

Environmental policy is at a crossroads, Mr. President. We have a historic opportunity to improve our environmental laws so that they better serve the American people. That is not to say that we have failed in the past. We have many, many, many successes, including the Merrimack River in my State, which is now beginning to see fish and recreation again. It should not be controversial. We all live on this planet, and we should be working together on this. If there is anything we ought not to be partisan about, it ought to be the environment.

I will close on this point. This week, as Earth Day commences, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee begins hearings on a Superfund bill. During the Earth Day festivities, Americans will be presented with a number of conflicting images of what is good for the environment and what is not. It is my hope that the President and Members of Congress, as I said earlier, will rise above the urge to exploit this event for short-term political gain and join our efforts to inject common sense and fairness into the Nation's Superfund Program, which is the one program which I happen to be involved in because I chair the subcommittee.

So, Mr. President, at this point, I yield the floor and thank my colleagues, and I thank the Senator from Georgia for the opportunity to speak on this very important issue.

Mr. COVERDELL. How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute remains.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank all of the Senators who came to the floor to honor Earth Day and to talk in very meaningful terms about how to manage our environment. This legislation, wherever it falls in the environment, should be guided by a working relationship between the Government and the stewards of the land. In too many cases, recently, we are seeing the Government taking on the form of arrogance. We have threatened the constitutional rights of personal property. That is a very high law, the Constitution. If it becomes public policy to take interests of private property owners, the public will have to assume the responsibility for that. That has to be a working partnership. We have to protect our constitutional rights. We must learn to work together on this legislation. We have heard words like partnership, balance, working together, common ground, nonpartisan. This is the answer to our modern environment.

I appreciate the Senate's time this afternoon, and I yield back whatever seconds are remaining.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, is leader time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader time has been reserved.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first, I thank the distinguished Senator from

Georgia for his efforts this morning on Earth Day and on the environment. I will be making a statement later on that.

I thank Senator SMITH for his efforts on Superfund. He has been working on this, I know, month after month after month, and we have been trying to come together with a bipartisan bill. Hopefully, that will be accomplished and we can pass Superfund legislation in the next 30 to 60 days.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES STACK TO ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. DOLE. Last Friday, I outlined some of my views on the issue of judicial nominations, one of the most lasting legacies of any President. I said that Federal judges should respect the clear language of the Constitution as it is written; that judges should understand that society is not to blame for crime, criminals are; that judges should protect the rights of crime victims, not invent new and more expansive rights for criminal defendants.

Today, let me make another point: Those who seek to sit on the Federal bench should be well-grounded in the basics of constitutional law. Unfortunately, Charles "Bud" Stack, one of President Clinton's nominees to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, does not meet this standard.

During his recent confirmation hearing, Mr. Stack was unable to cite any fourth amendment case concerning the law of search and seizure. He demonstrated little knowledge about Supreme Court precedent on capital punishment. And despite the Supreme Court's highly publicized decision in the Adarand case, Mr. Stack was unable to discuss any Supreme Court or Federal case concerning discrimination or affirmative action.

When asked how he would remedy his own ignorance of key aspects of the law, Mr. Stack said he "Could attend some courses" or ask other judges for help.

Yet Mr. Stack has been nominated to sit on one of the Nation's most influential judicial panels, the court that effectively serves as the court of last resort for the citizens of Florida, Georgia, and Alabama.

Apparently, Mr. Stack's most important qualification is his prowess as a political fundraiser. According to news reports, administration aides had discussed offering Mr. Stack an ambassadorship and a seat on the Federal district court as a reward for his fundraising efforts, but that Mr. Stack had his heart set on a court of appeals position.

Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Stack raised millions and millions of dollars for President Clinton and the Democratic Party, but does that qualify him to be on the next highest court in the land? I do not think so. That is not what the judicial system is all about.

Mr. President, I understand that the American Bar Association has given Mr. Stack a qualified rating, but in my judgment, this rating is yet another example of why we should not rely on the ABA to review the qualifications of our judicial nominees.

