Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 10:55 a.m.)

REQUEST TO EXTEND DEBATE ON IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY RESOLUTION

□ 1055

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on House Resolution 581 regarding proceeding with an impeachment inquiry be expanded to the time of 8 hours.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is constrained not to recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this time.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INVESTIGATE WHETHER SUFFICIENT GROUNDS EXIST FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up H. Res. 581, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 581

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by any subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman for the purposes hereof and in accordance with the rules of the committee, is authorized and directed to investigate fully and completely whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States of America. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee is authorized to require—

(1) by subpoena or otherwise—

(A) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and

(B) the production of such things; and

(2) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information;

as it deems necessary to such investigation.

(b) Such authority of the committee may be exercised—

(1) by the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly, or, if either declines to act, by the other acting alone, except that in the event either so declines, either shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the committee shall be convened promptly to render that decision; or

(2) by the committee acting as a whole or by subcommittee.

Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be issued over the signature of the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them. The chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them (or, with respect to any deposition, answer to interrogatory, or affidavit, any person authorized by law to administer oaths) may administer oaths to any witness. For the purposes of this section, ''things'' includes, without limitation, books, records, correspondence, logs, journals, memorandums, papers, documents, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, reproductions, recordings, tapes, transcripts, printouts, data compilations from which information can be obtained (translated if necessary, through detection devices into reasonably usable form), tangible objects, and other things of any kind.

The SPEAKER. The resolution, since reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, constitutes a question of privilege and may be called up at this time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, while the normal procedure grants 1 hour of debate on a privileged resolution, I propose doubling that time.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 2 hours for the debate on H. Res. 581, 1 hour of which I intend to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CONYERS) for the purposes of debate only. And anybody on my side who was constrained to object, I hope they will withhold their objection so we can have the 2 hours of debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the unanimous consent that is being put forward, and ask my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, if he would add 2 hours to that request, please.

I understand the exigencies of the moment, but I have enormous pressure being put upon the ranking member for Members to merely have a chance to get in a brief expression on this historic occasion, and I ask that the gentleman give that his most generous consideration.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I can only say that we have had extensive discussions and I am fearful that there would be several objectors to that. So, I am constrained to offer the extra hour only and not go beyond that.

I would suggest a special order tonight where everybody can speak as long and as loudly as they want.

□ 1100

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 hour to the distinguished minority ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, considering the historical importance of this vote today and the precedent we will set for decades to come, would it be within the rules of the House for me at this time to ask unanimous consent that each Member of this House, who feels in his or her conscience that he or she would want to speak for 2 minutes on this issue, be allowed that opportunity as they try to represent the 560,000 people in their district?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recognized for that purpose, and the House has already established by unanimous consent the 2-hour time limit.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. There is no request to be objected to at this time, but the Chair would be glad to recognize the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DINGELL. Then I will make this a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Why is it we are not being afforded more time to debate this? This is one of the most important questions——

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, but that might be raised during debate, if the gentleman gets time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. I would like to inquire if a unanimous consent request is in order.

The SPEAKER. That would not be in order at this time unless the gentleman from Illinois yielded for that purpose.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) controls the time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I must insist on regular order or we will not get through with this, so I cannot yield for a unanimous consent request.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 581, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are just asking for fairness.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) object?

Mr. ACKERMAN. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, general leave was objected to?

The SPEAKER. General leave was objected to. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) controls the time and has yielded to himself.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on an historic resolution to begin an inquiry into whether the President has committed impeachable offenses. All of us are pulled in many directions by our political parties, by philosophy and friendships; we are pulled by many competing forces, but mostly we are moved by our consciences. We must listen to that still small voice that whispers in our ear, duty, duty, duty.

Some years ago Douglas MacArthur, in a famous speech at West Point, asserted the ideal of our military forces as duty, honor and country. We do not have to be a soldier in a far-off land to feel the force of those words. They are our ideal here today as well.

We have another ideal here, to attain justice through the rule of law. Justice is always and everywhere under assault, and our duty is to vindicate the rule of law as the surest protector of that fragile justice.

And so here, today, having received the referral in 17 cartons of supportive material from the Independent Counsel, the question asks itself: Shall we look further or shall we look away?

I respectfully suggest that we must look further by voting for this resolution and thus commencing an inquiry into whether or not the President has committed impeachable acts. We do not make any judgments, we do not make any charges, we simply begin a search for truth.

My colleagues will hear from our opponents that, yes, we need to look further, but do it our way. Their way imposes artificial time limits, limits our inquiry to the Lewinsky matter, and requires us to establish standards for impeachment that have never been established before, certainly not in the Nixon impeachment proceedings, which we are trying to follow to the letter.

We have followed the Rodino format. We will move with all deliberate speed. Many raise concerns about that proposition. Let me speak directly to those concerns. Some suggest the process to date has been partisan, yet every member of the Committee on the Judiciary voted for an inquiry in some form. We differ over the procedural details, not the fundamental question of whether we should go forward.

Many on the other side of the aisle worry that this inquiry will become an excuse for an open-ended attack on this administration. I understand that worry. During times when Republicans controlled the executive branch and I was in the minority, I lived where they are living now.

With that personal experience, I pledge to my colleagues the fairest and most expeditious search for the truth that I can muster. I do not expect that I will agree with my Democratic friends at each step along the way, but I know that to date we have agreed on many things. In fact, we have agreed on many more things than is generally known.

I hope at the end of this long day we will agree on the result. I am determined we will continue to look every day for common ground and to agree where we can. When we must disagree, we will do everything we can to minimize those disagreements. At all times, civility must be the watch word for Members on both sides of the aisle. Too much hangs in the balance for us not to rise above partisan politics.

I will use all my strength to ensure that this inquiry does not become a fishing expedition. Rather, I am determined that it will be a fair and expeditious search for truth. We have plenty enough to do now, we do not need to search for new material.

However, I cannot say that we will never address other subjects, nor would it be responsible to do so. I do not know what the future holds. If substantial and credible evidence of other impeachable offenses comes to us, as the Independent Counsel hinted or suggested in a letter we received only yesterday, the Constitution will demand that we do our duty. Like each of my colleagues, I took an oath to answer that call. I intend to do so, and I hope my colleagues will join with me if that day comes. I do not think we want to settle for less than the whole truth.

Some are concerned about timing. Believe me, nobody wants to end this any sooner than I do. But the Constitution demands that we take the amount of time necessary to do the right thing in the right way. A rush to judgment does not serve anybody's interest, certainly not the public's interest. As I have said publicly, my fervent hope and prayer is we can end this process by the end of the year. That is my new year's resolution. However, to agree to an artificial deadline would be irresponsible. It would only invite delay and discourage cooperation.

For those who worry about the timing, I urge them to do everything possible to encourage cooperation. No one likes to have their behavior questioned. The best way to end the questions is to answer them in a timely and truthful manner. Thorough and thoughtful cooperation will do more than anything to put this matter behind us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON.)

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I just rise in support of the resolution and to commend the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate whether sufficient grounds exist to impeach the President of the United States.

I commend the Judiciary Committee for following the intent of the Rules Committee resolution, H. Res. 525, which passed the House overwhelmingly on September 11. That resolution instructed the Committee to carefully review and release the material in the independent Counsel's report, expunging that material in the Independent Counsel's report, expunging that material which is not relevant or may interfere with ongoing investigations.

I would say to the Committee—you have judiciously carried out the instructions given to you by the House, and I commend you for it.

The public release of the material in that report, with appropriate redactions, was necessary to give Members of the House the ability to cast informed votes here on the floor today. Members of the House and the public, unfortunately, must have a dialogue about the contents of this report.

I believe that in approving the release of this material by such a large margin, the House relied on the traditional notion that an informed citizenry is critical to the success of our republic.

In supporting this resolution before the House today, let me say to the Members that regardless of your personal feelings about the President, whether political supporters or not, you have a constitutional obligation to set aside those feelings and cast your vote solely on the basis of whether you believe the evidence submitted to this House is sufficient grounds to undertake an impeachment inquiry.

Prior to today, I have withheld judgment and made no statements to the media regarding the substantive grounds for impeachment. However, I have reviewed the evidence in the report and I find it thorough, well-documented, and exhaustive in its corroborating detail.

After reviewing all of this evidence, I believe we have an overwhelming constitutional duty to vote to proceed with an inquiry.

I for one will continue to reserve judgment on whether articles of impeachment should be brought until after the Judiciary Committee has completed its investigation and sends a further recommendation to the House.

Mr. Speaker, today we should not determine whether to impeach the man who holds the Executive Office of the President. Rather, we should ratify the Judiciary Committee's recommendation that there is enough evidence to formally ask that question.

In doing so, we affirm the grim charge handed down by the framers of the Constitution, to guard against degradation of the office by the man who happens to hold it.

During the debate on whether to include the impeachment clause in the Constitution at the convention, Governor Morris, a delegate from Pennsylvania, offered an amendment to strike the clause.

At the conclusion of the debate, he changed his mind and supported the impeachment clause and argued, ''Our executive is not like a Magistrate having a life interest, much less like one having an hereditary interest in his office.''

With the unique idea of this constitutional clause as a foundation for our deliberation, our action here today affirms that we are not like the rest of the world.

I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I really want to say to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HENRY HYDE), that I respect the fulsomeness and fairness of his statement. I know that he is a person of his word, and I hope that these processes within our committee and the Congress will follow along the lines that he has outlined so admirably.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RICK BOUCHER), the principal architect of the alternative proposal to the motion on the floor that will be embodied in a motion to recommit.

(Mr. BOUCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding this time to me and commend him for the leadership that he has exerted as we have worked on this side in order to offer a fair and a balanced alternative to the resolution of inquiry.

At the conclusion of this debate, I will offer a motion to recommit the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the Committee on the Judiciary with the instruction that the committee immediately report back that resolution to the House with instructions that it contain our Democratic alternative.

While we would have preferred that Democrats have a normal opportunity to present our resolution as an amendment, the procedure that is being used by the House today does not make a Democratic amendment in regular course in order. The motion to recommit with instructions does, however, give us an opportunity to have the House adopt the Democratic plan.

The Democratic amendment is a resolution for a full and complete review by the Committee on the Judiciary of the material that has been presented to the House by the office of Independent Counsel. The Republican resolution also provides for that full and complete review. The difference between the Democratic and the Republican approaches is only over the scope of the review, only over the time that the review will take, and only over our insistence that the Committee on the Judiciary, in conducting its process, pay deference and become aware of the historical constitutional standard for impeachment that has evolved to us over the centuries and was recognized most recently by the Committee on the Judiciary in 1974 and then recognized by the full House of Representatives.

The public interest requires a fair and deliberate inquiry in this matter. Our resolution provides for that fair and deliberate inquiry. But the public interest also requires an appropriate boundary on the scope of the inquiry. It should not become an invitation for a free-ranging fishing expedition, subjecting to a formal impeachment inquiry matters that are not before the Congress today. The potential for such a venture should be strictly limited by the resolution adopted today by the House, and our Democratic proposal contains those appropriate limits. It would subject to the inquiry the material presented to us by the office of Independent Counsel, which is the only material before the House today.

The public interest also requires that the matter be brought to conclusion at the earliest possible time; that is, consistent with a thorough and complete review. The country has already undergone substantial trauma. If the committee carries this work beyond the time that is reasonably needed to conduct its complete and thorough review, that injury to the Nation will only deepen. We should be thorough, but we should also be prompt.

Mr. Speaker, given that the facts of this matter are generally well-known, given that there are only a handful of witnesses who have relevant information that can be addressed in this inquiry, and given the further fact that all of those witnesses have already been the subject of extensive review by the Grand Jury, and their testimony is available, this inquiry can, in fact, be prompt. The committee's work should not extend into next year. A careful and a thorough review can be accomplished between now and the end of this year, and our Democratic resolution provides that appropriate limitation on time.

The resolution requires that the committee hold hearings on the constitutional standard for impeachment, which was clearly stated in the conclusion of the committee's report in the Watergate years of 1974. Our substitute then directs that the committee compare the facts that are stated in the referral of the Independent Counsel to that historical constitutional standard and, if any facts rise to the level of impeachable conduct, that material would then be subjected to the thorough inquiry and review process contained within our resolution.

Under the resolution that we are putting forth, the committee will begin its work on the 12th day of October, that is next Monday, and will conclude all proceedings, including the consideration of recommendations, during the month of December.

□ 1115

There would then be ample time for the House of Representatives to consider those recommendations and conclude its work by the end of this year.

The procedure we are recommending is fair, it is thorough, it is prompt. It is a recommendation for an inquiry. It would assure an appropriate scope. It would give deference to the historical constitutional standard for impeachment, and it would assure that this matter is put behind us so the Nation can proceed with its very important business by the end of this year.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), a member of the committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution of inquiry.

