

the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record during the past 10 years, and has served in that office since 1977;

Whereas, prior to that, Thom rendered exemplary service in the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms for 14 years as Senate Press Liaison;

Whereas, during this 35½ year period, he has at all times discharged the difficult duties and responsibilities of his office with extraordinary efficiency, aplomb, and devotion; and,

Whereas, Thomas Pellikaan's service to the Senate has been marked by his personal commitment to the highest standards of excellence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Thomas G. Pellikaan be and hereby is commended for his outstanding service to his country and to the United States Senate.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Thomas G. Pellikaan.

PERMITTING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 19, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) was agreed to.

REFERRAL OF NOMINATION OF DAVID WILLIAMS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Governmental Affairs Committee have until February 25, 1999, to report the nomination of David Williams to be Inspector General for Tax Administration, Department of Treasury. I further ask consent that if the nomination has not been reported by that date, the nomination then be automatically discharged and placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING SENATE COMMITTEE EXPENDITURES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 38 submitted by Senators MCCONNELL and DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 38) to waive the Standing Rules of the Senate in order to permit a resolution authorizing Senate committee expenditures for the period March 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 38

Resolved, That, notwithstanding paragraph 9 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to report a continuing resolution authorizing Senate committee expenditures for the period March 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, unanimous consents work well when no one is here.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1999

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment, under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 27, until 12 noon on Monday, February 22. I further ask consent that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that Senator VOINOVICH be recognized to deliver to the Senate Washington's Farewell Address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I further ask consent that following the farewell address there be a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with the time equally divided between the majority leader and Senator DURBIN, or their designee; further, that at the conclusion of morning business the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 13, S. 4, a bill to improve pay and retirement equity for members of the Armed Forces, for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. THOMAS. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will reconvene on Monday, February 22, at 12 noon. Senator VOINOVICH will then inspire us with the recitation of Washington's

Farewell Address. At the conclusion of the address, there will be a period of morning business until 3 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will begin consideration of S. 4 regarding military pay raises and retirement benefits. There will be no votes during Monday's session of the Senate. Votes could occur as early as Tuesday morning as amendments are offered and debated. As always, Members will be notified of the voting schedule as it becomes available.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 27, following the remarks of Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Mr. THOMAS assumed the Chair.)

IMPEACHMENT TRIAL OF WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON

Mr. INHOFE. First, Mr. President, now that the vote to impeach William Jefferson Clinton has been taken, and before I discuss my vote, let me say that this whole thing could have been avoided had President Clinton resigned months ago. I say this because I called for his resignation last September. Rather than explain my reasoning for calling for President Clinton's resignation, I believe it is better explained by an 8th grade school teacher from Tulsa, Oklahoma, Mr. Terrence Hogan. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hogan's letter to the President dated September 26, 1998, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1998.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is in the early morning hours. The infamous Starr report has been made public for less than twentyfour hours and I am unable to sleep. I don't imagine you've had much of a restful night either. As you no doubt are troubled, so am I.

As the forty eight year old father of five and a teacher of eighth grade Civics these past twenty two years I am greatly concerned about the moral direction of our nation. It is as if we have lost our compass and know not what we as a nation wish to be. I am fearful, for I do not wish us to become a nation that is only concerned about the economy and has lost the will to be a nation of admirable principles. I do not want us to dissolve into a people who are more influenced by the spin of the facts than the facts themselves. I am concerned about the effects the next six months of a legal nit picking debate over whether or not you committed an impeachable offense will have on our nation. I am also concerned that the debate will not ask what I believe to be the two paramount questions. First, are you capable of leading this nation for the next 30 months in the directions that we want and need to go? And secondly, do you deserve to be allowed to lead this country?

