

for it; demand it. The only entity that can make the present hide-and-seek system work are integrators. And not in just today's livestock markets. Tomorrow's grain markets will be equally messy if the current price reporting system is not pried open so all farmers have equal standing and full information when approaching the market.

4. Don't buy from firms that are destroying farm markets and rural communities. Hold-over from the '60s, heh? Positively. You don't have to buy eggs from a sleazy company that violates every state pollution law on the books; you don't need to buy chicken from a firm that buys members of Congress and Cabinet members; and you don't have to buy livestock feed—at whatever price—from the integrated conglomerate that is building hog units and destroying your neighbors' businesses and families. And sure, withholding your nickels and dimes may not stop the inevitable. But it won't finance it either.

5. Join a farm organization—any of them—and get involved. You can't hit the game-winning home run if you're not a player.

6. Make 1999 the year you reclaim your co-ops, especially your regional co-ops. It—and as a stockholder, really you—should not be in the business of ruining the livestock industry and building a fabulously well-paid bureaucracy in the process. If you reshape it from its present vertical structure to a more horizontal structure—the co-op shape your grandfather envisioned—more of its profits will come back to co-op's owners. That's you.

7. Push, prod, poke, pound and humiliate Congress to pass tough, meaningful campaign finance reform. The present system is a dollar democracy, owned and operated by well-oiled influence peddlers and puppeteers who make politicians dance like an organ grinder's monkey.

It is the very rotten core of your growing powerlessness.

8. The United States grows billions of pounds of beef and not one pound of bananas. Yet this administration will fight for the handful of very rich U.S. banana exporters and not impose similar import tariffs on European goods in support of 900,000 U.S. cattlemen (See No. 7.) Every farm group and every farmer should make exposing this sham one of their top five priorities in 1999.

9. Draw the line and categorically oppose every new agribusiness merger. Every one. Why is the farmer's share of the food dollar dwindling? Largely because big—and getting bigger—corporations have strengthened their holds on choke points in the food chain until they choke their profits out of you.

10. Don't quit. To paraphrase an old axiom, all it takes for bad ideas to further dominate agriculture is for good people—you—to do nothing.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT J. SCHWINGHAMER

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Mr. Robert Schwinghamer on the occasion of his retirement for his significant contributions to our nation's space and rocket program. He served most recently within the office of the Director as the Associate Director, Technical, at NASA's George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama. Bob Schwinghamer's legacy is one of outstanding leadership, unselfish professional service, and a steadfast dedication to America's space program. It is a personal honor for me to recognize the more than 40 years that Bob so

willingly committed to our country. I salute the distinguished achievements of this remarkable Alabamian for what his service has meant to the State of Alabama, the Nation, and NASA.

Bob's splendid record of achievement speaks for itself. He has been the recipient of several NASA Outstanding Leadership and Distinguished Service Medals; the Presidential Rank Distinguished Executive Award from President George Bush in 1992; Top Engineer in NASA and one of the Top Ten Engineers in Federal Government in 1990 and 1992. He also received numerous Group Achievement and Sustained Superior Performance Awards. With an ebullient leadership style, Bob Schwinghamer also led NASA investigation teams through times of crisis. In 1973, he received the NASA Medal for Exceptional Service to the Apollo Program. In 1986, he led the Space Shuttle Challenger Accident Solid Rocket Motor Investigation Team. In 1998, he received the NASA Outstanding Leadership Medal for leadership in Returning the Space Shuttle Safely to Flight, and in 1990, he led the Space Shuttle Hydrogen Leak Investigation Team. His outstanding record of service and his unfailing loyalty to the U.S. space program cannot be paid its proper due with mere words.

Bob Schwinghamer received his Bachelor-of-Science Degree in Engineering from Purdue University in 1950 and then completed his Master of Science Degree in Management from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1968. During his notable career, he served as a registered professional engineer in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Alabama.

Bob is a member of several highly regarded professional and honorary societies including the American Society for Materials, International; American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics; Society of Manufacturing Engineers, and the Society for Advancement of Materials and Processes Engineering. His devotion to the field of science has earned him continuing recognition throughout the space and missile community all over the country.

