

and complete health care coverage that they need and they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to become cosponsors of H.R. 135 and H.R. 164 and to reassert our commitment to protecting the health of American women.

CONGRESS SHOULD OPPOSE INCREASES IN WHALING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 days I have been in Monaco at my own expense to try to prevent the renewal of whaling in the continental United States.

From the beginning of this debate over whether the Makah Indian Tribe in Washington State should be allowed to resume the practice of hunting whales after a 70-year cessation, I have maintained what is being described as "aboriginal subsistence whaling" is not that at all. It will in fact lead to a tragic resumption of commercial whaling and a geometric increase in the number of whales killed worldwide.

Without now addressing whether the Makah Tribe itself is motivated by the \$1 million value of a gray whale in Japan, other powerful evidence exists that indicates that we are on the threshold of a dramatic increase in whaling. The official U.S. delegation to the IWC has been asking for a change in the definition of aboriginal subsistence whaling, the only type of whaling now legal under the International Whaling Commission, which the United States has ratified.

In their shortsighted attempt to legalize the intentions of the Makah Tribe, the United States is asking the other nations at the IWC to expand the definition of subsistence whaling to permit cultural issues to be addressed. Why? Currently aboriginal whaling is solely for the physical nutrition of the tribe in question. In other words, they need the food. It is obvious the Makah do not need to eat whales to survive.

What is the problem with expanding the definition into the cultural realm? There are villages and people all over the world who have a cultural history of whaling but who do not now qualify under the current definition of subsistence.

Saturday at the IWC hearings, the Japanese repeatedly asked the United States delegation: What is the difference between the Makah request and the desire of four villages on the Taiji Peninsula to resume whaling? It is obvious the Japanese are going to use this loophole that our own delegation is attempting to create to increase their commercial harvest of the whales. Other nations will undoubtedly follow suit if the Makah are successful.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this to happen. The killing of whales around the world is on the increase. For this fraudulent cultural subsistence to be-

come a legal authorization for further killing would be a tragedy. In addition, staff members of other IWC delegations have indicated resentment at the tremendous pressure the U.S. delegation is putting on other nations to support this fraud.

However, this pressure may not be changing votes. Observers today have informed me that the United States is now attempting to set an even more dangerous precedent of lobbying to increase the Russian gray whale quota. This new tactic would allow, this under-the-table deal would allow the Russians to give the Makah five whales at no loss to themselves. More importantly, this backroom style deal would not require a vote of the IWC. In other words, when they ran into trouble they are trying to go around the system.

A new whale hunt could then occur without IWC authorization. This is dangerous and dishonorable, Mr. Speaker. Frankly the tactics of this administration have been an embarrassment. They depicted the 43 Members of Congress who signed the letter that I took there that oppose the Makah as the only opponents in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone really believe that 389 Members of this House support the killing of whales in the continental United States? When pressed, the U.S. delegation could only name two Members of Congress who support the Makah hunt.

Mr. Speaker, they are not representing the best interests of our Nation or the sentiments of the vast majority of our people. It is now time for Congress to speak in a large, loud, bipartisan voice in condemnation of this blatant attempt at the expansion of commercial whaling. The vote will be tomorrow, and this is a critical issue.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR RESEARCH NECESSARY TO SOLVE PFIESTERIA PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, Pfiesteria has plagued North Carolina for many years and experts now think that this organism was first observed in our waters almost 20 years ago in 1978.

While the Old North State has made multiple efforts to address this pestilence through estuary studies, non-discharge rules, phosphate bans, rapid resource teams, nitrogen load reduction, nutrient limit reductions, source wetland restoration programs, and a 2-year moratorium on new and expanding swine farms, Pfiesteria is an enigma for us all as it has been found in many Atlantic waters from the Chesapeake Bay south to Florida and west to Texas.

We must work together constructively and effectively, Federal, State, and local governments and agencies,

academic researchers, concerned citizens, to attack and find rapid and workable solutions to this predicament.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to find additional funds for Dr. Burkholder, one of the leading researchers in the area, as well as other scientists and researchers like her, in order to answer the remaining questions concerning the effects of Pfiesteria on humans, animals, and watersheds.

The waters of North Carolina have certainly felt the effects of the Pfiesteria outbreak, especially in the Neuse River, the Tar River, the Pamlico River, as well as the entire Albemarle-Pamlico Estuary, parts of which are in my congressional district. There have been more than 1 million fish killed in our State and many reports of human health problems. Given the adverse impact of such significant fish kills upon my district, North Carolina, and the mid-Atlantic, we need to seek solutions through aggressive research.

Mr. Speaker, we face a very serious threat that must be addressed immediately. We should not rush to judgment, however. Scientific inquiries are ongoing, but we should not waste time. Further research and testing should be undertaken at once. It is my hope that funding for critically needed research and testing will come as a result of recent hearings in the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Only through funding will come opportunities for a solution. Additionally, several of my mid-Atlantic colleagues and I introduced H.R. 2565 on September 26, 1997, the Pfiesteria Research Act of 1997. This bill appropriates a minimum of \$5.8 million in fiscal year 1998 and 1999 for the establishment of a research and grant program for Pfiesteria through EPA, USDA, and HHS.

All North Carolinians and others who live, work, and play in the affected waters look forward to successful results of this research, and that is because many of their lives and their livelihood depend upon it.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL FRANK WORTH ELLIOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight saddened with the responsibility of informing this House of the loss of a great American, a man who served his country for many years, a man who reached the rank of Major General in the Air Force, a citizen of the 15th district of Illinois and a friend and somebody who will be missed a great deal by all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, memorial services for U.S. Air Force Major General Frank Worth Elliott of Rantoul, Illinois, will be held at the United Methodist Church