

of course, will threaten the economic future of our own country. Getting rid of these four student aid programs will cost about \$20 billion over the next 5 years for middle-income families.

Now, let us look at it this way. It is not just the cost, it is a tax. Because these are middle-income families that otherwise would have been able to help their children go on to college. But because they are being taxed in higher fees, less money for student loans, they will now be paying the cost of these tax cuts that will be going mostly to the privileged few in their Contract With America.

This is the worst time, by the way, to be cutting back on student aid. Tuition is rising rapidly throughout the country. Without any assistance, the cost of attending college will go up even more. Some will be forced to forgo school altogether.

In California, tuition rates have skyrocketed. The goal of California's master plan of giving every young person the chance to go to college, whether it is community college, State university or the University of California campuses, is evaporating rapidly. Those students who represent the first generation of college students in their family just might come home without a degree, a devastating blow for parents, students and siblings alike.

I can give an example: I myself am the first in my family to get an education. My parents were immigrants. I would not have been able to go, but I took advantage of work study and student aid and student loans.

I hope we will understand this is not the way to go, and we will not support the Contract With America's attempt to go after our college students.

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

[Mr. SHAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### JULIA BAILEY IS MISSISSIPPI WINNER IN VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the winning entry from Mississippi in the VFW's annual Voice of Democracy contest. It was submitted by Julia Bailey of West Point, MS.

Julia is a senior at West Point High School and the daughter of Eugene and Elizabeth

Bailey. I had the chance to meet and visit with this outstanding young lady when she came to Washington recently. Her patriotic essay is one of the best I have read and commend it to all my colleagues.

#### "MY VISION FOR AMERICA"

The people who fought for the American Revolution had a vision of a country they governed themselves. The South had a vision of keeping their slaves. The North had a vision of defeating the South. Abraham Lincoln had a vision of forming a Union again, and the slaves had a vision of being free. History is a picture show of many groups with many visions. I am following in a long line of history because I, too, have a vision.

Everyday I go to school, and, to me, it is a small scale America. In our school we have black people, white people, people with learning disabilities, and straight A students. We have as many visions as we do groups of people, but all the students and faculty come together five days a week for one purpose, whether it is conscious or buried under all their other concerns. We come to school to educate and to be educated because we all have a vision of success. My vision for America is that, like the school, we will recognize that we, too, have a common goal to work towards—unity.

The civil rights movement was perhaps a time when many people combined dreams to form one vision. Sit-ins, boycotts, and marches were all a part of a people's fight for justice. The civil rights movement was special because it included everyone. The object of the movement was unity. A person did not have to be black to fight for civil rights but simply a person with an eye for justice and a belief that it was time for the truth to be acted upon that all people are created equal, not "separate but equal," equal.

We tend to focus on the qualities that we can see are equal—like our color or our financial status—rather than the qualities that we cannot see. In my vision our new focus will be on equality of mind and spirit, of opinions and beliefs, equality, not agreement, unity of spirit, not race. Spirit has no color; it has no age, it is not divided into categories.

I had the privilege of standing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. The Washington Monument pierced the air, and the green glow of the Capitol filtered from behind it. I felt powerful, humble, and thankful. Not only are those monuments reflected in the water they rise above, they are reflected in me.

I realize that even though the states are not always united, and that corruption threatens our freedom, in the capital of my country I can stand and ponder and pray for as long as I want without being threatened or dragged away or embarrassed. We have a starting point for equality. We are all free. The answer for a truly united nation is not at the top of the Washington Monument or clutched by Lady Freedom on the tip of the Capitol. It is as low and as humble as we make it in our hearts. Those monuments are not representing a country about to fall, but a country with the potential to rise, not in concrete, in power, or money, but in unity and goodness. My vision for our nation to be united through spirit begins in the seedbed of real freedom—our hearts.

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

[Mr. DAVIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### KEEP LONG ISLAND SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OPEN

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

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of small businessmen and women and the potential hundreds of thousands of small businessmen and women on Long Island. Earlier this week the Clinton Administration announced that they were going to streamline and consolidate departments at the Small Business Administration, something that I on the face of it applaud, and I commend the administrator, Phil Lader of the Small Business Administration, for his leadership in that endeavor.

Unfortunately, included in this measure to downsize the agency is the closing of a very valuable office, the Small Business Administration's Long Island office in Melville. I am most supportive of the efforts to consolidate. As a former head of the Small Business Administration in New York, we led a pilot program to do just that. I strongly urge, however, that the Clinton Administration reconsider closing the Long Island office.

Long Island is in a unique situation. For most of the century, Long Island's economy has been dependent on a healthy defense industry. However, in recent years, draconian cuts to the defense budget have left the Long Island economy reeling, and today we are searching for an alternative. Forced to diversify, Long Island now more than ever looks to the small business sector as its major source of jobs, revenue, and income. Small businesses on Long Island look to the local Small Business Administration office for valuable help and counsel. The closing of the Long Island office would be devastating to an economy so dependent on a viable small business sector.

Madam Speaker, the administration's plan to close the Long Island office would negatively impact, as I have said, over 82,000 small businesses in Nassau and Suffolk County. This is an area larger in population than some 20 States. While the economy in most of the Nation has rebounded of late, the Long Island economy continues to lag. Long Island has endured extensive cuts in defense spending and the loss of the SBA office on Long Island would be another blow to an economy already struggling to right itself.