At Monday's meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, Investigative Counsel David Shippers informed the committee that the material received to date shows that the President may have committed 15 felonies. These alleged felonies were in the course of the President's successfully defeating Paula Jones' civil rights lawsuit, claims the Supreme Court in a 9–0 decision said that she had the right to pursue. The President denies all these allegations. Obviously someone is telling the truth and someone is lying.

The Committee on the Judiciary must be given the power to decide this issue. What is at stake here is the rule of law. Even the President of the United States has no right to break the law. If the House votes down this inquiry, in effect, it will say that even if President Clinton committed as many as 15 felonies, nothing will happen. The result will be a return to the imperial presidency of the Nixon era where the White House felt that the laws did not apply to them, since they never would be punished. That would be a national tragedy of immense consequences.

Vote for the resolution. Let the Committee on the Judiciary try to find the truth.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the able gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), a senior member of our Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious and solemn day. After a careful reading of the Starr report and other materials submitted by the Office of Independent Counsel as well as a study of the origins and history of the impeachment clause of the Constitution, I have come to the conclusion that, given the evidence before us, while the President deserves significant punishment, there is no basis for impeachment of the President and it is time to move on and solve the problems facing the American people, like health care, education and protecting seniors' retirement.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the President lied when he testified before the grand jury not to cover a crime but to cover embarrassing personal behavior. While it is true that in ordinary circumstances and in most instances an ordinary person would not be punished for lying about an extramarital affair, the President has to be held to a higher standard and must be held accountable. But high crimes and misdemeanors, as defined in the Constitution and as amplified by the Federalist Papers and Justice Story, have always been intended to apply to public

actions relating to or affecting the operation of the government, not to personal or private conduct.

That said, the punishment for lying about an improper sexual relationship should fit the crime. Censure or rebuke is the appropriate punishment. Impeachment is not. It is time to move forward, not have the Congress and American people endure the specter of what could be a year-long focus on a tawdry but not impeachable affair. Today the world economy is in crisis and cries out for American leadership, without which worldwide turmoil is a grave possibility. The American people cry out for us to solve the problems facing them. This investigation, now in its fifth year, has run its course. It is time to move on.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCHALE).

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, Franklin Roosevelt once said that ''the presidency is preeminently a place of moral leadership.''

I want my strong criticism of President Clinton to be placed in context. I voted for President Clinton in 1992 and 1996. I believed him to be the ''Man from Hope'' as he was depicted in his 1992 campaign video. I have voted for more than three-fourths of the President's legislative agenda and I would do so again. My blunt criticism of the President has nothing to do with policy. Moreover, the President has always treated me with courtesy and respect and he has been more than responsive to the concerns of my constituents.

Unfortunately, the President's misconduct has now made immaterial my past support or agreement with him on issues. Last January 17, the President of the United States attempted to cover up a sordid and irresponsible relationship by repeated deceit under oath in a Federal civil rights suit. Contrary to his later public statement, his answers were not ''legally accurate,'' they were intentionally and blatantly false. He allowed his lawyer to make arguments to the court based on an affidavit that the President knew to be false. The President later deceived the American people and belatedly admitted the truth only when confronted some 7 months later by a mountain of irrefutable evidence. I am convinced that the President would otherwise have allowed his false testimony to stand in perpetuity.

What is at stake is really the rule of law. When the President took an oath to tell the truth, he was no different at that point from any other citizen, both as a matter of morality and as a matter of legal obligation. We cannot excuse that kind of misconduct because we happen to belong to the same party as the President or agree with him on issues or feel tragically that the removal of the President from office would be enormously painful for the United States of America. The question is whether or not we will say to all of our citizens, including the President of the United States, when you take an oath, you must keep it.

Having deliberately provided false testimony under oath, the President in my judgment forfeited his right to office. It was with a deep sense of sadness that I called for his resignation. By his own misconduct, the President displayed his character and he defined it badly. His actions were not ''inappropriate.'' They were predatory, reckless, breathtakingly arrogant for a man already a defendant in a sexual harassment suit, whether or not that suit was politically motivated.

And if in disgust or dismay we were to sweep aside the President's immoral and illegal conduct, what dangerous precedent would we set for the abuse of power by some future President of the United States?

We cannot define the President's character. But we must define the Nation's. I urge an affirmative vote on the resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who coauthored the alternative proposal that we shall shortly offer this morning.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the issue in the potential impeachment is whether to overturn the results of a national election, the free expression of the popular will of the American people. It is an enormous responsibility, and an extraordinary power. It is not one that should be exercised lightly. It is certainly not one which should be exercised in a manner in which or would be perceived to be unfair or partisan.

The work of this House during the Nixon impeachment investigation commanded the respect and support of the American people. A broad consensus that President Nixon had to go was developed precisely because the process was seen to be fair and deliberate. If our conduct in this matter does not earn the confidence of the American people, then any action we take, especially if we seek to overturn the result of a free election, will be viewed with great suspicion and could divide a nation for years to come.

We do not need another ''Who lost China?'' debate. We do not need a decade of candidates running for office accusing each other of railroading a democratically elected President out of office, or participating in a thinly failed coup d'etat.

The issue has the potential to be the most divisive issue in American public life since the Vietnam War. The process by which we arrive at our decision must be seen to be both nonpartisan and fair. The legitimacy of American political institutions must not be called into question.

I do not believe personally that all the allegations in the Starr report, if proven true, describe impeachable offenses. We need to remember that the framers of the Constitution did not intend impeachment as a punishment for a wrongdoing but as a protection of constitutional liberties and of the structure of the government that they were establishing against a President who might seek to become a tyrant.

The President's acts, if proven true, may be crimes, calling for prosecution or other punishment, but not impeachment. So I do not believe we need a formal impeachment inquiry. But if we are to have an inquiry, it must be fair. So far it has been anything but fair. The President was not given the Starr report before it was made public; a violation of all the precedents. No debate on the committee occurred on the merits whatsoever. We spent a month on deciding what should be released and what should be kept in private, and then we heard the report of the two counsels and then we discussed procedure but not a minute of debate on the merits on the evidence, on the standard of impeachment, on anything.

The supreme insult to the American people, an hour of debate on the House floor on whether to start, for the third time in the American history, a formal impeachment proceeding. We debated two resolutions to name post offices yesterday for an hour and a half. An hour debate on this momentous decision is an insult to the American people and another sign that this is not going to be fair.

The democratic amendment is a fair device for a fair process. It provides for a limitation in scope in time, and I urge its adoption.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly important issue. It seems to me that if Members are going to vote on it the least they could do is be here in the chamber when it is debated, and I would hope that the leadership of both parties would be sending out messages to the Members that whatever they are doing, they ought to drop it and get their tails here.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY), a member of the committee.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the impeachment inquiry resolution of the Committee on the Judiciary, a resolution which ensures that we expeditiously deal with the serious charges against the President in a process that is fair, thoughtful and deliberative.

In this resolution, we followed the pattern and procedures established in the Nixon impeachment inquiry. This model served the House well in the Nixon case. It has stood the test of time and there is no reason that we should abandon this model now.

The House should reject the unprecedented Democratic alternative with its unwise, arbitrary and unrealistic limitations and restrictions on the ability of the Committee on the Judiciary to

do its job. We must recognize that the Democratic alternative sets up a process that has never, not once, been followed in the more than 200-year history of impeachment under our constitution. It is totally without precedent.

Some have claimed that the charges against the President do not amount to high crimes and misdemeanors but the very report cited by the President's lawyers, which was prepared by the impeachment inquiry staff in the Nixon case, recognizes that conduct of the President which, and I quote, ''undermines the integrity of office'' is impeachable. The unavoidable consequence of perjury and obstruction of justice by a President would be to erode respect for the office of the President. Such acts inevitably subvert the respect for the law, which is essential to the well-being of our constitutional system.

If perjury and obstruction of justice do not undermine the integrity of office, what offenses would? Not long after the Constitution was adopted, one of the framers wrote, if it were to be asked what is the most sacred duty and the greatest source of security in a republic, the answer would be, an inviolable respect for the Constitution and laws. Those, therefore, who set examples which undermine or subvert the authority of the laws lead us from freedom to slavery. They incapacitate us for a government of laws.

Today, as Members of this House, it is our solemn responsibility under the Constitution to move forward with this inquiry and to set an example that strengthens the authority of the laws and preserves the liberty with which we have been blessed as Americans.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), a valuable member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, God help this Nation if today we become a Congress of endless investigation, accomplices to this unAmerican inquisition that would destroy the presidency over an extramarital affair.

The global economy is crumbling and we are talking about Monica Lewinsky.

Saddam Hussein hides weapons and we are talking about Monica Lewinsky.

□ 1130

Genocide wracks Kosovo, and we are talking about Monica Lewinsky.

Children crammed into packed classrooms, and we are talking about Monica Lewinsky.

Families cannot pay their medical bills, and we are talking about Monica Lewinsky.

God help this Nation if we trivialize the Constitution of the United States and reject the conviction of our Founding Fathers that impeachment is about no less than the subversion of the government. The President betrayed his wife; he did not betray the country. God help this Nation if we fail to recognize the difference.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a resolution of inquiry into the conduct of the President of the United States. It is not about a person, but it is about the rule of law. Each of us took a simple oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution provides a path to follow in these circumstances. The path may not be well worn, but it is well marked, and we will be wise to follow it rather than to concoct our own ideas on how to proceed.

The gentleman from New York concluded that the President has lied under oath, that he should be punished, but he should not be impeached. The gentleman is way ahead in his conclusion of where this process should be and where I am. I would say that this process is not about punishment. The purpose of this process is to examine the public trust, and, if it is breached, to repair it.

We have been referred serious charges of perjury, obstruction of justice and abuse of power. The President and his lawyers have denied each of these charges, as is his right to do. Our response should be that we need to examine these facts to determine the truth and to weigh the evidence, and it is our highest duty today to vote for this inquiry so that, if the result is there are no impeachable offenses, we can move on, but if there is more to be done, we can be sure that the rule of law will not be suspended or ignored by this Congress.

The Watergate model was chosen because that was what was demanded by my friends from across the aisle. This resolution does not direct the committee to go into any additional areas, but it does give the committee the authority to carry out its responsibility and to bring this matter to a conclusion without further delay.

It is my firm commitment, as an Arkansan, as an American and as someone who has tried to work with my colleagues from both side of the aisle, to be fair in every way in the search for truth. Did the President participate in a scheme to obstruct justice? Did the President commit perjury? Do these allegations, if proven, constitute impeachable offenses? We can answer these questions in a fair and bipartisan manner, and that is my commitment.

People say this is not Watergate. That is true. Every case is different. But the rule of law and our obligation to it does not change. They do not change because of position, personalities or power. The rule of law and justice depends upon this truth.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many of the President's actions were wrong. In fact, they were indefensible. But our role today is not to attack him. Our role today is to make sure that this process is defensible.

And this is not a defensible process. This Chamber spent a day, a little more than a day, debating renaming an airport, and we are spending 2 hours on deciding the future of this Presidency. That is unfair.

There should be an inquiry; we should move on. But it has to be fair, and what we are seeing today is not fair, it is not focused.

We have a report from Kenneth Starr. We should focus our inquiry on the report and any subsequent matters Ken Starr brings us.

We should have a target date of completion. We should aim to finish this by December 31. And if we cannot get it done, we can ask for an extension, and that can happen.

But the American people want this to be a fair process, and they are not stupid, and they recognize that this is not a fair process. The President may be punished, the President should be held accountable for his actions, but we have a duty, each and every person in this Chamber has a duty, to do that in a fair way.

And I think each of us has to examine our conscience and ask whether we want to have a wide-ranging fishing expedition or whether we want to focus it on the report that has been brought to us and any subsequent matters the special prosecutor brings to us. If we do that, I think we can do that on a bipartisan basis, and I think that will be fair, and that is what the American people want.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a very difficult time for every Member of this House.

I think it was said first by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE): Duty, duty, duty. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT) just talked about our duty. But I think, over and above our duty, I think it is important for us to recognize the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCHALE) who talked about the importance of the rule of law. That really is why we are here.

Over the past several weeks and months a number of us have dusted off our copies of the Federalist Papers, John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison—James Madison being the author, the father of the Constitution. Towards the end of the 51st Federalist, James Madison puts it perfectly as we look at the challenge that we face today. He said:

> Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued until it be obtained or until liberty be lost in the pursuit.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the motion

to recommit we be granted 5 minutes on each side for the purpose of comments and for the purpose of debate.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Illinois yielded to the gentleman from Michigan for the purpose of that request?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think 5 minutes on each side on the motion to recommit is justifiable, and I support the gentleman in his request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), an able member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, after 4½ years investigation of nearly every aspect of President Clinton's public and private life, Independent Counsel Ken Starr presented the House with 11 allegations of impeachment, all relating only to the President's misconduct with Monica Lewinsky. The Democrats say that these are serious allegations and that we should resolve these 11 charges by the end of this year and let the chips fall where they may. The Republicans say that they will not be limited to the 4½ year investigation by Mr. Starr. They feel that Mr. Starr was too light on President Clinton, and so they want an impeachment inquiry not only limited to Mr. Starr's charges regarding Miss Lewinski, but any other charges anyone can come up with on any subject at any time and with no time limit. And they want the American people to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Republican bill is unfair, it is unfair to the President, it is unfair to our country, and it is not in our national interest. We already know that what the President did was wrong, It was morally wrong, and now we need to decide what is an appropriate punishment for his offenses.

