama Declaration. It is the purpose of this bill to implement that agreement in order to strengthen international conservation programs and set the stage for a further reduction in dolphin mortality. We need to support this legislation in order to be able to keep that international cohesion together in support of a goal that I think all Members share.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. I believe that its enactment is necessary if we are to continue to make progress in reducing dolphin mortality associated with fishing for tuna.

I think everyone here agrees that further reducing dolphin mortality should be the goal. But it's evident that opinions are divided about how we should pursue that objective—and as a result there are divisions of opinion about this bill. I respect those who have questions about this bill's approach, because I think that what's primarily involved here is an honest difference of opinion over the specific legislation, not a fundamental difference over its objectives.

We all remember the horrifying images of dolphins dying in fishermen's nets. Those scenes rightly brought a public clamor for urgent action. And, since then we've made real progress. In fact, dolphin mortality in the eastern tropical Pacific has been cut by better than 90 percent.

This improvement is to a large extent the result of an informal, voluntary agreement—known as the La Jolla Agreement—among countries whose nationals fish in the eastern Pacific.

However, while this agreement has brought much improvement, more attention has gone to the U.S. law setting criteria for labeling tuna as "dolphin safe"—criteria based on fishing practices rather than on dolphin mortality.

Last year, a dozen tuna-fishing nations—including the United States—met in Panama to develop a binding international agreement to replace the strictly voluntary La Jolla Agreement. The result of those talks is a new framework agreement, known as the Panama Declaration. The purpose of this bill is to implement that declaration, in order to strengthen international conservation programs and to set the stage for further reducing dolphin mortality.

As we consider this legislation, we should keep in mind what the Panama Declaration provides, because it goes beyond previous agreements in several important ways.

Under the Panama Declaration, there would for the first time be a firm, binding international commitment to the goal of completely eliminating dolphin loss resulting from tuna fishing in the eastern Pacific Ocean. In addition, the declaration would provide new, effective protection for individual dolphin species—biologically-based mortality caps that will provide important new safeguards for the most depleted dolphin populations. And the Panama declaration provides for the world's strongest dolphin monitoring program, with independent observers on every fishing boat.

Implementation of the Panama Declaration depends upon the changes in U.S. law that would be made by this bill. Among other things, these changes will lift restrictions on access to our markets for tuna caught in compliance with the new agreement, including revision of the standard for use of the "dolphin safe" label. That change in the "dolphin safe" label seems to be the most controversial part of the bill, but it is an essential part and should be approved.

Remember, under the current law that a "dolphin safe" label on a can of tuna doesn't necessarily mean that no dolphins died in connection with the catch of the fish. Instead, it simply means that the fishermen did not use a school of dolphins as their guide for setting their nets. If that condition is met, the "dolphin safe" label can be applied even if dolphin mortality in fact has occurred. By contrast, under the Panama Declaration—as implemented by H.R. 2823—the term "dolphin safe" may not be used for any tuna caught in the eastern Pacific Ocean by a purse seine vessel in a set in which a dolphin mortality occurred—as documented by impartial, independent observers.

In other words, it's not true that this bill would destroy the meaning of the "dolphin safe" label—it would make its meaning more specific and more accurate, by imposing a no-mortality standard, while providing for further study of the effects of dolphin-encirclement and a mechanism to again stop that fishing technique if it's determined to have an adverse impact on dolphins. I think this is a desirable change in the law.

Furthermore, fishing can't be truly "dolphin safe" unless it's safe for the ecosystem. Because it focuses on fishing methods, not dolphin mortality, the current labeling law has had serious unintended consequences. Some of the "dolphin safe" methods tend to result in a catch of primarily juvenile tuna—harmful to the viability of the fishery—or result in numerous catches of other species such as endangered sea turtles or billfish.

In fact, it well may be better for the ocean ecosystem for tuna fishermen to set their nets on dolphins and then to release the dolphins safely when the tuna are harvested—something that is strongly discouraged by the current labelling standard.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, one that represents a win-win situation for all. It's supported by the administration and the U.S. fishing industry as well as by environmental and conservation groups, including the National Wildlife Federation, the World Wildlife Fund, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Center for Marine Conservation, and Greenpeace. It deserves the support of the House.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, sponsored by Mr. GILCREST. This bill is vital to the protection of dolphins, sharks, endangered sea turtles, and other creatures of our marine ecosystem.

This bill is supported by such well-known environmental advocates as Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, the Center for Marine Conservation, and the Environmental Defense Fund.

H.R. 2823 is better for dolphins because it locks into place binding international legal protections for dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific [ETP]. Currently, dolphin protection in the ETP is voluntary. Many nations seek to protect dolphins in order to sell tuna in the U.S. market.

The nations that fish for tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific have developed new fishing methods to reduce dolphin mortality. As a result of these efforts, dolphin mortality has dropped from 125,000 in 1991 to 3,300 last year, just 0.2 percent of the population. This is a level more than four times lower than that recommended by the National Research Council to allow recovery of dolphins. This bill sets aggressive mortality limits, with the goal of reducing dolphin mortality to zero.

Under the Gilchrest bill the "dolphin safe" definition is based on actual dolphin mortality. If a dolphin dies as a result of harvesting tuna, then that tuna will not be permitted into the United States and onto our shelves. Currently, despite the label on cans of tuna that it is dolphin safe, there has been shown to be some dolphin mortality in even log and school sets of tuna harvests. H.R. 2823 assures consumers that no dolphins died in the catch of labeled tuna.

Despite the current embargo, existing law has been ineffective in changing fishing practices of foreign fleets in the ETP; in fact, approximately 50 percent of sets by the foreign fleet are on dolphin schools despite the embargo.

H.R. 2823 implements the Panama Declaration, and international agreement to reduce dolphin mortality in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean and to be bound by the conservation and management measures enacted by the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission [IATTC]. Without the Gilchrest bill the signers to the Panama Declaration will walk away from the agreement and we will risk all protections of dolphin throughout the region.

A vote for this bill is a vote for the marine environment. The Gilchrest bill contains tough provisions that require tuna fishermen to protect dolphins, sea turtles, sharks, and bill fish. Under current methods of fishing, hundreds of endangered sea turtles and thousands of sharks die every year. The Gilchrest bill provides for protections of these species while simultaneously strengthening international dolphin protections.

This bill is supported by the administration, Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, the Center

for Marine Conservation, and the Environmental Defense Fund. While important environmental advocates like the Sierra Club and the Humane Society oppose this legislation, I feel this bill is a good compromise in protecting dolphins, sea turtles, and sharks throughout the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2823 and vote to protect dolphins in the ETP. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, last year the United Nations adopted a new treaty to assure the conservation of fish caught in international waters, known as the Agreement on the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

This new treaty, which was recently ratified by Congress with bipartisan support, seeks to reverse the depletion of fish and other marine life that has resulted from unsustainable fishing practices and the lack of effective international management.

The need for this new treaty is painfully obvious. Many of our most important fisheries have been depleted, undermining the economic well-being of coastal communities worldwide. Similarly, the wasteful bycatch of marine life in many fisheries poses a major threat to biodiversity.

The legislation we are debating today, H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, and the Panama Agreement upon which it is premised, represents the most far-reaching attempt to date to implement the conservation mandates of the new treaty. If enacted by Congress, it will create a model for the management of high seas fisheries around the world.

H.R. 2823 advances several of the new, important conservation objectives of the U.N. treaty. For example, like the U.N. treaty, it prevents overfishing by requiring the establishment of catch limits based on a precautionary approach. Like the U.N. treaty, it also requires steps to minimize the wasteful by catch of all forms of marine wildlife. Like the U.N. treaty, it assures transparency in the management of fisheries in the eastern Pacific, so that all interested stakeholders can effectively participate in the management process; and like the U.N. treaty, it secures international cooperation in the conservation of marine resources.

H.R. 2823 recognizes that unilateral measures alone cannot succeed in conserving fisheries that are prosecuted in international waters. It builds upon the recent, important work by the United Nations aimed at the sustainable management of world fisheries.

H.R. 2823 is our best hope of assuring healthy fisheries as well as dolphin protection in the eastern Pacific Ocean. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 2823. This is a unique opportunity to approve legislation that would put us in compliance with our international obligations, use multilateral standards for the imposition of sanctions instead of unilateral standards that violate the GATT, and meet our environmental concerns over dolphin mortality.

This bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee to address its trade aspects. We reported it out as approved by the Resources Committee, without further amendment.

I support the bill because it would replace the current use of United States unilateral

standards as a trigger for an import ban of tuna caught with purse seine nets with multilateral standards agreed to as part of the Panama Declaration. If countries are in compliance with the multilateral standard for the fishing of yellowfin tuna, then the import ban would not apply.

Any use of unilateral standards for the imposition of sanctions is troubling. In fact, a GATT panel has found our current law to violate our international obligations. Instead, enforcement actions are most effective when they are based on international consensus, as this bill would establish. Such consensus is more constructive to effective management of the ETP tuna fishery by all countries concerned. I believe that these standards will serve as a positive incentive to reduce dolphin mortality, while, at the same time, putting the United States in compliance with international agreements.

The Studds amendment, however, would put the Panama Declaration at risk and would threaten all we have achieved. Adoption of this language would invite a serious challenge under the WTO and would discourage our trading partners from adopting more environmentally sound fishing methods. Far from achieving increased protection for dolphins, the amendment would undo the progress we have already made.

Proof of the benefits of H.R. 2823, without the Studds amendment, is the fact that this legislation is supported by the administration and key environmental groups such as the National Wildlife Federation, the Center for Marine Conservation, the Environmental Defense Fund, Greenpeace, and the World Wildlife Fund. In addition, our tuna fishing industry supports the bill, and our trading partners have indicated that they believe implementation of the bill would put us in compliance with our international obligations. With such a strong and diverse coalition behind this bill, we should strongly support this bill.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act. Among other things, this legislation implements the Declaration of Panama, agreed to by a dozen different nations, including the United States. As a strong proponent of free and fair trade, I think this represents a good example of how we can work together with out trading partners to achieve our shared goal of preserving the Earth's precious resources.

H.R. 2823 includes several provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2823 provides for implementation of the declaration in an effort to increase international participation in activities to reduce the number of dolphins and other marine mammals that die each year as a result of tuna fishing techniques. This bill would also modify the definition of "dolphin safe" for the purpose of labeling tuna products sold in the United States, and alter current regulations on the importation of tuna products. Also, the bill would make misuse of the "dolphin safe" label an unfair and deceptive trade practice under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

In short, this legislation will help the United States achieve its environmental goals by implementing a reasonable agreement reached by the United States and its trading partners. It is supported by Republicans and Democrats alike, some environmental groups, and the Clinton administration. I would also like to take

this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for his support and willingness to work with the Commerce Committee to expedite consideration of this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, we are here today to make a decision on an issue of great importance first and foremost to our marine environment, but also to the process by which we will craft the environmental and public health policies of the future. We have a choice between the status quo, which would focus solely on one issue at the expense of others which are equally important, and a comprehensive, forward-looking agreement which will carry strong dolphin and marine protection policies well into the next century. If we are truly interested in progressive, outcome-based environmental policy, then H.R. 2823 must serve as a cornerstone of that policy foundation.