There is no question in my mind that you have the will to lead. The sad conclusion I have drawn is that you no longer have the moral authority to lead for you have violated the main foundation upon which all relationships are built, that being the existence of mutual trust. In the elections of 1992 and 1996 the American voters forgave you for your one admitted transgression with Ms. Flowers. Then, however, you chose to repeat that transgression in the confines of the Oval office. After which, when confronted with your choices you chose to repeatedly lie to your wife, daughter, supporters and the American people. You chose to continually lie about your choices rather than to frame the debate around the issue that this was a private matter between you and your wife and therefore no business of the American public. It is my heartfelt belief that your choice to lie was designed not so much to save your wife and daughter certain pain but to save yourself and your presidency, an understandable choice but not an acceptable one. Your willful and repeated lying has given the people of this country an insight into the character and integrity of their leader.

With this in mind I am asking you to resign your position as President of these United States for if we are even to pretend to be a nation of principles we cannot tolerate from our president actions and choices that we would not tolerate from the principal of our neighborhood school.

In the last few days you have begun to ask the forgiveness of the American people. If your contrition is heartfelt you deserve the forgiveness of all those individuals whose trust you have violated. I for one forgive you. But as a member of the body politic I must also hold you accountable for your public choices and demand that certain natural consequences be allowed to occur. You no longer possess the trust of the majority of the American people and can therefore no longer lead that people and must therefore give up your position of leadership.

No doubt you share my belief that God our creator calls each of us to be all we can be and that we are also called to sacrifice ourselves for what is in the ultimate best interest of our neighbors. I am asking you now, Mr. President, to do both of those things. Please set aside your personal pride and ambitions, take full responsibility for the choices you have made, accept the natural consequences of those choices and step down as our president and save this nation from the turmoil that the debate over your choices will undoubtedly cause. Let this nation heal and get on with those issues you believe need to be dealt with. Please remember that in making this personal sacrifice that your true legacy will not be determined by what kind of president you were but by what kind of man you became.

Please know that my prayers are with you and your family in this time of trial for you, your family and this country.

With sincerity,

TERRENCE HOGAN.

Mr. INHOFE. Today I voted to convict William Jefferson Clinton on each of the two Articles of Impeachment presented by the House of Representatives.

I find the President guilty, as charged, of high crimes and misdemeanors: lying under oath and obstructing justice. The President engaged in a deliberate and selfish pattern of conduct designed to thwart the civil rights of a fellow citizen. This conduct represents a serious breach of faith and trust. This conduct is incom-

patible with the solemn duties and moral responsibilities of the high office of President of the United States.

Similar conduct by others results in consequences: perjurers, witness tamperers and obstructors of justice go to jail; supervisors lose their jobs; military officers are court-martialed, imprisoned or forced out of the armed forces; judges are impeached and removed from office. Shall we embrace a lower standard for this President under these circumstances? I think not. I believe that the President of the United States should be held to the very highest of standards.

I believe that conviction and removal from office is justified in order (1) to preserve the integrity, honor and trust of the presidency; (2) to protect the sanctity of the witness oath in judicial proceedings; and (3) to uphold the fundamental principle of "equal justice under law."

INTRODUCTION

In accord with my sworn oath to do "impartial justice according to the Constitution and the laws," I have approached the trial of William Jefferson Clinton as a solemn constitutional duty. Voting on the Articles of Impeachment may be the most historically significant thing I will do in my entire career in public service. I have taken this obligation seriously, without concern for public opinion polls or for any partisan political advantage of consequence. This is a moment when one must put the longer-term interests of the country first.

PREVIOUS JURY TRIAL

As a political opponent of this President, I have made an extra effort to weigh the evidence and the arguments on both sides with a sense of detachment and fairness. Having served on a jury in a criminal trial some 24 years ago, I learned how important it is to listen and to exercise impartial judgment. During jury selection in a local murder trial, I found myself assigned to a murder case about which I had expressed a definite opinion. From press reports, I was already convinced the defendant was guilty. With that and since I was the author of the capital punishment bill in the legislature, I thought for sure they would never qualify me for the jury, but somehow they did. Five days later, I surprised even myself when I became the foreman of the jury that acquitted that very defendant.

I have approached the trial of the President with that experience in mind. I have also considered whether in good conscience, I would apply the same judgment I made here equally to a similar set of facts and circumstances if they applied to a Republican—and not a Democratic—president.

