

Atlantic herring and the Atlantic mackerel fishing seasons.

As members of our committee are aware, stock quotas are spread over a number of ships and are not meant to be filled by a small percentage of ships. My fear is that a large, highly efficient ship could close a fishery and reduce its stock simply because of the number of fish it can catch. I am concerned with NMFS's ability to react if overutilization occurs and this fishery needs to be shut down. If we allow a ship of this size into a forage fishery and we are mistaken as to the size of the stock, we will have a problem. And I would prefer that we err on the side of conservation, not exploitation.

In the past, we have encouraged highly efficient gears to fish underutilized stocks. I do not want to get into examples. But I have to say that in the 1980's we encouraged the fishing gears to redirect efforts toward the shark species. At the time, sharks were considered to be underutilized. Since then, we have witnessed a drop in various shark species as a result of this redirected effort.

Mr. Speaker, we should learn from that mistake and be cautious of redirecting any highly efficient gear. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that a vote in favor of H.R. 1855 is a vote for protecting one of our Nation's largest public resource. We have the opportunity to save the fish stock not only for those fishermen who depend on this resource along the Atlantic coast, but for future generations of fishermen as well. That is why I strongly urge my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 1855.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for all the work that he has done on this legislation.

I would also like to note that with the depleted state of the North Atlantic groundfish, and restrictions on other fisheries, certain New England fishermen have been forced into the mackerel and herring fishery. It is my belief that this highly efficient gear will most likely compromise their needs and whatever relief these fishermen have experienced through herring and mackerel fisheries.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers at this time, and 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 pass the Senate bill, S. 430.

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.

# EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ACTS OF ILLEGAL AGGRESSION BY CANADIAN FISHERMEN WITH RESPECT TO PACIFIC SALMON FISHERY

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 124), expressing the sense of the Congress regarding acts of illegal aggression by Canadian fishermen with respect to the Pacific salmon fishery, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 124

Whereas Pacific salmon migrate across international boundaries, allowing United States salmon stocks and Canadian salmon stocks to intermingle as they travel through the waters of the North Pacific Ocean;

Whereas after many years of negotiations, in 1985 the United States and Canada signed the Pacific Salmon Treaty based on a primary principle of conservation and a secondary principle of equity;

Whereas the United States and Canada formed the Pacific Salmon Commission to implement the Pacific Salmon Treaty;

Whereas the Pacific Salmon Commission does not regulate the Pacific salmon fishery, but provides regulatory advice and recommendations to the United States and Canada;

Whereas since the signing of the Pacific Salmon Treaty, the United States and Canada have not agreed on the definition of "equity" for purposes of the principle of equity underlying the Treaty, and this disagreement has created a rift between the 2 governments and the regional stakeholders of the Pacific salmon fishery;

Whereas Pacific salmon fishery regulatory regimes have not been in place since 1994 because of a lack of agreement;

Whereas an illegal fee in violation of international agreements was assessed on the United States fishermen traveling to Alaska, and neither the United States Government nor United States fishermen have been reimbursed for that fee;

Whereas since 1994, the United States and Canada have used special negotiators, a mediation process, and the current stakeholders process to attempt to resolve past disputes and negotiate annual and long-term Pacific salmon fishery regimes;

Whereas the good faith efforts of the United States in attempting to resolve differences under the Pacific Salmon Treaty have not been matched, as demonstrated in particular by the rejection of continued attempts by the United States to reach agreement and the withdrawal from negotiations in June 1997 when an agreement seemed imminent;

Whereas Canadian fishermen have been frustrated with their own government's effort to resolve the Pacific Salmon Treaty disputes and have used the harassment of United States citizens as a way to get attention;

Whereas Canadian fishermen, in protest over the lack of an agreement regarding various issues under the Pacific Salmon Treaty, recently undertook acts of illegal aggression against United States citizens by blocking the passage of a United States vessel, and there was a failure to act quickly to end those acts; and

Whereas those acts and that failure should be condemned: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—*

(1) the recent acts of illegal aggression by Canadian fishermen with respect to the Pa-

cific salmon fishery and the slow response to those acts should be condemned;

(2) the President should immediately take steps to protect the interests of the United States with respect to the Pacific salmon fishery and should not tolerate threats to those interests;

(3) the President should use all necessary and appropriate means to prevent any further illegal or harassing actions against the United States or its fishermen with respect to the Pacific salmon fishery; and

(4) negotiations with the stakeholders with respect to the Pacific salmon fishery should resume in good faith in the fall following the 1997 fishing season.