But let us reject the open-ended Republican inquiry. Let us instead follow the democratic model and resolve the 11 charges that Mr. Starr actually brought to us and do so before the end of the year so that we can get together as a Nation and address the serious and important other issues that face us here at home and around the world.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the committee.

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Our responsibility today is to determine if the evidence we have examined thus far warrants further investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary. We do not sit in judgment today. We are not here to convict or punish or sentence today. We are here to seek the truth.

To fulfill our constitutional duty we must determine if the evidence presented to date strongly suggests wrongdoing by the President and if the alleged wrongdoing likely rises to the level of an impeachable offense; that is, a high crime or misdemeanor. I would submit that strong evidence exists that the President may have committed perjury and the historic record demonstrates that perjury can be an impeachable offense.

Based on the facts and on the law, this House has a constitutional duty to proceed to a formal inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I think I speak for most of my colleagues when I say that this is not a matter to be taken lightly. Rarely in one's political life is one forced to confront such an awesome and historic responsibility. It is my sincere hope that we can work together as the Founding Fathers envisioned, in a bipartisan fashion, to complete this task as expeditiously as possible and to do what is in the best interests of the country.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to rise above the partisan fires that too often burn in our Nation's capital. Consider the facts at hand and fulfill our constitutional responsibilities by moving forward with a fair and thorough investigation of this important matter.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary who has worked tirelessly on crafting a middle course for the Members of the House of Representatives.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have labored very hard to craft a plan that would allow us to deal with the referral of the independent counsel in a way that is focused, in a way that is fair, in a way that is prompt and efficient, and, most of all, in a way that puts our Constitution first. I am very distressed to say that I do not see that that is going to happen today in this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I fear what Alexander Hamilton warned against in Federalist Paper Number 65, that ''there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt.'' That prophecy, that fear, is about to be realized. I believe that the majority has used its raw voting power to create a proposal that could result in a wide-ranging and lengthy impeachment inquiry. The Committee on the Judiciary may become the standing committee on impeachments. And I further fear that the rules in the Constitution may never be applied to the referral that has been sent to us. Even worse, we may end up—as happened Monday—with the majority counsel creating entirely new standards for high crimes and misdemeanors, which will have a very serious distorting effect on our constitutional system of government.

□ 1145

When we are lost, the best thing for us to do is to look to our Constitution as a beacon of light and a guideline to get us through trying times. Historically, impeachment was to be used when the misconduct of the executive was so severe that it threatened the very constitutional system of government itself. Ben Franklin described it as the alternative to assassination. It is that standard that needs to be applied in this case.

The question is not whether the President's misconduct was bad. We all know that the President's misconduct was bad. The question is, are we going to punish America instead of him for his misconduct? Are we going to trash our Constitution because of his misconduct? Are we going to make sure that this investigation goes on interminably while we ignore economic crises, or the needs of our students for education?

I fear that we are letting down our country. Twenty-four years ago, as an idealistic student, I watched this body rise to the occasion. Twenty-four years ago, as an idealistic student, I worked on the staff of a member of the Judiciary Committee, and I saw the committee, and I saw this Congress do a very hard thing: come together, become nonpartisan, and do a tough job for America.

I am very concerned that, instead of rising to this occasion today, we are falling down and lowering ourselves and America with it. I urge the adoption of the Boucher amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, our laws promise a remedy against sexual harassment. But if we say that lying about sex in court is acceptable or even expected, then we have made our sexual harassment laws nothing more than a false promise, a fraud upon our society, upon our legal system, and upon women.

Lying under oath and obstruction of justice are ancient crimes of great weight because they shield other offenses, blocking the light of truth in human affairs. There they are a dagger in the heart of our legal system and our democracy. They cannot and must not be tolerated.

The office of the presidency is due great respect, but the President is a citizen with the same duty to follow the laws as all other citizens. The world marvels that our President is not above the law, and my vote today helps assure that this rule continues.

With a commitment to the principles of the rule of law, which makes this country the beacon of hope for political refugees like myself throughout the world, I cast my vote in favor of the resolution to undertake an impeachment inquiry of the conduct of the President of the United States.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), my friend and a senior prosecutor.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that there is limited time for this debate. I think that is, indeed, unfortunate, because I was going on to talk about how we have abdicated our constitutional duties to an unelected prosecutor, how we have released thousands of pages that none of us in good conscience can say that we have read.

We violated the sanctity of the Grand Jury so that we can arrive here today to launch an inquiry without an independent, adequate review of the allegations by this body, which is our constitutional mandate. Ken Starr is not the agent of the United States Congress. It is our responsibility.

I was going to go on and speak about the proposal put forth by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), one that would have addressed and would address all of the allegations raised in the Starr referral in a fair way and in an expeditious way without dragging this Nation through hearings that will be interminable in nature.

What it really means for this country, is all the President's, any President's, enemies have to do to commence an impeachment process is to name an independent counsel so that we can here just simply rubber stamp that independent counsel's conclusions.

I was going to speak about the letter that was referred to by the universally respected chairman of the committee and a gentleman whom I hold in high esteem, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the letter where Mr. Starr is saying that he may make further referrals and keep this inquiry going on indefinitely. That is not a process, Mr. Speaker; it is a blank check. That is what I was going to talk about.

But out of deference to others that want to speak, I will conclude by saying, one hour to begin only the third impeachment inquiry in U.S. history is a travesty and a disgrace to this institution. I think that says it all, and besides, I am probably out of time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), a distinguished member of the committee.

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the question for us today is not whether or not the President committed impeachable offenses or whether or not we are here to impeach, the question is, do the allegations that have been presented to us by Kenneth Starr and his report merit further consideration?

Some would have us believe today that, even if all of those allegations were proven to be true, that the answer is no. They are wrong. The issue before us when we consider this matter is not Monica Lewinsky. The issue is not sex. The issue is not whether the President committed adultery or betrayed his wife.

The issue is did the President of the United States commit the felony crime of perjury by lying under oath in a deposition in a sexual harassment case. The issue is did the President of the United States commit the felony crime of perjury by lying under oath to a Grand Jury. The issue is did the President of the United States commit a felony crime of obstructing justice or the felony crime of witness tampering. If he did, are these high crimes and misdemeanors that deserve impeachment?

I would suggest that these are extraordinarily serious; that if the President of the United States is to be judged not to have committed a high crime and misdemeanor if the facts are proven, and we do not know that, that these things are true and he committed these crimes, but if he is judged not to have committed a high crime and misdemeanor for committing these other crimes of perjury, we will have determined that, indeed, he is no longer the legal officer at the highest panicle of this country.

Because to leave him sitting there is to undermine the very judicial system we have. It is to convey the message that perjury is okay, certainly at least perjury in certain matters and under certain circumstances. It is not okay. It is a very serious crime. Obstructing justice is. Witness tampering is.

One hundred fifteen people are serving in Federal prisons today who may be watching these proceedings today, serving in prison for perjury. Two judges have been impeached since I have been in Congress for nothing more than perjury, committing perjury as we call it.

What do we say in the future to all of those people who take the oath of office who say ''I swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?'' What do we say to all of those people who swear to tell the truth, nothing but the truth, but the whole truth when they are witnesses in cases throughout this country, civil and criminal? What do we say to all of the people who we may judge in the future who may be judges or otherwise who come before us who commit perjury? Is it okay?

If we leave this President alone if he committed these crimes, then we have undermined our Constitution, and we have undermined our system of justice. This is serious. We need to investigate these allegations.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), the departing chair of our caucus.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, today's proceeding is of such great historical importance that it should be approached with a deep and abiding respect for the Congress, the Constitution, and the Presidency.

We had the opportunity to develop a fair and responsible process that would protect, not only the dignity of the office of the Presidency, but create a precedent worth following. But I believe the Republican majority has squandered that, and, by doing so, has set in motion a process that is too much about partisanship and not enough about statesmanship.

The Republican proposal offers no limits on how long this partisan inquiry will go on nor on how long independent counsel Ken Starr can drag up issues that he has had 4 years to bring to this House. Sadly, there has been no willingness to limit the duration or scope of this resolution.

The Republican proposal moves ahead with an impeachment inquiry before the Committee on the Judiciary has even conducted a review of the facts and determined whether those facts constitute substantial and credible evidence. It lowers the threshold for which a President can be harassed and persecuted to the point of distraction from his constitutional duties.

From now on, any Congress dissatisfied with the policies of a particular administration or the personal behavior of any President could simply conduct an ongoing, costly, and distracting inquiry designed to dilute the authority of the Presidency.

After this election, when rational behavior returns, and cooler heads can prevail, I urge us to forge a way to rise above the nasty politics that have clouded this body.

I will not be here with those of you who return to this next Congress. I leave after 20 years with my self-respect intact. I have reached across the lines within my own party and, when necessary, across the aisle to the other party to make this House work and to get things done for this country.

I fought partisan battles. I have stood my ground on issues that matter to my district. The American people expect us to do that. But they also expect us to, each of us, to rise above the base political instincts that drive such a wedge through this institution.

In the months ahead, we must find a way, my friends, to do what is right for America to find a way to return this House to the people through a respect for law, for fairness, and due process. In the end, we must do a lot better than we will do today.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me very briefly?

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I just want the record to be clear. My good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) talked about 60,000 pages that were released that were not reviewed or looked at.

I want him to know, and I want everyone listening to know that every single page of anything that was released was reviewed, and things that were not released were reviewed by our staff.

I also would like to point out that total time spent looking at these

records by the Democrats, members of the Committee on the Judiciary on the Democrat side, were 21.81 hours. Six of them never came over to see the material. On the Republican side, 114.59 hours, and every Member came over to look at the material.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I will give the gentleman from Georgia additional time.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). That really contributes to the comity of this body, and I am sure it is an interesting statistic that everybody ought to know about.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my friend that when the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) says this has been done careless or in a slipshod manner not reviewing these things, it is important to know we took our job seriously. They were there to be reviewed. If my colleagues did not choose to do it, that is their option.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Mr. HYDE.

Mr. HYDE. You are welcome, Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the committee, if I have, in fact, 2 minutes remaining?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has every reason to inquire, and I would like to give the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) a total of 3 minutes for his generosity.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the United States Attorney appointed by President Reagan, when a case was presented to me, I started at the beginning. I would look and see what the law says, and I would look and see what the history of that law said.

Here we have similarly to look at the Constitution. It is pretty clear. What makes it even clearer, though, Mr. Speaker, is if we look at the sources for Article II Section 4, which is the impeachment power, we find, for example, Mr. Speaker, that, according to the Federalist writings 211 years ago, that an impeachable offense is, quote, ''Any abuse of the great trust reposed in the President.''

□ 1200

Moreover, they tell us, as Federalist 65 did, written by that great constitutional scholar Alexander Hamilton, an impeachable offense is a ''violation of public trust.''

I did not stop there, Mr. Speaker. I looked at further constitutional scholars. I find that 24 years ago, no less a constitutional scholar than William Jefferson Clinton, defined an impeachable offense as, ''willful, reckless behavior in office.''

I did not stop there. I looked at a report coauthored by Hillary Rodham, part of the impeachment team in the Watergate years, and I find that at page 26 of their report, she and others of her colleagues define an impeachable offense as ''wrongs that undermine the integrity of office.''

Where are we now, Mr. Speaker? The step we are taking today is one I first urged nearly a year ago. All we are doing today is taking the constitutionally equivalent step of impaneling a grand jury to inquire into whether or not the evidence shall sustain that offenses have, in fact, occurred.

The passage of H.R. 581 will mark the dawn of a new era in American government. We are sending the American people a clear message, that truth is more important than partisanship, and that the Constitution cannot be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency; that no longer will we turn a blind eye to clear evidence of obstruction of justice, perjury and abuse of power. We will be sending a message to this and all future Presidents that if, in fact, the evidence establishes that you or any future President have committed perjury, obstruction of justice, subversion of our judicial system, that we will be saying, no, sir, Mr. President, these things you cannot do.

It is our job as legislators to diagnose threats to our democracy and eliminate them. By the time the damage to our system is so great that everyone can see it, the wounds will be too deep to heal. We have already waited too long to address this issue. We must move forward quickly, courageously, fairly, and most importantly, constitutionally, along the one and the one and only path charted for us in the Constitution, the impeachment process.