In 1990, I did not hesitate to publicly condemn a Republican President, George Bush, when he violated his "read my lips" campaign pledge. Politicians who deliberately violate public trust undermine good government and

increase the level of cynicism in society.

Today, I have a clear conscience in rendering the judgment I believe is just, and in the best interests of the future of the country.

CONCLUSIONS

I have concluded that the President engaged in a deliberate and premeditated pattern of conduct which was corruptly designed to undermine the rights of a fellow citizen. That citizen was entitled under the law to obtain truth and justice in a duly constituted legal proceeding.

The President had a legal obligation, as a citizen, to comply with ordinary and proper legal procedure and to faithfully abide by the standard oath to "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

I believe the President also had a moral obligation, as President, to refrain from engaging in any conduct which would, by example, undermine respect for the rule of law, the witness oath, or the dignity, honor, or public trust embodied in the presidency.

The President failed to fulfill these obligations. He lied under oath, obstructed justice and tampered with witnesses. He sought to undermine the judicial system for his own personal gain. In so doing, he set a perverse example for every school child, parent, teacher, employer, supervisor and citizen in America. He brought dishonor upon himself and his office.

PRESIDENT'S SUPPORTERS CONCEDE ESSENTIAL FACTS

White House lawyers went to great lengths to try to deny the specific charges, but common sense and the weight of the evidence leave no reasonable doubt in my mind that the charges are true. I believe there are few, if any, members of the Senate who do not believe the President lied under oath and obstructed justice. Even many of the President's most ardent supporters in and out of the Senate have openly stated their belief that the essential facts of the case are not in dispute.

Senator ROBERT BYRD pretty well summed it up in a recent TV appearance. He said of the President: "I have no doubt that he has given false testimony under oath and . . . there are indications that he did indeed obstruct justice . . . It undermined the system of justice when he gave false testimony under oath. He lied under oath."

NON-LAWYER PERSPECTIVE

I have often said that one of the qualifications I have for the U.S. Senate is that I am not an attorney. So, when I read the Constitution, I know what it says. When I read the law, I know what it says. When I look at the evidence and apply common sense from a non-lawyer perspective, I know what it says. In this case, it says—without question—the President is guilty as charged.

CONDUCT WARRANTS REMOVAL

The President's attorneys kept arguing that the President's conduct does

not amount to the technical crimes of perjury or obstruction of justice, but that even if it does, it should not warrant his removal from office.

I have concluded the President's conduct does amount to the crimes of perjury and obstruction, but that even if it does not, it still warrants his removal from office because it is unacceptable behavior, incompatible with his duties and responsibilities as President.

LYING UNDER OATH

I was not persuaded by the hair-splitting argument that the President did not lie under oath. The President lawyers claim he did not lie or commit perjury before the grand jury and they imply that his conduct there should be deemed acceptable. As a non-lawyer, I find their arguments preposterous and an insult to the intelligence and moral sensibilities of the members of the Senate of both parties, not to mention the American people.

The President was afforded every opportunity to treat the grand jury with the respect it deserved. He was not blind-sided, tricked or trapped. He could anticipate all the key questions in advance. He had plenty of time to prepare. He was warned on numerous occasions by members of both parties in the Congress of the serious consequences of untruthful testimony. Yet he deliberately sought to continue weaving a self-serving and misleading web of deception and falsehood.

OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE

Similarly, I reject the argument that the President did not commit obstruction of justice in an improper and illegal effort to undermine the legitimate search for truth in the Paula Jones civil suit. To believe the President's defense is to stand common sense on its head.

Does anyone seriously believe the Lewinski job search would have proceeded to a successful conclusion in early January 1998—a critical moment in the Jones case—had her name not appeared on the Jones case witness list?

Does anyone seriously believe the President was suggesting to Ms. Lewinski that she file a truthful affidavit?

Does anyone seriously believe that the decision to conceal the gifts (evidence) was not blessed and ordered by the President?

Does anyone seriously believe the President was seeking to "refresh his memory" while planting false stories with Ms. Currie when his conversations took place after he had testified that the Jones lawyers should talk to Ms. Currie.

Does anyone seriously believe the President did not want and expect Mr. Blumenthal and other aides to repeat false stories to the grand jury?