Over the last decade, great strides have been made in reducing dolphin mortality rates in the eastern tropical Pacific [ETP], as a result of improved and innovative tuna fishing methods pioneered by the U.S. tuna fleet, and stepped-up levels of on-vessel observer monitoring. These improvements were reflected in the landmark La Jolla Agreement of 1992, a voluntary resolution entered into by a number of tuna fishing nations, including the United States, Mexico, and several Latin American countries. This agreement established strict and declining levels of annual dolphin mortality rates, requiring that an annual overall rate of less than 5,000 be achieved by 1999, which is less than 0.1 percent of the estimated total dolphin population. This program has been so effective that it has already achieved a rate of below 4,000 annually, which is considered by scientists to be below levels of biological significance. I have an article that elaborates further on this point, Mr. Chairman, which I would ask to be entered into the RECORD along with my statement, but I would like to read one passage from it at this point. These remarks come from Dr. James Joseph, who is the director of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission [IATTC]:

Joseph said the dolphin mortality rate is now so low that it cannot affect the survival of any of the dolphin species. "The dolphins increase at a rate of from 2.5% to 3.5% per year. The mortality for every (dolphin) stock is less than one-tenth of 1 percent," he said. In other words, a great many more young dolphins are born and survive each year than die in tuna nets. There are about 9.5 million dolphins in Eastern Pacific populations in all, and none of their several species—including common, spinner, and spotted—is endangered. "We continue to take the approach that we can bring it (dolphin mortality) lower, and we continue to work in that direction. It is essential that we keep all of the countries involved in the fishery cooperating in our program," Joseph said.

The La Jolla Agreement also required that observers be posted on each licensed vessel, which were each assigned strict dolphin mortality limits [DML]. To date, the signatories have continued to operate in good faith to protect dolphin in the course of harvesting tuna under this nonbinding agreement; however, some nations had openly considered dropping out of the La Jolla Agreement and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, its umbrella organization, because despite the advances made in reducing dolphin mortality

rates, U.S. law had not been changed to lift the existing embargoes on tuna imported into the United States. However, H.R. 2823, if enacted, would provide the incentives for these other fishing nations to want to remain involved in the IATTC and continue to fish for tuna in a dolphin-sensitive fashion, rather than "leaving the table" and reverting to older and more dolphin-unsafe fishing methods.

In addition to this threat of retreat from vastly improved dolphin protection practices, biological problems of significant dimensions have arisen as a result of alternative "nondolphin" fishing methods now in use due to the existing restrictions to setting tuna nets "on dolphin". Such methods include setting nets around tuna attracted to floating objects—log fishing—or around free-swimming schools of fish—school fishing. While these methods do reduce direct contact with dolphin, they create other problems. Studies indicate that up to 25 percent of volume of these harvest methods is "bycatch" of other species, including high volumes of sharks, billfish, and other pelagics, endangered sea turtles, and immature tuna. These young tuna are not market-ready, and are largely dead by the time they are returned to the sea. This wasteful depletion of juvenile tuna poses a serious threat to maintaining healthy, long-term populations of yellowfin tuna, in addition to stressing the populations of these other sensitive species.

Conversely, setting tuna nets "on dolphin" creates little bycatch other than the dolphin themselves. While this was problematic—and lethal—for dolphin in past years, recent improvements in tuna harvest methods, such as the "backing down" procedure, in which the edge of the nets are allowed to swim below the surface, affording dolphins the opportunity to leave the net, have served to greatly minimize the threat to dolphin. In addition, small boats and a number of divers are often deployed within the net to assist dolphin out of danger.

However, the problem of bycatch underscores a policy dilemma, as to how best to manage our marine resources on an "ecosystem" basis, rather than channeling all our energy and resources into "single population" strategies. While it is clearly essential that we continue to work to reduce dolphin mortality rates toward zero, this cannot and should not occur at the expense of other parts of our ocean biosystem. Fortunately, in H.R. 2823, we have a long-term solution before us today which will resolve the challenges, both environmental and economic, which we now face.

In October 1995, 12 nations, including the United States, met in Panama to craft a binding international agreement to protect dolphin and other species in the eastern tropical Pacific. Five major environmental organizations were instrumental in developing this agreement, which been dubbed the Panama Declaration. The declaration will establish a permanent mortality limit, with the goal of zero dolphin mortality in that fishery. It will set mortality caps for individual species of dolphin, and provide for individual vessel accountability by establishing strict per vessel mortality caps. Just as important, the Panama Declaration provides greater study of and protection for other now at risk from "bycatch", and increase internationally enforceable monitoring systems to ensure compliance by participating nations who wish to fish in the ETP.

The Panama Declaration, which will be codified into law by enactment of H.R. 2823, creates a binding and enforceable process to ensure continued declining rates of dolphin mortality, while for the first time adopting an "ecosystem-based" approach to ocean resource management. While there is absolutely no question that dolphin populations must and will continue to be protected and strengthened under the progressive strategies of this legislation, we can no longer ignore the potentially harmful problems which have been inadvertently created by our existing "dolphin-safe" policies. The Panama Declaration, in the form of H.R. 2823, should be codified into law, in order to ensure that we manage our marine resources to protect all species, in a sound and science-based manner. We must reject efforts, however well-intended, to reinforce the status quo, and move swiftly to enact the provisions of this legislation. H.R. 2823, which I have cosponsored along with a great number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, is the vehicle to achieve this, and I would urge all my colleagues to lend their support to this progressive measure.

This is more than sound ocean resources management. It is a blueprint for how we should proceed on future environmental strategy matters. This is an opportunity for us to move beyond the outdated "single species" approach of years past, and embrace more comprehensive, inclusive, and effective multi-species conservation management style. We have to be able to see the whole picture, and assemble our strategies accordingly. The increased loss of other marine life and sensitive species to "bycatch" under existing law has to date been largely overlooked, and is a looming biological threat which certainly merits the same levels of concern and proper scientific attention as has our dolphin population.

These unintended consequences are indeed troubling, and will be comprehensively addressed by the Panama Declaration and H.R. 2823. We have created the technology and the incentives to keep dolphin mortality at insignificant and declining levels, which will be reinforced and locked in by H.R. 2823. However, protection for the dolphin is not the "end of the story" for conserving our ocean environment. It is also not the end of our responsibilities. As we have done with other strategies, we must take a comprehensive approach to marine conservation as well, in order to identify and understand these threats, and take action on them before they reach a crisis point.

If we are truly interested in progressive, outcome-based environmental policy, guided by science, then we should embrace this bipartisan proposal, which is supported by the U.S. tuna fleet, the Clinton administration, and a number of major environmental groups. As we move into the next century, we should lead with an environmental strategy which reflects the level of scientific knowledge we have now, not what we knew 15 or 20 years ago. This bill keeps dolphins safe, and will help us avoid future problems with marine conservation. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Act of 1996.

[From the San Diego Union Tribune, June 7, 1996]

SCIENTIST HAILED FOR SAVING DOLPHINS
(By Steve La Rue)

Dolphin deaths in tuna fishing nets have declined by about 98 percent since 1986 in the

Eastern Pacific Ocean, and a San Diego marine scientist will get a large share of the credit tonight when he receives San Diego Oceans Foundation's highest award.

The annual Roger Revelle Perpetual Award will be presented to James Joseph, director of the La Jolla-based Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission since 1969.

With Joseph at the helm, the eight-nation commission has mounted a sustained effort to reduce drowning deaths of dolphins in tuna fishing nets. Its success could help unlock a decades-old environmental dispute and end a U.S. embargo on tuna caught by boats from Mexico and other countries that look for the popular fish under dolphin schools.

Large tuna often swim under schools of dolphins in the Eastern Pacific Ocean for reasons that are not entirely understood. Fishing boats historically have encircled these surface-swimming schools with their nets, cinched the nets shut at the bottom, then reeled in their catch.

Air-breathing dolphins drowned in vast numbers, because they were snared in the nets and dragged under water. An estimated 133,174 dolphins died this way in 1986, but the total fell to an estimated 3,274 last year, according to the commission.

The decline has come through a variety of measures, including placement of observers on every tuna boat in the Eastern Pacific, newer equipment for some boats, better training of tuna crews and captains, special attention to individual boats with high-dolphin kills and other measures.

Joseph said the dolphin mortality level is now so low that it cannot affect the survival of any of the dolphin species.

The dolphins increase at a rate of from 2.5 to 3.5 percent per year. The mortality for every (dolphin) stock as a percentage of every stock is less than one-tenth of 1 percent," he said.

In other words, a great deal more young dolphins are born and survive each year than die in tuna nets. There are about 9.5 million dolphins in Eastern Pacific populations in all, and none of their several species—including common, spinner and spotted dolphins—is endangered.

"We continue to take the approach that we can bring it lower, and we continue to work in that direction. It is essential that we keep all of the countries involved in this fishery cooperating in our program," Joseph said.

Commission members include Costa Rica, France, Nicaragua, Panama, the United States; the Pacific island-nation of Vanuatu and Venezuela.

Frank Powell, executive director of Hubbs-Sea World Research Institute and last year's award winner, praised Joseph in a prepared statement as "A first-class biologist who has devoted his entire career to the ocean. He has been instrumental in reducing the number of dolphin fatalities related to tuna fishing."

The award—a wood sculpture of a garibaldi fish that remains in Scripps Bank's La Jolla office—will be present tonight at the San Diego Oceans Foundation benefit dinner.

The foundation is a volunteer organization committed to preserving San Diego's bays and ocean waters. The Roger Revelle Perpetual Award is named for the late scientist who was founder of UCSD and director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Lowering the dolphin kill also was a prelude to the introduction of proposed federal legislation to allow tuna caught by setting nets around dolphin schools to be sold in the United States as "dolphin-safe"—but only if the commission's on-board observers certify that no dolphins were killed.

Under current law, no tuna can be sold as "dolphin-safe" in this country if they are

caught by setting nets around dolphin schools.

The issue also has split environmental groups. Greenpeace, the Center for Marine Conservation, the Environmental Defense Fund, and the National Wildlife Federation support the proposed law. The Earth Island Institute, the Sierra Club, the Human Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals oppose it.

Because of the current law and other factors, the U.S. tuna fishing fleet, which once numbered 110 vessels and was prominent in San Diego, has shrunk to 40 vessels operating in the Western Pacific and 10 in the Eastern Pacific.

The Earth Island Institute said in a statement that the legislation would allow "Foreign tuna stained by the blood of dolphins to be sold on U.S. supermarket shelves" and allow "chasing, harassing, injuring, and encircling dolphins as long as no dolphins were 'observed' being killed outright."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as No. 1 is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2823

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "International Dolphin Conservation Program Act".

(b) REFERENCES TO MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.).

