

I look forward to supporting a bill adding the District and the other four insular areas when we return next year.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to S. 1228, a bill that does a number of things, including calling for the redesign of the Susan B. Anthony dollar coin.

While I enthusiastically support the portion of this legislation providing for the minting of 50 different circulating commemorative quarters, I have serious concerns about the portion dealing with the redesign of the Susan B. Anthony dollar coin.

For over a decade, I have been the principal sponsor of legislation calling for the redesign of the Anthony dollar and for the phaseout of the \$1 Federal Reserve note. While S. 1228 addresses the issue of the look and feel of our Nation's \$1 coin, it neglects the important issue of what to do with the \$1 note.

S. 1228 recognizes one of the great myths about the Anthony dollar—that size was not the problem with the coin. It maintains the Anthony's dimensions, but changes the color to golden and calls for a distinctive edge—exactly what I've been proposing for the last decade. With the changes, the newly-designed dollar will be easier to distinguish from a quarter than a quarter from the current nickel.

Unfortunately, S. 1228 will not remove the \$1 bill from circulation.

Ever since Congressman Mo Udall and I introduced the first dollar coin legislation in 1986, I have argued that the Anthony dollar failed for two reasons: it looked and felt like a quarter and the \$1 bill was not taken out of circulation. So, this legislation takes a first and very important step in the effort to introduce a circulating \$1 coin. However, I fear that the new dollar coin will be doomed to the fate of the Anthony dollar since the \$1 note remains in circulation and no provision for its phase-out is included in the legislation.

I've been delivering this unpopular message for a decade, and it has been my experience that the general public understands the necessity of a phaseout when given the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I have been raked over the coals by those who opposed the phaseout of the \$1 note. My efforts have been attacked through sound bites that instill fear and tell the public that elimination of the \$1 note is taking about the choice. Well, when those delivering that message introduce legislation to create paper pennies, nickels, dimes, and quarters, and \$1, \$2, \$5, \$10, \$20, \$50, and \$100 coins, I will be convinced they truly believe in giving choice to the American public.

Sadly, the smear campaigns that have been going on for over a decade leave Congress in a situation where we can take only incremental steps to implement good currency policy. Sadly, this and prior administrations have forwarded no comprehensive policy objectives related to modernizing our currency.

I still read and hear about the stunning success of the Canadian "loon" dollar coin which was introduced in 1987. Make no mistake. The coin was extremely unpopular in concept before its introduction. And the coin did not widely circulate until late in 1989—when the \$1 bill was removed from circulation. The retail industry was very reluctant to use the \$1 coin, and it did not circulate widely for that reason.

I traveled to Ottawa several years ago to meet with officials of the Royal Canadian Mint, the Canadian banking industry, the Canadian Parliament, and Canadian retail executives.

While they were very proud of the accomplishment, they did acknowledge one significant error in their planning. The said that the prolonged cocirculation of both the "loon" coin and the \$1 bill made the transition more difficult and unpopular than it should have been.

That is my fear about S. 1228. Congress cannot idly sit back and expect the mere introduction of a redesigned dollar coin will develop its own momentum. And no amount of marketing by the Mint will make the coin succeed. As a matter of fact, heavy simultaneous circulation of both the redesigned dollar coin and \$1 bills will become a major nuisance to retailer, mass transit, and the visually impaired. I expect Congress will be hearing from them before long.

Let me finally add that unlike my legislation, H.R. 1174, there is little budgetary savings associated with legislation that only has redesignated the Anthony dollar without phasing out the \$1 note. While passage of H.R. 1174 would ultimately result in about \$12 billion in savings to taxpayers over 30 years, I understand that the language in S. 1228 will result in minimal budgetary savings.

