

The striped bass, commonly called rockfish in this area, is an anadromous fish which lives in marine waters during its adult life and migrates to a freshwater river stream to spawn. On the Atlantic coast, striped bass range from the St. Lawrence River in Canada to the St. Johns River in Florida. They are migratory, moving along the coast primarily within the three-mile zone which is subject to State fishery management. Adult habitats include the coastal rivers and the nearshore ocean and are distributed along the coast from Maine through North Carolina. Because striped bass pass through the jurisdiction of several States, Federal involvement in conservation efforts are necessary.

A severe population decline, which began in the 1970's, raised serious concerns about the sustainability of the striped bass fishery. In 1979, I offered an amendment to the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act that directed the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to conduct an emergency study of striped bass. The study found that, although habitat degradation played a role, overfishing was the primary cause of the population decline.

In 1981, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission prepared the first coast-wide management plan for the Atlantic striped bass. In 1984 Congress enacted the Striped Bass Act in 1984 to ensure that the States would comply with the plan. The act, which includes funding authority for a Federal striped bass study, has been amended in 1986, 1988, and 1991. The most recent reauthorization bill expired at the end of fiscal year 1994.

Under the Striped Bass Act, States are required to implement management measures that are consistent with the Commission's plan for the conservation of striped bass. The act authorizes the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior to impose a moratorium on striped bass fishing in any state that is not in compliance with the Commission's management plan. The act also authorizes funding for the ongoing striped bass study that was approved by Congress in 1979 in response to the decline in the Atlantic striped bass populations. The Federal study, undertaken jointly by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service, provides information on the threats to and the status of the striped bass population and scientific data necessary for sound management decisions.

The striped bass study in 1994 showed that most population indices had returned to pre-decline levels, and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission declared the species to be fully restored. It is a great testament to the Striped Bass Act and the cooperative efforts of the States and Federal Government that the fishery is continually improving.

The striped bass has proven once again that, given a chance, nature will rebound and overcome tremendous setbacks. But it is up to us to help the

striped bass receive that chance. Reauthorization of the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act Amendments of 1997 will ensure that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Commission will continue to monitor the populations, and collect data that will provide the necessary information needed to make informed decisions essential to maintaining healthy populations of striped bass.

Mr. President, I strongly encourage the Senate to pass H.R. 1658 to continue one of the most significant recovery ever experienced for a coastal finfish species.●

#### PEOPLE'S LODGE

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to address a project that unfortunately was not incorporated in the list of projects to be funded by the Economic Development Administration outlined in the Senate report to accompany the Fiscal Year 1998 appropriations bill for Commerce, State, Justice and the Judiciary.

This project is the People's Lodge—a multi-cultural center designed to serve the urban Indian and Alaska Native populations in Seattle, Washington, and all of the Indian tribes in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. The People's Lodge represents the next phase of development of the Daybreak Star Center and will include a permanent Hall of Ancestors exhibition, a multiple-use Potlatch House, and an exhibition gallery, the John Kauffman, Jr. Theater, a resource center, and the Sacred Circle of the American Indian Art. The federal funding for this project—approximately \$13 million—would be matched by funds from private sources. The private fund-raising efforts are already well-underway.

In the coming days, Senator STEVENS and Senator MURRAY and I will be pursuing this matter directly with the Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Economic Development Administration will agree with us as to the merits of this most worthwhile project.●

#### SANCTIONS POLICY REFORM ACT

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I was pleased to join yesterday with the distinguished Senator from Indiana, Senator LUGAR, as a cosponsor of his bill, S. 1413, the Enhancement of Trade, Security, and Human Rights Through Sanctions Reform Act.

This bill is an attempt to bring some order to one of the more vexing foreign policy problems we in Congress face—the question of when to impose unilateral economic sanctions.

Congress has been quick to enact unilateral economic sanctions over the years in response to behavior of foreign nations that we find objectionable. At times, the executive branch has done the same. By one estimate, between 1993 and 1996, the United States imposed unilateral sanctions 61 times on 35 countries.

The question we must ask, and which in my view we fail to ask at times,

really is fundamental to the conduct of U.S. foreign policy: Are U.S. interests advanced best by deepening relations or diminishing relations with a country that is not acting as we would like?

Frankly, there is no one answer to this question. The answer clearly varies from case to case. There is no doubt that unilateral sanctions do have a place in our foreign policy tool box. I have voted for them at times, as has nearly every Member of Congress.