SEC. 2. PURPOSE AND FINDINGS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to give effect to the Declaration of Panama, signed October 4, 1995, by the Governments of Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, France, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Spain, the United States of America, Vanuatu, and Venezuela, including the establishment of the International Dolphin Conservation Program, relating to the protection of dolphins and other species, and the conservation and management of tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean;

(2) to recognize that nations fishing for tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean have achieved significant reductions in dolphin mortality associated with that fishery; and

(3) to eliminate the ban on imports of tuna from those nations that are in compliance with the International Dolphin Conservation Program.

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The nations that fish for tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean have achieved

significant reductions in dolphin mortalities associated with the purse seine fishery from hundreds of thousands annually to fewer than 5,000 annually.

(2) The provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 that impose a ban on imports from nations that fish for tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean have served as an incentive to reduce dolphin mortalities.

(3) Tuna cannerys and processors of the United States have led the canning and processing industry in promoting a dolphin-safe tuna market.

(4) 12 signatory nations to the Declaration of Panama, including the United States, agreed under that Declaration to require that the total annual dolphin mortality in the purse seine fishery for yellowfin tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean not exceed 5,000, with a commitment and objective to progressively reduce dolphin mortality to a level approaching zero through the setting of annual limits.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(28) The term 'International Dolphin Conservation Program' means the international program established by the agreement signed in La Jolla, California, in June 1992, as formalized, modified, and enhanced in accordance with the Declaration of Panama, that requires—

"(A) that the total annual dolphin mortality in the purse seine fishery for yellowfin tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean not exceed 5,000, with the commitment and objective to progressively reduce dolphin mortality to levels approaching zero through the setting of annual limits;

"(B) the establishment of a per-stock per-year mortality limit for dolphins, for each year through the year 2000, of between 0.2 percent and 0.1 percent of the minimum population estimate;

"(C) beginning with the year 2001, that the per-stock per-year mortality of dolphin not exceed 0.1 percent of the minimum population estimate;

"(D) that if the mortality limit set forth in subparagraph (A) is exceeded, all sets on dolphins shall cease for the fishing year concerned;

"(E) that if the mortality limit set forth in subparagraph (B) or (C) is exceeded sets on such stock and any mixed schools containing members of such stock shall cease for that fishing year;

"(F) in the case of subparagraph (B), to conduct a scientific review and assessment in 1998 of progress toward the year 2000 objective and consider recommendations as appropriate; and

"(G) in the case of subparagraph (C), to conduct a scientific review and assessment regarding that stock or those stocks and consider further recommendations;

"(H) the establishment of a per-vessel maximum annual dolphin mortality limit consistent with the established per-year mortality caps; and

"(I) the provision of a system of incentives to vessel captains to continue to reduce dolphin mortality, with the goal of eliminating dolphin mortality.

"(29) The term 'Declaration of Panama' means the declaration signed in Panama City, Republic of Panama, on October 4, 1995."

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR INCIDENTAL TAKING.—Section 101(a)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(2)) is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after the first sentence "Such authorizations may also be granted

under title III with respect to the yellowfin tuna fishery of the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, subject to regulations prescribed under that title by the Secretary without regard to section 103."

(2) By striking the semicolon in the second sentence and all that follows through "practicable".

(b) DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE.—Section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 1371(a)) is amended by striking so much of paragraph (2) as follows subparagraph (A) and as precedes subparagraph (C) and inserting:

"(B) in the case of yellowfin tuna harvested with purse seine nets in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and products therefrom, to be exported to the United States, shall require that the government of the exporting nation provide documentary evidence that—

"(i) the tuna or products therefrom were not banned from importation under this paragraph before the effective date of the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act;

"(ii) the tuna or products therefrom were harvested after the effective date of the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act by vessels of a nation which participates in the International Dolphin Conservation Program, such harvesting nation is either a member of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission or has initiated (and within 6 months thereafter completed) all steps (in accordance with article V, paragraph 3 of the Convention establishing the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission) necessary to become a member of that organization;

"(iii) such nation is meeting the obligations of the International Dolphin Conservation Program and the obligations of membership in the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, including all financial obligations;

"(iv) the total dolphin mortality permitted under the International Dolphin Conservation Program will not exceed 5,000 in 1996, or in any year thereafter, consistent with the commitment and objective of progressively reducing dolphin mortality to levels approaching zero through the setting of annual limits and the goal of eliminating dolphin mortality; and

"(v) the tuna or products therefrom were harvested after the effective date of the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act by vessels of a nation which participates in the International Dolphin Conservation Program, and such harvesting nation has not vetoed the participation by any other nation in such Program."

(c) ACCEPTANCE OF EVIDENCE COVERAGE.—Section 101 (16 U.S.C. 1371) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(d) ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE.—The Secretary shall not accept documentary evidence referred to in section 101(a)(2)(B) as satisfactory proof for purposes of section 101(a)(2) if—

"(1) the government of the harvesting nation does not provide directly or authorize the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission to release complete and accurate information to the Secretary to allow a determination of compliance with the International Dolphin Conservation Program;

"(2) the government of the harvesting nation does not provide directly or authorize the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission to release complete and accurate information to the Secretary in a timely manner for the purposes of tracking and verifying compliance with the minimum requirements established by the Secretary in regulations promulgated under subsection (f) of the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385(f)); or

"(3) after taking into consideration this information, findings of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and any other relevant information, including information that a nation is consistently failing to take enforcement actions on violations which diminish the effectiveness of the International Dolphin Conservation Program, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, finds that the harvesting nation is not in compliance with the International Dolphin Conservation Program.

"(e) EXEMPTION.—The provisions of this Act shall not apply to a citizen of the United States who incidentally takes any marine mammal during fishing operations outside the United States exclusive economic zone (as defined in section 3(6) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(6))) when employed on a foreign fishing vessel of a harvesting nation which is in compliance with the International Dolphin Conservation Program."

(d) ANNUAL PERMITS.—Section 104(h) is amended to read as follows:

"(h) ANNUAL PERMITS.—(1) Consistent with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 103 and the requirements of section 101, the Secretary may issue an annual permit to a United States vessel for the taking of such marine mammals, and shall issue regulations to cover the use of any such annual permits.

"(2) Annual permits described in paragraph (1) for the incidental taking of marine mammals in the course of commercial purse seine fishing for yellowfin tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean shall be governed by section 304, subject to the regulations issued pursuant to section 302."

(e) REVISIONS AND FUNDING SOURCES.—Section 108(a)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1378(a)(2)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A).

(2) By adding at the end the following:

"(C) discussions to expeditiously negotiate revisions to the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (1 UST 230, TIAS 2044) which will incorporate conservation and management provisions agreed to by the nations which have signed the Declaration of Panama;

"(D) a revised schedule of annual contributions to the expenses of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission that is equitable to participating nations; and

"(E) discussions with those countries participating or likely to participate in the International Dolphin Conservation Program, to identify alternative sources of funds to ensure that needed research and other measures benefiting effective protection of dolphins, other marine species, and the marine ecosystem;"

(f) REPEAL OF NAS REVIEW.—Section 110 (16 U.S.C. 1380) is amended as follows:

(1) By redesignating subsection (a)(1) as subsection (a).

(2) By striking subsection (a)(2).

(g) LABELING OF TUNA PRODUCTS.—Paragraph (1) of section 901(d) of the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) It is a violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act for any producer, importer, exporter, distributor, or seller of any tuna product that is exported from or offered for sale in the United States to include on the label of that product the term 'Dolphin Safe' or any other term or symbol that falsely claims or suggests that the tuna contained in the product was harvested using a method of fishing that is not harmful to dolphins if the product contains any of the following:

"(A) Tuna harvested on the high seas by a vessel engaged in driftnet fishing.

"(B) Tuna harvested in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean by a vessel using purse seine nets unless the tuna is considered dolphin safe under paragraph (2).

"(C) Tuna harvested outside the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean by a vessel using purse seine nets unless the tuna is considered dolphin safe under paragraph (3).

"(D) Tuna harvested by a vessel engaged in any fishery identified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4) as having a regular and significant incidental mortality of marine mammals."

(h) DOLPHIN SAFE TUNA.—(1) Paragraph (2) of section 901(d) of the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a tuna product that contains tuna harvested in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean by a vessel using purse seine nets is dolphin safe if the vessel is of a type and size that the Secretary has determined, consistent with the International Dolphin Conservation Program, is not capable of deploying its purse seine nets on or to encircle dolphins, or if the product meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

"(B) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a tuna product that contains tuna harvested in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean by a vessel using purse seine nets is dolphin safe if the product is accompanied by a written statement executed by the captain of the vessel which harvested the tuna certifying that no dolphins were killed during the sets in which the tuna were caught and the product is accompanied by a written statement executed by—

"(i) the Secretary or the Secretary's designee;

"(ii) a representative of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission; or

"(iii) an authorized representative of a participating nation whose national program meets the requirements of the International Dolphin Conservation Program,

which states that there was an observer approved by the International Dolphin Conservation Program on board the vessel during the entire trip and documents that no dolphins were killed during the sets in which the tuna concerned were caught.

"(C) The statements referred to in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (B) shall be valid only if they are endorsed in writing by each exporter, importer, and processor of the product, and if such statements and endorsements comply with regulations promulgated by the Secretary which would provide for the verification of tuna products as dolphin safe."

(2) Subsection (d) of section 901 of the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385(d)) is amended by adding the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), tuna or a tuna product that contains tuna harvested outside the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean by a vessel using purse seine nets is dolphin safe if—

"(A) it is accompanied by a written statement executed by the captain of the vessel certifying that no purse seine net was intentionally deployed on or to encircle dolphins during the particular voyage on which the tuna was harvested; or

"(B) in any fishery in which the Secretary has determined that a regular and significant association occurs between marine mammals and tuna, it is accompanied by a written statement executed by the captain of the vessel and an observer, certifying that no purse seine net was intentionally deployed on or to encircle marine mammals during the particular voyage on which the tuna was harvested.

"(4) For purposes of paragraph (1)(D), tuna or a tuna product that contains tuna harvested in a fishery identified by the Secretary as having a regular and significant incidental mortality or serious injury of marine mammals is dolphin safe if it is accompanied by a written statement executed by the captain of the vessel and, where determined to be practicable by the Secretary, an observer participating in a national or international program acceptable to the Secretary certifying that no marine mammals were killed in the course of the fishing operation or operations in which the tuna were caught.

"(5) No tuna product may be labeled with any reference to dolphins, porpoises, or marine mammals, unless such product is labeled as dolphin safe in accordance with this subsection."

(i) TRACKING AND VERIFICATION.—Subsection (f) of section 901 of the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (16 U.S.C. 1385(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) TRACKING AND VERIFICATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall issue regulations to implement subsection (d) not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act. In the development of these regulations, the Secretary shall establish appropriate procedures for ensuring the confidentiality of proprietary information the submission of which is voluntary or mandatory. Such regulations shall, consistent with international efforts and in coordination with the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, establish a domestic and international tracking and verification program that provides for the effective tracking of tuna labeled under subsection (d), including but not limited to each of the following:

"(1) Specific regulations and provisions addressing the use of weight calculation for purposes of tracking tuna caught, landed, processed, and exported.