We must do this, Mr. Speaker, so that tomorrow morning as we in this Chamber, as teachers all across America, lead their students in the pledge of allegiance, we can look America in the eye and say, yes, at least for today the Constitution is alive and well.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is very important for the record and for the American people to know that yes, the staff worked hard; the staff, the majority staff and the minority staff, to review 60,000 and some odd pages. But let me suggest that no Member in this House, no member in this committee in good conscience can stand here in this well today and state that he or she adequately reviewed that testimony before its release.

And this is a responsibility mandated by the Constitution to Members, not to staff, and that is what this is about today. This is not about defending the President, this is about defending the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Republicans to limit the debate on this very important resolution to decide whether this body will move with an inquiry to impeach is a continuation of the partisan, unfair, inconsiderate actions that have dictated the management of this impeachment crisis since independent counsel Ken Starr dumped his referral in the laps of this Congress and in the laps of the public. This continuous, shameless and reckless disregard for the Constitution, basic civil rights and the citizens of this country cannot be tolerated.

This is a sad and painful time for all of us. The least we can do is handle this matter with dignity and fairness for everyone involved. Four and one-half years, $40 million. Unnecessary. Subpoenas of uninvolved individuals, and Mr. Starr's close relationships with groups and individuals, with demonstrated hatred for the President, taints the independent counsel's investigation.

This Congress does not need a protracted, open-ended witch-hunt of intimidation, embarrassment and harassment. The tawdry and trashy thousands of pages of hearsay, accusations, gossip, and stupid telephone chatter does not meet the standard of high crimes and misdemeanors.

The President's actions in this matter are disappointing and unacceptable, but not impeachable. Mr. Schippers, the general counsel for the Republicans, extended the allegations in search of something, anything that may meet the constitutional standards, and even the extended and added allegations do not comport with the Constitution.

It is time to move on. Reprimand the President, condemn him, but let us move on. These grossly unfair procedures will only tear this Congress and this Nation apart. I ask my colleagues to vote down this open-ended and unfair resolution. It does not deserve the support of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have constantly warned this body about the dangers of a prosecutor run amok. They have warned this body about the abuse of the power of the majority. We ask our colleagues to listen to us as we remind our colleagues of the history of our people who have struggled against injustice and unfairness. Let us not march backwards; let us be wise enough to move forward and spend our precious time working on the issues of education, health care, senior citizens, children, and in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, justice, and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has

33½ minutes; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) as 34½ minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are now engaged in a constitutional process that is about the search for truth. I believe that we should do that in a fair and expeditious way, completely disregarding polls, completely disregarding the pendency of an election on November 3, and answering the question that our colleague from California just asked about whether it is appropriate just to move along.

Of course, we do want to move along to important issues facing the country. We do want to restore freedom in health care, we do want to secure the future of Medicare and Social Security, and we do want to continue the progress toward balancing the budget. All of those things we want to do.

But I would ask my colleagues to consider this. Really, this is the crucial business of the country. This is the crucial business.

As we go into the next century, the question is, does the truth even matter. Now, some would say, let us move along, it does not matter, just move along. But if we move along, what we are leaving aside is serious allegations of serious crimes.

Just this week one of my staffers was on her way over here with a staff member of one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY). An accident occurred, occurred on a bicycle, struck this young lady, not my staffer, but the other staffer. She was hurt. Now, she has two duties as a citizen. One is to testify, to be a witness, to come forward; and the second is to testify truthfully when called on, if necessary, in court.

Now, what shall we say to her if we are going to just move along and say that the potential of the crime of perjury just does not matter, then what of that small case in a court here in D.C.? We say to that case, well, it is not necessary to tell the truth in court, and it is not necessary to testify, I suppose. But we must say, if we are going to preserve the rule of law in this Nation, that it does matter, and that when that young staffer is called on to testify, if she must, she must testify, and then she must tell the truth.

This is the essential work of this Congress and of this Nation.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), and a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as members of the Committee on the Judiciary, we have had the opportunity to indicate our willingness to engage in a process that is fair, measuring the President's conduct against a constitutional standard, not a bicycle standard; focused on what the independent counsel has referred or might refer to us; and timely, one that sets an objective to conclude this matter and put it behind us.

We have also had the opportunity to listen to our colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary who want to engage in an unfair and open-ended, partisan political fishing expedition, dealing with bicycles rather than constitutional standards, some of whom have already gone on television and already declared their conclusion in this matter before a trial even begins.

We have had our opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield the balance of my time to a nonmember of the Committee on the Judiciary, my good colleague from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the Republican leadership has placed an incredibly unfair gag rule on a constitutional debate of historic proportions. If this gag rule is the first test of the Republicans' fairness in this inquiry, they have failed that test.

The most important issue today, Mr. Speaker, before us is not the November 3 elections, or even the fate of President Clinton. The most important issue before us is the historical precedent we set in beginning the process of undoing an election for the most important office of our land. The right to vote is the foundation of our entire democracy. To override the votes of millions of Americans in a Presidential election is an extraordinary action. It is a radical action, and, in effect, it is allowing the votes of 535 citizens to override the votes of tens of millions of citizens.

In its rush to begin an impeachment inquiry just days before a crucial election, this Congress will have lowered the threshold for future Presidential impeachment inquiries in such a way that compromises the independence of the Presidency as a coequal branch of government.

The truth is the Committee on the Judiciary has not even had 1 day, not even 1 hour of hearings on our Founding Fathers' original intent about the threshold for impeachment. I find it ironic that the very Republicans who have preached all year long that we should impeach Federal judges for not abiding by our Founding Fathers' constitutional intentions have now decided we can start an historic constitutional process without even 1 hour of hearings. How ironic that those same Republicans will today force us to vote on a truly historic constitutional issue without even 1 hour, 1 day of hearings on our Founding Fathers' intent about high crimes and misdemeanors.

To begin a formal impeachment inquiry after only a cursory review of the Independent Counsel's report, in light of a standard that has not been defined, within the context of a pending congressional election weeks away, at the very least undermines the credibility of this House on this important issue, and at the very worst has set an historical precedent that we can easily begin the process of undoing the freely exercised votes of millions of Americans.

To even begin this radical process without the greatest of deliberation, regardless of one's final vote, is in itself, in my opinion, an attack upon the very core of our democracy.

□ 1215

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT), a member of our committee.

(Mr. BRYANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind our colleagues that we are not voting on impeachment today. We are here today simply to uphold our constitutional obligation to look further into the allegations of wrongdoing against this president, and not to look away.

We seem to all agree that the President's conduct was wrong, and we seem to now agree that we must continue this process toward finding the truth. But this is not about keeping political score. It is not about allowing the President to dictate the terms of this process. We are here protecting our Constitution, which we have a duty to uphold. So let us complete our task fairly and expeditiously.

I must respectfully disagree with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and his alternative to this. Now is not the time to set arbitrary time limits, because, as we have learned before, that encourages stonewalling. We can actually get this done quicker, as the chairman said, without time limits. Now is not the time to consider possibly piecemealing allegations. Let us get all this done, get all this behind us, and move forward.

As part and parcel of that, our responsibility to the American people is to be fair throughout this process. It is an elementary principle of this fairness that the President should not be allowed to limit or direct or influence the process that Congress uses to investigate these allegations.

At the end of the day, our Constitution will still stand as a pillar of our Nation. It will and it should, fittingly, outlast any person, whomever it might be, who has the great privilege of serving in the office of the presidency.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ACKERMAN

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn, we do so to Salem, a quaint village in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, whose history beckons us thence.

The SPEAKER. That is not a proper motion, the Chair would say to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), whose district I do not think includes the town of Salem.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, this debate is as important for what it is not about as for what it is about. It is not about whether to conduct an inquiry. Both the Democratic and Republican resolutions would initiate an inquiry. It is not about who has been more faithful to the Watergate precedent. Neither side is pure on that subject.

What this debate is about is whether the Committee on the Judiciary will take up Whitewater, Travelgate, and Filegate, without a shred of paper from the Independent Counsel on this subject. It is about whether the committee will commence a fullscale impeachment hearing without asking itself, as a threshold matter, whether even Ken Starr's best case compels impeachment.

If Members can somehow convince themselves that after 4½ years and nearly $50 million in taxpayers' money, that Ken Starr has been less than aggressive in pursuing Whitewater, Travelgate, and Filegate, then Members should vote for the Republican resolution which authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to take them up even without a referral from Kenneth Starr.

If Members believe that the committee should avoid the question of whether even Ken Starr's best case compels impeachment, and, instead, plunge blindly into a month-long evidentiary fiasco, then they should vote for the Republican resolution.

How is it in our Nation's best interest to initiate an impeachment inquiry which willfully blinds itself to the numerous constitutional scholars that say that even Ken Starr's best case does not compel impeachment? At this time of global political and economic turmoil, it is in our Nation's interest to deal with the Lewinsky matter fairly and expeditiously. Only the Democratic alternative would do that.

So please, let us put the national interest above partisanship. I ask Members to vote their conscience, vote for the Democratic alternative, and against the Republican resolution.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DENNIS KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not on behalf of Democrats or Republicans, but as an American who is deeply concerned that our country bring closure to the charges against the President. A vote for an inquiry is not the same as a vote for impeachment. This vote is neither a vote to impeach nor a license to conduct a partisan witchhunt.

In fact, some have called for impeachment without a hearing. Some have called for resignation without a hearing. Some have called for exoneration without a hearing. I believe there will be no resolution without an open hearing. There will be no accountability without an open hearing. There will be no closure for this country, for this Congress, or for our president, without an open hearing.

The Nation is divided. The House is divided. A House divided against itself will not stand, so if inquire we must, let us do it fairly, and in the words of Lincoln, with malice towards none, with charity towards all, because there will be an inquiry. The American people expect it to proceed fairly, expeditiously, and then they expect it to end. The people want us to get this over with, and they will be watching.

Let the President make his case. Give him a chance to clear his name and get back to his job. Bring everything out in the open. Bring forward the accusers and subject them to the light of day, settle this, and then move forward to do the business of the people, the business for which the people elected us: to further economic growth, to protect social security, to improve health care, and to meet all the other pressing needs of the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn moment, but as theater, it is overdone. It is overdone because this vote is not about whether or not we should have an impeachment inquiry. Both resolutions call for such an inquiry, so we will have one. This vote is about what kind of impeachment inquiry we will conduct. That question is important.

The majority wants an open-ended impeachment inquiry with no limits on its scope or duration. Under their plan, the Committee on the Judiciary can investigate anything and everything it wants for 6 months, a year, or even longer. I believe their plan will inflame partisanship, and if prolonged, weaken the institution of the presidency and this country.

This is not Watergate. That committee conducted a factual inquiry. We have piles of facts from the special prosecutor. Our task is to find an appropriate consequence for behavior we know is wrong. Our alternative will provide for thorough consideration of the Starr alternative, of the Starr referral, by December 31, 1998. What is wrong with that?

I urge my colleagues to oppose an inquiry resolution that does not say when it will end or what it will cover, and instead, support the focused, fair, and expeditious Democratic alternative.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. KENNY HULSHOF).

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, last night I addressed this body and urged my colleagues to please avoid partisan wrangling. Today I implore the Members of this body to recognize the historical gravity of the moment. Today is not the day to condemn the process or the prosecutor. Today is not the day for talking points or pointing fingers.

Mr. Speaker, in this debate, let us pledge not our loyalty to our party, let us pledge allegiance to our country. Let us not be partisans. Instead, let us be patriots.

I, too, am concerned about the open-ended nature of the investigation. I believe each one of us would fervently wish this cup would pass us by, but I have faith in the integrity and ability of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and when he says this process will be handled fairly and expeditiously, I think his word deserves great weight in this body.

So the question I have for the Members is simply this: Is it possible, is it possible, that there is credible evidence that exists that would constitute grounds for an impeachment? If Members' answer is a solemn yes, then vote in favor of the resolution.

But I submit, even if Members' answer is an equivocal ''I do not know,'' then I think that the judgment of the doubt, the benefit of the doubt, must go in favor of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last January I was privileged to enter this Chamber for the first time, my family proudly beaming from the House gallery as I rose in unison with the Members of this body to take an oath. I pledged my sacred honor to the Constitution of the United States. That is what this vote is about.

In my humble and considered opinion, that oath requires from me a vote of aye on the resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the able gentleman from New York (Mr. CHARLES RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving on the Watergate Committee on the Judiciary. One difference then, as opposed to now, is that we worked together as Republicans and Democrats to search for the facts and to report to the House of Representatives for them to make a determination.

Now, we do not have any question of trying to impeach the President of the United States or protecting the integrity of the Congress or the Constitution. The Republicans do not want to impeach, and would not touch it with a 10-foot political pole. They know at the end of this year that this Congress is over, and they even want to carry this over for the next 2 years, to attempt to hound this president, who has been elected twice, out of office.

The reason for it is because it is the only thing they have to take to the American people before this election. What else are they going to take? Their legislative record? The fact that they have renamed National Airport after Ronald Reagan, that they have deep-sixed the tax code to the year 2002?