Although I do not know Mr. Stack personally, I have no reason to challenge his integrity. I am sure he is a fine man who has contributed much to his community and to his country. But that is not the point. The question we must ask is whether Mr. Stack is, in fact, qualified to sit on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, the second highest court in the land? The answer, or course, is, "No." President Clinton should withdraw the Stack nomination without delay.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

NO MORE GAMES—RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know that under the rule we will move very swiftly to the term limit legislation, but I would like to speak before that debate starts on another matter which, although not directly before the Senate today, is very much in the thinking of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, certainly the President and, most importantly, working families and needy working families, and that is the issue of the increase in the minimum wage.

On "Face the Nation" yesterday, Senator DOLE was asked whether he would allow a straight up or down vote on the minimum wage. Senator DOLE said, "No, our view is that it needs to be packaged with other things—maybe comp time, flex time."

Let me be very clear in response. There is no reason to delay or saddle the minimum wage with other controversial measures. I intend to offer a clean vote on increasing the minimum wage on the nuclear waste bill or any other bill this week or next week that is open to amendments. There is no excuse for further delay in raising the minimum wage.

Raising the minimum wage is a matter of basic economics, not politics, for millions of American families. More than 10 million people will receive a direct pay increase if the minimum wage is raised to \$5.15 or \$5.25 an hour. To those millions of working Americans, the issue is not politics. It's paying the rent and putting food on the table for themselves and their families.

An overwhelming majority of Americans want the minimum wage increased. They do not want to see this legislation buried in procedural maneuvers, or loaded up with antiunion amendments. They want to see it increased, and increased now.

Yet, ignoring the clear interest of low-wage workers and the desire of an overwhelming majority of the American people, Senator DOLE intends to

prevent a straight up-or-down vote on the minimum wage. We can only wonder why. Senator DOLE says it is politics, but it is hard to believe that this kind of inside-the-beltway politics will work to his advantage.

A Lou Harris poll released 2 weeks ago found that 85 percent of surveyed adults support an increase to \$5.15 an hour, and Chilton Research Services found that 80 percent support such a raise. Even 73 percent of Republicans support raising the minimum wage to \$5.15.

But no group feels more strongly about this than women. The Chilton survey asked about the strength of the respondents' feelings and found that a clear majority—57 percent—feel strongly that the raise should be enacted. But 64 percent of women strongly agree with the legislation.

What explains the strength of women's support?

First, 60 percent of the 10 to 12 million people who will get a pay increase from this legislation are women, and 77 percent of those women are adults.

That means 7 million women, and 5 million adult women will get a pay raise from this bill.

Second, who are these 5 million adult women? Two million are single heads of households with at least one dependent. They are raising families, caring for children, and trying to get by on poverty level wages.

Third, 60 percent of minimum wage workers are married. They contribute, on average, 51 percent of family earnings. We are not talking about teenagers earning pocket money. We are talking about people whose families depend on them for their survival and well-being.

Fourth, what kinds of work do these 7 million women do? Many of them are in the retail, hospitality, and food service industries, where they work as cashiers, serve meals, clean hotel rooms, and work in laundries. Their jobs are hard and unrewarding, but they do them with dignity, working to provide for their families.

Fifth, but many of these women work directly with children in occupations that are almost entirely held by women, such as child care. The vast majority of child care workers would get a pay increase from a raise in the minimum wage to \$5.15. Teachers aides, too, hold low-paid jobs dominated by women. These people deserve more for the care they give the Nation's children—it is time they got a raise.

Sixth, the other major industry that employs large numbers of women at or just above the minimum wage is health care, including occupations such as nurses aides and home health care aides. These are some of the hardest jobs in our society, caring for the sick and helpless, washing them, feeding them, cleaning their bedpans. The women who hold these jobs deserve a raise.

Seventh, raising the minimum wage is the best, most targeted solution we

have to the problem of the income gap between the richest and poorest American families. Its distributional effects are powerful and positive.