I do not believe any of these things. I believe—and I suspect most Senators believe—the President is guilty as charged of obstruction of justice.

THE PRESIDENT KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING

The President's efforts to cover up his relationship with Ms. Lewinski, however understandable in a non-legal context, became textbook examples of obstruction of justice once her name appeared on a witness list and in a duly constituted legal proceeding.

The President, after all, is himself a lawyer. He was well aware that—orchestrating a job search to silence a potential hostile witness, suggesting the filing of a false affidavit, concealing relevant evidence, and coaching potential witnesses to give false testimony—all are improper and illegal.

Yet he chose to take these actions, not in some contorted belief that they were proper, but in the calculation that if successful, he could thwart the legal search for truth and justice in the Jones case.

To accept this behavior by the President without Constitutional consequence is to permit the setting of a precedent which will reverberate negatively for years throughout our legal justice system and beyond.

DIFFERENT STANDARDS FOR JUDGES AND PRESIDENTS?

I am amazed that there is any debate whatsoever over whether lying under oath before a grand jury is an impeachable offense. The precedent is clear: Judge Walter Nixon and others have been rightly convicted and removed from office for lying under oath. Is there to be a different standard for a president, or for this particular president, or for this particular set of circumstances? Are we to make exceptions for lying under oath so long as it is lying about some things but not others? If so, what precedent will that set?

Our legal system depends of the sanctity of the witness oath. There can be no exceptions to the obligation every citizen incurs when he solemnly swears "to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." Setting any other precedent would totally disrupt our system of jurisprudence by breeding disrespect for the rule of law.

The White House lawyers argued that since the President is elected and judges are appointed, a different standard should apply. The only conceivable way they might be right is if the President is held to a higher—not a lower—standard.

Important as each of a thousand judges is to our legal system, it is the President alone who stands at the pinnacle of our system of law and justice. He alone is constitutionally charged to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." He appointed the judges. He embodies the public trust to a degree far and above anyone else. He sets the example for the entire nation. His public conduct in abiding by the oath must be above reproach.

YOUNG BILL CLINTON'S STANDARD

In speaking about President Richard Nixon in 1974, a young Arkansas congressional candidate spoke to the need for high standards:

"Yes, the President should resign. He has lied to the American people, time

and time again, and betrayed their trust. Since he has admitted guilt, there is no reason to put the American people through an impeachment. He will serve absolutely no purpose in finishing out his term; the only possible solution is for the president to save some dignity and resign."

The Candidate, Bill Clinton, set his own perfectly understandable standard: "If a President of the United States ever lied to the American people, he should resign." *Arkansas, Democrat Gazette* (8/6/74)

WHAT KIND OF LYING IS IMPEACHABLE?

Recently, one of my Democrat colleagues, in a television interview, explained his standard for perjury as an impeachable offense: "Perjury could be an impeachable offense," he said. "If he lied about the national security interest of the United States, or if he did something else that had serious consequence for the country, or performing improperly in his official capacity, that's impeachable." But if he's "not acting in his official capacity" and only "as an individual," that's different. That's not impeachable, he says.

I believe this kind of making exceptions for lies about certain subjects, and not others, is a dangerous and slippery slope. I believe any lying before a grand jury by a sitting president will have "serious consequences for the country" if it is deemed to be in some way acceptable.

NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS

Indeed, part of the reason this is so important is that if the President is capable of lying under oath about one thing, it reveals a predisposition and capability to lie about other more important things, while not under oath. For example, we already know this president has lied about the national security interest of the United States on numerous occasions. He lied to Congress in 1995 in pledging U.S. troops would not remain in Bosnia beyond one year. He lied or misled audiences over 130 times 1995 and 1996 in asserting that no nuclear missiles were aimed at American children. People know he has lied on numerous other public occasions. Such behavior eats away the public trust and the moral authority of the presidency, which are so vital to the national security.

In addition, it should not go unremarked that the President's underlying conduct in this matter showed astonishingly bad judgment and disregard for the national security implications of his own behavior. In the modern world, the President is always a potential target of foreign intrigue, blackmail and salacious propaganda.