On the question of social security, what have they done? Tried to rape the reserve. What have they done as it relates to minimum wage and providing jobs? What have they done for education? What have they done for the health of the people in this Nation?

They are not just going to get elected by hounding the President of the United States, because as they judge the President of the United States, the voters will be judging them on November 3.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CHRIS COX).

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, a member of the minority stated during the debate that the decision to limit the debate to 2 hours on this resolution is partisan. In allocating 2 hours for debate on a resolution authorizing an inquiry of impeachment, the Congress is adhering to precedent, the precedents established by the House of Representatives when it was under Democratic control. It is in fact doubling the amount of time that was spent in debate on the identical resolution in February, 1974.

Likewise, the wording of the resolution adheres directly to precedent. The minority argues today that an impeachment inquiry should be narrowly limited to the evidence we already know, but on February 6, 1974, when the Democrats were in the majority, Committee on the Judiciary Chairman Rodino stated: ''To be locked into . . . a date (for completion of the inquiry) would be totally irresponsible and unwise.'' The inquiry, he said, must be ''thorough, so that we can make a fair and responsible judgment.''

The resolution does, as it must, follow precedent. We, in undertaking this solemn constitutional duty, must follow precedent. A vote for the resolution is a vote for a fair, full, and complete inquiry today, just as in 1974.

□ 1230

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, today I will cast the most important vote of my whole time here in the United States Congress. And if we are not going to listen to each other, then I would like us to listen to the eminent scholar, Lawrence Tribe, on what we are doing today.

He said that, ''Today this Congress is twisting impeachment into something else, instead of keeping it within its historical boundaries, and our Nation and its form of government are imperiled as a result.'' He went on to say that, ''Today we are losing sight of the constitutional wreckage that this vote will cause as we lay down historical precedent that a President of the United States can be impeached for something other than official misconduct as President of the United States.''

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING).

(Mr. BUNNING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Except for declaring war, impeachment is the most serious and sobering issue that the House can consider. The question before us today demands that we act out of statesmanship and not raw, political partisanship. Our history and our Constitution demand the best for us.

I have read the referral to the House from the Independent Counsel, Ken Starr, and I believe there is enough evidence to warrant further inquiry by the Judiciary Committee.

The Judiciary Committee's review of the evidence accumulated by the Independent Counsel indicates that there exists substantial and credible evidence of fifteen separate events directly involving the President that constitute grounds to proceed with an impeachment inquiry. The charges are troubling—perjury, obstruction of justice, witness tampering, and abuse of power. They are not simply about extra-marital affairs, or making misleading statements. Instead, the allegations touch more profoundly upon claims of criminal conduct.

I do not know if all of the allegations in the Starr report are true and factual. But, the charges are serious and some of the claims made against the President are compelling. However, the report represents only one side of the story, and the President deserves the right to exonerate himself before the Judiciary Committee, the full House and the American people.

Our Constitution and historical precedent set out a procedure to follow in proceedings such as this, and I believe we must strictly follow the letter of the law. Impeachment is a grave matter, and at this crucial moment in our history we must not rush to judgment.

The inquiry by the Judiciary Committee must be orderly, and judicious. But, it must also be expeditious. While I do not think that an arbitrary deadline should be imposed on the panel, for the good of the country I believe it is incumbent upon the Committee to work with all deliberate speed in order to conclude this matter as soon and as fairly as possible. Chairman Hyde's goal of the Committee concluding its work by the end of the year is fair and reasonable.

By the same token, I also believe that the President has a duty to work with, and not against, the Judiciary Committee to speedily resolve this matter. The sooner we can conclude these proceedings, the better it will be for the country. Now is not the time for further foot-dragging and delay by anyone.

I believe the President was right yesterday when he said members of the House should cast ''a vote of principle and conscience'' on authorizing the impeachment inquiry. I agree. Of all the votes cast in this Congress, this should be one of integrity and honor.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be here today. I wish I could just ignore all of this and make it go away. But I have a responsibility to answer a question today and that question is: How will history judge our actions that we take today?

I believe that this Nation sits at a crossroad. One direction points to the high road of the rule of law. Sometimes hard, sometimes unpleasant. This path relies on truth, justice, and the rigorous application of the principle that no man is above the law.

Now, the other road is the path of least resistance. This is where we start making exceptions to our laws based on poll numbers and spin control. This is when we pitch the law completely overboard when the mood fits us; when we ignore the facts in order to cover up the truth.

Shall we follow the rule of law and do our constitutional duty no matter how unpleasant, or shall we follow the path of least resistance, close our eyes to the potential law breaking, forgive and forget, move on, and tear an unfixable hole in our legal system?

No man is above the law and no man is below the law. That is the principle that we all hold dear in this country. The President has many responsibilities and many privileges. His chief responsibility is to uphold the laws of this land. He does not have the privilege to break the law.

The American system of government is built on the proposition that the President of the United States can be removed if he violates his oath of office. This resolution simply starts that process of inquiry. Did the President break the law? And if he did, does that lawbreaking constitute an impeachable offense?

Closing our eyes to allegations of wrongdoing by voting ''no,'' or by limiting scope or time, constitutes a breach of our responsibilities as Members of this House. So let history judge us as having done our duty to uphold that sacred rule of law.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the able gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

(Mr. KANJORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to any impeachment inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. Today, for only the third time in our nation's history, the House will consider whether to initiate an impeachment inquiry against the President. I take my sworn constitutional duty and responsibility in this matter very seriously.

Over the last four weeks, I have reviewed the Starr report and other material submitted by his office. I have also listened to legal experts, constitutional scholars, and my constituents about the referral. I have further studied the origins and history of our Constitution's impeachment clause. After considerable deliberation, I have determined that there is no

convincing reason to vote for an impeachment inquiry into the matters referred by the independent counsel based on the evidence that we have before us at this time.

Clearly, President Clinton behaved badly. He was wrong to engage in an inappropriate relationship with a young woman. He was wring to mislead the American people in his public statements, and he was wrong to provide misleading answers in judicial proceedings. For that wrong behavior the President should be reprimanded, but he should not be removed from office.

Our Constitution demands a higher standard for the Congress to undertake the extraordinary action of removing a duly-elected President. This Congress has not sufficiently considered what constitutes an impeachable offense. Before we irreparably damage our nation's delicate system of checks and balances among our three branches of government, it is imperative that we establish that standard in a fair, non-partisan matter. The resolution we are considering today is not about whether the man who holds the highest elected office in the country engaged in an improper relationship and then tried to conceal it. Rather, this resolution is about the standard under which the Congress has the right to overturn the will of the people who elected the President of the United States.

IMPEACHMENT DEFINITION

Both the text of the Constitution and the comments of its authors place the bar for impeachment quite high, and mandate that Congress use the impeachment process to address only the gravest of wrongs. Specifically, Article II of the Constitution states that the President may be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of ''treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors.''

Because this phrase is often truncated and used out of context, it is necessary to carefully examine the writings and debates of the Constitution's authors. Fortunately, evidence of the phrase's meaning and development is extensive. One individual who can provide especially helpful guidance about the meaning of the term is George Mason, the man who proposed the language adopted by the Constitutional Convention. Mr. Mason noted that ''Impeachment should be reserved for treason, bribery, and high crimes and misdemeanors where the President's actions are great and dangerous offenses or attempts to subvert the Constitution and the most extensive injustice.''

Read in their entirety the writings of the Constitution's authors firmly imply that the bar for impeachment is extremely high, and that Congress should use it to address only those Presidential actions that threaten the stability of our democracy. Moreover, the debate over the Constitution indicates that the Founders clearly intended that ''other high crimes and misdemeanors'' had to be crimes and actions against the state on the same level of magnitude as treason and bribery.

We can also look to precedent when seeking to understand the definition of impeachment and whether the actions of a President in his private life rise to the level of ''high crimes and misdemeanors.'' In 1974, the House Judiciary Committee considered substantial evidence that Richard Nixon committed tax fraud during his presidency. Although the evidence overwhelmingly indicated that President Nixon had committed such fraud, the panel concluded by a bipartisan vote of 26 to 12 that personal misconduct is not an impeachable offense. Further, the Supreme Court has ruled that other remedies exist for addressing Presidential wrongdoing, including civil lawsuits and criminal prosecutions.

Finally, it is important to note that the Founders included impeachment as a constitutional remedy because they worried about Presidential tyranny and gross abuse of power. They did not intend impeachment or the threat of its use to serve as a device for denouncing the President's private actions. Instead, they left punishment for improper private Presidential conduct to public opinion, the political process, and judicial proceedings. I support the Framers' wise counsel on impeachment. The consideration of whether to overturn a decision of the electorate should only be undertaken in extreme situations. In short, Presidents ought not to be impeached for private conduct, however reprehensible.

POOR PRECEDENT

Beyond failing to meet the standard of impeachment envisioned by our Founders and strengthened by past practice, an impeachment inquiry into the matters recently referred by the independent counsel would create dangerous and undesirable precedents for the country in at last three significant ways. First, if this politically-inspired effort ultimately succeeds, it will tip the delicate system of checks and balances in favor of Congress. The result would be a parliamentary system whereby the party in power in Congress could impeach a President and a Vice President of another party for virtually any reason. Our Founders created a government with three separate, but equal branches of government. We should remember this fact today and not upset the balance of power they so sensibly established.

Second, as noted above, the House should vote to pursue an impeachment inquiry only if it has credible evidence of action constituting fundamental injuries to the governmental process. Assuming the facts presented by the independent counsel thus far to be true, the President's conduct does not rise to the level the Founders deemed impeachable because it was not ''a serious abuse of power or a serious abuse of official duties.'' Furthermore, Congress has in more than 200 years never removed a President from office even though several Presidents have committed far more serious abuses. One must consequently ask whether this is where we want to set the bar for impeaching this and future Presidents. From my perspective it is not.

Finally, based on the facts of this referral, an impeachment inquiry would impose an extraordinary invasion of privacy. An impeachment inquiry on what is fundamentally a private matter will likely deter worthy contenders in both parties from running for political office—particularly the presiency—because they fear protracted, government-sponsored investigations into their past, current, and possibly future actions. Moreover, it could also provoke a move to impeach future Presidents every time that Congress thinks they may have made false statements.

THE SOLUTION

Like most Americans, I am personally disappointed with the President's acknowledged inappropriate personal behavior. Clearly, the President engaged in an improper relationship about which he did not want anyone to know. The President, as a result, was not forthcoming with the truth regarding this relationship, not only with the independent counsel and Congress, but also with his family and the American people. Ultimately, after months of personal turmoil the President admitted the affair, and suffered great humiliation and much public embarrassment, probably more than any other individual in our nation who has made similar mistakes.

The President's conduct was wrong and worthy of rebuke. Even if such personal behavior is not impeachable, as representatives of the people we must tell the President that his actions are not acceptable. We should, therefore, immediately consider some sort of censure against the President. Censure is a serious act that will certainly damage his standing in the public and lower his rank in history.

CONCLUSION

At the end of my prepared remarks, I will attach four excellent articles that further elaborate on the points I have made today. They include an analysis by noted constitutional scholar Cass Sunstein, thoughts by Robert F. Drinan and Wayne Owens who served as Democratic Members on the House Watergate panel, and a commentary by former Republican President Gerald R. Ford. The former President argues that instead of impeachment, the House should publicly censure the current President's behavior. I have also attached several recent statements about the Starr referral from some of the individuals integrally involved in Watergate all of whom conclude that this is vastly different form and less serious than Watergate.

Mr. Speaker, from my perspective Congress must swiftly resolve the matters referred by the independent counsel. We need to admonish the President for his inappropriate personal behavior and quickly move forward and address the nation's real priorities. We also need to ensure that we rebuke the President, and not punish the nation. The American people should not have to suffer through what could be an unlimited Congressional inquiry into a tawdry, but hardly impeachable extramarital affair. This Congress should begin the process of healing the nation's wounds. We should also begin to forgive. For these reasons, I will oppose this impeachment inquiry.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1998]

''IMPEACHMENT? THE FRAMERS WOULDN'T BUY IT''

(By Cass Sunstein)

We all now know that, under the Constitution, the president can be impeached for ''Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.'' But what did the framers intend us to understand with these words? Evidence of the phrase's evolution is extensive—and it strongly suggests that, if we could solicit the views of the Constitution's authors, the current allegations against President Clinton would not be impeachable offenses.

When the framers met in Philadelphia during the stifling summer of 1787, they were seeking not only to design a new form of government, but to outline the responsibilities of the president who would head the new nation. They shared a commitment to disciplining public officials through a system of checks and balances. But they disagreed about the precise extent of presidential power and, in particular, about how, if at all, the president might be removed from office. If we judge by James Madison's characteristically detailed accounts of the debates, this question troubled and divided the members of the Constitutional Convention.