I commend Chairman CASTLE for his continuing attention to coinage matters—especially the circulating commemorative quarter legislation. And frankly, I am relieved to know that the Mint will be saved from the embarrassment of having to produce more Anthony dollars. However, I remain convinced that the absence of a plan to address the necessary action of removing the \$1 bill from circulation will doom us to the same embarrassment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1228.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1658) to reauthorize and amend the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act and related laws.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 9, line 16, strike out "Secretary" and insert "Secretaries".

Page 9, line 21, strike out "Secretary" and insert "Secretaries".

Page 10, line 3, strike out [Secretary] and insert Secretaries

Page 11, after line 10 insert:

"(b) SOCIO-ECONOMIC STUDY.—The Secretaries, in consultation with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, shall conduct a study of the socio-economic benefits of the Atlantic striped bass resource. The Secretaries shall issue a report to the Congress concerning the findings of this study no later than September 30, 1998.

Page 11, line 11, strike out [(b)] and insert: (c)

Page 12, strike out all after line 23, over to and including line 11 on page 13 and insert:

"(a) REGULATION OF FISHING IN EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations governing fishing for Atlantic striped bass in the exclusive economic zone that the Secretary determines—

"(1) are consistent with the national standards set forth in section 301 of the Magnuson Act (16 U.S.C. 1851);

"(2) are compatible with the Plan and each Federal moratorium in effect on fishing for Atlantic striped bass within the coastal waters of a coastal State;

"(3) ensure the effectiveness of State regulations on fishing for Atlantic striped bass within the coastal waters of a coastal State; and

"(4) are sufficient to assure the long-term conservation of Atlantic striped bass populations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that we are on the verge of enacting H.R. 1658, the Striped Bass Conservation Act of 1997. The House passed two prior versions of this bill in the last Congress, but, regrettably, they were not acted upon by the other body. Today, however, we can complete the legislative process by voting to agree to the Senate amendments to this important legislation.

The first sentence of the Striped Bass Conservation Act of 1984 states that the Atlantic striped bass are of historic importance and of great benefit to the Nation. I would like to assure all of my colleagues of the truth of this statement. These fish are renowned for their fighting ability and have been an important part of the lives of generations of east coast fishermen from all parts of the Northeast.

When this country was settled, striped bass were one of the most abundant natural resources that staggered early explorers. Captain John Smith, exploring the Chesapeake Bay in 1608, wrote that striped bass were so abundant that he thought he could walk across the bay on the backs of stripers without wetting his feet.

Unfortunately, the striped bass population has not remained all that bountiful. In the 1970's, heavy fishing pressure on the species coincided with water pollution and other environmental changes, and the population plummeted. The thriving industry that striped bass had supported was nearly wiped out, and it seemed that this flagship species might disappear completely.

Congress responded to the crisis by enacting the Striped Bass Conservation Act of 1984. The act put teeth in the existing interstate management plan for

striped bass. It created the Federal enforcement mechanism for the plan, authorized studies of the causes of the decline, and provided for regular population assessments. This law assured that the States would adopt the tough regulations that were required to bring the species back.

Madam Speaker, the Stripped Bass Act has turned out to be a huge success. After a period of persistently low populations in the 1980's, the species has rebounded to its highest levels in the last 30 years. The sacrifices that fishermen coast-wide have made to bring the stripers back have paid off, and my constituents in New Jersey as well as all striped fishermen from North Carolina to Maine can once again count this fish among the abundant natural resources with which our region is blessed.

This bill reauthorizes the Striped Bass Act for the next 3 years. It authorizes continued funding for the population assessments and adds studies of stripers to related species. Although stripers are recovered, they are still at risk from the numerous natural and man-made factors. This bill will ensure that we remain vigilant so that we can protect the gains that we have made in recent years.

The House passed this bill on July 8; the Senate has now passed the legislation with several amendments. The amendments make small changes related to the Secretary of Interior's role in enforcement, authorize a socioeconomic study on the benefits of Atlantic striped bass resource, and clarify provisions regarding striped bass regulation in Federal waters. These changes are not only acceptable, they actually enhance the bill. In fact, I wish I had thought of them myself.