"(2) Additional measures to enhance observer coverage if necessary.

"(3) Well location and procedures for monitoring, certifying, and sealing holds above and below deck or other equally effective methods of tracking and verifying tuna labeled under subsection (d).

"(4) Reporting receipt of and database storage of radio and facsimile transmittals from fishing vessels containing information related to the tracking and verification of tuna, and the definition of sets.

"(5) Shore-based verification and tracking throughout the transshipment and canning process by means of Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission trip records or otherwise.

"(6) Provisions for annual audits and spot checks for caught, landed, and processed tuna products labeled in accordance with subsection (d).

"(7) The provision of timely access to data required under this subsection by the Secretary from harvesting nations to undertake the actions required in paragraph (6) of this subsection.

The Secretary may make such adjustments as may be appropriate to the regulations promulgated under this subsection to implement an international tracking and verification program that meets or exceeds the minimum requirements established by the Secretary under this subsection."

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III.

(a) HEADING.—The heading of title III is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM"

(b) FINDINGS.—Section 301 (16 U.S.C. 1411) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Nations harvesting yellowfin tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean have demonstrated their willingness to participate in appropriate multilateral agreements to reduce, with the goal of eliminating, dolphin mortality in that fishery. Recognition of the International Dolphin Conservation Program will assure that the existing trend of reduced dolphin mortality continues; that individual stocks of dolphins are adequately protected; and that the goal of eliminating all dolphin mortality continues to be a priority."

(2) In subsection (b), by amending paragraphs (2) and (3) to read as follows:

"(2) support the International Dolphin Conservation Program and efforts within the Program to reduce, with the goal of eliminating, the mortality referred to in paragraph (1);

"(3) ensure that the market of the United States does not act as an incentive to the harvest of tuna caught with driftnets or caught by purse seine vessels in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean that are not operating in compliance with the International Dolphin Conservation Program;"

(c) INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM.—Section 302 (16 U.S.C. 1412) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.

"(a) REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAM REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary shall issue regulations to implement the International Dolphin Conservation Program.

"(2)(A) Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue regulations to authorize and govern the incidental taking of marine mammals in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, including any species of marine mammal designated as depleted under this Act but not listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), by vessels of the United States participating in the International Dolphin Conservation Program.

"(B) Regulations issued under this section shall include provisions—

"(i) requiring observers on each vessel;

"(ii) requiring use of the backdown procedure or other procedures equally or more effective in avoiding mortality of marine mammals in fishing operations;

"(iii) prohibiting intentional deployment of nets on, or encirclement of, dolphins in violation of the International Dolphin Conservation Program;

"(iv) requiring the use of special equipment, including dolphin safety panels in nets, monitoring devices as identified by the International Dolphin Conservation Program, as practicable, to detect unsafe fishing conditions before nets are deployed by a tuna vessel, operable rafts, speedboats with towing bridles, floodlights in operable condition, and diving masks and snorkels;

"(v) ensuring that the backdown procedure during the deployment of nets on, or encirclement of, dolphins is completed and rolling of the net to sack up has begun no later than 30 minutes after sundown;

"(vi) banning the use of explosive devices in all purse seine operations;

"(vii) establishing per vessel maximum annual dolphin mortality limits, total dolphin mortality limits and per-stock per-year mortality limits, in accordance with the International Dolphin Conservation Program;

"(viii) preventing the intentional deployment of nets on, or encirclement of, dolphins after reaching either the vessel maximum annual dolphin mortality limits, total dolphin mortality limits, or per-stock per-year mortality limits;

"(ix) preventing the fishing on dolphins by a vessel without an assigned vessel dolphin mortality limit;

"(x) allowing for the authorization and conduct of experimental fishing operations, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, for the purpose of testing proposed improvements in fishing techniques and equipment (including new technology for detecting unsafe fishing conditions before nets are deployed by a tuna vessel) that may reduce or eliminate dolphin mortality or do not require the encirclement of dolphins in the course of commercial yellowfin tuna fishing;

"(xi) authorizing fishing within the area covered by the International Dolphin Conservation Program by vessels of the United States without the use of special equipment or nets if the vessel takes an observer and does not intentionally deploy nets on, or encircle, dolphins, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe; and

"(xii) containing such other restrictions and requirements as the Secretary determines are necessary to implement the International Dolphin Conservation Program with respect to vessels of the United States.

"(C) The Secretary may make such adjustments as may be appropriate to the requirements of subparagraph (B) that pertain to fishing gear, vessel equipment, and fishing practices to the extent the adjustments are consistent with the International Dolphin Conservation Program.

"(b) CONSULTATION.—In developing regulations under this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of State, the Marine Mammal Commission and the United States Commissioners to the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission appointed under section 3 of the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 952).

"(c) EMERGENCY REGULATIONS.—(1) If the Secretary determines, on the basis of the best scientific information available (including that obtained under the International Dolphin Conservation Program) that the incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals authorized under this title is having, or is likely to have, a significant adverse effect on a marine mammal stock or species, the Secretary shall take actions as follows—

"(A) notify the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission of the Secretary's findings, along with recommendations to the Commission as to actions necessary to reduce incidental mortality and serious injury and mitigate such adverse impact; and

"(B) prescribe emergency regulations to reduce incidental mortality and serious injury and mitigate such adverse impact.

"(2) Prior to taking action under paragraph (1) (A) or (B), the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of State, the Marine Mammal Commission, and the United States Commissioners to the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

"(3) Emergency regulations prescribed under this subsection—

"(A) shall be published in the Federal Register, together with an explanation thereof; and

"(B) shall remain in effect for the duration of the applicable fishing year; and

The Secretary may terminate such emergency regulations at a date earlier than that required by subparagraph (B) by publication in the Federal Register of a notice of termination, if the Secretary determines that the reasons for the emergency action no longer exist.

"(4) If the Secretary finds that the incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals in the yellowfin tuna fishery in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean is continuing to have a significant adverse impact on a stock or species, the Secretary may extend the emergency regulations for such additional periods as may be necessary.

"(d) RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall, in cooperation with the nations participating in the International Dolphin Conservation Program and with the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, undertake or support appropriate scientific research to further the goals of the International Dolphin Conservation Program. Such research may include but shall not be limited to any of the following:

"(1) Devising cost-effective fishing methods and gear so as to reduce, with the goal of eliminating, the incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals in connection with commercial purse seine fishing in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean.

"(2) Developing cost-effective methods of fishing for mature yellowfin tuna without deployment of nets on, or encirclement of, dolphins or other marine mammals.

"(3) Carrying out stock assessments for those marine mammal species and marine mammal stocks taken in the purse seine fishery for yellowfin tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, including species or stocks not within waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(4) Studying the effects of chase and encirclement on the health and biology of dolphin and individual dolphin populations incidentally taken in the course of purse seine fishing for yellowfin tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce \$1,000,000 to be used by the Secretary, acting through the National Marine Fisheries Service, to carry out this paragraph. Upon completion of the study, the Secretary shall submit a report containing the results of the study, together with recommendations, to the Congress and to the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

"(5) Determining the extent to which the incidental take of nontarget species, including juvenile tuna, occurs in the course of purse seine fishing for yellowfin tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, the geographic location of the incidental take, and the impact of that incidental take on tuna stocks, and nontarget species.

The Secretary shall include a description of the annual results of research carried out under this subsection in the report required under section 303."

(d) REPORTS.—Section 303 (16 U.S.C. 1414) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. REPORTS BY THE SECRETARY.

"Notwithstanding section 103(f), the Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress which includes each of the following:

"(1) The results of research conducted pursuant to section 302.

"(2) A description of the status and trends of stocks of tuna.

"(3) A description of the efforts to assess, avoid, reduce, and minimize the bycatch of juvenile yellowfin tuna and other nontarget species.

"(4) A description of the activities of the International Dolphin Conservation Program and of the efforts of the United States in support of the Program's goals and objectives, including the protection of dolphin populations in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program.

"(5) Actions taken by the Secretary under subsections (a)(2)(B) and (d) of section 101.

"(6) Copies of any relevant resolutions and decisions of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and any regulations promulgated by the Secretary under this title.

"(7) Any other information deemed relevant by the Secretary."

(e) PERMITS.—Section 304 (16 U.S.C. 1416) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. PERMITS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Consistent with section 302, the Secretary is authorized to issue a permit to a vessel of the United States authorizing participation in the International Dolphin Conservation Program and may require a permit for the person actually in charge of and controlling the fishing operation of the vessel. The Secretary shall prescribe such procedures as are necessary to carry out this subsection, including, but not limited to, requiring the submission of—

"(A) the name and official number or other identification of each fishing vessel for which a permit is sought, together with the name and address of the owner thereof; and

"(B) the tonnage, hold capacity, speed, processing equipment, and type and quantity of gear, including an inventory of special equipment required under section 302, with respect to each vessel.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to charge a fee for issuing a permit under this section. The level of fees charged under this paragraph may not exceed the administrative cost incurred in granting an authorization and issuing a permit. Fees collected under this paragraph shall be available, subject to appropriations, to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere for expenses incurred in issuing permits under this section.

"(3) After the effective date of the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, no vessel of the United States shall operate in the yellowfin tuna fishery in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean without a valid permit issued under this section.

"(b) PERMIT SANCTIONS.—(1) In any case in which—

"(A) a vessel for which a permit has been issued under this section has been used in the commission of an act prohibited under section 305;

"(B) the owner or operator of any such vessel or any other person who has applied for or been issued a permit under this section has acted in violation of section 305; or

"(C) any civil penalty or criminal fine imposed on a vessel, owner or operator of a vessel, or other person who has applied for or been issued a permit under this section has not been paid or is overdue, the Secretary may—

"(i) revoke any permit with respect to such vessel, with or without prejudice to the issuance of subsequent permits;

"(ii) suspend such permit for a period of time considered by the Secretary to be appropriate;

"(iii) deny such permit; or

"(iv) impose additional conditions or restrictions on any permit issued to, or applied for by, any such vessel or person under this section.

"(2) In imposing a sanction under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into account—

"(A) the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the prohibited acts for which the sanction is imposed; and

"(B) with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, and other such matters as justice requires.

"(3) Transfer of ownership of a vessel, by sale or otherwise, shall not extinguish any permit sanction that is in effect or is pending at the time of transfer of ownership. Before executing the transfer of ownership of a vessel, by sale or otherwise, the owner shall disclose in writing to the prospective transferee the existence of any permit sanction that will be in effect or pending with respect to the vessel at the time of transfer.

"(4) In the case of any permit that is suspended for the failure to pay a civil penalty

or criminal fine, the Secretary shall reinstate the permit upon payment of the penalty or fine and interest thereon at the prevailing rate.

"(5) No sanctions shall be imposed under this section unless there has been a prior opportunity for a hearing on the facts underlying the violation for which the sanction is imposed, either in conjunction with a civil penalty proceeding under this title or otherwise."

