

humpback were indeed depleted, but those species were later protected by international agreement long before the existence of Greenpeace or Sea Shepherd. (There have been abuses. Alexei V. Yablokov, special adviser to the president of Russia for ecology and health, has revealed that the whaling fleet of the former Soviet Union illegally killed more than 700 protected right whales during the 1960's but the International Whaling Commission's institution of an observer program in 1972 essentially put an end to the Soviet fleet's illegal activities.)

The only whale species that Enghaugen and his fellow Norwegian whalers hunt is the minke, which Norwegians eat as whale steaks, whale meatballs, and whaleburgers. As it turns out, minke whales are no more in danger of extinction than Angus cattle. In 1994, thirty-two Norwegian boats killed a total of 279 minkes, out of an estimated local population of about 87,000 and a world population of around 900,000.

In 1982 the IWC voted to suspend commercial whaling for a five-year period starting in 1986. The ostensible purpose was to permit the collection of better data on whales before hunting resumed. Norway lodged a reservation exempting itself from the moratorium, as the IWC treaty permitted, but it complied voluntarily.

Whaling nations soon learned, though, that the majority of nations in the IWC—including the United States—intended to maintain the ban indefinitely, no matter what the numbers showed. Canada left the IWC in 1982, and Iceland left in 1992. Norway terminated its voluntary compliance in 1993. To protest the commission's disregard of the facts about whale stocks, the British chairman of the IWC's scientific committee resigned that year pointing out in his angry letter of resignation that the commission's actions "were nothing to do with science." The IWC continued the moratorium anyway at its next meeting.

A 1993 report by the Congressional Research Service observed that the data on whales undercut the conservationist argument, and that "if the United States argues for continuing the moratorium on commercial whaling, it may have to rely increasingly on moral and ethical appeals." The ban on whaling is no longer about conservation, in other words, but about the desire of many Americans and Western Europeans to impose their feelings about whales upon the whaling nations (which include Iceland, Russia, Japan, and the Inuits of Canada and Alaska).

Popular notions of whales' human-like intelligence, often cited by opponents of whaling, have little real support. Whales possess large brains, but that proves nothing about their mental agility. Margaret Klinowska, a Cambridge University expert on cetacean intelligence, holds that the structure of the whale brain has more in common with that of comparatively primitive mammals such as hedgehogs and bats than with the brains of primates.

Whales can be trained to perform stunts and other tasks, but so can pigeons and many other animals that have never been credited with the cerebral powers of homo sapiens. And the idea that whales have something like a human language is, at present, pure folklore. Like virtually all animals, whales make vocalizations, but there is no evidence that they are uttering Whalish words and sentences. Their famed "singing" is done only by the males, and then during but half the year—a pattern more suggestive of bird-song than human speech.

Much of the popular mythology about cetacean intelligence comes from crank scientist John Lilly, a physician who became convinced in the 1950s that whales and dolphins are not only smarter and more commu-

nicative than humans, but also have their own civilizations, complete with philosophy, history, and science that are passed down orally through the generations. His conclusions about the animals' mental skills were based partly on his observations of captive dolphins at his lab in the Virgin Islands, but mainly on wild flights of conjecture. Lilly also predicted in the late seventies that the State Department would eventually negotiate treaties with the cetaceans, and that humanity's progress in its dealings with them would lead the Galactic Coincidence Control Center to send agents to planet Earth to open the way for extraterrestrial contacts with us. The anthropomorphization of the whale reached new heights with a 1993 open letter to the Norwegian people from Sea Shepherd president Paul Watson, who predicted, "The whales will talk about you in the same vein as Jews now talk of Nazis. For in the eyes of whalekind, there is little difference between the behavior of the monsters of the Reich and the monsters behind the harpoon."

Cetacean behavior researchers have rejected Lilly's claims. Dolphin investigator Kenneth Norris of the University of California Santa Cruz, who was among the first to study dolphins in the wild and is responsible for much of our knowledge about dolphin sonar, writes that they have "a complicated animal communication system, yes, but for an abstract syntactic language like ours, no compelling evidence seemed, or seems, to exist." The late David and Melba Caldwell, who studied dolphin behavior at the University of Florida, maintained flatly that "dolphins do not talk." In their view, "dolphins probably are just exceptionally amiable mammals with an intelligence now considered by most workers, on a subjective basis, to be comparable to that of a better-than-average dog."

Louis Herman, director of the University of Hawaii's marine mammal laboratory and an opponent of whaling, has been studying the behavior of captive dolphins since 1967. Herman says he has seen no evidence that the natural vocalizations of dolphins constitute a language. And for whales? "There's no reason to think the situation would be different with other cetacean species," he answers.