Since 1979, the bottom three-fifths of American families have experienced a loss in their real income, while the top 1 percent of families saw its income grow 62 percent.

The bottom 40 percent of American families, whose incomes have suffered the most since 1979, would get 60 percent of the gains from raising the minimum wage.

That says that those workers who are out there now working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, the ones that have fallen the furthest behind since 1979, they would get 60 percent of the benefits of the increase in the minimum wage, and they are the ones who have been left furthest behind.

This is the single most effective thing Congress can do for those families. Compared with balancing the budget—I ask the attention of our colleagues on this issue—compared with balancing the budget, for example, which the Congressional Budget Office claims will raise average wages one-half of 1 percent by the year 2002, the Congressional Budget Office says, if you pass the Republican balanced budget amendment by the year 2002, average wages will increase one-half of 1 percent. Raising the minimum wage will increase the earnings of people in the bottom 40 percent by 4 percent in just 2 years—the bottom 40 percent. If you go down to 30 percent or 20 percent it becomes 8 or 10; down to just the bottom line, you go up to about 20, 22 percent, because you will go from \$4.25 to \$5.15, or \$5.25, as suggested over in the House of Representatives. That represents almost 25 percent of the wages.

But just with this very modest increase, we are seeing for the bottom 40 percent of American workers that they will go up 4 percent while just the balanced budget in and of itself will provide one-half of 1 percent.

Eighth, women will not lose jobs, despite the scare tactics of the Republicans. The economy has added 10 million new jobs since the last increase 5 years ago. A dozen studies show that even teenagers won't lose jobs. In fact, the Card & Krueger study of New Jersey and Pennsylvania showed that employment in the fast food industry increased after New Jersey raised its minimum wage. Other studies have also found employment increases. There are two reasons: First, better wages attract more employees to the job market; second, because workers have better pay, they have more to spend and the economy gets a boost that leads to more employment.

Massachusetts raised the minimum wage to \$4.75 an hour as of January 1, 1996. Unemployment has fallen in Massachusetts since the start of the year, while in neighboring New Hampshire, which left its minimum wage at \$4.25, unemployment has increased.

In Massachusetts, we have seen the continued reduction in the unemployment figures virtually across the State, even with that increase up to \$4.75 an hour.

The opponents of raising the minimum wage cry crocodile tears about its effect on the employment of people at the bottom of the economic ladder, but the people at the bottom of the economic ladder want the raise.

Lou Harris' most recent poll showed that 94 percent of Americans with household income of \$7,500 or less support the legislation.

So to all those on the other side from whom we hear the arguments that they are most concerned about those poor workers, many of them women, many of them minorities; we do not want to have them thrown out of a job, the fact is the poor workers are the ones who overwhelmingly say they want the increase in the minimum wage.

Industry lobbyists probably should not try to speak for families at the bottom of the economic ladder.

This is an issue about women and the children they raise; 100,000 of whom will be lifted out of poverty with this bill's passage—100,000 Americans lifted out of poverty when this bill passes. Two million single heads of households who have to feed their children on poverty wages, get them to school while getting themselves to work, arrange for child care and provide them shelter is the issue in this legislation.

Mr. President, \$1,800—the annual increase in the earnings this bill will provide to minimum wage workers—provides 7 months' of groceries for those families, 9 months' worth of utility bills, and an entire year of health care costs; the tuition for a community college or a State 2-year college.

This is an issue of fairness. CEO pay is up 30 percent and corporate profits are higher than they have been since the 1960's. It is time businesses shared that wealth with the lowest paid of their workers. Productivity has increased 25 percent over the last 20 years, but the value of the minimum wage has fallen 25 percent.

Is that not an interesting phenomenon? Productivity has increased 25 percent and generally at other times when we have had a level playing field, where all of the country moved up in terms of wages, the standard of living, the hopes and dreams for everyone, for the families and for their children, and for the parents, everyone moved up together. Now we have seen a 25-percent increase in productivity, which is usually associated with the increase in the wages for those workers, and we have seen a 25-percent reduction for those individuals at the lowest level of the economic ladder, again men and women that are working.