(f) PROHIBITIONS.—Section 305 is repealed and section 307 (16 U.S.C. 1417) is redesignated as section 305, and amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a):

(A) By amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) for any person to sell, purchase, offer for sale, transport, or ship, in the United States, any tuna or tuna product unless the tuna or tuna product is either dolphin safe or has been harvested in compliance with the International Dolphin Conservation Program by a country that is a member of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission or has initiated steps, in accordance with Article V, paragraph 3 of the Convention establishing the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, to become a member of that organization;"

(B) By amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) except in accordance with this title and regulations issued pursuant to this title as provided for in subsection 101(e), for any person or vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States intentionally to set a purse seine net on or to encircle any marine mammal in the course of tuna fishing operations in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean; or"

(C) By amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) for any person to import any yellowfin tuna or yellowfin tuna product or any other fish or fish product in violation of a ban on importation imposed under section 101(a)(2);"

(2) In subsection (b)(2), by inserting "(a)(5) and" before "(a)(6)".

(3) By striking subsection (d).

(g) REPEAL.—Section 306 is repealed and section 308 (16 U.S.C. 1418) is redesignated as section 306, and amended by striking "303" and inserting in lieu thereof "302(d)".

(h) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 is amended by striking the items relating to title III and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM

"Sec. 301. Findings and policy.

"Sec. 302. Authority of the Secretary.

"Sec. 303. Reports by the Secretary.

"Sec. 304. Permits.

"Sec. 305. Prohibitions.

"Sec. 306. Authorization of appropriations."

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS TO THE TUNA CONVENTIONS ACT.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 3(c) of the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 952(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) at least one shall be either the Director, or an appropriate regional director, of the National Marine Fisheries Service; and"

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE.—Section 4 of the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 953) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. GENERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE.

"The Secretary, in consultation with the United States Commissioners, shall:

"(1) Appoint a General Advisory Committee which shall be composed of not less than

5 nor more than 15 persons with balanced representation from the various groups participating in the fisheries included under the conventions, and from nongovernmental conservation organizations. The General Advisory Committee shall be invited to have representatives attend all nonexecutive meetings of the United States sections and shall be given full opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed programs of investigations, reports, recommendations, and regulations of the commission. The General Advisory Committee may attend all meetings of the international commissions to which they are invited by such commissions.

"(2) Appoint a Scientific Advisory Subcommittee which shall be composed of not less than 5 nor more than 15 qualified scientists with balanced representation from the public and private sectors, including nongovernmental conservation organizations. The Scientific Advisory Subcommittee shall advise the General Advisory Committee and the Commissioners on matters including the conservation of ecosystems; the sustainable uses of living marine resources related to the tuna fishery in the eastern Pacific Ocean; and the long-term conservation and management of stocks of living marine resources in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. In addition, the Scientific Advisory Subcommittee shall, as requested by the General Advisory Committee, the United States Commissioners or the Secretary, perform functions and provide assistance required by formal agreements entered into by the United States for this fishery, including the International Dolphin Conservation Program. These functions may include each of the following:

"(A) The review of data from the Program, including data received from the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

"(B) Recommendations on research needs, including ecosystems, fishing practices, and gear technology research, including the development and use of selective, environmentally safe and cost-effective fishing gear, and on the coordination and facilitation of such research.

"(C) Recommendations concerning scientific reviews and assessments required under the Program and engaging, as appropriate, in such reviews and assessments.

"(D) Consulting with other experts as needed.

"(E) Recommending measures to assure the regular and timely full exchange of data among the parties to the Program and each nation's National Scientific Advisory Committee (or equivalent).

"(3) Establish procedures to provide for appropriate public participation and public meetings and to provide for the confidentiality of confidential business data. The Scientific Advisory Subcommittee shall be invited to have representatives attend all nonexecutive meetings of the United States sections and the General Advisory Subcommittee and shall be given full opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed programs of scientific investigation, scientific reports, and scientific recommendations of the commission. Representatives of the Scientific Advisory Subcommittee may attend meetings of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission in accordance with the rules of such Commission.

"(4) Fix the terms of office of the members of the General Advisory Committee and Scientific Advisory Subcommittee, who shall receive no compensation for their services as such members."

SEC. 7. EQUITABLE FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

It is the sense of the Congress that each nation participating in the International Dolphin Conservation Program should con-

tribute an equitable amount to the expenses of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. Such contributions shall take into account the number of vessels from that nation fishing for tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, the consumption of tuna and tuna products from the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean and other relevant factors as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon certification by the Secretary of State to the Congress that a binding resolution of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, or another legally binding instrument, establishing the International Dolphin Conservation Program has been adopted and is in effect.

The CHAIRMAN. No other amendment shall be in order except a further amendment printed in House Report 104-708, which may be offered only by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] or his designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUDDS

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUDDS: In section 901(d)(2)(B) of the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (as proposed to be amended by section 4(h)(1) of the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text), insert ", chased, harassed, injured, or encircled with nets" after "killed" in each of the places it appears.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 489, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. STUDDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by stating most emphatically that I would very much prefer not to be standing here debating this issue or offering this amendment. I have very little doubt that by now every Member in this Chamber, and there must be at least six of them, and those who are watching, are thoroughly confused about how best to save dolphins. Apparently, so are the environmental groups, and, quite frankly, so am I.

Nonetheless, I offer this amendment because the one portion of this debate that should not be confusing is the definition of the word "safe," notwithstanding the fact that people in this city have been always able to take short English words and euphemize the meaning out of them. When I grew up, safe meant secure from danger, harm or evil. That is what the dictionary says it means.

Under this bill, safe would permit doing all kinds of things to dolphins,

including seriously injuring them, and as long as no one actually noticed it happening, they might even be able to kill them. This legislation would define as safe a process that stops dolphins from feeding, separates mothers from their calves, injures animals, and allows them to be chased for hours until they are unable to swim any longer. We can only hope that the Committee on the Judiciary does not get a hold of this reasoning the next time it takes up reform of the criminal code.

For three of the four debates during which we have had strong bipartisan support for legislation protecting dolphins from the extraordinary slaughter that occurred in this fishery, I had the honor of chairing the subcommittee of jurisdiction. We passed the law requiring truth in tuna labeling because American consumers, American voters, and American schoolchildren demanded it. They made it clear that they did not want to endorse the selling of a product whose harvesting caused any harm to dolphins. Since its enactment in 1972, the Marine Mammal Protection Act has prohibited any, quote, attempt to harass, hunt, capture or kill any marine mammal, unquote.

Again, it is illegal under current law to harass, hunt, capture or kill any marine mammal. That language is in the law because we know that these activities are not safe from marine mammals.

Those who support the labeling change in this bill, I am sure, would not allow whale-watching vessels in my district to harass whales and separate mothers from nursing calves and then market those cruises as safe for whales. I suspect they would not allow Mr. YOUNG's oil companies to conduct exploratory drilling that disrupts the feeding behavior of whales and then call the oil whale-safe.

Two years ago, some of the environmental groups that are supporting this bill blocked regulations allowing dolphin-feeding cruises in Florida and in Texas because they were convinced that the harassment of dolphins was not safe.

The double standard in this bill, put there for Mexico's sake, violates in my judgment the integrity of everything we on both sides of this aisle have worked to achieve over the last 20 years.

The amendment is simple. It did not get read but it would have taken less time to read it than to designate it. It simply adds after the word "killed," and I quote, "chased, harassed, injured or encircled with nets." You cannot do any of those things under our amendment and call it dolphin safe.

The amendment leaves intact the provisions of the bill that lift the embargoes on tuna. It leaves intact the remainder of the international agreement. But it retains honest information for American consumers, and that is all it does.

Not long ago we held a debate on this floor about truth in nutrition labeling.

Right now there is a bipartisan effort under way in both Chambers to establish simple labels on clothing and sporting goods that would inform consumers if those products were made by child labor. Labeling means something to consumers. It means trust.

The American people know what the word "safe" means. If we cannot be honest about the meaning, then we should probably get rid of the label. Perhaps we could call it "good for Mexico," or "NAFTA-consistent," or "caught under international guidelines," but we should not call it safe for dolphins, because by any standard, semantic or otherwise, it is not.

Let me once again remind my colleagues that the amendment does not address the international agreement. It does not address the embargo. It simply says that we retain the sanctity and the meaning of the label "dolphin-safe" which has been so successful as it is now in current law, which says that if they want to use that label on imported tuna, they not only have to demonstrate that that tuna was caught in a way that did not kill dolphins but did not involve chasing, harassing, injuring, or encircling with nets the aforementioned dolphins.

Like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], I too have communed with my own dolphins on this matter and, as I have in the past, I can assure my colleagues that in unequivocally dolphin ways they have made it very clear to me that they support this amendment. That is pretty tough. I know the gentleman from Alaska is going to suggest that these may be a regional dialect in question here, and that dolphins in other parts of the country may be saying something different, but I rather doubt that.

I am also prepared to stipulate, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, that the gentleman from Maryland is a class act. I think I made that observation myself even before the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] did. I have no doubt whatsoever about that. I wish there were more like him in this Chamber.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I usually agree with my esteemed colleague from Massachusetts on fishery issues. He and I have worked together for 24 years and rarely do we disagree on the issues of fisheries. I must oppose his amendment,

though, because the Gilchrest bill implements the Panama Declaration, as discussed in general debate, which locks into place binding conservation management measures for dolphin and other marine life.

This bill is supported, as has been said before, by five environmental organizations, the American Tunaboat Owners, the National Fisheries Institute, the Seafarers' International Union, the California Federation of Labor, the United Industrial Workers, the American Sportfishing Association, and the Clinton administration, although that gives me some reservation.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2823 recognizes the international voluntary compliance with the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission's dolphin conservation program, which has been in place for the past 4 years. This bill incorporates provisions into U.S. law to continue the international cooperation and compliance.

Over the last couple of months, Mr. GILCHREST has worked to address the concerns of the opponents to H.R. 2823. However, the definition of dolphin-safe has kept the two sides from reaching an agreement.

The amendment being offered by Mr. STUDDS was offered at subcommittee markup by Congressman FARR and was defeated. The Studds-Miller amendment will keep the current dolphin-safe definition which will continue to outlaw the use of fishing practices with the lowest bycatch, despite technological breakthroughs which have reduced dolphin mortality by 97 percent.

The proponents of this amendment will tell you that by keeping the current dolphin-safe definition, it will protect dolphins. However, the Studds-Miller amendment will not end the encirclement of dolphins by foreign fishermen in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Since the adoption of the embargo in 1992, the number of dolphin sets has not decreased. Approximately 50 percent of sets by foreign fleets are on dolphin schools despite the embargo. The Studds-Miller amendment also promotes fishing practices which have a high bycatch of juvenile tuna, billfish, sea turtles and sharks.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2823 promotes conservation and management measures based on science. It does not promote the protection of one species over the needs of other marine species. This legislation protects dolphins and other marine life.