Reauthorizing the Striped Bass Act has been a long process. Fortunately, as William Woods of the Massachusetts Bay Colony said in 1635, men are soon wearied with other fish, yet they never are with bass.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 1658 with the improvements adopted by the other body.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. First of all, Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for his diligent work in this area, and I rise in strong support of this legislation.

The remarkable recovery of the striped bass fishery a little more than a decade after the passage of the original Striped Bass Conservation Act is truly a success story, demonstrating that conservation can work, and, again, I think we all are grateful to Mr. SAXTON for his deep interest and diligence in pursuing this.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. Madam Speaker, at this time I have, as far as I know, no additional speakers, and so with just one thought I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

I was made aware earlier today that there is a regulatory problem off the shores of Massachusetts that relates to Nantucket and the State waters there and the Federal waters through which fishermen must pass on their way back to the mainland.

I understand that there is a regulatory issue, and I have talked with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] about this issue, and we both have agreed that we will try our best in the first couple of months of 1998 to deal with the National Marine Fisheries Service relative to these issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in strong support of H.R. 1658, the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act Amendments. The remarkable recovery of the striped bass fishery, a little more than a decade after the passage of the original Striped Bass Conservation Act, is a success story, demonstrating that fish conservation can work.

For the last three decades, Atlantic striped bass stocks have been declining due to overfishing, pollution, habitat destruction and other factors. Recently, however, the Atlantic striped bass stocks have grown and are slowly returning to their previous abundance. Many Atlantic Coast states have recognized the significance of this growth and understand the pressure that commercial fishing interests may have on breeding stocks. In response, states such as New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and Georgia, and several others, have passed gamefish laws or have prohibited the Atlantic striped bass commercial angling.

The management program established under this Act was, at the time of its inception in 1984, unique. It relies on the states to develop regulations for their waters that are consistent with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's management plan for striped bass. If the state fails in its efforts, a federal moratorium is imposed. This plan was so successful, that last year the Commission declared the striped bass to be fully recovered. Today, the fish are being found in record numbers up and down the coast.

Mr. Speaker, as I previously stated, striped bass populations were placed in jeopardy due to severe over-harvesting. Support of this legislation would allow us to better understand striped bass stock and management plans that not only benefit the striped bass stock, but the striped bass fishing community as well. Furthermore, these amendments increase public participation in the preparation of striped bass management plans. This fishery is one of the most important fisheries for marine recreational anglers. In 1995, over a million anglers made almost seven million trips and nearly spent 160 million dollars in pursuit of this fish. We must support this legislation and ensure that over a decade striped bass conservation and restoration is not erased.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1658.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1658.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR DIVISION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE OTTAWA AND CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments numbered 1 through 60, 62 and 63, and disagree to the Senate amendment numbered 61 to the bill (H.R. 1604) to provide for the division, use, and distribution of judgment funds of the Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan pursuant to dockets numbered 18-E, 58, 364 and 18-R before the Indian Claims Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 2, before line 1 insert:

TITLE I—DIVISION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE OTTAWA AND CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MICHIGAN

Page 2, line 1, strike out "SECTION 1" and insert "SEC. 101".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 2, line 3, strike out "2" and insert "102".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "Tribe" and insert "Band".

Page 3, line 9, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 3, line 14, strike out "3" and insert "103".

Page 3, line 15, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 4, line 13, strike out "6" and insert "106".

Page 4, line 16, strike out "4" and insert "104".

Page 4, line 23, strike out "10" and insert "110".

Page 6, line 13, strike out "10" and insert "110".

Page 7, line 23, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 7, line 24, strike out "10" and insert "110".

Page 8, line 3, strike out "5" and insert "105".

Page 8, line 9, strike out "4" and insert "104".

Page 8, line 13, strike out "7" and insert "107".

Page 8, line 15, strike out "4" and insert "104".