

lobbyists. They would become the real experts, and very few Members of Congress would be able to develop experience and expertise about important matters on which they were expected to legislate.

Six, term limits would hurt small, less populous States. A State like California, with 52 Members, would be able to get far more than its share. Many smaller States gain at least some protection and some benefits if they are represented by Members with some seniority.

Seventh, term limits would cause even more money to be spent on elections. Most people want less money to be spent on election campaigns, not more. Now, some incumbents who are doing a good job and doing what their constituents want do not have to spend huge amounts to be reelected, nor do they have huge amounts spent against them. Term limits would cause big money to play an even greater role in elected politics.

Eighth, and perhaps most important of all, we would never consider applying term limits to any other field. We would never go to a great teacher or doctor or engineer or scientist and say, we know you are doing a great job, but even though we cannot prove it, we have this feeling that we need new blood every 6 years or 8 years or 12 years or whatever, so you have to go do something else. Workers in any other field would scream to high heaven if arbitrary time limits were applied to them, except possibly after a full career. I would say to anyone listening to these words, or who later reads these words: Would you want term limits applied to you?

Ninth, term limits would have cut short the careers of some of our greatest legislators. People like Howard Baker, Everett Dirksen, Sam Rayburn, Robert Taft, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, George Norris, Robert LaFollette, and many, many others have achieved some of their greatest service after they would have been term-limited out by the proposals that we will vote on tomorrow, and several did not become even well known nationally until their later years in office, after they would have been forced out of office by the proposals we will vote on tomorrow. John Kennedy in this country and Winston Churchill in Great Britain would have been term-limited out before gaining national office under these proposals.

Finally, last but certainly not least, term limits are being pushed primarily for political reasons, not because they are needed or are good public policy. There is a great deal of hypocrisy, demagoguery and outright political posturing on this issue. Many elected officials pushing term limits are doing so just as a way to gain higher office. If an officeholder says he believes in a 6-year term limit, ask him if he will leave public office and never run for another public office after 6 years. If he really believed in term limits, he would re-

turn to the private sector and not just use advocacy of term limits as a way to gain higher office.

If you really want to see someone squirm, Mr. Speaker, ask your State legislator or any officeholder supporting term limits, will you limit yourself to 6 years in public office or are you just promoting this so you can run for higher office?

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that Mexico is the only Nation that presently has term limits for its national legislators. I do not think many people would hold Mexico up as the best example of good government for us to follow.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of this talk, term limits solve a problem that does not exist. We should let the voters decide, and not just arbitrarily limit their choices.

NINE PROPOSED RESCISSIONS RELATING TO BUDGET RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-44)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE] laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report nine proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling \$397 million, and one revised deferral, totaling \$7 million.

The proposed rescissions affect the Departments of Agriculture, Defense-Military, Energy, Housing and Urban Development, and Justice, and the General Services Administration. The deferral affects the Social Security Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1997.

REPORT ON CANADIAN WHALING ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-45)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On December 12, 1996, Secretary of Commerce Michael Kantor certified under section 8 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (the "Pelly Amendment") (22 U.S.C. 1978), that Canada has conducted whaling activities that diminish the effectiveness of a conservation program of the International Whaling Commission (IWC).

The certification was based on the issuance of whaling licenses by the Government of Canada in 1996 and the subsequent killing of two bowhead whales under those licenses. This message constitutes my report to the Congress pursuant to subsection (b) of the Pelly Amendment.

In 1991, Canadian natives took a bowhead whale from the western Arctic stock, under a Canadian permit. In 1994, Canadian natives took another bowhead whale from one of the eastern Arctic stocks, without a permit.

In 1996, under Canadian permits, one bowhead whale was taken in the western Canadian Arctic on July 24 and one bowhead whale was taken in the eastern Canadian Arctic on August 17. The whale in the eastern Arctic was taken from a highly endangered stock. The IWC has expressed particular concern about whaling on this stock, which is not known to be recovering.

None of the Canadian whale hunts described above was authorized by the IWC. Canada withdrew from the IWC in 1982. In those instances where Canada issued whaling licenses, it did so without consulting the IWC. In fact, Canada's 1996 actions were directly contrary to IWC advice. At the 1996 Annual Meeting, the IWC passed a resolution encouraging Canada to refrain from issuing whaling licenses and to rejoin the IWC. However, Canada has recently advised the United States that it has no plans to rejoin the IWC and that it intends to continue granting licenses for the taking of endangered bowhead whales.

Canada's unilateral decision to authorize whaling outside of the IWC is unacceptable. Canada's conduct jeopardizes the international effort that has allowed whale stocks to begin to recover from the devastating effects of historic whaling.

I understand the importance of maintaining traditional native cultures, and I support aboriginal whaling that is managed through the IWC. The Canadian hunt, however, is problematic for two reasons.

First, the whaling took place outside the IWC. International law, as reflected in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, obligates countries to work through the appropriate international organization for the conservation and management of whales. Second, whaling in the eastern Canadian Arctic poses a particular conservation risk, and the decision to take this risk should not have been made unilaterally.

I believe that Canadian whaling on endangered whales warrants action at this time.

Accordingly, I have instructed the Department of State to oppose Canadian efforts to address taking of marine mammals within the newly formed Arctic Council. I have further instructed the Department of State to oppose Canadian efforts to address trade in marine mammal products within the Arctic Council. These actions grow from our concern about

Canada's efforts to move whaling issues to fora other than the IWC and, more generally, about the taking of marine mammals in ways that are inconsistent with sound conservation practices.

Second, I have instructed the Department of Commerce, in implementing the Marine Mammal Protection Act, to withhold consideration of any Canadian requests for waivers to the existing moratorium on the importation of seals and/or seal products into the United States.