The Studds-Miller amendment, on the other hand, will jeopardize the progress made in reducing dolphin mortalities in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean and do nothing to protect other marine life. Finally, the amendment will negate all of the international cooperation and compliance envisioned in the Panama Declaration.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to vote against the Studds-Miller amendment. I think it will actually cut this bill.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to believe the gentleman from

Alaska has been here for 24 years given his appearance, but we will have to take his word for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Studds amendment. This amendment does one thing, it protects the integrity of the "dolphin safe" label.

Now, it is really very simple. The rest of the world would like to get into our market, they would like to sell their product under the label "dolphin safe," but without this amendment and under this bill, tuna fisheries could chase, harass, injure dolphins and still get the benefit of the "dolphin safe" label.

Now, maybe in this bill we should have a "dolphin less-safe" label or a "dolphin almost-safe" label, but if we want the consumers to rely on the "dolphin safe" label, we must pass the Studds amendment because we simply do not know what the effects are of chasing and harassing these mammals. However, marine mammal biologists believe that the trauma that dolphins endure under this type of encirclement does lead to the diminishment of the dolphin populations.

I would remind my colleagues that our first obligation is to the U.S. consumer, not, not to the Mexican Government. We cannot allow our domestic consumer protection laws and environmental laws to be held hostage.

Please join me and the millions of Americans who want the opportunity to choose the type of tuna they are buying. They want to know that "dolphin safe" means "dolphin safe." Support the Studds amendment. Make this bill significantly better.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, first let me thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me this time and thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2823 and against the Miller-Studds amendment. I first want to compliment my colleague from Maryland, Mr. GILCHREST, for his leadership on this legislation. He has done a great job in bringing this issue forward, which would implement the Panama Declaration by opening up the U.S. market to tuna caught in compliance with the Tuna Commission Program, which would reduce dolphin mortality, lessen the bycatch of other forms of marine life and sustain dolphin and fish populations for the future.

Mr. Chairman, people are most concerned with the practice of dolphin encirclement by fishing vessels. The rate of dolphin mortality under the Panama Declaration has dramatically declined because of the declaration's goals to strictly limit any deaths, provide tuna-boat crew training, and require internationally trained observers on all

tuna vessels. This bill requires that the annual mortality rate be further reduced to less than a fraction of 1 percent of the dolphin population, leading to the elimination of dolphin mortalities altogether. The "dolphin-safe" label is preserved because certified inspectors aboard ship guarantee that no dolphins were killed.

We should not forget that other methods of catching tuna kill other sea life. Tuna have been known to swim near logs and debris close to shorelines. Fishermen who cast their nets to catch these tuna don't kill dolphins, but they do kill a huge bycatch of sharks, endangered sea turtles, and juvenile tuna whose survival is crucial to tuna prosperity years from now.

Because of the progress made through an international effort led by the United States, we have negotiated an agreement among all the countries that have fishing vessels in the eastern Pacific. Dolphin conservation gains have come as a result of more careful fishing and international cooperation, and we must continue with this progress by passing H.R. 2823.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment that would compromise this bill. Let us pass H.R. 2823. It is in the interest of the environment, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Studds amendment and let me tell my colleagues why. There is a problem that I think the author, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], is trying to address. We all want to address that problem, and that is the problem of bycatch. But the bill, as written, really does not do that without harming dolphins, and that is why the Studds amendment makes the bill a better bill.

It is very simple. In America we have what we call truth in labeling. For 6 years U.S. consumers have been buying tuna in the stores that say that it is dolphin safe. We all know what the word "safe" means, our constituents know what it means, school kids know what it means. They are confident that tuna labeled as "dolphin safe" has not been caught in a way that harms dolphins.

The amendment that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] is offering only puts 6 words into law. If the bill goes through right now, however, dolphins that are chased and die can be labeled "dolphin safe." Dolphins that are harassed and die can be labeled "dolphin safe." Dolphins that are injured or encircled with nets and die can be labeled as "dolphin safe."

That is not truth in labeling, and that is the problem here. We need to have truth in labeling.

I urge my colleagues, add these 6 words to this bill to make it a good

bill, to make it a better bill, to make it a bill we can all vote for and support, because that is what the American people want. They do not want us in Congress to play tricks with labels on cans in order to enhance an industry that fishes way offshore from here.

Changing the definition of "dolphin safe" now without a sound scientific basis for that decision not only risks undercutting the progress we have made in the last decade to protect dolphins, but it also misleads the American consumers.

Vote "yes" on this simple amendment. Restore order to this bill.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] who was the first to point out to me that this bill not only protects dolphins, but it also protects sea turtles, sharks, and billfish.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his applause.

Mr. Chairman, if we could just look at this photograph over here for a second, what I want to try to display to my colleagues is the present condition of the marine ecosystem under the present law.

When we talk about bycatch, that means discarded fish, that means discarded marine mammals, that means discarded reptiles, that means discarded turtles, sea turtles, many of which are endangered.

If we look at this picture, up in the right-hand corner we will see sharks that are discarded in the present process of fishing techniques.

If we look at this photograph here, we will see in this trough immature tuna that will not be able to spawn, that will not sustain the population.

The basic point I want to get across here is that we need to find new methods of fishing, new techniques. Unless we change what we are doing at the present time, and unless we have an agreement with other countries to try to preserve and sustain the resources of our coastal oceans, we cannot do it alone.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want the gentleman to explain perhaps to Members who are not on the committee why it is that fishing on log sets and why it is that fishing on schools of tuna produces a larger bycatch than the proposed method of fishing on dolphins.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will try to in 60 seconds educate people on encirclement, log sets, and tuna sets, if I can.

Basically, encirclement the way we did it in the past was bad. We had an embargo, we ended it, we reduced the dolphin kills from 100,000 a year down to under 4,000 a year. That is what we are trying to do here.

Log sets. Tuna, for some strange reason, will swim under something. If they do not swim under dolphins like mature tuna fish do, they will swim under logs. Now, we have a lot of immature tuna that swim under logs. We do not have any dolphins there, but when they encircle the tuna and catch them in these big nets, not only do they catch tuna fish, but what we see in these pictures here is they catch many more marine species.

These species are under stress because they are being discarded. They are not being used.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield. This is an important point.

If we prohibit fishing on dolphins, which we now believe we can do much safer than we used to, then we not only permit fishing on log sets and permit fishing on schools, but we encourage those fishermen who would normally be fishing in a safer way on dolphins to go fish on log sets and on schools where we get this higher bycatch.

Mr. GILCHREST. The whole reason for this particular legislation is threefold: to reduce the number of dolphins killed, to reduce the number of marine species that are killed in the process of catching tuna, and to set up an agreement that we are sponsoring to ensure the sustainability of the marine ecosystem. We can then open the door to a number of other environmental agreements, including global warming.

What I want to do is to talk briefly on some of the charges that the other side has made.

Last year there were 3,300 dolphins killed in the eastern tropical Pacific. That is down 99 percent from what it was. That is using this particular technique.

Why do we have in our bill a maximum, maximum, of 5,000 dolphins killed? That is because there will be more fishers in the fishery, so we need to have some reasonable number. Five thousand dolphins killed is biologically insignificant as assessed by some of the best scientists in the world. One of them is from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, a woman named Elizabeth Edwards, who says that is biologically insignificant.

We understand that. We do not accept the 5,000 number. We will continue to work toward zero.

Here is what Dr. Edwards says about the study, that the process that we are trying to get into law stresses dolphins to the degree that it harms them. She says, "In particular the 5 reviewers were unanimous in their opinion that the study failed to confirm the stated conclusion that dolphins were experiencing acute continuous stress."

□ 1915

So I wanted to dismiss that accusation that the encirclement, where you allow the dolphins to get out, which is what we are doing, causes stress that harms the dolphin. There is no evidence to that effect. The Center for

Marine Conservation, one of our more sophisticated, respected environmental groups around the country, says arguably stress is not found to lead to species decline, the stress that they experience in this encirclement. And understand, we do not want to encircle dolphins. This is not the last step in this process. This international agreement does not end the way we catch tuna fish.

This international agreement by the United States, by the environmental groups such as Greenpeace, Center for Marine Conservation, we want to continue to use the expertise of the United States to find ways to ensure the sustainability of the marine ecosystem and reduce dolphin kills to zero and some day hopefully end encirclement entirely. But we cannot do it alone. We need this international agreement. I want to point out one other thing. IATTC is showing an increase in dolphin population.

Now, the comment that we are importing tuna fish for the purpose of doing something for the benefit of Mexico or Mexican fishermen, and we are not concerned about the death of dolphins. Well, I want to say something. In our bill, on every single boat there will be, there must be, observers in order to sell that tuna fish into the United States. So we will know, however unfortunate it might be, every single dolphin death. And we will know that because we have observers on board those boats. Since we have observers on those boats, we recognize in the past year there has been 3,300 dolphin deaths, but we know that, and we are trying to reduce that.

Now, the present regime, before this legislation goes into effect, we are getting much of our tuna fish, if not most of our tuna fish, from the western tropical Pacific, where there are no observers on those boats, and it is fundamentally understood. It is fundamentally understood that from 10,000 to 40,000 dolphins are killed a year. We have no control over that. Do we want to have dolphin kills without anybody to observe those dolphin deaths and then quite likely import that tuna, can it in the United States, and then label it dolphin safe? I would much rather have an understanding as to the number of dolphin deaths and a continuous effort to reduce those dolphin deaths.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Miller-Studds amendment and to support the legislation. It is an international agreement of very positive proportions so that we can continue down the road as a planet, as a world population that is continuing to increase to have some sense of understanding together as a global community to sustain the limited resources that are essential for the food of this planet.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to correct one thing. The gentleman from Maryland may be right or he may be wrong, but

he is simply asserting something without documentation. There has only been one study to date that we know on the effect of encirclement of dolphins, and I am holding it in my hand. It is from the Journal of Pathophysiology, and it has the imposing title of "Adrenocortical Color Darkness and Correlates as Indicators of Continuous Acute Premortem Stress in Chased and Purse-seine Captured Male Dolphins." So there. I want the record to reflect that, done by the National Marine Fisheries Service, the only study we have suggests, does not assert, suggests to the contrary.

Now, the dolphins as usual speak for themselves. There are two species that have been consistently, over time, chased and netted in this fishery: The eastern spinner dolphin and the northern offshore spotted dolphin. I do not know which one the gentleman is communing with. According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, these two populations are at less than 20 percent of their original size. This is an indisputable fact due to the 8 million deaths that have taken place over the last 20 years.

Now, we have been enormously successful in reducing those deaths, as most people have mentioned speaking on both sides of this issue, but, and this is a large "but," in spite of the much observed lower level of dolphin deaths these two dolphin populations are now growing. The fact is worth repeating. Although dolphin deaths have dropped from approximately 100,000 annually to about 3,600, we see no increase in these populations.