However, there is no doubt, as well, that we have imposed sanctions recklessly at times, without due regard to their effectiveness, or to the damage they could cause other U.S. foreign policy interests, the U.S. economy, and our ability to provide humanitarian assistance.

What S. 1413 would do is force Congress and the executive branch to apply the brakes in the occasional rush to impose unilateral sanctions. Our effort is not to prevent unilateral sanctions in all cases, but instead to impose a more judicious process that we should follow before they are imposed. This process is designed to create some breathing space—time to adequately consider both the possible impact of unilateral sanctions on other U.S. interests, and whether there are other policy alternatives that might be more effective than unilateral sanctions.

It will also ensure that when we do pass unilateral sanctions, we do not lock ourselves into a policy that deprives us of all flexibility. By making Presidential waivers and a 2-year sunset policy standard practice for the imposition of unilateral sanctions, we will ensure that we are not forced to perpetuate a policy that is not working, has become outdated, or is excessively damaging U.S. interests in other areas.

It is worth repeating that nothing in this legislation will prevent us from passing unilateral sanctions into law. This bill is merely designed to bring some order and discipline to the process. I want to commend the Senator from Indiana for his leadership in this area, and I look forward to working with him to pass this bill into law.●

#### SUPPORT THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to join a number of my colleagues in speaking briefly about one of the most important issues that will come before the Senate next year in the second session of the 105th Congress.

In late September, President Clinton submitted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for ratification. The President's transmission statement includes the following:

The Conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is a signal event in the history of arms control. The subject of the treaty is one that has been under consideration by the international community for

nearly 40 years, and the significance of the conclusion of negotiations and the signature to date of more than 140 states cannot be overestimated. The Treaty creates an absolute prohibition against the conduct of nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosion anywhere. . . . The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is of singular significance to the continuing efforts to stem nuclear proliferation and strengthen regional and global stability. Its conclusion marks the achievement of the highest priority item on the international arms control and nonproliferation agenda.

I commend the President for his leadership on this issue. I look forward to working closely and in a bipartisan fashion to secure prompt ratification of the CTBT. I will do absolutely everything I can to support the passage of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I expect a spirited debate on the CTBT including vigorous opposition from some who continue to believe in nuclear expansion and experimentation.

Several Senate hearings have recently been held and I urge the body to move forward in a timely and deliberative manner early in 1998. As a member of the Appropriations Energy and Water subcommittee with funding responsibility for nuclear weapons activities including stockpile stewardship, I look forward to actively participating in Senate consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask that a brief titled, "Ten Reasons for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," be printed in the RECORD. This information was prepared by a nongovernmental organization in support of CTBT ratification.

The material follows:

Ten Reasons for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

1. THE CTBT WOULD GUARD AGAINST THE RENEWAL OF THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would limit the ability of nuclear weapons states to build new nuclear weapons by prohibiting "any nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions." The ban on nuclear explosions would severely impede the development of new, sophisticated nuclear weapons by the existing nuclear powers. While countries could build advanced, new types of nuclear weapons designs without nuclear explosive testing, they will lack the high confidence that the weapons will work as designed. Thus, the Treaty can impede a nuclear arms buildup by five declared and three undeclared nuclear weapon states.

2. THE CTBT WOULD CURB NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, "threshold" states would be prevented from carrying out the types of tests required to field a modern nuclear arsenal. While a country could develop nuclear weapons for the first time without conducting nuclear explosions, the bomb design would be fare from optimal in size and weight and its nuclear explosive power would remain uncertain. The CTBT is therefore vital to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to additional states, where these weapons could destabilize international security.

3. THE CTBT WOULD STRENGTHEN THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

The conclusion of the CTBT is a key element in the global bargain that led to the

signing and the extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. In May 1995, non-nuclear states agreed to extend that Treaty in May 1995 with the understanding that Article VI measures in the original treaty—like the CTBT—would be implemented. At the May 1995 NPT extension conference, all nations agreed to "The completion by the Conference on Disarmament of the negotiations on a universal and internationally and effectively verifiable Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty no later than 1996." Ratification of the CTBT would further legitimize U.S. non-proliferation efforts and lay the basis for universal enforcement of the CTBT, even against the few nations that may not sign.

4. NUCLEAR TESTING IS NOT NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN THE SAFETY AND RELIABILITY OF THE U.S. ARSENAL

The U.S. has a solid and proven warhead surveillance and maintenance program to preserve the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear deterrent without nuclear test explosions and this program is being augmented through the Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship Program (SBSS). Although some of the projects that are part of the SBSS program are not essential to the maintenance of the stockpile, many objective experts—both critics and supporters of the program—agree that the program can ensure the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile without resorting to nuclear explosive testing.