Finally, the United States will continue to urge Canada to reconsider its unilateral decision to authorize whaling on endangered stocks and to authorize whaling outside the IWC.

I believe the foregoing measures are more appropriate in addressing the problem of Canadian whaling than the imposition of import prohibitions at this time.

I have asked the Departments of Commerce and State to keep this situation under close review.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1997.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I come today to open a discussion and create a forum right here on the floor of the House on African-Americans. We are, in the month of February, proudly celebrating American life and history for African-Americans.

We come today to take this time to talk about the contributions of African-Americans, to talk about the struggle of African-Americans, to identify and to celebrate the many contributions that African-Americans have made to this country and this world.

Back in 1926, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, a Harvard Ph.D. who had 11 years earlier founded the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History, initiated what was known as Negro History Week. It was Dr. Woodson's hope that through this very special observance, all Americans would be reminded of their ethnic roots, and a togetherness in U.S. racial groups would develop out of a mutual respect for all backgrounds.

Now we have expanded Negro History Week to Negro History Month, so the entire month of February you will see programs and activities all over America. You will see children in elementary schools identifying the contributions of African-Americans to this Nation. You will witness plays, you will see poems written, all kinds of activities basically focusing on the work, the life, the history, and the times of African-Americans.

□ 1530

I come today to share this time with the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus and others who would like to give their observations and to do their documenting of those events and those individuals who have been central and important to the development of African-Americans in this Nation.

It is with that that I will yield to the gentleman from Chicago, IL [Mr. DAVIS], one of our new Members in the House of Representatives, who has come today to share in this very special moment and to give his observations on the life and times of African-Americans in this Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is indeed a strong, vibrant, diverse, and great Nation. Much of its strength, character, and greatness stems from the fact that it is rich in diversity.

We are America, a nation that is made up of many different individuals and groups who have contributed significantly to its growth and development.

During the month of February, yes, we celebrate African-American or Black History Month, a period which we set aside to take special note and highlight the accomplishments and achievements of African-Americans who have excelled or made noteworthy contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I should take this opportunity to highlight some of the outstanding African-Americans who grew up in, lived, and/or worked in the district which I am proud to represent, the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, one of the most diverse districts in the Nation. Downtown Chicago, Chinatown, the Gold Coast, the Magnificent Mile, housing developments like Cabrini, like Rockwell, Abla, the West Side of Chicago, home of the riots, suburban communities, Oak Park, Maywood, Bellwood, Broadview.

It became a focal point of the Negro Free Speech Movement in the 1890's. At that time it was home to one of the most famous black female journalists of all times, Ida B. Wells Barnett.

It was the last port of entry for African-Americans leaving the South in large numbers, migrating to the North, the Northeast, and the Midwest.

It has been a launching pad for many black firsts. The first black woman to receive an international pilot's license, Bessie Coleman, lived there. The world renowned chemist Dr. Percy B. Julian, the holder of 19 honorary doctorate degrees, an individual who helped to shape medical research procedures, lived there.

The famous black daily newspaper, the Chicago Daily Defender, was founded there by Robert Abbot with \$25 and a typewriter at his kitchen table.

Johnson Publishing Co., Ebony, Jet, and other components of the business founded by Mr. John H. Johnson and now operated by his daughter, Ms.

Linda Johnson Rice, operates in the Seventh District.

Parker House Sausage Co.'s president, Daryl Grisham, lived in the district. Oprah Winfrey, that everybody in America knows, operates out of the Seventh District. Marva Collins, founder of the Westside Prep School and Paul Adams, principal of Providence-St. Mel College Prep, two of the most successful educators in the country today, live and work in the district.

Earl Neal, one of the top attorneys in the Nation, lived and worked in the district. Jewel Lafentant-Mankarious, the first black woman to become Deputy Solicitor General of the United States of America, lived in the district.

The district has been home to the practice of Dr. Maurice Robb, one of the foremost ophthalmologists in the Nation. It has produced star athletes like Mark Aguirre, Isiah Thomas, Kevin Garnett, Daryl Stingley, Michael Finley, Glenn Rivers, Hershey Hawkins, Russell Maryland, Mickey Johnson, Otis Armstrong, and others.

Michael Jordan and Scottie Pippin have perfected their craft in the Seventh District. And when we see children playing in the James Jordan Boys and Girls Club, you see greatness at work. The renowned writer, producer, and actor, Robert Townsend, grew up in the district.

This inner city district has produced the likes of Jerry (Iceman) Butler, Ramsey Lewis, Tyrone Davis, Alvin Cash, Gene Chandler, the Brown Brothers, the Family Jubilee, Vernon Oliver Price, the Thompson Community Singers, Angela Spivey, and other great entertainers; nationally renowned African-American ministers like the Reverend Clay Evans, Bishop Louis Henry Ford, Rev. Harry McNelty, Rev. Wallace Sykes, Rev. Johnny Miller, Rev. Clarence Stowers, Rev. Charlie Murray, Rev. Jimmie Pettis, Rev. Albert Tyson, Rev. August Minor, and others all live in the district.

I have spoken of contemporaries. I have made a point to do so because so often when we talk about history, we forget about those individuals who are struggling each and every day in an effort to make history real. And so all of the individuals, the people who struggle on a daily basis, who work with our children, who work with our seniors, the chairpersons of local advisory councils, of public housing units and public housing developments, all of these individuals are my heroes and heroes. They are my heroes, Mr. Speaker, they are my heroes because they understand what Fred Douglass taught when he suggested that struggle, struggle, strife, and pain are the prerequisites for change. They understand that if there is no struggle, there is no progress. And so Black History Month reminds us that when we glory in the struggle, all of America can rejoice in the victory.

So, yes, African-Americans have indeed contributed and African-Americans have indeed made progress. But I