Many biologists believe that the constant injury and harassment of these animals is preventing the recovery of the populations. I do not pretend to assert that as fact. I have been quite open from the beginning that I do not know. But I suggest that no one else here knows either. Insofar as we have any study to suggest that the contrary may be true, to assert something on the floor of this hallowed institution does not make it so, and in this case it might be that a little bit of humility and caution might be in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS]. Consumers have a right to know that "dolphin safe" means that dolphins were not harassed or killed. That is what the label has meant for the last 6 years.

Under the Studds amendment, tuna can be sold in the United States regardless of whether it was caught using safe techniques, but it could not be labeled "dolphin safe" unless it meets the standard that every American consumer has relied upon and should be able to continue to rely upon.

It is hard to believe that chasing dolphins by speedboats and helicopters until they are too exhausted to escape

and then encircled in a purse-seine net can be considered safe. At worst, the netted dolphins face the risk of crushed bones, loss of fins, or suffocation in the nylon nets. At the very least, mortal injuries may ensue from separation of mothers from their calves or the severe stress caused by this harassment which may have detrimental effects.

One study suggests that there may be immediate effects of stress on these animals or long-term effects on the population as a whole, as indicated by the reduced pregnancy rates from heavily fished areas. There are signs that netting dolphins may have adverse effects, with the stress being one possible cause.

All of which may not necessarily go observed as the dolphins also sink or survive the experience only to die later. Meaning that the change to the "dolphin safe" label would render it worthless as now observed, and I quote, "observed," mortalities occurred during the netting.

The bottom line is that the only true safe method to fish for tuna is to remove dolphins from the equation. The public knows this and so do over 80 environmental groups that support this amendment. That is why I voted for the current definition of dolphin safe in 1990 under the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act.

At Mexico's request in 1991, a GATT panel found that trade embargoes on tuna imports under the authority of the Marine Mammal Protection Act did not meet with trade obligations. But the dolphin-safe label was not an issue before the GATT dispute panel; only the embargo itself. There is no legitimate trade conflict with the dolphin-safe label. The Studds amendment will continue to preserve the dolphin-safe label, which is an integral part of dolphin protection.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following "Dear Colleague" letter for the RECORD.

SAVE THE "DOLPHIN SAFE" LABEL

DEAR COLLEAGUE: H.R. 2823, "The International Dolphin Conservation Program Act" will change U.S. law and allow tuna caught by methods that injure and terrorize dolphins to be labeled "Dolphin Safe." The bill's proponents admit that under H.R. 2823, the number of dolphins that will be killed could rise. In fact, H.R. 2823 specifically permits a 25% increase in the number of dead dolphins.

This legislation would perpetuate a fraud on American consumers.

Consumers have a right to know that "Dolphin Safe" means that dolphins were not harassed or killed. That is what the label has meant for the past 6 years.

Under the Studds amendment, tuna can be sold in the United States regardless of whether it was caught using safe techniques. But it could not be labelled "Dolphin Safe" unless it meets the standard that every American consumer has relied upon and should be able to continue to rely on.

WHAT THE "DOLPHIN SAFE" LABEL MEANS

H.R. 2823 (Gilchrest)	Studds Amendment
Dolphins can be encircled, harassed, injured and tuna can still be called Dolphin Safe; 25% increase in dolphin mortality allowed.	Current law: no harassing techniques, no dolphin injuries, no dolphin deaths; non-safe tuna may be sold without the label.

If we can't save dolphins, at least we can save the label.

Support the "Dolphin Safe" Label: Support the Studds Truth in Labelling Amendment.

Sincerely,

SAM FARR.

FRANK PALLONE, Jr.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] for purposes of responding to the author of the amendment.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, in response to the assertion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me respond to the study that was done on stress by Dr. Elizabeth Edwards of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This is what she said about the study concerning stress in dolphins:

"While all five reviewers felt that post-mortem examination of one or more physiological or histological samples taken from dolphins killed during purse-seining might well provide some indication of types and amounts of stress the animals may have experienced prior to death, none of the reviewers," talking about the study that was done, "none of the reviewers felt that the body of work described in this paper presented any convincing evidence. In particular, the reviewers" of the study "were unanimous in their opinion that the study failed to confirm the stated conclusion * * *"

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I regretfully have to oppose the Studds amendment, and I would like to clarify that. I oppose the amendment because it locks us into the old concepts of species management that might have served us well in the seventies and the eighties, but is totally deficient for the latter part of the nineties and going into the next century.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great accomplishments that we are seeing this decade is the movement from single-species management to multispecies management when it comes to environmental protection. This amendment would lead us back into single-species management.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone who originally supported this legislation meant to endanger sensitive marine species or to encourage, if not mandate, fishing practices that would directly and negatively impact different species, including endangered species. The loss of endangered sea turtles as a result of the present alternative to this legislation, H.R. 2823, the main bill, was, I think, totally unforeseen back in the 1970's and the 1980's, and new science says that we need to address this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make this a battle between Flipper and the Ninja Turtles; that we are going to have to choose between porpoises and billfish, or dolphins and endangered turtles. I think there is a proper way to do this, and one of the ways is to direct our fishing practices in a manner that would facilitate protection of multiple species, as H.R. 2823 would do. This amendment would strike that concept and move us back to the era of the 1970's and 1980's; the old concept that we will only look at one species rather than the entire environment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues consider the fact that both Vice President GORE and Greenpeace, among others, recognize that it is time to move forward and be more progressive and more global in our approach to ocean species management. America must lead, but we cannot do this alone, and species management cannot be done appropriately when focused only on one species or subspecies. This amendment would move us back to that position, that would hamstring us in addressing these protection issues in a comprehensive manner.

So I would ask the supporters of the motion to recognize its unintentional but negative impact to endangered marine species, and to reflect on the facts which are that this Studds amendment does not address the concerns that we need to address to definitely protect dolphins and other ocean animals.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

I think this is an exceptional bill providing an international solution to an international problem, and that is the regulation of tuna fishing in the open seas. It is a good bill and reflects a good compromise among a lot of competing interests. But, I think we need to start by putting it in historical perspective.

In the mid-1970's, dolphin mortality rates were clearly at unacceptable levels. Over 500,000 dolphins were being killed each year in pursuit of tuna stocks. So in response to this unacceptable loss of life among the dolphin population, 5 years ago the United States placed an embargo on the importation of tuna caught using primitive encirclement measures.

But as has been pointed out in this debate, in recent years tuna fishermen have developed new and innovative methods which enable them to capture tuna without ensnaring dolphins at the same time. We have tough new monitoring procedures that have been instituted and international oversight responsibility has been strengthened.

Over time, these procedures have become increasingly internationalized, first through voluntary compliance with the La Jolla Agreement, then through permanent binding procedures set forth in the Panama Declaration.

By implementing the Panama Declaration, H.R. 2823 brings us along in the next step as the gentleman from Maryland has suggested, the next step in this evolutionary process. It locks in the reforms of the Panama Declaration and strengthens compliance procedures. The bill also provides incentives needed for other nations to remain in compliance by providing those nations who abide by the agreement with access to their most important tuna market, the United States.

It was this issue with Mexico and my work with the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference that brought me first to this issue.

□ 1930

Make no mistake about it, these market incentives are absolutely critical to the continued success of the program. The procedures required under the Panama Declaration are costly: on-board observers on all tuna boats, individual boat licensing, and use of nets and divers to ensure the safety of the dolphin population.

But let us be blunt. Without the U.S. market as an incentive, these nations are certain to revert to destructive fishing practices of the past and just export to the markets that they can, and we will end up with dolphin kill ratios as high as we had in the 1970's and 1980's. If we do not act today and enact this legislation without amendment, what we have left is a dolphin-safe label but no dolphins.

As has been pointed out, this bill does more than protect dolphins. It provides an effective method to conserve total marine ecosystem in the eastern Pacific. The fishing practices encouraged by proposed alternative legislation result in an unreasonably excessive bycatch of a number of different species, including endangered sea turtles, sharks, billfish, and large numbers of tuna and other fish species. In fact, the fishing procedures advocated by the opponents to this bill are likely to endanger the long-term health of tuna stocks themselves.

We need this bill. We can do it. We can have tuna fishing, and we can protect dolphins. We have the technology to preserve the marine ecosystem and protect the dolphin. Let us do it. Let us implement the legislation of the Panama Declaration. Keep the dolphin and the marine ecosystem safe. I urge support for the bill and opposition to the Studds amendment.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, now that English is about to become the official language and we have La Jolla and Saint Diego, I guess I should yield to the gentlewoman from Saint Frank or Saint Francis, whatever that will become once we become English speaking.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in support of his amendment.

It is a wonderful thing in the House of Representatives that we are expressing all of this concern for the dolphin. Hopefully, this will carry over to the human species as well.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I rise in opposition to the legislation as it is and in the hopes that our colleagues will vote in support of the Studds amendment. As has been said, in 1990, environmental, animal and consumer activists won a victory with the advent of the dolphin-safe label for commercially sold tuna. No product can be labeled dolphin-safe if the tuna is caught by chasing, harassing or netting dolphins. The issue before the house tonight is about what can be labeled dolphin-safe.

The dolphin-safe label has worked to preserve dolphin populations. After Congress adopted its ban of imported tuna caught using enclosure nets in 1992, the dolphin mortality rate dropped from 100,000 per year to less than 3,000, as has been indicated.

The bill before us would change the meaning of dolphin-safe to allow activities that would include highspeed chases with boats and helicopters, the separation of mothers from their calves, the withholding of food from trapped schools and the deliberate injury of dolphins to prevent the school from escape.

I call to the attention of my colleagues this chart which compares what the dolphin-safe label means.

Under the bill, it means this. Under the public view, dolphin-safe means this. We have got to keep faith with the public in our truth-in-labeling.

In fact almost any fishing activity would be termed dolphin-safe provided that no dolphins were observed to die during the catch. Dolphin populations have been depleted by as much as 80 percent. The dolphin-safe label stopped this trend and has proved one of the most successful consumer initiatives in U.S. history. Americans care about what is left of our natural resources and the threatened creatures who inhabit them.

The Studds amendment maintains the integrity of the dolphin-safe sticker to the definition of the label. Dolphin-safe must mean that dolphins are safe and not injured or killed in the hunt for tuna.

H.R. 2823 allows an increase in the dolphin deaths and unlimited injury and harassment of dolphin. That is by no means dolphin-safe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to support the Studds amendment which would enable us to keep the promise made to the American people. The trade agreements would not result in the weakening of U.S. environmental laws. At the same time, it would help us live up to those trade obligations and protect dolphins. I urge

an "aye" vote on the Studds amendment.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] who is busy re-erecting some visual aids.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

If I may, the gentleman from California asked me to get my own chart so I will not use the chart that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] used just a second ago. What I would like to do, when we looked at the chart from Ms. PELOSI, the fine gentlewoman from California, she showed us a dolphin sort of beat up and said that that is what is going to happen under our bill, and then a dolphin that looked really healthy and find and not beat up. That is what would happen with their bill and their dolphin-safe bill.

What I want to explain though, just another point, existing law, 10,000-40,000 dolphins are killed that are not observed. Many likely are killed in the process of catching tuna fish that are sold in the United States because we do not observe those deaths as dolphin-safe with the label.