The initial draft of the Constitution took the form of resolutions presented before the 30-odd members on June 13. One read that the president could be impeached for ''malpractice, or neglect of duty,'' and, on July 20, this provision provoked extensive debate. The notes of Madison, who was representing Virginia, show that three distinct positions dominated the day's discussion. One extreme view, represented by Roger Sherman of Connecticut, was that ''the National Legislature should have the power to remove the Executive at pleasure.'' Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, Rufus King of Massachusetts and Gouvernor Morris of Pennsylvania opposed, with Pinckney arguing that the president ''ought not to be impeachable whilst in office.'' The third position, which ultimately carried the day, was that the president should be impeachable, but only for a narrow category of abuses of the public trust.

It was George Mason of Virginia who took a lead role in promoting this more moderate course. He argued that it would be necessary to counter the risk that the president might obtain his office by corrupting his electors. ''Shall that man be above'' justice, he asked, ''who can commit the most extensive injustice?'' The possibility of the new president becoming a near-monarch led the key votes—above all, Morris—to agree that impeachment might be permitted for (in Morris's words) ''corruption & some few other offences.'' Madison concurred, and Edmund Randolph of Virginia captured the emerging consensus, favoring impeachment on the grounds that the executive ''will have great opportunitys of abusing his power; particularly in time of war when the military force, and in some respect the public money, will be in his hands.'' The clear trend of the discussion was toward allowing a narrow impeachment power by which the president could be removed only for gross abuses of public authority.

To Pinckney's continued protest that the separation of powers should be paramount, Morris argued that ''no one would say that we ought to expose ourselves to the danger of seeing the first Magistrate in foreign pay without being able to guard against it by displacing him.'' At the same time, Morris insisted, ''we should take care to provide some mode that will not make him dependent on the Legislature.'' Thus, led by Morris, the framers moved toward a position that would maintain the separation between president and Congress, but permit the president to be removed in extreme situations.

A fresh draft of the Constitution's impeachment clause, which emerged two weeks later on Aug. 6, permitted the president to be impeached, but only for treason, bribery and corruption (exemplified by the president's securing his office by unlawful means). With little additional debate, this provision was narrowed on Sept. 4 to ''treason and bribery.'' But a short time later, the delegates took up the impeachment clause anew. Mason complained that the provision was too narrow, that ''maladministration'' should be added, so as to include ''attempts to subvert the Constitution'' that would not count as treason or bribery.

But Madison, the convention's most careful lawyer, insisted that the term ''maladministration'' was ''so vague'' that it would ''be equivalent to a tenure during pleasure of the Senate,'' which is exactly what the framers were attempting to avoid. Hence, Mason withdrew ''maladministration'' and added the new terms ''other high Crimes and Misdemeanors against the State''—later unanimously changed to, according to Madison, ''against the United States'' to ''remove ambiguity.'' The phrase itself was taken from English law, where it referred to a category of distinctly political offenses against the state.

There is a further wrinkle in the clause's history. On Sept. 10, the entire Constitution was referred to the Committee on Style and Arrangement. When that committee's version appeared two days later, the words ''against the United States'' had been dropped, probably on the theory that they were redundant, although we have no direct evidence. It would be astonishing if this change were intended to have a substantive effect, for the committee had no authority to change the meaning of any provision, let alone the impeachment clause on which the framers had converged. The Constitution as a whole, including the impeachment provision, was signed by the delegates and offered to the nation on Sept. 17.

These debates support a narrow understanding of ''high Crimes and Misdemeanors,'' founded on the central notions of bribery and treason. The early history tends in the same direction. The Virginia and Delaware constitutions, providing a background for the founders' work, generally allowed impeachment for acts ''by which the safety of the State may be endangered.'' And consider the words of the highly respected (and later Supreme Court Justice) James Iredell, speaking in the North Carolina ratifying convention: ''I suppose the only instances, in which the President would be liable to impeachment, would be where he had received a bribe, or had acted from some corrupt motive or other.'' By way of explanation, Iredell referred to a situation in which ''the President has received a bribe . . . from a foreign power, and, under the influence of that bribe, had address enough with the Senate, by artifices and misrepresentations, to seduce their consent to a pernicious treaty.''

James Wilson, a convention delegate from Pennsylvania, wrote similarly in his 1791 ''Lectures on Law'': ''In the United States and in Pennsylvania, impeachments are confined to political characters, to political crimes and misdemeanors, and to political punishments.'' Another early commentator went so far as to say that ''the legitimate causes of impeachment . . . can have reference only to public character, and official duty. . . . In general, those offenses, which may be committed equally by a private person, as a public officer, are not the subjects of impeachment.''

This history casts new light on the famous 1970 statement of Gerald Ford, then a representative from Michigan, that a high crime and misdemeanor ''is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers it to be.'' In a practical sense, of course, Ford was right; no court would review a decision to impeach. But in a constitutional sense, he was quite wrong; the framers were careful to circumscribe the power of the House of Representatives by sharply limiting the category of legitimately impeachable offenses.

The Constitution is not always read to mean what the founders intended it to mean, and Madison's notes hardly answer every question. But under any reasonable theory of constitutional interpretation, the current allegations against Clinton fall far short of the permissible grounds for removing a president from office. Of course, perjury and obstruction of justice could be impeachable offenses if they involved, for example, lies about unlawful manipulation of elections. It might even be possible to count as impeachable ''corruption'' the extraction of sexual favors in return for public benefits of some kind. But nothing of this kind has been alleged thus far. A decision to impeach President Clinton would not and should not be subject to judicial review. But for those who care about the Constitution's words, and the judgment of its authors, there is a good argument that it would nonetheless be unconstitutional.—Cass Sunstein, who teaches at the University of Chicago School of Law, is the author of ''Legal Reasoning and Political Conflict'' (Oxford University Press).

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1998]

''AN EASY LINE TO DRAW''

(By Robert F. Drinan and Wayne Owens)

This is not the first time the House Judiciary Committee has been called on to determine whether actions of the President in his private life rise to the level of ''high crimes and misdemeanors.'' In 1974, we were members of the House Judiciary Committee that considered evidence that Richard Nixon committed tax fraud while President. The panel concluded that personal misconduct is not an impeachable offense.

The evidence against President Nixon was convincing. He had claimed a $565,000 deduction on his taxes for the donation of his Vice Presidential papers, but the loophole that allowed the deduction was closed in 1969. The IRS concluded that the documents for the donation had been signed in 1970 and backdated. There was persuasive evidence that Nixon was personally involved in the decision, making him criminally liable for tax fraud.

But the committee decided by a vote of 26 to 12 that he should not be impeached for tax fraud because it did not involve official conduct or abuse of Presidential powers.

As one of the committee's most partisan Democrats, Jerry Waldie, said, ''Though I find the conduct of the President to have been shabby, to have been unacceptable, and to have been disgraceful even, this is not an abuse of power sufficient to warrant impeachment.''

This bipartisan conclusion was made easier because the first order of business when the committee convened in 1974 was to discuss what the standards should be for impeachment. Without such standards, the impeachment process could become a partisan free-for-all.

The committee stipulated from the beginning that ''because impeachment of a President is a grave step for the nation, it is predicted upon conduct seriously incompatible with either the constitutional form and principles of our government or the proper performance of constitutional duties of the Presidential office.''

The current House Judiciary Committee would do well to ''follow the precedents set in the Nixon hearings,'' as the chairman, Henry Hyde, recently pledged to do. If the panel applies the standard that emerged in 1974, it will decide that the charges against Clinton do not fall under the articles of impeachment.—Robert F. Drinan and Wayne Owens are former Democratic Representatives from, respectively, Massachusetts and Utah.

RECENT STATEMENTS COMPARING THE LEWINSKY MATTER TO WATERGATE BY INDIVIDUALS CLOSELY INVOLVED IN WATERGATE

''With Mr. Nixon, of course, you had really serious abuse of high office. He engaged in wiretapping of newsmen and government officials. He ordered break-ins—the staff did—of government institutions, and then there was a cover-up where there was clearly no question when you're paying hush money that you're seeking silence of those involved. So, the width and breadth of Watergate was much different than the single incident we have involved here.''—John Dean (CNN, 9/11/98)

''The offenses being investigated are totally different. . . . In the aggregate, Watergate was serious, piece-by-piece subversion of presidential accountability to the Congress and public. Those are very wide differences from Whitewater and Monica

Lewinsky.''—Elliot Richardson (Associated Press, 9/10/98)

Asked if the Starr Report established grounds for impeachment, Ben-Veniste answered, ''No, I don't. And I believe that the report itself is a flagrant and arrogant misuse of the power and the authority of an independent counsel. It had been reported that Mr. Starr was going to follow the example of the Watergate prosecutors in transmitting evidence as a statute permits him to do relating to his view of impeachable offenses. Instead, he has set himself up, not only as investigator and prosecutor, but as judge and jury and has had the arrogance to write articles of impeachment as to make an argument here, a prosecution argument for the removal of the President of the United States. This report has gone so far beyond what he was authorized to do that is has now merged Starr, the prosecutor, and Star the Supermarket tabloid.''—Richard Ben-Veniste (Meet the Press, 9/13/98)

''I think we have to remember what the crimes in Watergate were. Watergate was about a vast and pervasive abuse of power by a President who ordered break-ins; who ordered fire bombings; who ordered illegal wiretappings; who ordered a squad of goons to thwart the constitutional electoral process. We've seen nothing like that here.''—Carl Bernstein (CNN Saturday Morning News, 9/12/98)

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1998]

''THE PATH BACK TO DIGNITY''

(By Gerald R. Ford)

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.—Almost exactly 25 years have passed since Richard Nixon nominated me to replace the disgraced Spiro Agnew as Vice President. In the contentious days of autumn 1973, my confirmation was by no means assured. Indeed, a small group of House Democrats, led by Bella Abzug, risked a constitutional crisis in order to pursue their own agenda.

''We can get control and keep control,'' Ms. Abzug told the Speaker of the House, Carl Albert.

The group hoped, eventually, to replace Nixon himself with Mr. Albert.

The Speaker, true to form, refused to have anything to do with the scheme. And so on Dec. 6, 1973, the House voted 387 to 35 to confirm my nomination on accordance with the 25th Amendment to the Constitution.

When I succeeded to the Presidency, in August 1974, my immediate and overriding priority was to draw off the poison that had seeped into the nation's bloodstream during two years of scandal and sometimes ugly partisanship. Some Americans have yet to forgive me for pardoning my predecessor. In the days leading up to that hugely controversial action, I didn't take a poll for guidance, but I did say more than a few prayers. In the end I listened to only one voice, that of my conscience. I didn't issue the pardon for Nixon's sake, but for the country's.

A generation later, Americans once again confront the specter of impeachment. From the day, last January, when the Monica Lewinsky story first came to light, I have refrained publicly from making any substantive comments. I have done so because I haven't known enough of the facts—and because I know all too well that a President's responsibilities are, at the best of times, onerous. In common with the other former Presidents, I have had to wish to increase those burdens. Moreover, I resolved to say nothing unless my words added constructively to the national discussion.

This much now seems clear: whether or not President Clinton has broken any laws, he has broke faith with those who elected him. A leader of rare gifts, one who set out to change history by convincing the electorate that he and his party wore the mantle of individual responsibility and personal accountability, the President has since been forced to take refuge in legalistic evasions, while his defenders resort to the insulting mantra that ''everybody does it.''

The best evidence that everybody doesn't do it is the genuine outrage occasioned by the President's conduct and by the efforts of some White House surrogates to minimize its significance or savage his critics.

The question confronting us, then is not whether the President has done wrong, but rather, what is an appropriate form of punishment for his wrongdoing. A simple apology is inadequate, and a fine would trivialize his misconduct by treating it as a mere question of monetary restitution.

At the same time, the President is not the only one who stands before the bar of judgment. It has been said that Washington is a town of marble and mud. Often in these past few months it has seemed that we were all in danger of sinking into the mire.

Twenty-five years after leaving it, I still consider myself a man of the House. I never forget that my elevation to the Presidency came about through Congressional as well as constitutional mandate. My years in the White House were devoted to restoring public confidence in institutions of popular governance. Now as then, I care more about preserving respect for those institutions than I do about the fate of any individual temporarily entrusted with office.

This is why I think the time has come to pause and consider the long-term consequences of removing this President from office based on the evidence at hand. The President's hairsplitting legalisms, objectionable as they may be, are but the foretaste of a protracted and increasingly divisive debate over those deliberately imprecise words ''high crimes and misdemeanors.'' The Framers, after all, dealt in eternal truths, not glossy deceit.

Moving with dispatch, the House Judiciary Committee should be able to conclude a preliminary inquiry into possible grounds for impeachment before the end of the year. Once that process is completed, and barring unexpected new revelations, the full House might then consider the following resolution to the crisis.

Each year it is customary for a President to journey down Pennsylvania Avenue and appear before a joint session of Congress to deliver his State of the Union address. One of the binding rituals of our democracy, it takes on added grandeur from its surroundings—there, in that chamber where so much of the American story has been written, and where the ghosts of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower call succeeding generations to account.