What American policy on whaling enforces is simply a cultural preference—one comparable to our distaste for horsemeat, which is favored in France. The whale-savers have succeeded in shaping policy by selling the idea that whales are different; that they are endangered underwater Einsteins. That's why Icelandic filmmaker Magnus Gudmundsson, who has produced a documentary showing Greenpeace's machinations on the issue, is correct in calling the movement "a massive industry of deception."

INTRODUCTION OF THE OMNIBUS ADOPTION ACT OF 1995 AND THE HEALTH CARE AND HOUSING FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN ACT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Today, I reintroduced two important bills which will have a direct and substantial impact on women, children, and families nationwide. These bills—the Omnibus Adoption Act of 1995 and the Health Care and Housing for Women and Children Act—both promote the joining of needy chil-

dren and caring families through the loving option of adoption.

There is no doubt that there are children patiently and hopefully awaiting adoption. Over the past decade, between 50,000–60,000 children found adoptive homes each year. This figure is down from 89,000 in 1970; but that is not indicative of fewer needy children. In fact, over this same time period, the number of children in foster care increased to more than 407,000 and the number of children born out-of-wedlock increased three-fold to 1,165,000.

The National Council for Adoption [NCFA] estimates that between one and two million individuals and couples want to adopt. But there are obstacles in their way. Some of these obstacles are financial; some are merely education; some are cultural. The Omnibus Adoption Act of 1995 takes aim at these hurdles with the intention of leveling them.

Furthermore, evidence suggests that the benefits of adoption to birthmothers are overwhelmingly positive. In fact, some research indicates that those women who do choose to make an adoption plan for their children will be less likely to live in poverty, more likely to complete high school, and less likely to have additional unplanned pregnancies. We must provide Federal support to these pregnant women and all pregnant women who lack the means to pay for prenatal and maternal health care.

The centerpiece of the Omnibus Adoption Act is the means tested \$5000 tax credit. According to the NCFA, the average cost of an adoption is \$14,000 and it is not uncommon for this figure to reach upwards of \$25,000. Often this includes prenatal care for the birthmother and child, counseling for the adoptive family, and legal fees. For a middle-income family already on a tight budget, this one-time up-front cost can be prohibitive.

The targeted tax credit would be available in full to families earning less than \$60,000 and in part to families earning between \$60,000 and \$100,000. In this way, it is able to give as much help as possible to the families which need it the most. And while this tax credit has a limitless reward, it has a very modest cost. The Republican staff of the Budget Committee estimated last year that the adoption tax credit would cost \$900 million over 5 years.

You may recognize this provision from the Republican Contract with America as well. I am pleased that this aspect of my bill has been included in the Contract's Family Reinforcement Act [H.R. 11].

Other provisions of the Omnibus Adoption Act are equally valuable and popular. For instance, the bill establishes a national advisory council on adoption to monitor the progress of the various adoption related programs which exist and which the bill institutes. The bill also establishes a national adoption data collection system. These two provisions will work hand-in-hand to further advance adoption options. As does a section stating the sense of Congress that every State implement and enforce uniform adoption laws ranging from detailed home studies for prospective adoptive families to health benefits for birthmothers and adopted children.

The Omnibus Adoption Act establishes a program of graduate study fellowships to encourage our best young minds to research and develop innovation in adoption programs. Additionally, the bill organizes a grant program within the Department of Education offering

grant funding to States which implement adoption education programs. The Boston Globe, in an editorial highly supportive of this bill in general and the tax credit provision in particular, noted that this was an idea that deserves close study.

Another provision in the Omnibus Adoption Act which the Globe thought worthy of closer study clarifies Federal and military employee adoption benefits. This would allow these families to use sick leave for adoption purposes. They would also be eligible for reimbursement through Federal health benefit plans for the prenatal and maternity care of the birthmother in their adoption plan. The bill specifically prohibits surrogate parenting arrangements with regard to this provision.

The final two provisions of the Omnibus Adoption Act are so critical to the promotion of adoption and the health of birthmothers and their children that I have introduced them as a separate bill as well—the Health Care and Housing for Women and Children Act. These provisions establish material health certificates and grants for rehabilitation of housing for use as maternity homes. Maternal health certificates could be used by low-income pregnant women who seek assistance in carrying their child to term at maternity homes. Here they could get housing, medical care, educational and vocational training, adoption counseling, and other supportive services. To ensure that maternity homes are available to these women, a grant program would be established to give non-profit organizations aid in rehabilitating old housing for use as maternity homes.

The American Enterprise in its January/February 1995 noted the central role which maternity homes once played in helping young, low-income women to carry their pregnancies to term and how that role has unfortunately diminished. Writer George Liebmann observed that:

Current American welfare policy is plagued by an ideology of cash entitlement. What the poor really need today is not a check but a powerful set of rehabilitative social services. These should be offered by private community groups, without any illusion of moral neutrality. Rescuing an underclass is by definition a highly moralistic undertaking.