For the months ahead, Congress will have some very difficult decisions to make about the budget and the future

spending by the Federal Government. But instead of eliminating an SBA office that is a value-added commodity to the taxpayers, that the Small Business Administration generates more in local income and is a stimulus to the local economy and is not, I repeat, not a drain on Federal taxpayers, it would be wrong-headed to go forth and close an office that is a value-added commodity to the taxpayer.

I propose that instead the Small Business Administration consider closing down the Office of Advocacy. This Office of Advocacy was created in a political climate and for political reasons, and with today's budget of \$7 million, it is an economy well worth considering. The Office of Advocacy is often the source of reports and research that many have come to understand to be 7, 8, 9, 10 years old, research that is often outdated.

By retaining the Long Island office of the Small Business Administration, we can generally give a hand up to the local people in Nassau and Suffolk County. I urge that the Clinton administration reconsider the closing of that office.

Let me just mention one case in point. There are many small businesses that have been helped through the guaranteed loan program that works with private lenders. One such case is J. D'Addario and Company, a family owned small business that produces guitar and other instrument strings.

This company benefited from several loans administered by the Long Island office of the Small Business Administration that eventually allowed the business to relocate from rented space where they employed originally 25, to a new location where they are now employing over 250 people. They purchased the land and constructed a site that was four times the size of the previous location.

There are literally hundreds and hundreds of success stories as a result of the efforts made by the men and women who work for the Small Business Administration on Long Island. I know the difficulties administrator Phil Lader faces in making the tough decisions, and he is right to consolidate duplicating programs. To date his efforts have been superb. But again I would ask that the Clinton Administration and the Small Business Administration in particular reconsider closing the Long Island office, and add that this important resource to the small businessmen and women of Long Island be kept open.

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

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT SHOULD HAVE PASSED

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

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I was very disappointed today that we were not able to pass the resolution to limit our own congressional terms. I was very disappointed. I think it is a sad day for us. Shame on us. I cannot understand it, because more than two dozen states sent a strong message to us that they want some kind of term limits. The people are tired of all these professional politicians entrenched in Washington, D.C. They want some circulation. Yet we ignore them, because we are so arrogant that we know the best. Today, again, we ignored those people's wishes.

I was listening carefully why some Members are opposed to term limits. Let me tell you how ridiculous it is, the arguments I heard today. The first argument is experience. We need the experience here. What kind of experience do we need, experience how to play politics? Experience how to present speech, feel good speech? Experience how to understand the parliamentary procedure? Is that experience we need?

All this Washington, D.C. experience we do not need. All we need is experience, fresh experience from the outside, the real world. What is happening there us people are suffering every day. Small business is suffering, trying to maintain their business, trying to meet the payroll. That kind of experience we need, not inside-the-beltway experience. It is a ridiculous comparison.

Also one Member from the other side of the aisle mentioned Gen. Colin Powell's statement that it took him 30 years to learn the job, implying that it will take us 30 years to learn this job. That is a ridiculous comparison.

□ 2200

I think it is a sad day that Members using that kind of comparison try to justify why term limits should not be implemented. The second argument I am hearing is that people should decide, not us. Especially from the gentlewoman from California, I was surprised. Only 30 years ago the California voters voted overwhelmingly to supporting term limits. How quickly we forgot. That is another reason why we have got to have some rotation here. How arrogant it is. Only 30 years ago the California people overwhelmingly passed this term limit, yet we forgot. Say they, people should decide. They did, they spoke already.

The other one I am hearing is this nonsense that we are going to give more power to nonelected staff members. Come on. Our staff members, until we passed the bill not too long ago, they do not have very much power. They can be fired, they can be dismissed any time. Laws do not apply to them even. Look at California, we

have term limits out there and state assemblies, the state Senate, the staff does not bother us. They do not take over any powers. They are running fine in Sacramento. That is another stupid argument that I cannot understand.

Finally, this retroactive. I voted yes on that, 12 years retroactive. What is wrong with it? Is not 12 years long enough?

The argument is we need an orderly transfer, otherwise we are going to have a chaotic situation, that so many Members will resign. That is nonsense. The last 2 years ago, when I came to Congress, we had 110 freshmen. This year something like 87. Added together, more than 200 changes in the last 3 years. I do not see any chaos. It was very, a very orderly transfer. As a matter of fact, we made so much change, so much dynamic changes the last two years, I think it is good that we should have such a dramatic change.

Look at California. I do not see any disorderly chaotic situation out there serving only 2 years, only 6 years and give up the seat.

Also they say that they are against it because Democrats are playing games. They do not want to have a term limit. They are playing games. They are using this as an excuse to play games. I do not understand that. I do not know what kind of playing games they are doing. If it is true, then shame on them. But that is another reason why we have to get rid of those folks who know how to play games. They have been here too long. That is why they are playing games. I do not know how to play games. Maybe I should be here 10 years, and then I know how to play games. This bunch of rhetoric that I cannot understand coming from the private sector, it is totally beyond my comprehension why we are rejecting our own term limits.

I think it is really a sad day.

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

[Mr. POSHARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### PERMISSION TO SUBSTITUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak in substitution for the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### TERM LIMITS

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