Ms. Lewinski testified before the grand jury that the President himself speculated that his phone calls to her may have been monitored by a foreign embassy. In essence, he was admitting that he had exposed himself to potential blackmail. Such behavior by any president is not merely inappropriate. It is clearly dangerous and unacceptable.

EROSION OF PUBLIC TRUST

Economic-driven "popularity" polls are masking an unprecedented erosion of public trust in this President which has already caused serious damage to his ability to rally the country in time of national threat or crisis. His consistent and long-term pattern of untruthful and deceptive behavior, as exemplified in the Articles of Impeachment, has undermined his credibility to such an extent that he can longer be afforded the benefit of any public doubt about virtually any topic.

When the President took military action against overseas terrorists targets in August and when he ordered air strikes against Iraq in December, popular majorities (!)—in the polls—questioned his timing and motives—and rightly so. Suspicions about both of these actions linger to this day, draining the small reserves of trust the President may have left.

What happens if and when there is a much more serious international or domestic crisis, requiring timely public sacrifice mobilized through presidential leadership? Will the President be believed—even if he is telling the truth? In a world of many lurking dangers of which much of the public is only vaguely aware (from information warfare to weapons of mass destruction), such questions raise very serious concerns.

WHAT DO WE SAY TO PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED LIARS?

If we do not hold the President accountable in this case, what do we say to the over 100 people who are serving time in federal prison for committing perjury in legal proceedings? What do we say to Ms. Barbara Battalino, who was convicted of perjury, sentenced, and lost her right to practice her profession because she lied under oath . . . about sex . . . in a civil case . . . that was eventually dismissed by the judge? What do we say to others in similar situations? I was waiting for the President's lawyers to address these issues. But they never did in any remotely satisfactory way.

WHAT DO WE SAY TO MILITARY OFFICERS DISCIPLINED FOR LYING ABOUT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT?

What do we say to the military officers whose careers and lives have been ruined over misconduct similar to the President's, including sexual misconduct, lying and obstructing justice?

Capt. Derrick Robinson, an Army officer caught up in the Aberdeen sex misconduct case, is serving time in Leavenworth prison for admitting to consensual sex with an enlisted person who was not his wife.

Drill Sgt. Delmar Simpson is serving 25 years in a military prison because a court martial found that, even though his relationship with a female recruit was consensual, the power granted him by his rank made such consensual sex with a subordinate unacceptable and—in the military—illegal.

Lt. Kelly Flinn was forced out of the Air Force for lying about an adulterous affair.

Sgt. Maj. Gene McKinney, the Army's top enlisted man, was tried for perjury, adultery and obstruction of justice concerning sexual misconduct. He was convicted of obstruction of justice, but not before his attorney asserted at trial how people in uniform rightly ask: "How can you hold an enlisted man to a higher standard than the President of the United States," the Commander-in-Chief.

DOUBLE STANDARD

When we establish a glaring double standard in the law, we diminish respect for all law. This is why we must uphold the highest of standards for officials in public office.

CENSURE

I will oppose any censure resolution that may be offered after the trial, as I opposed any so-called "finding of fact" during the trial, because it is little more than a thinly veiled effort to give people political cover. I believe some who might otherwise vote to convict look to censure as a way to justify or politically cover a vote to acquit. There is no precedent for censure in the Constitution or in an impeachment context. It would be dangerous and wrong to set such a precedent now. I believe it could threaten the separation of powers between the branches of government as Congresses start censuring Supreme Courts and Presidents for all manner of perceived misconduct.

Senators should vote on the Articles of Impeachment, explain their reasons, and live with the consequences.

I am struck that some of my colleagues who agree that the President did commit the serious offenses charged in the Articles of Impeachment, still believe Congress can render some effective consequence short of removal such as censure, which will uphold the presidency, the rule of law, and the sanctity of the oath. I believe they are wrong.

I fear that they are not properly considering the precedent they would establish. Nevermind what we think of this particular president. A thoroughly corrupt president in the future will not be inhibited by the empty words of a non-biding "sense of the Senate" resolution. However, such a corrupt president will think twice about certain conduct, if he knows without doubt, by precedent, that such conduct is removable.