This is the historical mission of the maternity home. They provide therapy and support through the grouping of several young women in similar circumstances under one roof. They provide rehabilitation through education, vocational training, health care, and counseling. Furthermore, they offer discipline and supervision to women who have often lived on streets and in neighborhoods devoid of such backbone. This is crucial to the health and welfare of both mother and child. And it can all be provided by community groups with a commitment to care.

Over the past two sessions in which I have introduced these bills, they have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from more than one hundred Members. I encourage my colleagues to respond to the needs of homeless children and the families who long to help them by co-sponsoring both the Omnibus Adoption Act and the Health Care and Housing for Women and Children Act.

HONORING THE STUDENTS OF FAIRFAX HIGH SCHOOL

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to some students at Fairfax High School in Fairfax, Virginia. These students represented the Eleventh Congressional District in the We The People Competition on February 14, 1995 in Richmond, Virginia. These students ranked in third place in the statewide competition with a score of 897, studying for months to become experts on the Bill of Rights. This is significant when I remind members that Fairfax County was the home of George Mason, the author of the Bill of Rights. By all accounts, these fine students have demonstrated expertise on those rights.

The We The People program is the most extensive education program in the country developed to teach young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the principles and values they embody. The course of instruction, using the specially designed With Liberty and Justice for All text, is followed by a test designed to measure the students' constitutional literacy. High school classes may then elect whether to enter a series of competitions at the congressional district, State, and national levels.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education by an Act of Congress, the program is currently being implemented in every Congressional District in the country, the four Trust Territories, and the District of Columbia. When combined with the noncompetitive elementary and middle school levels, more than 20 million students have participated in the program over the past 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge these fine students at this time: Pretty Bhatt, Alicia Bridges, Lucy Brown, Paul Cavazos, Maya Crumbaugh, Anita Grover, Brian Johnson, Brooke Kemp, Margarita Koushinova, Christy McMillian, Kevin McPherson, Moghees Nezam, Jonathan Park, Iana Phillips, Jake Spatz, Thanh Tran, Beth Ulan, Patrick Varney, Alex Will, Laurie Wright, and Rabiah Yusef.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues join me in commending these fine students for becoming experts on the Bill of Rights and for joining in the battle of ideas with their peers on all levels of competition.

TRIBUTE TO THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the efforts of one organization to prevent the youth of our Nation from becoming school dropouts. The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) will be holding its Annual Youth Leadership Conference on Friday, March 17 on the campus of Pima Community College in Arizona. Approximately 1,500 at-risk 7th through 12th graders

from around the State will be participating in this day of education and motivation. They will be directed by business, government and community leaders through 40 workshop sessions designed to teach goal-setting skills and instill the value that staying in school is a necessity in facilitating their success in life. Muralist, Judith Baca will be this year's keynote speaker. I am confident this program will leave its young participants with a sense of hope for the future and the realization that their education is the cornerstone in their preparation to become tomorrow's leaders.

LULAC, the conference organizer, was founded in 1929 and is the Nation's oldest Hispanic-American civic organization. Its purpose is to assist underprivileged Hispanics through a variety of programs which promote economic development, cultural heritage, and political involvement. For the past 6 years, the League has targeted the prevention of dropouts as a high priority for all volunteer efforts in Arizona. This year it will team up with the Metro Educational Commission, Pima Community College, the University of Arizona, the Tucson Police Department, and the Pima County Sheriff's Department in promoting education as the road to persistence and success in the Hispanic community.

I would like to commend and extend my gratitude to all involved in LULAC for their untiring efforts to preserve the promise of tomorrow by working to keep America's young people in school. I have no doubt that the leadership conference will be resounding success and a model for other events around the country.

SSI FOR SAMOA

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVEAGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. FALEOMAVEAGA. Mr. Speaker, American Samoa is the only jurisdiction of the United States that is not served by the SSI program, nor its predecessor program, the Aid to the Aged, Blind, or Disabled [AABD]. SSI and AABD are basically the same in design. The only significant difference between the two programs is funding. With SSI, benefits and the cost of administering the program are fully financed by the Federal Treasury. As for AABD, the Federal Government pays 75 percent of benefits up to a specified limit and the States absorb the remaining 25 percent. Administrative cost is shared by both the Federal Government and the States at 50 percent each.

Under current law, in order to receive SSI benefits, a low-income elderly, blind or disabled individual must reside in one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. For qualified individuals who reside in Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, similar benefits are available to them through the AABD program. Unfortunately, the elderly, blind and disabled individuals in American Samoa who have low or no income are not covered by either program.

Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of a vital program extended to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands,