

through? Who reads them? You then go back and you take a look at when the grants go out, how much paperwork?

The statistics I believe that we had in our hearing in Arizona 2 weeks ago was that of the 6 percent—let me find the exact quote—this was from Lisa Graham Keegan who is Arizona's superintendent of education—said, I will say that the 8 percent Arizona receives from the Federal Government easily accounts for more than 50 percent of the work in my department and school districts.

The paperwork. They receive 8 percent of their money—remember this \$120 billion is only about 5 or 6 percent of what any school district gets, but on a national average some get more, some get less. Here in Arizona it is about 8 percent of their total dollars come from Washington and about 50 percent of their paperwork. Is that a good investment? What do bureaucrats in Washington really know about what needs to be done in Arizona?

So what is the paperwork that goes back and forth? We have had meetings, and we asked superintendents to tell us about their paperwork, and one of the things that they keep coming back with is, we appreciate the money we get from Washington. In some cases it does some good and we can work in those areas. But the real problem is when we take a look at our local school district and we take a look at the needs that we have. If we had more flexibility to use that money in different ways, we would spend it in different ways than what you are mandating that we spend it on.

So we know that this process is not an ideal process. Fifty billion dollars of more spending in Washington is not the way to improve education. Spending \$50 on education may be a worthwhile effort. It is probably a good exercise. Spending it at the State and the local level, where you have more control and direction about what you need in your community, and actually getting the dollars into the classroom probably makes a lot more sense.

Recognize that when we spend and say we are going to spend \$50 billion in Washington, maybe only 25 to 30 billion will actually make it back into the classroom. Twenty billion is going to get lost somewhere else in the process.

A couple of other proposals that the President is talking about that I think need serious consideration: talking about school construction. As soon as we put in Federal dollars, any amount of Federal dollars, into a local school construction, Washington will come in and mandate what contractors need to be paid on an hourly basis for the work that they perform in your school district. It is called Davis-Bacon, mandated from Washington what you will pay. We have an elaborate system in the Department of Labor that is not very good but that tries to track wages in thousands of different communities around this Nation, in a number of different construction categories, and

that is what you have to pay. In other projects where you do not have Davis-Bacon, we go through this kind of complex way of determining how much a project will cost. It is called competitive bidding. School districts cannot competitively bid. They have to pay Davis-Bacon wages.

So in effect, when you go on a construction project with Federal dollars or partially funded with Federal dollars, you lose again about 15 percent of your purchasing power by being required to pay the wages established here in Washington versus what you may be able to get in a competitive bid.

I enjoy the discussion about the HOPE scholarships. Making education available to more students on a longer basis I think is a worthwhile goal, saying that Washington is now going to provide scholarships for those that maintain a B average.

The IRS today cannot track our income tax system, our Income Tax Code. Just think of what wonderful work they are now going to have also trying to match tax deductions with information from schools indicating that, yes, these people did maintain a B average and that B averages across the country are consistent, so that the same B that you get in Michigan is equivalent to a B that you get in Arizona.

It is going to create a lot more work for bureaucrats, and it is going to move a lot less money into the classroom.

The evidence is clear. We need to focus on education, but more compelling is the case that rather than increasing and building and expanding this city in Washington, the keys to improving education is moving dollars and power away from this city and moving it back to parents, moving it back to local school boards and empowering teachers.

It is not only school boards. It is teachers that want control of their classroom. It is the parents that want their schools back. They do not want to come to Washington to take a look or to fight for what they want to do in their classroom. They want control of their schools. They know specifically what they need for their kids and their community.

The needs of this country are so diverse. We need to be able to have the flexibility to tailor the programs for our kids from one city and one community to the next, and we need to empower parents.

That is not a concept or a theory. We know that it works. Take a look at the schools that are working, take a look at the schools that are excelling, and that is the bright spot in the picture in education.

Yes, there is some bad news, there is some information that says we ought to be worried about this and that in some parts of the Nation education may be in a state of crisis. But the good news is that we can look at models of success and we can learn from

those models of success, we can learn what the characteristics are, and we can then tailor Federal policies and rules and regulations, or whatever, to empower that kind of change and reform to happen at the local level.

And what we learn is very simple: Parents, basics and getting dollars into the classroom, empowering parents instead of empowering bureaucrats, dollars to kids, not to bureaucracy, fundamental basic education, not the latest education fads; it is a key issue, it is an important issue. It is going to be a vigorous debate. I think in the end kids and parents will win, and politicians and bureaucrats in Washington will lose. That is the system that works, that is the model that we will build on, and that is the direction that we need to go.

PROPOSING A TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I come today to speak about a subject that will be greatly debated tomorrow on the floor of the House; that is, term limits. I am the author of House Joint Resolution 2 which will be out here on the floor. It is the term limits amendment for 12 years in the U.S. Senate, 12 years in the U.S. House, something that better than 70 percent of the American people in principle support.

The issue that will be before us will be a historic debate, the second time that we have heard the subject of term limits debated in the Congress of the United States. First time was in the 104th Congress, 2 years ago when this amendment that I offered received 227 votes, which is a simple majority, more than a simple majority because 218 is that, but not enough to reach the required supermajority of 290 votes to pass a constitutional amendment in the House.

I am hopeful that when we conclude the debate tomorrow that this amendment will receive more than the 227 votes it received last year, that we will be further progressing toward the 290 votes that we need for the ultimate passage of this amendment, even though I have no illusions that we have yet to reach the numbers in the House who support term limits sufficient to actually pass this amendment tomorrow.

I am hopeful that the debate will be centered primarily upon the divisive issues that normally we debate here; that is, those who favor a differing length of term and those who favor no term limits at all.

There are those who favor 6-year House terms and 12 years in the Senate, and I respect that view. There is certainly a difference of opinion we can

all share. I personally think that 12 and 12 is far superior. For one thing, if we are going to limit the Senate to 12 years and the House to 6, we are going to wind up giving the Senate more power than the House in conference committees and elsewhere, and I do not think that is smart. I think we need a balance between the two bodies. We need to have a symmetry. There should be the same length of term limits with respect to the House as there is with the Senate.

So that is why I for one think the 12 and 12 is better than a 6 and 12 or an 8 and 12 limit process.

I also happen to believe that 6 years is frankly too short in the House. I think there needs to be time in grade, if you will, time to learn and time to gain knowledge in this very complex government that we operate, to learn the subject matters that we have to deal with before a Member becomes the chairman of a full committee or ascends to a major leadership post in one of the political parties running this body. And I do not believe, having been here a few years, that 6 years is long enough for a Member in most cases to acquire that kind of knowledge and that experience that we would like to see; and to support a lesser term than 12 years is to support something that is subject to the criticism of those opponents objectively who oppose term limits altogether.

□ 1500

But that is a fair argument to have. Men and women of differing persuasions will come to different conclusions about these things, and I look forward to that debate.

What bothers me more than anything else, though, is that there is a group working supposedly for term limits out there that may in fact be in the process of destroying the effort we are making; may in fact be so intent upon getting their way or no other way that in the end they gridlock this body and we never reach the goal ultimately of getting to term limits.

The reason I say that is because the tactics they are using are such that we are likely to see that instead of 227 votes out here tomorrow, there may be a lesser number than 227 for the one and only proposed amendment that really has any chance of getting to the 290 needed to pass it any time in the foreseeable future. I am referring to an organization known as United States Term Limits. I want to talk about this group and what it has been doing for a few minutes today so that we can focus more tomorrow on the substance of the actual debate over term limits itself.

I, first of all, would like to refer to a column that was written in this week's current issue of Newsweek magazine by a very well-liked and respected columnist, George F. Will. George Will's column of February 17, 1997, is too long for me to read in its entirety into the RECORD, but I would like to request that at the end of my remarks today

that the column in its entirety appear in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

I do want to quote from one of those:

United States Term Limits is a bellicose advocate of term limits, and, like fanatics through the ages, it fancies itself the sole legitimate keeper of the flame of moral purity. However, it has actually become the career politician's best friend. That is why it was opponents of term limits who invited a U.S. Term Limits spokesman to testify at recent House hearings on the subject. Opponents understand that U.S. Term Limits' obscurantism, dogmatism and bullying embarrassed the cause.

Frankly, they do more than embarrass the cause. In their effort to have their way or no other way, they have done a lot of damage to the cause. They have embarked in the past on a course of attacking term-limit supporters. In the last Congress they produced television commercials and ran them in a number of districts of term-limit supporters who supported something other than their preferred version, which is the 6-year House limit and the 12-year Senate limit. They took the position that if you were willing to compromise to actually pass a term-limits amendment, and that meant looking for proposals other than the 6-year House limit, then you incurred their wrath. Their view is that 12 years in the Senate is fine, but they declare that a greater limit than 6 years in the House is worthless and the Congressman who votes for a 12-year House limit is hypocritical.

How inconsistent and reckless that is. It is really quite reckless, in fact. They have turned on the prime supporter of 6 years, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and criticized him. He is part of their Rogue's Gallery, now on the Internet, if you want to look it up, and yet he is a strong advocate and will probably offer the 6-year House version here tomorrow.

The reason they turned on him is because when the 6-year version came up, way short of getting anywhere near the number necessary to pass it, he saw the truth of the matter was that the only way we are ever going to get term limits in this body was to vote for the 12-year limit. So after his version failed, he voted for the 12-year limit.

Their latest strategy is the passage of misleading ballot initiatives. Like the wolf in Red Ridinghood, disguised as the sweet old granny, United States Term Limits has deceived voters into believing they were instructing their representatives to vote for term limits. The deception involves passing initiatives in the States that would require legislators to adopt their no-compromise policy on a 6-year limit. Any legislator who runs afoul of United States Term Limits gets the words "disregarded voter instructions on term limits" next to their name on the ballot in the next election.

Let us make this crystal clear. This scarlet letter is placed beside any Congressman's name, even if, in fact, he voted for several term-limit amendments, just not solely for United

States Term Limits' 6-year limit. Not only that, but there are nine separate States that have passed this particular initiative, and each of the States has some different language in it, which is why we are going to have a series of nine votes, in addition to the base bill and Mr. INGLIS' and perhaps a couple of other amendments out here tomorrow.

The States of Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, and South Dakota have all passed an initiative that United States Term Limits sponsored regarding the 6-year-term limit for the House and the 12-year for the Senate, but each one has some subtle difference, and if you do not follow their instruction precisely, if you are a Member of Congress from the particular State in question and you do not offer and get an opportunity to vote for precisely the language that was put on the ballot in those States and passed, then you get this scarlet letter beside your name on the next ballot when the next election comes around. It is absolutely designed to gridlock this body over the issue of term limits, not help it pass it.

Therein lies the whole problem. For good reason, many Members do not want to appear to be against term limits. So in order to avoid the scarlet letter, Members from these States that have passed the initiatives, who support term limits in general, will vote against the one bill, a 12-year limit in the House and Senate, that has a chance of ever passing the House, much less the Senate. Instead of working to pass term limits, the United States Term Limits' initiatives are actually reducing the number of votes for term limits in the House. How ironic that is.

Here is how this scam works in one particular illustration. In Idaho, one of the nine States that passed the initiative, the actual United States Term Limits initiative text runs 2,286 words. That is four pages of single-type space. However, all that appeared on the ballot were 207 words, not 2,286. The full text and requirements were available only upon special request from the secretary of state or the elections office.

Most importantly, however, is the clever wording of the short title and the first thing voters see on the ballot:

Initiative instructing candidates for State legislature and U.S. Congress to support congressional term limits requires statement indicating nonsupport on ballot.

That is a very broad statement. I would submit that any citizen who supports term limits, and as I said earlier, about 70 percent do, would wholeheartedly support, I would support that, and the people of Idaho supported that. They voted for it. If United States Term Limits were really sincere in their drive for a 6-year limit, then why did they not declare right up front in the title of the initiative that it requires support for only the 6-year limit?

Their latest effort to attack limit supporters is destructive not only of

the term-limit movement itself, but it sets a dangerous precedent for manipulation of the Federal ballot by special interest groups. It does not take much imagination to see that the initiative process could be manipulated by powerful special interest groups on a whole variety of issues to do this sort of destructive thing. It would not be long before every special interest group in the country would seize on the opportunity to gain the ballot to their political and legislative advantage.

So again I have to ask the question, What is United States Term Limits' real objective? Obviously, they are saying they are for term limits. They are a nonprofit organization that goes around the country beating their chest over this issue.

They have every right to be for a different term-limits proposal than I am or the majority of this body is. They have every right to go out and advocate it, and they have a right technically to get on these ballots. But what is their effort really going to amount to, and why would any rational person who really wants term limits be proceeding in this manner that is guaranteed in a suicidal fashion to gridlock this body over the whole issue, and instead of leading us to term limits, will mean the death of the term-limits movement as a practical matter?

There is no way anybody can look forward and see when it will ever occur if they continue this process, even if they pass initiatives in several States that ultimately conform to one methodology and one set of language. There is no way anybody could ever see in the far-distant future how that is going to lead to the passage of a term limits constitutional amendment through Congress or through the several States.

For one thing, only about half the States, actually I think a little less than half, have an initiative process. The State legislatures of other States will not go along with this. Maybe one or two would, but certainly not all. In the most ideal of circumstances, there is no way that United States Term Limits can succeed with this suicidal methodology. It is absolutely replete with a useless type of process, and in addition to that, as I said, is a dangerous type of process.

Now I would like to comment a little bit about why some of us passionately believe in this issue, why we believe term limits is so important. The reason I believe term limits is so important is because I am concerned that Members of Congress are too concerned about getting reelected every time and not enough concerned in each vote that is taken with the best interest of the country as a whole. That is a simple way of saying they are career oriented. They are worried about staying around here, and so they try to please every interest group. That is not true of every vote and every Congressman, of course, but true of too many; too many votes and too many Congressmen at any given time.

Yes, we have had some turnover in Congress. We have had quite a bit in the last couple of years. The problem is those who are really in control and run this place are those who are most senior. While there is not an absolute seniority system since the Republicans took over control of Congress and limited the tenure of 6 years to any committee or subcommittee, and limited the tenure of our leadership to any 6- or 8-year period, there still is, as a practical matter, seniority.

Those who have been here longest serve in the positions of the most power, and that is the way it is going to continue to be. That is the way it has been historically in every legislative body, and that is the way it will continue to be here. If we do not have term limits, we are going to have to choose who do stay, those who choose to stay and be reelected, and the vast majority are. A very high percentage are reelected or run for reelection every time that run for Congress, and they are going to have control of this body. I do not think that is an appropriate thing. I think that we need to change that career orientation. I think it is much better if we have term limits, and as I said, I think 12-year is the best of all.

In the article I cited earlier by George Will that appears in Newsweek, under the last column heading, "Save Us From the Purists," where he discusses the folly of U.S. Term Limits at some length, he also talks about the rationale for term limits, and I agree with him on this. He says, "Term limits are a simple surgical Madisonian reform. By removing careerism, a relatively modern phenomenon as a motivator for entering politics and for behavior in office, term limits can produce deliberative bodies disposed to think of the next generation rather than the next election. This is the argument favored by those who favor term limits, not because of hostility toward Congress, but as an affectionate measure to restore Congress to its rightful role as the first branch of government."

Mr. Will goes on to discuss, intelligent people will differ, as I have said earlier, about the terms and whether they are this term or that term and even whether term limits is a good idea at all. But he wonders aloud, with me, over why an organization like U.S. Term Limits, supposedly dedicated to the proposition, would go about doing what they are doing in such a reckless manner.

He says, "U.S. Term Limits is not merely eccentric, but preposterous and antithetical to dignified democracy because it insists that three House terms is the only permissible option. If U.S. Term Limits", and I am continuing to quote Mr. Will, "merely espouses this position, it could simply be disregarded as a collection of cranks. What makes it deeply subversive of the term limits movement is its attempt to enforce its three-year House term fetish by using

a device that degrades what the movement seeks to dignify—the principle of deliberative representation."

"Last November", he goes on to say, "in 9 States with 30 House Members, 19 of them Republicans, whose party platform endorses term limits, U.S. Term Limits sponsored successful campaigns to pass pernicious initiatives. These stipulate precisely the sort of term limits measure for which those States' Members should vote and further stipulate that unless those Members vote for them and only for them, then when those Members seek reelection, there must appear next to their names the statement, "violated voter instruction on term limits."

"More than 70 percent of Americans favor the principle of term limits without having fixed, let alone fierce, preferences about details. But U.S. Term Limits, tentatiously presenting meretricious evidence, baldly and farcically asserts that Americans believe that term limits involving 6-year House terms is not worth having. Because of U.S. Term Limits' coercive device of instruction, there may have to be a dozen votes, which probably will happen, this week on various term limits amendments to the Constitution. And U.S. Term Limits' ham-handedness probably will produce a decline in the votes for the most popular proposal: 6 House and two Senate terms, or 12 years, I might add, in each body. No measure is yet going to receive the 290 votes or 67 Senate votes needed to send an amendment to the States for ratification debates. However, U.S. Term Limits' rule-or-ruin mischief will splinter the voting bloc that last year produced 227 votes for a 12-years-for-each-chamber amendment."

"The thinking person's reason for supporting term limits is to produce something that U.S. Term Limits' instruction of Members mocks: Independent judgment. U.S. Term Limits, which thinks of itself as serving conservatism, should think again. It should think of that noble fountain of conservatism, Edmund Burke. In 1774, having been elected to Parliament by Bristol voters, Burke delivered to them an admirably austere speech of thanks, in which he rejected the notion that a representative should allow "instructions" from the voters to obviate his independent judgment.

□ 1515

He said, "Government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment," and asked: "What sort of reason is that in which the determination precedes the discussion?"

In the 1850's some Abolitionists were interested less in effectiveness than in narcissistic moral display, interested less in ending slavery than in parading their purity. The abolition of slavery required someone [Lincoln] who was anathema to fanatical abolitionists. Similarly, restoration of deliberative democracy will require patient people, not USTL's exhibitionists.

I quoted liberally from Mr. Will, though not his entire text, which will

appear, as we said earlier, at the end of these remarks. I think he stated it very well.

Let us hope tomorrow as we debate term limits the debate is civil, and that our Members debate the merits of the various proposals. But understanding that, if we do parade before this body and the country nine separate proposals in addition to the underlying 12 years in the House, 12 years in the Senate, House Joint Resolution 2, that we are doing that because of this rather bullying tactic of U.S. term limits, this self-defeating effort that they are making to try and somehow bring attention to this cause.

It is very obscure to me as to what they think they are going to achieve in this process, other than gridlock on the term limits movement. I would urge my colleagues all to seriously weigh this when they vote tomorrow, and as many as possible who do not feel compelled to follow the instructions in those nine States, take the risk and the chance of facing up to these bullies, and, in the end, after all is said and done, please vote for the passage of the one term limits proposal that is rational and has a chance of ultimately prevailing and being sent to the States for ratification: 12 years in the House and 12 years in the Senate.

I include for the RECORD the article previously referred to.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 17, 1997]

SAVE US FROM THE PURISTS—SOME SUPPORTERS OF TERM LIMITS HAVE DEVISED A TACTIC AT ODDS WITH THE BEST REASON FOR LIMITS

(By George F. Will)

Since the apple incident in Eden, the human race has been disappointing. Hence term limits for Congress may become one of the few exceptions to the rule that when Americans want something, and want it intensely and protractedly, they get it. Only the political class can enact limits, and limits would be unnecessary if that class were susceptible to self-restraint.

That is a structural problem of politics with which supporters of term limits must cope. But the organization U.S. Term Limits is an unnecessary impediment to term limits. As the House votes this week on the issue, consider what happens when a reform movement's bandwagon is boarded by people ignorant of, or indifferent to, the principal rationale for the reform.

USTL is a bellicose advocate of term limits, and, like fanatics through the ages, it fancies itself the sole legitimate keeper of the flame of moral purity. However, it has actually become the career politician's best friend. That is why it was opponents of term limits who invited a USTL spokesman to testify at recent House hearings on the subject. Opponents understand that USTL's obscurantism, dogmatism and bullying embarrass the cause.

The primary argument for term limits is not that, absent limits, there will be a permanent class of entrenched incumbents shielded from challengers by advantages of office. Although incumbents who choose to seek re-election still are remarkably safe—91 percent of them won in the turbulence of 1994 and 94 percent won in 1996—most members of Congress arrived there in this decade. (This rotation in office has been produced partly by something the nation does not wish to

rely on—revulsion arising from scandals and other malfeasance.) And the primary argument for term limits is not that Congress is insufficiently "responsive" and hence must be made "closer to the people." Rather, the primary argument is that we need "constitutional space" (the phrase is from Harvard's Harvey Mansfield) between representatives and the represented.

Term limits are a simple, surgical, Madisonian reform. By removing careerism—a relatively modern phenomenon—as a motive for entering politics and for behavior in office, term limits can produce deliberative bodies disposed to think of the next generation rather than the next election. This is the argument favored by those who favor term limits not because of hostility toward Congress, but as an affectionate measure to restore Congress to its rightful role as the First Branch of government. This would put the presidency where it belongs (and usually was during the Republic's first 150 years), which is more towards the margin of political life.

Intelligent people of good will differ about whether term limits are a good idea, and supporters of limits differ concerning the appropriate maximum length of legislative careers. Most supporters consider six House and two Senate terms a temperate solution. It is symmetrical (12 years in each chamber) and allows enough time for professional learning, yet removes the careerism that produces officeholders who make only risk-averse decisions while in office. USTL is not merely eccentric but preposterous and antithetical to dignified democracy because it insists that three House terms is the only permissible option.

If USTL merely espoused this position, it could simply be disregarded as a collection of cranks. What makes it deeply subversive of the term limits movement is its attempt to enforce its three-House-terms fetish by using a device that degrades what the movement seeks to dignify—the principle of deliberative representation. Last November in nine states with 30 House members (19 of them Republicans, whose party platform endorses term limits) USTL sponsored successful campaigns to pass pernicious initiatives. These stipulate precisely the sort of term limits measures for which those states' members should vote, and further stipulate that unless those members vote for them and only for them, then when those members seek re-election there must appear next to their names on the ballot this statement: "Violated voter instruction on term limits."

More than 70 percent of Americans favor the principle of term limits without having fixed, let alone fierce, preferences about details. But USTL, tendentiously presenting meretricious "evidence," baldly and farcically asserts that Americans believe that term limitation involving six House terms is not worth having. Because of USTL's coercive device of "instruction," there may have to be a dozen votes this week on various term limits amendments to the Constitution. And USTL's ham-handedness probably will provide a decline in votes for the most popular proposal—six House and two Senate terms. No measure is yet going to receive the 290 House votes or 67 Senate votes needed to send an amendment to the states for ratification debates. However, USTL's rule-or-ruin mischief will splinter the voting bloc that last year produced 227 votes for a 12-years-for-each-chamber amendment.

The thinking person's reason for supporting term limits is to produce something that USTL's "instruction" of members mocks— independent judgment. USTL, which thinks of itself as serving conservatism, should think again. It should think of that noble fountain of conservatism, Edmund Burke. In

1774, having been elected to Parliament by Bristol voters, Burke delivered to them an admirably austere speech of thanks, in which he rejected the notion that a representative should allow "instructions" from voters to obviate his independent judgment. He said "government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment" and asked: "What sort of reason is that in which the determination precedes the discussion?"

In the 1850s some Abolitionists were interested less in effectiveness than in narcissistic moral display, interested less in ending slavery than in parading their purity. The abolition of slavery required someone (Lincoln) who was anathema to fanatical abolitionists. Similarly, restoration of deliberative democracy will require patient people, not USTL's exhibitionists.

TERM LIMITS: A SOLUTION FOR A PROBLEM THAT DOES NOT EXIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have the greatest respect for the Member who just finished speaking and, in fact, respect him about as much as anybody in this body, but I do disagree with him on this issue. If ever there was a solution for a problem that does not exist, it is term limits for Members of Congress.

First of all, more than half of this House has served just since January of 1993, 4 years or less. One-third has served 2 years or less. There is greater turnover in elective office today than at almost any time in the history of this country.

Second, unlike Federal judges, bureaucrats, and members of the military, the terms of Members of Congress are already limited. We face the voters every other year. We are given only a 2-year term in the House. If the voters do not like what we are doing, they can easily kick us out. Elections are the best term limits ever invented. In fact, it is slightly arrogant for someone to say, I am going to limit myself only to 6 or 12 or some other number of years in office. That decision is only up to the voters, and that is the way it should be.

Actually, if term limits are needed, they are needed more for unelected people than for those who regularly have to be approved by the voters already. Many people say the real power lies in the bureaucracy anyway.

Third, term limits are unconstitutional. They were specifically considered by our Founding Fathers and specifically rejected, for a whole host of good reasons.

Fourth, term limits are undemocratic, with a small d. They would prohibit voters from voting for a candidate who might otherwise be their first choice. They would prohibit good people from running for office. They would take away freedoms that we have always held dear in this Nation.

Fifth, term limits would increase the power of unelected bureaucrats and