Finally, Mr. President, this legislation could mean important savings to the Government. This is an argument that is forgotten by those who are unalterably opposed to the minimum wage. It would mean savings to the

Government in food stamps, Medicaid, and other public welfare programs. We can save more than \$600 million in AFDC, \$350 million in Medicaid, \$300 million more in food stamps.

In a two-earner family where both parents earn the minimum wage, \$3,600 in additional pay would make a dramatic difference in their dependence on public support. Why? Because their income would be sufficiently raised that they would no longer qualify for that kind of safety net. And if they no longer qualified for it, that would be a savings. And what should that mean savings for? Workers and workers' families because they are the principal ones paying taxes.

Or you can ask the question the other way. Why should all American workers, who are the bulk of the taxpayers, subsidize certain companies that are using sweat labor and refuse to pay the minimum wage for those who are working in the workplace?

That is what is happening today. So this is action in the interest of saving American taxpayer funds because it will raise sufficient numbers of needy people out of eligibility for these various support payments.

Mr. President, it is time to stop playing games and raise the minimum wage. I urge the majority leader to schedule a clean up-and-down vote on our bill to raise the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour. We need that. American workers need it.

It is interesting to those of us who had introduced at the start of the last Congress the increase in the minimum wage; that could have taken effect a year ago. We have already lost that year. Purchasing power has already declined. At that time, it was 50 cents, 50 cents, 50 cents. Instead, we went 45, 45, 45 as a way of compromise, and it is time we address this issue. This issue is not complex, nor complicated. It is a simple, straightforward issue that every Member is familiar with. We do not need to have more studies, more hearings. It is a matter of fundamental economic justice and fairness for hard working Americans. It is about time we get about that business.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for allowing me the opportunity to speak at this time. I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Chair. Before I discuss the pending business, I might make one comment. It certainly seems that partisan accusations are still alive and well. I sit here and listen to Republican this and Republican that. Of course, we are in the middle of an election year, but it occurs to me that in a 2-year period when the President of the United States was a Democrat, the Democrats controlled the Senate and Democrats controlled the House, we did not hear these calls on behalf of women and children and lower income workers. Such a bill was not introduced, and no committee hearings

were held. In fact, the President indicated that was not the way to go. So now I am relieved that we have discovered women and children and the lower paid workers of this country and perhaps we can have a debate on it and do the right thing. But I would like to discuss something that should be of bipartisan concern.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could I just respond?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I just wanted to mention the fact that, of course, during that debate in the earlier Congress we were debating comprehensive health care. The value of the comprehensive health care was between 40 and 50 cents an hour. It was the request of the workers at that time that we focus on that rather than the minimum wage, and the minimum wage came back into play right after that was defeated. It was very easy and understandable for those of us who had been working on it, but I just mention to our colleague that the last time we had a bipartisan increase in the minimum wage, as the Senator knows, was in 1989. At that time we had two-thirds of the Republicans who supported it. We had a Republican President, Democratic Congress, and now we have a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. Presidents Eisenhower and Nixon supported it as well.

So this is, as we have tried to point out over the period of time, what Republicans and Republican Presidents and Republican Congresses have supported, as Senator DOLE and Congressman GINGRICH did at other times. So it is a bit of a stretch to say that they would have supported it another time if it was just a partisan issue but not supporting it now.

I know we may have differences on the understanding of those series of events, but I wanted to just have a chance to add those brief comments to the RECORD.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would just say to my colleague that it is not I who was making it a partisan issue or saying it was a partisan issue. It has not been that in times past. It seems as if recently it has become a partisan issue. And I think the point still is well made that for a period of 2 years, both before and after the health care debate, certainly after the health care debate, when control of the Congress was well within the power of the other side, this could have been brought up and discussed. And the President did indicate that the minimum wage was not the way to go. As I understand it, the position is that there was other legislation which would obviate the need for the minimum wage, and some would say today there is other legislation that could obviate the need for the minimum wage. I am not even saying where this Senator would come down. I

would like to listen to the debate on it. We have not had a chance to debate it.

