

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source of reports and research that many have come to understand to be 7, 8, 9, 10 years old, research that is often outdated.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.

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, I want, first of all, to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM]. He is a genuine American hero. Those were great remarks. Absolutely truthful, absolutely right on the money, right on the mark, cutting through the, well, I cannot say that, just cutting through it all. And really telling it exactly like it is. Maybe a lot of people are in mourning tonight because they feel like they have been betrayed by this Congress because the American public understands that term limits is the cornerstone of congressional reform. The public understands that.

But do not be in mourning. Do not be in mourning. There is no reason to, because really, this is a situation of pay me now or pay me later. Vote for term limits tonight or your replacement will vote for term limits in 2 years.

That is exactly what goes on here. What you are going to have tonight or what we have seen tonight is with the defeat of this bill, we are going to see a ton of replacements in two years.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. It has been very interesting to listen to the debate, and I would associate myself in full with the remarks of the gentleman from California who preceded you in the well.

But, Madam Speaker, it was very interesting earlier tonight to hear one of our friends on the other side talk about the ship Contract with America listing and creaking and the bow breaking and all these terrible things. Amazingly, and undoubtedly since so many members of the media in this town work in complicity with those on the left, I just think they have missed the story.

The fact is that we pledged to bring 10 items to the floor for an up or down vote. And even though there is disappointment tonight, as my friend from Ohio mentions, the fact is there is cause for jubilation because now we have enjoined the dialogue. And coming from a State in which the major city is named Phoenix, I assure the American people tonight, Madam Speaker, that this issue will again rise from the ashes.

Mr. HOKE. Let us look at the numbers on this. The fact is the Republicans voted 189 yes, 40 no. That is about 82, 83 percent of the Republican Conference voted in favor of term limits. On the other hand, Democrats voted 38 yes, 163 no; 80 percent of the Democrat Caucus voted against term limits. Who defeated term limits? Democrats defeated term limits.

Who is going to be defeated in November of 1996? Well, the public will decide. The public will decide. But what I would urge, right out there tonight, there are people who should be stirred. There are men and women who have thought, I want to serve my country, I have something to offer. I have wanted

to do this for some time, but I have not had the courage, the motivation, the specific interest, the specific initiative to do this. Doggone it, there are 22 States out there that have already enacted term limits. Or is it 24? Twenty-two?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Twenty-two.

Mr. HOKE. Twenty-two States have enacted term limits; 24 million people in this country have voted for them. They have carried by a margin of 70 to 80 percent in every single one of those States. In each of those 22 States, there are men and women who ought to use this as their issue, because if your representative voted against term limits in one of those 22 States, that representative is saying, I know better than the people. I do not care what the people say. I do not care that 70 or 80 percent of the people demand that we have limited terms. I do not care that the public understands that this truly is the cornerstone of congressional reform, that this is the way that we are going to eliminate congressional careerism forever.

I do not care because I know better. And I know better because, gosh, after all, I have been here 20, 30, 40 years. How else would I not know better?

Those people should be inspired tonight and they should grab this and take this opportunity and get involved. And this is your campaign issue for November 1996.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman from Ohio has noted, as many of us have, during the course of these first 100 days, that indeed many folks who walk to the chamber in fact become walking advertisements for term limits, walking examples of the reasons why we should enact them.

Let me pause here to make a distinction because I also want to point out that good people can disagree and no doubt others will follow us in the chamber, making distinctions of conscience, of conviction, but we abhor the gamesmanship that was played during the course of this debate, really spurning the notion of what the will of the people might be.

MORE ON TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Madam Speaker, I think sometimes it is appropriate, again, to reflect a little bit on history. I happened to be sitting in the well this evening and looking up to the ceiling. Just behind the speaker's platform and above the clock is a saying on the wall and it is a very appropriate quote. It says, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Those words were uttered by Daniel Webster, a former member of this body and a former member of the United States Senate.

Intrigued by that, I happened to check his biography and noted that he served in both the House and the Senate, that he first served in the House for 4 years, was defeated, took 6 years in the private sector, ran again for the House, this time from another State. Initially he had been in New Hampshire, moved to Massachusetts, and then switched, ran for the Senate, served 14 years, resigned, spent 4 more years in the private sector and ended his career in the Senate with a term of 4 years before he resigned in, I believe, 1851 or 1852.

I mention that because there has been a lot that has changed in this country since men of the caliber of Daniel Webster served here. Let us hope that the actions that we take today and in the future will encourage more men and women of his caliber to serve in this body.

But I was very torn today on the issue of term limits. As many may know, my State enacted a referendum in the fall of 1994 imposing a 6-year limit, which I intend to honor, and which I believe is binding on representatives from the State of Maine. But given the fact that we were presented with a bill tonight on the floor that did not provide me with the required degree of certainty that it would not preempt State law, I voted against the bill and I did so reluctantly. But I want to add a message because it would be inappropriate to say that the debate has taken place entirely on this floor. Because I think the debate has taken place across the country in all 50 States and in the thousands of communities that make up this great land.

I think the people are speaking very loudly and clearly that they want some form of system that will guarantee that the lack of professionalism in the sense of people making a lifetime career out of service in this body, and we have seen enough information about the longevity of service, I think an average of some 25 or 30 years, particularly for committee chairs, and extended service by others well past their prime of life and well past their ability to display the type of sensitivity to the private sector that we would like to see displayed by representatives in this body. And so I call upon the three groups that have been active across the country, the groups supporting the 6-year term limit, the group supporting the 8-year limit, and the group supporting the 12-year limit, to get together and, in the words of our speaker, be prepared to support H.R. 1 on the first day of the next session that will somehow or other find a way to respect the difference in the diversity among the 50 States and provide for a term-limit because that will allow us to have once and for all one standard that we can apply in this country and not