Mr. Schwinghamer's professional prowess and outstanding leadership are certainly noteworthy, but he also deserves recognition for being a devoted husband and father and an involved citizen. As an active member of his community, he has given his efforts to outside activities including service as Vice President of Grissom High School's PTA, President of the Lily Flagg Club, and President of the MSFC Skeet Club. He has and continues to inspire individuals in his workplace, community, and home. Bob's generosity and willingness to serve others is a trait which endears him to all of us.

It is with warmest regards and best wishes that I offer Robert J. Schwinghamer and his family every happiness in all of their future endeavors. It is right that we honor and celebrate his retirement. I salute Bob

Schwinghamer as he embarks on the beginning of the next chapter of his life. Our nation's space program will have to replace one of its finest. His presence and expertise will certainly be missed.●

NEW SHOREHAM POLICE CHIEF WILLIAM A. MCCOMBE

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I wish to share with my colleagues the outstanding accomplishments of a great Rhode Islander, Mr. William A. McCombe, Chief of Police in the Town of New Shoreham on Block Island, Rhode Island.

Chief McCombe grew up in my hometown of Cranston, Rhode Island. He embarked on a long and successful career in public service by joining the New Shoreham Police Department in 1980 at the age of 20, attending the Rhode Island Police Academy the following year.

After being promoted to Sergeant in 1984, Mr. McCombe received a bachelors degree in Criminal Justice from Roger Williams University in 1987. In 1992, at 32 years of age, he was promoted to Chief of Police for the Town of New Shoreham. Two years later, Chief McCombe graduated from the FBI National Academy in Quantico, Virginia. He also has attended the Secret Service Diplomatic School in Washington, DC in 1998.

I have known Chief McCombe for a few years, but following President Clinton's decision to accept my invitation to visit Block Island, I worked closely with the Chief to ensure the President's short stay went smoothly. Chief McCombe's professionalism and attention to detail were exemplary and were essential in ensuring that the island's limited resources were not overwhelmed.

Chief McCombe has lived on Block Island for 21 years and has served on the police department for 19 of those years. He has devoted his life to preserving the public safety enjoyed by the people of the Town of New Shoreham and the entire state of Rhode Island. We are grateful for his continuing public service.●

OLIVE CHAPEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Olive Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Kirkwood, Missouri. Although the congregation is 145 years old, they will celebrate their 100th anniversary in their present building on February 26, 27, and 28. This is especially significant considering the Olive Chapel A.M.E. Church is the second oldest A.M.E. church west of the Mississippi River, and the oldest Protestant church in Kirkwood.

I commend Olive Chapel A.M.E. Church for their perseverance throughout the last 100 years and hope they will continue to be a positive influence

in the Kirkwood community for many years to come.●

THE IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, let me begin by saying that the reason we are here today, the reason the United States Senate is being asked to exercise what Alexander Hamilton termed the "awful discretion" of impeachment, is because of the wrongful, reprehensible, indefensible conduct of one person, the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton. Indeed, I believe it is conduct deserving of the censure of the Senate, and I will support such a resolution when it comes before us.

The question before the Senate, however, is not whether the President's conduct was wrong, or immoral, or even censurable. We must decide solely as to whether or not he should be convicted of the allegations contained in the Articles of Impeachment and thus removed from office. In my opinion, the case for removal, presented in great detail in the massive 60,000 page report submitted by the House, in many hours of very capable but often repetitive presentations to the Senate by the House Managers and the President's defense team, and in many additional hours of Senators' questioning of the two sides, fails to meet the very high standards which we must demand with respect to Presidential impeachments. Therefore, I will vote to dismiss the impeachment case against William Jefferson Clinton, and to vote for the Senate resuming other necessary work for the American people.

To this very point, I have reserved my judgment on this question because of my Constitutional responsibility and Oath to "render impartial justice" in this case. Most of the same record presented in great detail to Senators in the course of the last several weeks has long been before the public, and indeed most of that public, including editorial boards, talk show hosts, and so forth, long ago reached their own conclusions as to the impeachment of President Clinton. But I have now heard enough to make my decision. With respect to the witnesses the House Managers apparently now wish to depose and call before the Senate, the existing record represents multiple interrogations by the Office of the Independent Counsel and its Grand Jury, with not only no cross-examinations by the President's counsel but, with the exception of the President's testimony, without even the presence of the witnesses' own counsel. It is difficult for me to see how that record would possibly be improved from the prosecution's standpoint. Thus, I will not support motions to depose or call witnesses.