I just find two things that are happening very strange. First, is now it is an issue that is first and foremost in the minds of some of my colleagues on the other side. And, second, they seem to be the ones who are trying to make this a partisan issue. I say, let us consider it on its merits, both sides of the aisle, and do the right thing about it. But, if we start off in the very beginning making it a partisan issue and trying to draw lines and distinctions when the people on the other side of the aisle have sat and done nothing with regard to the minimum wage when they had it within their power to do so, we are not going to have much progress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could I have one final moment in the exchange? Of course, as the Senator knows, we have had good Republican support on the last vote for an increase in the minimum wage. That, I think, was something that was notable.

Second, as the Senator knows, we have not been given an opportunity to get to this issue scheduled as an order of doing business. As we have said—and I am sure the Senator is familiar with this—if we were able to get a time agreement on a clean bill, we would certainly welcome that opportunity. We have indicated we would be glad to let time go, as the Senator knows, on the two last occasions where the Senate has addressed it. We have had Republican support, the majority of the Members. There was Republican support.

Finally, as the Senator knows, we have both the minimum wage and the EITC, both of which affect the working poor. The increase in the minimum wage has the greatest advantage for single individuals, which, increasingly, are numbers of single women. The EITC has a greater impact on those families where they have a number of children. Really, if we are interested in doing it, these matters ought to be embraced and put on together. We have seen the expansion of the EITC in recent times, although there were attempts to cut back on that during the budget consideration.

So I agree with my colleague and friend. I would welcome the opportunity to join with him so we could have a good discussion. Let Members of this body have a look at these items and then make a judgment. I am just concerned, as the time goes on, and as we know we have less than 40 days legislatively where we expect the Congress to meet and where the House has not taken action, it might be appropriate to do so at a particular time. But I am grateful to the Senator for his comments, and I certainly welcome the chance to engage in further discussion when we focus on this particular matter.

Mr. THOMPSON. I appreciate the comments of my colleague, and I share his view this is something that ought

to be considered deliberately and fully at the appropriate time. I think it is wise that we approach it from the standpoint of what is good for the country; that neither side try to make undue political points at the outset. Otherwise, we are not going to get anywhere. I simply say, I share my colleague's concern and desire to get anything up for a vote.

It has taken 49 years to get the matter I am about to discuss up for a vote in this body, so I would like to turn to that now unless my colleague has any more comments.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Twenty minutes has expired. Morning business is now closed.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LIMIT CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 21, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 21) proposing a constitutional amendment to limit congressional terms.

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

Pending:

Thompson (for Ashcroft) amendment No. 3692, in the nature of a substitute.

Thompson (for Brown) amendment No. 3693 (to amendment No. 3692), to permit each State to prescribe the maximum number of terms to which a person may be elected to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Thompson (for Ashcroft) amendment No. 3694, of a perfecting nature.

Thompson (for Brown) amendment No. 3695 (to amendment No. 3694), to permit each State to prescribe the maximum number of terms to which a person may be elected to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Thompson amendment No. 3696, to change the length of limits on Congressional terms to 12 years in the House of Representatives and 12 years in the Senate.

Thompson (for Brown) amendment No. 3697 (to amendment No. 3696), to permit each State to prescribe the maximum number of terms to which a person may be elected to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Thompson motion to recommit the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions.

Thompson (for Ashcroft) amendment No. 3698 (to the motion to recommit), to change instructions to report back with limits on Congressional terms of 6 years in the House of Representatives and 12 years in the Senate.

Thompson (for Brown) modified amendment No. 3699 (to amendment No. 3698), to change instructions to report back with language allowing each State to set the terms of members of the House of Representatives and the Senate from that State.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, this is a constitutional amendment to limit the terms of Members of Congress. It calls for a limitation of 12 years, 2

terms in the U.S. Senate; a limitation of 12 years, 6 terms in the House of Representatives.