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

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

□ 1445

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 124 is introduced in response to illegal actions taken by Canadian fishermen on the weekend of July 19, 1997. Two hundred and fifty Canadian fishermen illegally blockaded an Alaskan ferryboat leaving from Prince Rupert, British Columbia. By taking these actions, Canada has escalated the Pacific salmon treaty negotiations beyond the scope of the treaty.

The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the Committee on Resources, has referred to the blockade as goon squad tactics. While I do not go quite that far, I find the blockade very unfortunate and very disruptive to negotiations, negotiations which are extremely important to another species, several species actually, of the Northwest salmon population.

House Concurrent Resolution 124 asks the President to use all necessary and appropriate means to compel the Government of Canada to prevent any further illegal actions. In addition, the resolution urges Canada to return to the negotiations this fall after the fishing season has ended. I would also like to urge Canada to return to the negotiations without further incidents.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important matter. It affects the livelihood and the lives of American citizens, many of whom live in the State of Alaska. It is also important because this House, along with the other House and our Government, and I am sure the Canadian Government as well, would like to take appropriate and necessary steps to provide for the rebuilding of salmon stock in the Northwest. This incident that occurred just a few days ago stands in the way of that process. We believe that it should be brought to a hasty end.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 124 was originally referred to the Committee on Resources and the Committee on International Relations. The version we are taking up today under the suspension of the rules has been

modified to address concerns raised by the Committee on International Relations and is now referred solely to the Committee on Resources. I urge my colleagues to support this timely and much needed resolution.

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

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

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has referred to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], our great chairman, and in the context of his remarks quoted one or two of them from the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is known that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has a well-deserved reputation for being blunt and direct. It remains for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and myself to take up the diplomatic mantle with respect to our committee and those elements expressed to us by the Committee on International Relations.

May I say in any context, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Government is indeed fortunate that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is in the process of recuperating and recovering from a recent operation, and I am sure all Members join with me in wishing the gentleman from Alaska a speedy recovery and a quick return to us here in the Congress. We need his leadership. We need his dynamism here.

In this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, the long-running debate over the Pacific salmon treaty has been contentious without a doubt. But both the United States and Canada share responsibility for the continuing impasse. As such, the recent blockade of an Alaskan ferryboat, as referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], by Canadian fishermen was not only illegal, it was counterproductive to the ongoing negotiations.

This resolution condemns the actions of the Canadians, but, more importantly, it urges them to return to the bargaining table that they abandoned this past June. Proper conservation and management of the Pacific salmon is more important to both the United States and Canada than confrontation. We cannot reach a meaningful agreement unless both sides are willing to come to the table and negotiate in good faith.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close by saying that on the domestic side in the United States and on the Canadian side in Canada, it is extremely important that we reach agreement internally in this country as well as in Canada and between our two countries on a plan that will re-

verse the decline in the population of the Northwest Pacific salmon. We are working diligently with Members from four northwestern States to try to arrive at an American plan. We are working with the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] because a very important part of the salmon stock comes from Alaska. And we are hopeful that the folks in British Columbia will be able to put in place a conservation plan for that part of the stock.

But it goes without saying that unless we have not only domestic cooperation, and, incidentally, we have tentatively scheduled a hearing in Idaho on this very matter during the break, during the August break for, I believe, the 15th of the month, and so we are diligently doing what we can to try to reverse the population decline of this species.

I personally appeal to the Canadian Government and to others who may be aware of our discussions here today to move as rapidly as we possibly can on an international basis to bring this very important conservation matter to a conclusion. We care about American fishermen, we care about Canadian fishermen, and we care about the salmon stock very much. That is why we are moving so diligently to try to accomplish the goals outlined here today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say only in conclusion that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is a man of resolute purpose, and so I advise both Governments that they should take this opportunity to come to a quick conclusion. Otherwise, I think when the gentleman from Alaska gets back, he will be happy to volunteer to solve the whole problem all by himself.

The remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] are well-taken, Mr. Speaker, and I trust that both Governments will take this opportunity, particularly over the break that we have coming, and bring the issue to a conclusion.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution being presented by the gentleman from Alaska.

This resolution is necessary because of an unfortunate and unacceptable situation that took place 2 weeks ago, when certain Canadian fishermen took the law into their own hands through an act of aggression aimed at the United States commercial fishing industry, allegedly in retaliation and frustration over the lack of progress in the renegotiation of the United States-Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty.

Specifically, 2 weeks ago in Prince Rupert, British Columbia, more than 150 Canadian fishing vessels surrounded the Alaskan ferry *Malaspina*, forming a blockade and would not let the ferry leave port for 3 days, stranding 300 innocent passengers, and disrupting a key transportation link on the Alaska Marine Highway. The fishermen conducting the illegal blockade of the ferry claimed that they were

conducting the disruptive act of aggression to bring attention to their government because of their frustrations and claims that Alaska is overharvesting sockeye salmon headed for spawning waters in the Fraser River.

As outrageous as this act was by the Canadian fishermen, equally unacceptable was the slow response by the Canadian Government to enforce its own laws. Canada allowed this situation to go on for 3 days. Even after a Canadian Federal judge ordered the blockade ended, Royal Canadian Mounted Police took no immediate action to enforce the order and end the blockade.

Canada is our neighbor and valued ally. We respect her sovereignty, and we support a free trade relationship that benefits the long-term stability and growth of both our nations' economies. This is why I have been a strong supporter of the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. My State borders Canada, and my State benefits from open access to Canadian markets. My State also has a significant fishing industry as a component of its economy, and this industry has been hard hit by a variety of unfortunate factors such as endangered species listings and El Nino conditions that have closed and reduced access to key fisheries. Many fishermen have gone out of business and the survivors are struggling.

Our fishermen recognize that the migratory patterns of salmon means that Canada, Alaska, and the Pacific Northwest States have a shared responsibility for the conservation and management of salmon populations moving through adjacent waters. Progress and completion of a new United States-Canada Treaty is the best insurance possible to provide stability for the commercial fishing industry on both sides of the border.

Our fishermen are frustrated as well. They want progress and they want results. But they have respected the rule of law, and have communicated their concerns through the administration and their elected officials. Canadian fishermen are going to have to do the same, and the Canadian Government is going to have to discourage future illegality by moving swiftly to enforce its own laws.

We encourage the President to join us in condemning the actions taken by Canadian fishermen 2 weeks ago, and urge the Canadian Government to condemn such acts as well.

I believe that Canada should be justifiably criticized for the deterioration of the present situation regarding progress on treaty negotiations. It was Canada that walked out on negotiations this past June, when the United States side was making significant moves toward a resolution. The only way that this situation is going to be resolved is if everyone stays at the table.

Our side is working to make progress and I urge the Canadians to work to do the same. Regarding the southern issues involved in the Pacific Salmon Treaty, the last United States proposal on coho, built on detailed scientific analysis, would have provided for sound conservation and rebuilding of the depleted coho stocks by reducing the harvest rate by approximately 50 percent. It would also have provided a west coast Vancouver Island coho troll fishery approximately three times as large as the United States fishery, and would have enabled Canada to intercept approximately 30 percent more United States-origin coho than U.S. fishers take in Washington and Oregon.

In contrast, State Department negotiators indicate that the proposal that Canada put on the table failed to meet even the minimum requirements necessary to conserve coho.

Regarding sockeye, the last proposal put on the table by the United States would have assured Canada received more than 80 percent of the Fraser River sockeye harvest. To accomplish this, the United States negotiators proposed a major restructuring of the sockeye fleet to reduce the nontreaty commercial fishery by 40 percent. This would have led to significant sacrifice on the United States side, but Canada would not recognize this and accept the proposal, and instead pushed for an even greater reduction.