Imagine a very different kind of Presidential appearance in the closing days of this year, not at the rostrum familiar to viewers from moments of triumph, but in the well of the House. Imagine a President receiving not an ovation from the people's representatives, but a harshly worded rebuke as rendered by members of both parties. I emphasize: this would be a rebuke, not a rebuttal by the President.

On the contrary, by his appearance the President would accept full responsibility for his actions, as well as for his subsequent efforts to delay or impede the investigation of them. No spinning, no semantics, no evasiveness or blaming others for his plight.

Let all this be done without partisan exploitation or mean-spiritedness. Let it be dignified, honest and, above all, cleansing. The result, I believe, would be the first moment of majesty in an otherwise squalid year.

Anyone who confuses this scenario with a slap on the wrist, or a censure written in disappearing ink, underestimates the historic impact of such a pronouncement. Nor should anyone forget the power of television to foster indelible images in the national memory—not unlike what happened on the solemn August noontime in 1974 when I stood in the East Room and declared our long national nightmare to be over.

At 85, I have no general personal or political agenda, nor do I have any interest in ''rescuing'' Bill Clinton. But I do care, passionately, about rescuing the country I love from further turmoil or uncertainty.

More than a way out of the current mess, most Americans want a way up to something better. In the midst of a far graver national crisis, Lincoln observed, ''The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion.'' We should remember those words in the days ahead. Better yet, we should be guided by them.—Gerald R. Ford, the 38th President of the United States, was a Republican member of the House of Representatives from 1949 to 1973.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE), an able member of our Committee on the Judiciary who was working until midnight on the floor.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding me this time, and I thank my democratic colleagues for the convictions they have shared with America today and for helping them understand this most somber challenge and the high constitutional that we may have.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, truth matters, but the Constitution also matters. The President's behavior was reprehensible, outrageous, and disappointing. But as George Mason indicated, impeachable offenses are those dangerous and great offenses against the Constitution. They constitute a subversion of the Constitution.

Members gathered in 1974 and refused to impeach Richard Nixon on the personal charge of tax evasion. It must be that we understand what these constitutional standards are for impeachment high crimes and misdemeanors—would that be private sexual acts—it appears not.

Mr. Speaker, I wish in my Republican friends' attempt to explain to the American people that they stand by the Constitution that they would have implored their own counsel, Mr. Shippers, and, of course, Mr. Starr, not to hide the truth, for the presentations made by both men did not forthrightly acknowledge that Monica Lewinsky said, ''No one ever asked me to lie and I was never promised a job for my silence.'' I am concerned about this uneven presenting of the facts.

Democrats do not want a cover-up. We simply want to have an inquiry that is fair, that is expeditious, and is not open-ended and is not a fishing expedition.

What is perjury? Perjury is lying; however perjury must be proven. Sev-

eral defenses if raised would disprove lying—such truth, or whether the proponent thought he or she was telling the truth, and materiality. My friends on the other side of the aisle are rushing to judgment. But I am reminded of the words of Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, ''It is reason and not passion which must guide our deliberations, guide our debate, and guide our decision.'' We must proceed deliberately—not eager to accuse without the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues, to let reason guide us. And then let me say to my constituents and those who face a moral dilemma, I have been in churches in my district, they believe in redemption. And, yes, the President has sinned. But those of you who want to rise and cast the first stone, my question is: Who has not sinned?

And whatever we do today, those of us who have received death threats in our office, attacks against our children because of the hysteria that has been created by this Congress, I simply ask that we give this proceeding a chance to be fair, to act judiciously, and to follow the Constitution.

Lastly, might I say I believe that we will survive this together as a Nation and we will do this if we let constitutional principals guide us for Isaiah 40:31 says, ''They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings as eagles and they shall walk and not be faint.''

Mr. Speaker, I will stand for the preservation of the Constitution.

It is fate that has put us all here today.

But history will reflect—and tell the story of how we acted today—whether or not the Constitution matters. Truth does matter, but the Constitution dictates that impeachable offenses be grounded in attempts to subvert the Constitution. I am supporting the democratic amendment today that focuses our review, establishes the constitutional standards, and allows us to bring this inquiry to closure by the end of the year.

Truth matters and the Constitution matters. The President is not above the law, however, neither is he beneath the law. We need to act with reason, not fury, harmony not acrimony, with deliberation, not recklessness, with constitutional discharge, and not with opinion, and speculation with justice and fairness and not injustice and unfairness.

Mr. Speaker, in November of 1992 President William Jefferson Clinton was elected President of the United States by focusing on the economy and using the slogan ''It's the Economy Stupid.'' I come here today with mixed feelings. We come here today not to focus on the economy, but the Constitution. It's the Constitution that matters!

Article II, Section IV states that,

> the President . . . shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

It's the Constitution that matters! The Framers of our Constitution set the standard. George Mason, one of the Framers, stated that ''high crimes and misdemeanors'' refers to Presidential actions that are ''great and dangerous offenses'' to attempt to subvert the Constitution.'' The noted legal scholar from Yale University Professor, Charles Black, writes in his Impeachment Handbook that,

> In the English practice from which the Framers borrowed the phrase, ''High Crimes and Misdemeanors'' . . . was intended to redress public offenses committed by public officials in violation of the public trust and duties. It was designed to be justified for the gravest wrongs—offenses against the Constitution itself.

This is our standard. It is clear that while we have no conduct or allegations showing the President to have committed either treason or bribery, we must focus our attention on two questions. One, what is a ''high crime and misdemeanor or an impeachable offense?, and two, did the President of the United States commit any high crimes and misdemeanors or an impeachable offense? Those are the questions, and it is up to the Congress to find the answers.

We are at this point today because the President of the United States had an affair with a White House intern and he didn't want anyone to know about it, and that was wrong. However, what we have heard or seen thus far does not set out a prima facie case for impeachment.

On the floor for consideration today is a Republican ''privileged resolution'' on the question to launch an impeachment inquiry ''to investigate fully and completely whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach the President.'' There are no limits to their investigation and no establishment of the necessary constitutional standards.

Twenty-five years ago, this committee undertook the constitutional task of considering the impeachment of President Nixon. The process was painstaking, careful, and deliberative, and both the Nation and the world were reassured that America's 200 year-old Constitution worked.

Impeachment is final, nonappealable without further remedy, a complete rejection of the people's will and thereby, I believe it must be done fully beyond a doubt and without rancor or vengeance—complying with every woven thread of the Constitution. Today, by contrast, the world and the American people have been alternatively puzzled, confused, and appalled by the reckless media circus our automatic dumping of documents has produced.

On July 24, 1974, the House Judiciary Committee had a meeting to consider the Impeachment of President Richard Nixon. One of my predecessors of the 18th Congressional District of Texas, the late, great, Barbara Jordan said that,

> My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution.

So I, like my predecessor come not to subvert or destroy the Constitution, but to uphold it.

I am fully aware like most of my colleagues, that this privileged resolution only allows for a 10-minute motion to recommit, and not the regular full time allotted to consider a Democratic amendment. In order for this process to be fair and balanced and for the American people to truly hear both sides of this debate the House should waive House Rule IX, and allow the Democratic amendment to be considered, for a certain designated time. The Republicans refused that request.

While the Republican resolution does not have a time certain for the inquiry to end, the Democratic amendment calls for the Judiciary Committee to make a full recommendation to the House concerning Articles of Impeachment by no later than December 31, 1998. This is a compromise. There must be fairness and balance. The Democrats have also yielded on the provision which allows the House to consider other pertinent matters, as long as it is referred by the Independent Counsel, and not arbitrarily decided by Congress. This impeachment inquiry must be limited in scope and have a time certain. On February 6, 1974, Congressman Hutchinson, then the ranking Republican on the committee spoke on the floor of the House about the Watergate inquiry and said,

> The resolution before you carries no cutoff date. Although charges have raged in the media there has yet to be demonstrated any evidence of impeachable conduct. Therefore, if by the end of April no such evidence has been produced, the committee should so report to the House and end its labors.

The American people have spoken and they have said that this has gone on too long. This can not be an endless process. There must be time certain or the House should ''end its labors.''

So far what we have in Congress is the word of one man, an Independent Counsel who is not duly elected by the people. We have convoluted facts, inconsistent stories and versions, possible illegal tape recordings, but no real hard evidence.

In Act V of Macbeth, William Shakespeare writes,

> Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player That struts and frets his hour upon the stage, And then is heard no more; it is a tale Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, Signifying nothing.

That's what we have so far Mr. Speaker. We have fury, but no facts, and a tale told by a nonelected official that is full of allegations, not yet fact signifying anything. As the Watergate Committee's February 1974 Staff Report explained, ''In an impeachment proceeding a President is called to account for abusing powers that only a President possesses.'' In Watergate, as in all prior impeachments, the allegations concerned official misconduct that threatened to subvert the constitutional order or balance, not private misbehavior. Impeachment is not a personal punishment. In all of American history, no official has been impeached for misbehavior unrelated to his official responsibilities. I make no attempt to excuse the President's behavior, but as we vote on whether to launch a full scale impeachment inquiry, I admonish my colleagues that we must adhere to the constitution and the writings of the Framers. It's the Constitution that matters!

As James Wilson explained in the Pennsylvania ratification convention: ''far from being above the laws, [the President] is amenable to them in this private character as [a] citizen, and in his public character by impeachment.'' The Constitution imposes a grave and serious responsibility on us to protect the fabric of the Constitution. To perform our job requires that we investigate the facts thoroughly before we begin dealing with what our predecessors called ''delicate issues of basic constitutional

law.'' We must avoid prejudging the issues or turning this solemn duty into another forum for partisan wrangling. The Republican resolution on the floor today, which may result in the House acting without all the facts, weakens the foundation of the Constitution.

The former Congressman and now a renowned Georgetown Law Professor, Father Drinan, who served on the House Judiciary Committee during the Watergate Impeachment hearings stated that,

> There is no such thing as a Democratic or Republican approach to the allegation of impeachment, The House of Representatives is now involved in a proceeding which was described by George Mason [a Founding Father] as the Constitution providing for the regular punishment of the executive when his misconduct should deserve it'' but also ''for his honorable acquittal when he should be unjustly accused.

It was George Washington, the first President of the United States who said in his Farewell Address on September 17, 1796, ''Let me now . . . warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party.''

This should be a nonpartisan debate, and a constitutional debate. We need to act with reason, not fury, harmony not acrimony, with deliberation . . . not recklessness, with constitutional discharge, and not with opinions and speculation, with justice and fairness, and not injustice and unfairness.

I hope my colleagues will allow for full consideration and debate of the Democratic amendment which is focused and fair. I leave you with the words of Martin Luther King, who said, ''Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere . . . whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.'' It's the Constitution that matters Mr. Speaker, and I hope today it will rule.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), a distinguished member of the committee.

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, others continue to argue or continue to imply that this inquiry is only about a personal relationship, but that is like saying Watergate was only about picking a lock or that the Boston Tea Party was only about tea.

During a similar investigation of President Nixon 24 years ago, there was little focus on the burglary. The Committee on the Judiciary and the special prosecutor rightly wanted to know, as we should today, whether the President lied to the American people, obstructed justice or abused his office.

While some try to describe this scandal as private, the President's own Attorney General found that there existed credible evidence of criminal wrongdoing.

This is not a decision to go forward with an inquiry into a personal relationship. It is about examining the most public of relationships, between a witness and the courts, between the President and the American people.

It is about respect for the law, respect for the office of the presidency, respect for the American people, respect for the officers of the Court, respect for women and ultimately about self-respect.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in passionate objection and opposition to the resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Hyde resolution, and in doing so point out the inconsistency of the Republican majority. At the start of this Congress, the Republican majority gave you, Mr. Speaker, the highest honor this House can bestow: The speakership. For the freshman Republicans, this was the first vote that they cast in this House. The Republican majority did this after you, Mr. Speaker, were charged with and admitted to lying under oath to the Ethics Committee about the conduct of your political affairs.

How inconsistent then, Mr. Speaker, for this same Republican majority to move to an impeachment inquiry of the President for lying about his personal life. Our Republican majority have said lying under oath is a dagger in the heart of the legal system. We all agree that lying is wrong, but why the double standard?

I urge my colleagues to reject this Republican double standard which exalts the Speaker and moves to impeach the President. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Hyde resolution.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the views expressed by the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and also by those expressed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

I am proud that my Republican colleagues have spent more than 5 times as much time reviewing the Starr referral material than my Democratic colleagues.

This is a solemn occasion and I feel the full weight of the responsibility that we are assuming today.