What we want to do is put an observer on every single boat, every single time they fish for dolphins, every single time they fish for tuna, and they cannot sell that tuna in the United States unless they have a licensed observer on board. We want to protect the system, protect the truth in labeling. Vote against the Studds amendment.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] so that he may politely but devastatingly respond to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the chart is terribly graphic and makes the point. We will have observers on the boat. What observers can observe is dolphins being, for example, encircled, harassed, hunted down, maimed, and injured. Under that bill that is what is allowed.

Under current law, that is not allowed, that is not allowed. And to be sold on supermarket shelves, the tuna that results cannot be sold as dolphin-safe. What we are saying is, you can have your ocean management techniques, you can try your bycatch, you can do all of those things. But when it results in a dolphin being maimed, being harassed and being chased and being stressed and being exhausted, do not try to tell the American consumer that that is dolphin-safe.

What the Studds amendment says is let the consumer choose. Let the consumer choose. They can choose the existing can of tuna with the existing label under the Studds amendment that they know is dolphin-safe. Or they can choose some pale imitation that lets you kill an increased number of dolphins, lets you harass, lets you encircle, lets you stress, lets you harm, lets you maim, all with observers.

The American people do not want observers to this activity. They want an end to this activity. That is what the Studds amendment allows to happen.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I observe no further requests for time on this side. If the gentleman has the right to close and intends to use it, I trust he will do it with humane brevity. I challenge the gentleman to prove to a certainty that anything that can be said has not already been said.

With that in mind and secure in the feeling that what has been said on behalf of the amendment far outweighs in subtlety and in strength and in humor and goodwill that which has been said in opposition to the amendment, I confidently, quietly, and quickly yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume for purposes of closing debate.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right. Much of what has been said has been said. It is pretty obvious to me that the weight of the arguments in opposition to the gentleman's amendment are strong and heavy and that we should move to a vote, hopefully directly to final passage.

Just let me close by summarizing. A vote in favor of final passage and previously to that, I suppose, against the Studds amendment enables the United States to join with 11 other countries to put in place fishing methods agreed to by those 12 countries that will protect dolphins, protect sea turtles, protect sharks, protect billfish, and protect juvenile tuna. That is what the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] was referring to when he talked about multispecies management.

It is true, I suspect, that if we were to reject this bill and in so doing enact the Studds amendment, I suppose that unilaterally we could protect dolphins in 1 country out of the 12. My understanding is that that includes presently something in the neighborhood of six to eight fishing boats on the west coast of the United States. That is what we would be regulating, six to eight boats in one country as opposed to many boats in a dozen countries.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out, once again, that it would be unusual for the major environmental groups, including the National Wildlife Federation, the Environmental Defense Fund, Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund, the Center for Marine Conservation, and others to join with this chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans and the Clinton administration and variety of labor groups in supporting final passage of this bill, if it were subject to all of the charges that have been made by some of the opponents.

Obviously, we hope that this bill passes. As one who has been a supporter of marine wildlife and aqua wildlife all of my career, along with

many other Members, such as Mr. GILCHREST and others from both sides, we believe on a bipartisan basis that this bill deserves to be passed, should be passed, and will implement a very important international agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members on both sides of the aisle for strong bipartisan support and encourage a "no" vote on the Studds amendment and obviously a "yes" vote on final passage.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment offers American consumers exactly what we know they want. It took American citizens more than two decades to get the Congress to end the slaughter of dolphins and adopt dolphin-safe labeling of tuna.

The terrible pictures of herds of dead dolphins in a sea of red are practically gone from memory. It's been great environmental success.

Without the Studds amendment the underlying bill moves us backward. No, it doesn't mean that we'll return to the days of mass dolphin slaughter, but it does mean that dolphins will be chased, harassed, and encircled.

Perhaps there is no mammal more symbolic of American's love and concern for animals—than the dolphin.

As this Congress desperately attempts to recast itself in the wake of its poor environmental record—no vote is easier and will please such a broad spectrum of the American public than the Studds amendment.

Recently, this Congress has voted for consumer-friendly right-to-know provisions in several bills.

Yet today, this bill aims to confuse the dolphin-safe label and deceive the American public.

Americans want to know which tuna has been caught without risks to dolphins.

The dolphin-safe label ought to mean what it says.

Finally, I believe it's fair to say that no one in recent memory in this body has done so much to protect so many of one individual species than my colleague from Massachusetts.

We should honor his 20 years of work and expertise by supporting the Studds amendment.

If Studds does not pass—we could be faced with another tuna boycott until the American public can be sure that dolphin-safe labels are telling the truth.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important and necessary amendment, and I thank Representatives STUDDS and MILLER for all of their efforts to protect our planet's ocean life and our Nation's consumers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple: It protects dolphins from being chased, harassed, injured, or encircled with nets by tuna fishermen.

It's necessary because the underlying legislation would allow unlimited harassment and injuring of dolphins, so long as no more than 5,000 are actually killed in the eastern tropical Pacific each year. Despite increased deaths and injury to dolphins, tuna caught under the provisions of the underlying legislation could still be labeled in the United States as dolphin-safe. That's not acceptable. In my view, there should be zero dolphin deaths associated with our dolphin-safe label.

Seven years ago, 100,000 dolphins were slaughtered each year. As a result of the U.S.

tuna industry's voluntary policy of refusing to purchase tuna caught while harming or killing dolphins, that number has dropped to approximately 3,200—an impressive 97 percent.

The Studds amendment retains the integrity of the dolphin safe label by ensuring that dolphins are not harassed while fishing for tuna. Although H.R. 2823, even if improved by the Studds/Miller amendment, would condone more dolphin deaths than are associated with the current U.S. dolphin safe label, it would actually result in fewer dolphin deaths worldwide. This is because only 5,000 deaths total would be permitted, and only those foreign fishermen that fish in compliance with the 5,000 limit would be able to sell their tuna to the U.S. market.

Consumers need to know that dolphin safe means what it says. The Studds amendment although imperfect, helps move us in that direction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Studds amendment, support the wishes of the American consumer, and support the dolphins.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, yeas 260, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—161

Abercrombie	Farr	Lipinski
Andrews	Fattah	Lofgren
Baldacci	Fazio	Lowey
Barcia	Fields (LA)	Maloney
Barrett (WI)	Filner	Manton
Becerra	Flanagan	Markey
Berman	Foglietta	Martini
Bilirakis	Foley	Mascara
Blumenauer	Forbes	McDermott
Blute	Frank (MA)	McHale
Bonior	Franks (NJ)	McKinney
Borski	Frost	McNulty
Brown (CA)	Furse	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Gejdenson	Meek
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	Menendez
Bryant (TN)	Goodling	Meyers
Bunn	Gordon	Millender-
Campbell	Green (TX)	McDonald
Chabot	Gutierrez	Miller (CA)
Clay	Hall (OH)	Mink
Clayton	Harman	Moakley
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Coleman	Hilliard	Moran
Collins (IL)	Hinchey	Murtha
Collins (MI)	Holden	Nadler
Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Ney
Coyne	(TX)	Oberstar
Cummings	Jacobs	Obey
de la Garza	Jefferson	Olver
DeFazio	Johnson (SD)	Owens
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Dellums	Jones	Payne (NJ)
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Dixon	Kaptur	Poshard
Doggett	Kennedy (MA)	Rahall
Dornan	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Doyle	Kildee	Reed
Durbin	Kleczka	Rivers
Engel	Klink	Rose
Ensign	LaHood	Roybal-Allard
Eshoo	Lantos	Rush
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Sabo

Sanders
Sanford
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes

Studds
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward

Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

Whitfield
Wicker

Bachus
Brownback
Flake
Ford

Williams
Wolf

Hastert
Martinez
McCrery
McDade

Young (AK)
Zeliff

Serrano
Thomas
Towns
Young (FL)

Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman

Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor

Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOES—260

Ackerman
Allard
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa

Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery

Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White

NOT VOTING—12

□ 2000

Mr. ARCHER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. HOLDEN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, have had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2823) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 489, he reported the bill back to the House with the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 316, noes 108, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—316

Ackerman
Allard
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton

Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer

Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baldacci

Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bilirakis

NOES—108

Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)

Bunn	Jacobs	Owens
Campbell	Jefferson	Pallone
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Payne (NJ)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Clayton	Kanjorski	Poshard
Coleman	Kaptur	Rivers
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Rose
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Conyers	Kildee	Sabo
Costello	Klecza	Sanders
Coyne	Klink	Sanford
Deal	Lantos	Schroeder
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
DeLauro	Lipinski	Serrano
Dellums	Lofgren	Smith (NJ)
Dornan	Lowey	Spratt
Doyle	Maloney	Stark
Durbin	Markey	Stokes
Engel	McKinney	Studds
Eshoo	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Evans	Meehan	Thurman
Farr	Menendez	Tiahrt
Fattah	Meyers	Torricelli
Filner	Millender-	Velazquez
Foglietta	McDonald	Vento
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Franks (NJ)	Moakley	Waters
Furse	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Gejdenson	Nadler	Waxman
Gephardt	Neal	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Neumann	Wynn
Hilliard	Oberstar	Zimmer
Hinchey	Obey	
Jackson (IL)	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—9

Bachus	Ford	McDade
Brownback	Martinez	Towns
Flake	McCrery	Young (FL)

□ 2020

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

TEAMWORK FOR EMPLOYEES AND MANAGERS ACT OF 1995—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 743) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President, together with the accompanying bill, H.R. 743, be referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 123, ENGLISH LANGUAGE EMPOWERMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 104-734) on the resolution (H. Res. 499) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 123) to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3754, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. PACKARD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3754) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-733)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3754) "making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 20, 23, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreements to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 19, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$2,750,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$69,356,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$33,437,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$2,782,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$24,532,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$9,753,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$1,310,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 314. (A) Upon enactment into law of this Act, there shall be established a program for providing the widest possible exchange of information among legislative branch agencies with the long range goal of improving information technology planning and evaluation. The Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate are requested to determine the structure and operation of this program and to provide appropriate oversight. All of the appropriate offices and agencies of the legislative branch as defined below shall participate in this program for information exchange, and shall report annually on the extent and nature of their participation in their budget submissions to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(B) As used in this section—

(1) the term "offices and agencies of the legislative branch" means the office of the Clerk of the House, the office of the Secretary of the Senate, the office of the Architect of the Capitol, the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Congressional Research Service, the Congressional Budget Office, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate; and

(2) the term "technology" refers to any form of computer hardware and software; computer-based systems, services, and support for the creation, processing, exchange, and delivery of information; and telecommunications systems, and the associated hardware and software, that provide for voice, data, or image communication.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 315; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 316 and at the end of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Sec. 317. For payment to Jo Ann Emerson, widow of Bill Emerson, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, \$133,600.

And the Senate agree to the same.

RON PACKARD,
CHARLES H. TAYLOR,
DAN MILLER,
ROGER F. WICKER,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
RAY THORNTON,
JOSÉ SERRANO,
VIC FAZIO,
DAVID R. OBEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.