As I indicated, the last vote on term limitations in this body was in 1947, so it has taken about 49 years to get the second vote on this, not that anybody has been particularly pushing for it.

I believe it is the first constitutional amendment for term limits to ever come out of committee. This had a full committee hearing. It passed out of the Judiciary Committee, and now, for the first time, a committee bill is on the floor ready for consideration. I think it is long overdue.

In this body, it has been my observation that we pay as close attention as we can to what the American people want. We pay as close attention as we can to what our constituents want. We have offices all across the various States. We go to those offices, we listen, we get tallies on what people are calling in about, what people's concerns are. We go out and we pride ourselves, as elected Members, having town hall meetings, and we say a large part of the purpose of that is to listen, to see what is going on so we can be reflective of the opinions of the people that we represent.

We run our campaigns on the same basis. We say, let us be your Representative and we will go up and listen to the people. Let us turn the Congress back to the people. We try to respond every time we get the feeling that 51 percent of our constituents want something. There is nothing more responsive than someone who has been elected to office, who feels his constituents are pressing for something, even by the barest of margins—except in one area. That is the area we are dealing with here today, term limits.

We see poll after poll after poll, and we poll early and often. Sometimes it is like all that is happening around here is a rendition of those polls. My colleague from Massachusetts was talking about how many women favored minimum wage, how many Republicans, how many Democrats, all based on polling results. Who is ahead in the Presidential race? All these various issues. Who is for us and who is against us? By what margin? The distinction between last week, when 52 percent of the people were for this proposition, and the week before last when only 49 percent of the people were for this proposition, so we see a little movement there.

There is extreme, extreme attention to the temperature of the American people and to our constituents, except about one thing, and that is term limits. Poll after poll indicates that upward of 75 percent of the American people favor term limits, and the overwhelming majority of States and localities that have had the opportunity to vote on term limits have come out in favor of term limits. Mr. President, 22 States have imposed term limits on themselves, even while other States were not doing so, saying: We think it

is an idea whose time has come. It would be for the benefit of America for us to set the example, and we are willing to impose it on ourselves even though there is no obligation for other States to do so.

Yet, even in light of this overwhelming majority of the American people who feel something is basically going wrong with their country and they are searching for something fundamental to do about it, we pay absolutely no attention to what is going on. We pay no attention to the overwhelming sentiment of the American people with regard to this one area.

The case can be made that we ought to be more reflective in some cases, that we ought to be a little more isolated. This is supposed to be a deliberative body and sometimes we do not take enough time to really reflect on the important issues that are facing us. Sometimes we get too caught up in the number of bills that we can pass and the gamesmanship of what is going on in this town. But, why is this the only one area where this rule seems to apply to this body, and no other area? The answer, of course, is because in a Congress that busies itself in regulating other people's lives and purifying other institutions, other businesses, other individuals, that changes when it comes to doing something about ourselves, even something as innocuous as a 12-year term. This constitutional amendment would not even need to be ratified for 7 years. Then it would be prospective. It is the most minimal first step toward trying to put us in a position to face the 21st century that we could possibly think of. It probably would not affect anybody in this body right now, another 12 years on top of what they have already served, and on top of the 7 years it might take for ratification of the constitutional amendment. That is not exactly a drastic move, not exactly a revolutionary change. Yet we have all this difficulty even getting to first base.

Let us talk about what this is not all about, because the detractors of term limits, in their scrambling around to try to come up with reasons why in this particular case the overwhelming majority of the American people are wrong, have set the terms of the debate for us, in many cases.

What it is not about is vindictiveness. A lot of people are angry with the Congress of the United States, but this is not about vindictiveness. Life is too short for that.

On the contrary, Mr. President, I really believe that imposing term limits on ourselves would do more to restore the dignity and the esteem of Congress with the American people than anything else. I pointed out the other day that columnist George Will wrote a book awhile back called "Restoration," and it was about term limits. Most people would have a hard time seeing that connection until they got into it and read it.

The point is, and a very valid point, I think, indeed, is that at the time our