The point is that our side has been trying and is continuing to push for an overall renegotiation of the treaty that benefits both nations. I believe that Mary Beth West, the lead U.S. negotiator on the treaty, is working in good faith to reach an expeditious resolution to the major sticking points in the negotiations. Recently, she appointed former EPA Director and Washington resident William Ruckelshaus, to serve as a mediator to help get the negotiations back on track.

We all want to see progress and a long-term resolution to problems associated with the extension of the United States-Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty. However, illegal acts and attempts at blackmail are not the way to make the situation better and to move us forward. The negotiations are complex, the underlying issues have enormous economic implications for the commercial and recreational fishing industry on both sides of the border. But we must deal with these matters and resolve tensions through good faith negotiations.

The Canadian fishermen were wrong to blockade the Alaskan ferry *Malaspina*, and the Canadian Government was wrong not to act to enforce laws against that illegal action.

I support this resolution condemning these events and urge Canada to return to good faith negotiations on the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 124 to respond to what I call goon squad tactics taken by Canadian fishermen on the weekend of July 19, 1997.

Canadian fishermen, frustrated with their Government's effort to resolve Pacific Salmon Treaty disputes, further escalated the salmon strife by illegally blockading the M/V *Malaspina*, an Alaskan ferry, in Prince Rupert, British Columbia. What I find most reprehensible, is the failure of the Canadian Government to enforce a court order to end the blockade. Innocent passengers were held hostage while the Government of Canada turned a blind eye.

This isn't the first time the Government of Canada has condoned illegal actions. In 1994, 258 United States fishermen were unfairly charged an illegal transit fee by the Canadian Government to transit from Washington to Alaska through the Inside Passage. U.S. fishermen have only two choices when traveling from Washington to Alaska. The safe route is through the Inside Passage, while the alternate is traveling in the treacherous waters of the Pacific Ocean. This illegal fee forced U.S. vessels to either risk their safety or be illegally fined.

In 3 years, the Canadian Government or its citizens have purposefully ignored and violated

international law and harassed United States citizens. How many times are we supposed to put up with Canada's disregard for international law? House Concurrent Resolution 124 asks the President to use all necessary and appropriate means to compel the Government of Canada to prevent any further illegal actions.

Mr. Speaker, Canada's past actions are serious and I would hope that Congress and the administration can work together to develop and implement measures to help protect the interests of the United States with respect to the Pacific salmon fishery. The United States should not tolerate threats to those interests from the action or inaction of a foreign government or its citizens.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 124, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the legislation just considered, H.R. 1855, S. 430 and House Concurrent Resolution 124.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR SAFE KIDS BUCKLE UP CAR SEAT SAFETY CHECK

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the SAFE KIDS Buckle Up Car Seat Safety Check.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 98

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The National SAFE KIDS Campaign (in this resolution referred to as the "sponsor") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the SAFE KIDS Buckle Up Car Seat Safety Check, on the Capitol grounds on August 27 and 28, 1997, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.

#### SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event authorized to be conducted under section 1 shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress,

under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

#### SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

(a) STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.—Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor may erect upon the Capitol grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, and may take such other actions, as may be required for the event authorized to be conducted under section 1.

(b) ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board may make such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 98, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Safe Kids Car Seat Check on August 28, 1997. This event is sponsored by the National Safe Kids Campaign. This campaign will educate families about the importance of the proper installation and use of car seats for children. Parents will have the opportunity to have an expert inspect car seats for proper installation.

There is a nationwide effort to conduct these inspections. This campaign is a grassroots effort intended to deliver important safety messages through more than 200 Safe Kids Coalitions and other private service organizations nationwide. This event is open to the public and free of charge and will be arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress under the conditions prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] and other members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in bipartisan support for House Concurrent Resolution 98, which would authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for the Safe Kids Buckle Up program. The event is scheduled for August 28 and is part of a national effort to assist parents in protecting young children from the leading cause of unintentional death of children, which is motor vehicle injury.

Each year, approximately 1,400 children die as motor vehicle passengers and more than 280,000 are seriously injured. I am deeply saddened to report that in my State of Texas, Mr. Speaker, 86 children age 8 and under died in motor vehicle crashes in 1995. Because