If perjury, obstruction of justice, and witness tampering are deemed—as a result of this trial—to be non-removal offenses in certain circumstances, then a corrupt future president may calculate them to be acceptable. We should not set that precedent.

WITNESSES

From the beginning, I strongly supported efforts to allow both the House managers and the White House lawyers to call whatever live witnesses they deemed necessary to make their case. I favored a full and complete trial, believing that it was more important to insure fairness to both sides than it

was to get the trial over by some arbitrary date. This was in keeping with normal procedures in all previous impeachment trials. It also seemed to me to be essential to fundamental fairness and a full airing of the facts and issues in dispute. A hundred years from now, no one will care whether the trial lasted two weeks or six months. They will care, we must hope, about the extent to which justice was done. Overall, I was disappointed in the unnecessarily tight procedural restrictions imposed on this trial, including the limits on witnesses, I fear that a bad precedent has been unnecessarily set for the future.

CLOSED DELIBERATIONS

Throughout the trial, I opposed efforts to waive the time-honored rules of procedure which require that deliberations among senators be closed to the public. I am convinced this was the right decision. The closed meetings allowed for a more collegial atmosphere among senators, limiting much of the posturing and grandstanding that often goes on before the cameras. The closed sessions also helped enhance a greater spirit of duty and cooperation concerning the tasks at hand. As with all jury trials going back for more than 2000 years in history, closed deliberations constitute proper procedure and I believe this tradition should be maintained.

This need not, and does not, diminish the accountability of senators to their constituents and the public at large. All roll call votes remain open and I believe every member maintains an obligation to inform his constituents of the reason for his votes.

CONSTITUTENT LETTER RAISES KEY ISSUE: THE KIDS

I received a letter from Mr. Terrence Hogan of Owasso, Okla., an eighth grade civics teacher at the Cascia Hall Middle School in Tulsa for the past 22 years. He wrote last September saying he "was greatly concerned about the moral direction of our nation" in light of the President's "willful and repeated lying." He said the nation "cannot tolerate from our President actions and choices that we would not tolerate from the principal of our neighborhood school."

And this is exactly the point that people across America are asking. Is the President subject to the same moral accountability as every other responsible citizen in the workplace, or in any other position of public trust? And what do we say to the kids about truth and justice, about honesty and integrity, about the political and governmental heritage they should admire and emulate?

IMPEACHABLE OFFENSES

These acts, which were committed willfully and premeditatedly by the President, are serious offenses which I believe clearly rise to the level of impeachable offenses.

I reject the White House lawyers' argument that the President's conduct

does not amount to the technical "crimes" of perjury and obstruction, but I'm content to allow a regular court of law to settle the issue. I also reject their argument that the President's conduct does not rise to the level of impeachable offenses.

I believe the President's conduct (however it is ultimately labeled) constitutes absolutely unacceptable behavior on the part of the President of the United States, the nation's chief law enforcement officer who is constitutionally charged to "faithfully execute the laws," and who, by word and deed, sets an example for every citizen.

In finding the President guilty on both Articles of Impeachment, I believe the constitutional consequence of removal from office is warranted in order to uphold for future generations:

The integrity, honor, and trust which are indispensable to the moral authority of the presidency;

The sanctity of the oath which every citizen must take in any legal proceeding to tell "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;" and

The viability of our judicial system, the rule of law, and the principle of "equal justice under law."

A FINAL NOTE TO MY FELLOW OKLAHOMANS

Holding public office is a special privilege and I am continually grateful to the people of Oklahoma for the opportunity to serve in the United States Senate.

During the past weeks and months, I have received thousands of letters, e-mails, faxes, phone calls and other communications relative to the impeachment trial and all of the subject matters surrounding it. Many have expressed strongly held views on one side or the other, often urging me to vote in accord with their wishes and thinking. My overworked staff and I have done our best to digest and respond to these inquiries and comments as best we could. To those who may have not yet received a personal response, I want to express my appreciation for sharing your thoughts, your ideas, and your concerns.