In reaching my decision on impeachment, there are a number of factors which have been discussed or speculated about in the news media which were not a part of my calculations.

First of all, while as political creatures neither the Senate nor the House can or should be immune from public opinion, we have a very precise Constitutionally-prescribed responsibility in this matter, and popular opinion must not be a controlling consideration. I believe Republican Senator William Pitt Fessenden of Maine said it best during the only previous Presidential Impeachment Trial in 1868:

To the suggestion that popular opinion demands the conviction of the President on these charges, I reply that he is not now on trial before the people, but before the Senate . . . The people have not heard the evidence as we have heard it. The responsibility is not on them, but upon us. They have not taken an oath to "do impartial justice according to the Constitution and the laws." I have taken that oath. I cannot render judgment upon their convictions, nor can they transfer to themselves my punishment if I violate my own. And I should consider myself undeserving of the confidence of that just and intelligent people who imposed upon me this great responsibility, and unworthy of a place among honorable men, if for any fear of public reprobation, and for the sake of securing popular favor, I should disregard the convictions of my judgment and my conscience.

Nor was my decision premised on the notion, suggested by some, that the stability of our government would be severely jeopardized by the impeachment of President Clinton. I have full faith in the strength of our government and its leaders and, more importantly, faith in the American people to cope successfully with whatever the Senate decides. There can be no doubt that the impeachment of a President would not be easy for the country but just in this Century, about to end, we have endured great depressions and world wars. Today, the U.S. economy is strong, the will of the people to move beyond this national nightmare is great, and we have an experienced and able Vice President who is more than capable of stepping up and assuming the role of the President.

Third, although we have heard much argument that the precedents of judicial impeachments should be controlling in this case, I have not been convinced and did not rely on such testimony in making my decision. After a review of the record, historical precedents, and consideration of the different roles of Presidents and federal judges, I have concluded that there is indeed a different legal standard for impeachment of Presidents and federal judges. Article 11, Section 4 of the Constitution provides that "the President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution indicates that judges "shall hold their Offices during good Behavior." Presidents are elected by the people and serve for a fixed term of years, while federal judges are appointed without public approval to serve a life tenure without any accountability to

the public. Therefore, under our system, impeachment is the only way to remove a federal judge from office while Presidents serve for a specified term and face accountability to the public through elections. With respect to the differing impeachment standards themselves, Chief Justice Rehnquist once wrote, "the terms 'treason, bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors' are narrower than the malfeasance in office and failure to perform the duties of the office, which may be grounds for forfeiture of office held during good behavior."

And my conclusions with respect to impeachment were not based upon considerations of the proper punishment of President Clinton for his misdeeds. During the impeachment of President Nixon, the Report by the Staff of the Impeachment Inquiry concluded that "impeachment is the first step in a remedial process—removal from office and possible disqualification from holding future office. The purpose of impeachment is not personal punishment; its function is primarily to maintain constitutional government." Regardless of the outcome of the Senate impeachment trial, President Clinton remains subject to censure by the House and Senate, and criminal prosecution for any crimes he may have committed. Whatever punishment President Clinton deserves for his misdeeds will be provided elsewhere.

Finally, I do not believe that perjury or obstruction of justice could never rise to the level of threatening grievous harm to the Republic, and thus represent adequate grounds for removal of a President. However, we must approach such a determination with the greatest of care. Impeachment of a President is, perhaps with the power to declare War, the gravest of Constitutional responsibilities bestowed upon the Congress. During the history of the United States, the Senate has only held impeachment trials for two Presidents, the 1868 trial of President Johnson, who had not been elected to that office, and now President Clinton. Although the Senate can look to impeachment trials of other public officials, primarily judicial, as I have already said, I do not believe that those precedents are or should be controlling in impeachment trials of Presidents, or indeed of other elected officials.

My decision was based on one overriding concern: the impact of this precedent-setting case on the future of the Presidency, and indeed of the Congress itself. It is not Bill Clinton who should occupy our only attention. He already stands rebuked by the House impeachment votes, and by the words of virtually every member of Congress of both political parties. And even if we do not remove him from office, he still stands liable to future criminal prosecution for his actions, as well as to the verdict of history. No, it is Mr. Clinton's successors, Republican, Democrat or any other Party, who should be our concern.