All operational U.S. nuclear weapons are already "one-point safe" against accidental detonation of the warhead's high explosives, making even low-yield nuclear explosions, known as "hydronuclear" tests unnecessary. In addition, the nuclear warhead designs of operational U.S. nuclear weapons incorporate additional modern safety features. Since instituting a new annual warhead safety and reliability certification process in 1995, U.S. nuclear weapons have been twice certified without nuclear test explosions.

5. THE CTBT IS EFFECTIVELY VERIFIABLE

The CTBT would put into place an extensive, global array of 170 seismic monitoring stations, 80 radionuclide monitoring stations, 11 hydroacoustic monitoring stations, and 60 infrasound monitoring stations to detect and deter possible nuclear test explosions. Monitoring capabilities would be especially sensitive at and around the established nuclear test sites. With this monitoring system, the CTBT would—with high confidence—be able to detect nuclear test explosions that are militarily significant. In addition, the CTBT would provide an additional deterrent against potential test ban violations by establishing on-site inspection (OSI) rights that could allow detection of the radioactive gases leaking from an underground nuclear test.

6. THE CTBT WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY ENHANCE CURRENT U.S. MONITORING CAPABILITIES

Whether or not the CTBT is ratified, U.S. intelligence agencies will be tasked with monitoring nuclear weapons programs of the nuclear powers and the efforts of non-nuclear states and groups to attain nuclear weapons. The Treaty will make that task easier by establishing a far-reaching international monitoring system across the globe that would augment existing national intelligence tools. Clearly, U.S. intelligence capabilities to detect nuclear tests and nuclear weapons development programs would be far better with the CTBT

7. THE CTBT WOULD ENHANCE THE INTERNATIONAL NORM AGAINST NUCLEAR TESTING

If the five declared nuclear weapon states ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, it will strengthen the global norm against

testing and weapons development that helps make the nuclear "have-not" nations far less inclined to develop nuclear weapons. The U.S. has not tested a nuclear weapon since 1992 when Congress passed and President Bush signed the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell legislation establishing a moratorium on nuclear testing. This law, which remains in effect, says that the U.S. may not conduct a nuclear test explosion unless another nation conducts a test. CTBT ratification would help bring other nations in line with U.S. policy.

8. THE CTBT IS SUPPORTED BY A LARGE MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is supported by a large majority of the American people. U.S. public support for a nuclear weapons test ban has remained consistently high since the early days of the Cold War. The most recent poll, conducted in September 1997 by the Mellman Group, revealed that 70 percent of Americans support United States ratification of a nuclear test ban treaty.

9. THE CTBT IS THE LONGEST-SOUGHT INITIATIVE TO HELP REDUCE NUCLEAR WEAPONS DANGERS

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty marks an historic achievement pursued by Presidents since Dwight D. Eisenhower. For forty years, Presidents and activists have worked for an end to nuclear testing. Previous negotiations have been hindered by international incidents, the failure to compromise at key times, and most importantly, the political dynamics of the Cold War nuclear arms race itself. Ratification of the CTBT would mark an important milestone in the effort to end the nuclear arms race.

10. THE CTBT WOULD PROTECT HUMAN HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Since 1945, six nations have conducted 2,046 nuclear test explosions—an average of one test every nine days. These tests spread dangerous levels of radioactive fallout downwind and into the global atmosphere. A 1997 National Cancer Institute Study estimates that fallout from only 90 U.S. nuclear test will likely cause 10,000—75,000 additional thyroid cancers in the U.S. Underground testing also poses environmental hazards: each blast spreads highly radioactive material underground; many underground nuclear explosions have vented radioactive gases. The Energy Department reports that 114 of the 723 U.S. nuclear tests since 1963 released radioactive material into the atmosphere.●

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE IMPROVEMENT

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to bring to my colleagues' attention the games being played by the majority regarding needed reforms at the IRS.

On one hand, the people want IRS reform, and only the Senate stands in the way. The House overwhelmingly passed an IRS reform bill, 426 to 4, and the President is waiting to sign it into law. But the Senate leadership says "no way, we can't begin fixing the IRS we have to get home for the holidays." So the taxpayer will have to wait for needed reforms making the IRS more user friendly. This means changes aimed at helping the American taxpayer deal with the IRS will be unnecessarily delayed and taxpayers will see little change in the IRS. Instead of a new IRS oversight board bringing new and more taxpayer friendly services, Americans who are dutifully paying their