Whether you agree or disagree, I want you to know that my votes for conviction on the two Articles of Impeachment represent my best judgment, based on my analysis of the facts, the law, the Constitution and what I believe is best for our country. They do not represent the results of any poll or political calculation about what may be popular, either in Oklahoma or elsewhere.

I have viewed the trial as a serious Constitutional duty and have listened and deliberated with profound sense of history and patriotism. I have sought to respect the process and preserve for future generations those wise procedural precedents, including the rule of law, that have served this nation so well for over 200 years.

I have stated my views and I accept the result of the trial. I harbor no personal bitterness or hatred toward the

President. It is time to look to the future. I hope all of us on all sides of these issues can unite in a prayer for the future of our country and for the ideals of freedom and justice it stands for in the world. God Bless America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask for a brief moment to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CENSURE RESOLUTION OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I just want to point out to everyone who is interested that a censure resolution has been entered at the desk. It has 38 cosponsors.

Mr. President, during these trying days, the question has been asked of many of us: "What will we tell our children about this sordid period in our Nation's history?"

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, I had hoped to be able to tell my granddaughter and, indeed, the rest of our Nation, that the United States Senate had come together in bipartisan fellowship to approve a censure resolution that would deliver a clear message that the behavior of President William Jefferson Clinton has been inappropriate, intolerable and unacceptable.

Unfortunately, some in this body have forestalled our ability to bring such a resolution to the floor of the Senate for a vote. This I regret deeply.

There are moments in history when we are able to rise up against the forces driving us apart and come together with a united purpose. I believe that the censure resolution provided us with just such an opportunity.

While not a cure-all, the resolution is a way to share with our children and the rest of our nation our findings, our sentiments, our belief that the actions of the President are a violation of the trust of the American people and have brought shame and dishonor upon the presidency and the man.

But as has been made clear, those of us who truly believe a strong censure is the appropriate resolution in this case are being prevented from bringing it to the floor of this Senate for a vote.

The main co-sponsor is the Senator from Utah, Mr. ROBERT BENNETT. In all, it is co-sponsored by 36 Senators—over 1/3 of this Senate.

The words of the resolution were strong, but they are fitting words and I

believe a bipartisan majority of the Senate would be prepared to vote for this censure resolution if it were permitted to come to a vote today.

Over the past few weeks, I have worked very closely with a large number of Senators to develop a bipartisan resolution, largely because I felt it so important that anyone who looks at this shabby episode of American history understands that while one may not vote to convict and remove a president, one can have profound dismay and concern about the misconduct that was inherent in the articles of impeachment.

That is why I regret deeply that some have seen fit to prevent us from voting on a censure resolution.

Because that cannot happen today, I have joined with the cosponsors of this resolution to formally present it to the Senate and record it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, making clear for all time the strong censure of this President and condemnation of his actions by at least one-third of the U.S. Senate.

Earlier today, I voted against conviction and removal of the President on both articles of impeachment. I did not believe the House managers established beyond a reasonable doubt that this President is guilty of perjury and obstruction of justice.

Although I deplore the circumstances that have brought us to this point, I do not believe they present a clear and present danger to the functioning of our government, and therefore this President, who has been a good President for the people of the United States, should not be convicted and removed from office.

However, I feel very strongly and sincerely that the acquittal of the President on the articles of impeachment should not be the Senate's last word on the President's conduct, and that without further action such as a resolution of censure, the wrong message about the President's actions and the Senate's views thereon will be sent to the country.

One of the most worthwhile experiences of my Senate career has been listening to the remarks of the Senators over the past three days on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Each one gave substantial deliberation, serious thought and research and tried his or her level best to maintain their oath of impartiality.

It should be clear that this was not an easy time. It should be clear that every one in the Senate at every minute of every day wished this were not happening. But we found ourselves caught up in a constitutional requirement that gave us little choice.

I hope we come out of this with a deeper understanding of the divisions and polarization, which all of this has caused, and that every effort can be made, not only by our leadership, but by every member of the Senate in every issue that comes before us to seek out a bipartisanship and to work