Some would trivialize this debate by giving it the name of a young intern or by referring to other important matters that face the Nation. They know that this is or they should know that this is inappropriate. Americans want this matter brought to closure. That can only occur if we fully determine the facts, place those facts in the context of the law and weigh the proper response that will preserve the integrity of the office of the presidency and the integrity of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I pledge to work diligently to move this matter forward.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Hyde resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Democratic alternative and in opposition to the open-ended Republican resolution of inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, the question of impeaching a sitting President has only come before the House of Representatives three times in our nation's history. There's a very good reason this has happened so seldom. Our nation's founders deliberately set very high standards for impeachment in order to spare the nation the trauma of such an inherently divisive debate and to maintain a strong and independent Presidency. At a time like this, we all have a responsibility to rise above party politics and short term political considerations. We are not just debating the fate of this President. We are setting precedents that will have a profound and long-lasting effect on our constitutional system of government.

The issue before the House today is whether we will initiate a lengthy and open-ended impeachment inquiry that will paralyze our government and throw this nation into a prolonged constitutional crisis, or whether we will demand a focused and speedy resolution of this matter. After carefully considering the evidence so far produced by Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr, I have concluded that the nation's interests are best served by an impeachment inquiry that is thorough, but focused—comprehensive, but promptly concluded.

This debate is already preventing Congress from addressing important issues facing the nation—including issues like the future of Social Security, health care reform and improving our educational system. There is no profit to the people of the United States in a drawn-out impeachment debate that could go on for another year or more. We have the information we need to conclude this matter by the end of this year. The Republican leadership should work with Democratic leaders to make that happen.

President Clinton's behavior has been outrageous, reckless and morally offensive. He flatly lied to the American people and may have committed perjury in a civil lawsuit. Mr. Starr also alleges that the President obstructed justice and otherwise abused his office.

Reasonable people can differ over whether these charges—if true—constitute the kind of offenses that warrant the national trauma of impeachment. For that reason, if for no other, I believe the Judiciary Committee should consider the evidence brought forward by the Independent Counsel, as well as any new evidence he sees fit to refer to us, and decide

without delay whether to forward articles of impeachment to the House. But I strongly disagree with the delay tactics and the blatantly unfair and partisan approach adopted by Republican leaders—a strategy aimed more at improving their party's election prospects than at promoting the national interest.

Impeachment of a President is not a matter for Congress to take lightly or use for narrow partisan purposes. By its very nature, impeachment repudiates the will of the people as expressed in a popular election. it severely undermines the separation of powers, which is at the core of our system of government. And in the long term, it would weaken not only the office of the President, but the nation's strength and prestige in international affairs.

For those reasons and others, I oppose the Republican leadership's drawn-out and open-ended impeachment inquiry proposal and will vote today in favor of the alternative: a prompt and focused impeachment inquiry aimed at resolving this crisis and putting these issues behind us, one way or another.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), my dear friend.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Hyde amendment.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in 1789, the Founding Fathers wrote a Constitution designed to create a stable government. They established a democracy of the people—not a parliamentary democracy—because they did not want a government that would change whenever the executive fell into disfavor with the majority party. The Founding Fathers wanted a government of laws, not people, so they made only one option available to change the chief executive outside of an election by the people—impeachment. Impeachment was prescribed only in unique and extraordinary circumstances.

The impeachment process was vaguely outlined in the Constitution and the established criteria are very few. Article II, Section 4 says that the President, ''Shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.'' Impeachment does not require criminal acts. In fact, the House Report on the Constitutional Grounds of Presidential Impeachment states, ''the emphasis has been on the significant effects of the conduct—undermining the integrity of the office, disregard of constitutional duties and oath of office, arrogation of power, abuse of the governmental process, adverse impact on the system of government.'' The bar was set high so that impeachment would be neither casual nor easy for fear that we would undermine the stability of the office. Alexander Hamilton summed up the dangers of impeachment by saying, ''there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties, than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt.''

Hamilton's warning seems prophetic today. Aside from its partisan nature, the situation before us is quite unusual. It is the first time an Independent Counsel has presented findings to the Congress for determination of the need for an impeachment process. Secondly, the House of Representatives undermined the process when they ignored the precedents which have been followed in the evaluation and released large volumes of testimony and documents collected in the grand jury process to not only the Congress but to the world at large.

This has allowed the full membership of the House of Representatives and the public to come to conclusions before the process of impeachment has begun. The polls would suggest that the public does not favor removing the President from office but it is less clear what they feel is an adequate sanction.

Today, the members of the House will be confronted with the question of whether or not an impeachment inquiry should begin. I will vote against an inquiry for the following reason:

The evidence presented to the Congress by Mr. Starr does not support the charge of an impeachable offense. When all is said and done, the President made some false statements under oath about a sexual relationship and lied to many people about that relationship. While I in no way condone the President's behavior, I have concluded that it requires no further investigation and does not support impeachment.

The framers of the Constitution did not anticipate litigation against a president in a sexual harassment case or investigation by an independent counsel. The framers limited impeachment to the kinds of improprieties—treason, bribery, and the like—that threatened the nation for the benefit of the individual. We have no such case before us. His actions, while totally unacceptable, do not rise to the level of a high crime or misdemeanor. The President's actions do not threaten our ability to act decisively in the world of politics for the benefit of all Americans, sadly, the House of Representative's actions do.

[From the National Law Journal, Oct. 5, 1998]

TOP PROFS: NOT ENOUGH TO IMPEACH

NLJ 'JURY' OF 12 CON-LAW EXPERTS WEIGHS EVIDENCE

(By Harvey Berkman)

ON A 'JURY' OF 12 constitutional law professors, all but two told The National Law Journal that, from a constitutional standpoint, President Clinton should not be impeached for the things Independent Counsel Kenneth W. Starr claims he did.

Some of the scholars call the question a close one, but most suggest that it is not; they warn that impeaching William Jefferson Clinton for the sin he admits or the crimes he denies would flout the Founding Fathers' intentions.

''On the charges as we now have them, assuming there is no additional report [from Mr. Starr], impeaching the president would probably be unconstitutional,'' asserts Cass R. Sunstein, co-author of a treatise on constitutional law, who teaches at the University of Chicago Law School.

The first reason for this conclusion is that the one charge indisputably encompassed by the concept of impeachment—abuse of power—stands on the weakest argument and evidence.

''The allegations that invoking privileges and otherwise using the judicial system to shield information . . . is an abuse of power that should lead to impeachment and removal from office is not only frivolous, but also dangerous,'' says Laurence H. Tribe, of Harvard Law School.

The second reason is that the Starr allegation for which the evidence is disturbingly strong—perjury—stems directly from acts the Founders would have considered personal, not governmental, and so is not the sort of issue they intended to allow Congress to cite to remove a president from office.

NO 'LARGE-SCALE INFIDELITY'

Says Professor Sunstein, ''Even collectively, the allegations don't constitute the kind of violation of loyalty to the United States or large-scale infidelity to the Constitution that would justify impeachment, given the Framers' decision that impeachment should follow only from treason, bribery or other like offenses . . . What we have in the worst case here is a pattern of lying to cover up a sexual relationship, which is very far from what the Framers thought were grounds for getting rid of a president.''

Douglas W. Kmiec, who spent four years in the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel and now teaches at Notre Dame Law School, agrees: ''The fundamental point is the one that Hamilton makes in Federalist 65: Impeachment is really a remedy for the republic; it is not intended as personal punishment for a crime.

''There's no question that William Jefferson Clinton has engaged in enormous personal misconduct and to some degree has exhibited disregard for the public interest in doing so, he says. But does that mean that it is gross neglect—gross in the sense of being measured not by whether we have to remove the children from the room when the president's video is playing, but by whether [alleged terrorist Osama] bin Laden is now not being properly monitored or budget agreements aren't being made?''

Adds Prof. John E. Nowak, of the University of Illinois College of Law, the impeachment clause was intended ''to protect political stability in this country, rather than move us toward a parliamentary system whereby the dominant legislative party can decide that the person running the country is a bad person and get rid of him.'' Mr. Nowak co-authored a constitutional law hornbook and a multivolume treatise with fellow Illinois professor Ronald Rotunda, with whom he does not discuss these matters because Professor Rotunda is an adviser to Mr. Starr.

''It seems hard to believe that anything in the report . . . could constitute grounds for an impeachment on other than purely political grounds.'' Professor Nowak says. ''If false statements by the president to other members of the executive branch are the equivalent of a true misuse of office . . . I would think that the prevailing legislative party at any time in our history when the president was of a different party could have cooked up . . . ways that he had misused the office.''

And that, says Prof. A.E. Dick Howard, who has been teaching constitutional law and history for 30 years, would be a step in a direction the Founders never intended to go.

''The Framers started from a separation-of-powers basis and created a presidential system, not a parliamentary system, and they meant for it to be difficult for Congress to remove a president—not impossible, but difficult,'' says Professor Howard, of the University of Virginia School of Law. ''We risk diluting that historical meaning if we permit a liberal reading of the impeachment power—which is to say: If in doubt, you don't impeach.''

Many of the scholars point to the White House's acquisition of FBI files on Republicans as an example of something that could warrant the Clintons' early return to Little Rock—but only if it were proved that these files were acquired intentionally and malevolently misused. The reason that would be

grounds for impeachment, while his activities surrounding Monica Lewinsky would not, the professors say, is that misuse of FBI files would implicate Mr. Clinton's powers as president. But if Mr. Starr has found any such evidence, he has not sent it to Congress, which he is statutorily bound to do.

One professor who believes there is no doubt that President Clinton's behavior in the Lewinsky matter merits his impeachment is John O. McGinnis, who teaches at Yeshiva University, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law. ''I don't think we want a parliamentary system, although I would point out that it's not as though we're really going to have a change in power. If Clinton is removed there will be Gore, sort of a policy clone of Clinton. A parliamentary system suggests a change in party power. That fear is somewhat overblown.''

Professor McGinnis considers the reasons for impeachment obvious. ''I don't think the Constitution cares one whit what sort of incident [the alleged felonies] come from,'' he says. ''The question is, 'Can you have a perjurer and someone who obstructs justice as president?' And it seems to me self-evident that you cannot. The whole structure of our country depends on giving honest testimony under law. That's the glue of the rule of law. You can go back to Plato, who talks about the crucial-ness of oaths in a republic. It's why perjury and obstruction of justice are such dangerous crimes.''

This argument has some force, says Professor Kmiec, but the public is hesitant to impeach in this case because of a feeling that ''the entire process started illegitimately, that the independent counsel statute is flawed and that the referral in this case was even more flawed, in that it was done somewhat hastily by the attorney general.''

Jesse H. Choper, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley School of Law (Boalt Hall) and co-author of a con-law casebook now in its seventh edition, agrees that perjury, committed for any reason, can count as an impeachable offense. ''The language says 'high crimes and misdemeanor.' and [perjury] is a felony, so my view is that it comes within the [constitutional] language. But whether we ought to throw a president out of office because he lied under oath in order to cover up an adulterous affair . . . my judgment as a citizen would be that it's not enough.''

A JUDGE WOULD BE IMPEACHED

Many of the professors say Mr. Clinton would almost certainly be impeached for precisely what he has done, were he a judge rather than the president. That double standard, they say, is contemplated by the Constitution in a roundabout way. Says Professor Kmeic, ''The places where personal misbehavior is raised have entirely been in the context of judicial officers. There is a healthy amount of scholarship that suggests that one of the things true about judicial impeachments (which is not true of executive impeachments) is the additional phraseology saying that judges serve in times of good behavior. The counterargument is that there is only one impeachment clause, applying to executive and judicial alike. But . . . our history is that allegations of profanity and drunkenness, gross personal misbehavior, have come up only in the judicial context.''

In addition to history, there is another reason for making it harder to impeach presidents, says Akhil Reed Amar, who teaches constitutional law at Yale Law School and who recently published a book on the Bill of Rights: ''When you impeach a judge, you're not undoing a national election . . . The questions to ask is whether [President Clinton's] misconduct is so serious and malignant as to justify undoing a national election, canceling the votes of millions and putting the nation through a severe trauma.''

THEY'RE UNCOMFORTABLE

None of these arguments, however, is to suggest that the professors are comfortable with what they believe the president may well be doing: persistently repeating a single, essential lie—that his encounters did not meet the definition of sexual relations at his Paula Jones deposition. Mr. Clinton admits that this definition means he could never have touched any part of her body with the intent to inflame or satiate her desire. It is an assertion that clashes not only with Ms. Lewinsky's recounting of her White House trysts to friends, erstwile friends and the grand jury, but also with human nature.

''That's one of the two things that trouble me most about his testimony—that he continues to insist on the quite implausible proposition [of] 'Look, Ma, no hands,' which is quite inconsistent with Monica Lewinsky's testimony, and that he's doing that in what appears to be quite a calculated way,'' Professor Tribe laments. ''But I take some solace in the fact that [a criminal prosecution of perjury] awaits him when he leaves office.''

Professor Amar agrees that ''whatever . . . crimes he may have committed, he'll have to answer for it when he leaves office, and that is the punishment that will fit his crime.''

Also disturbing to Professor Tribe is the president's apparent comfort with a peculiar concept of what it means to tell the truth, a concept the professor describes as ''It may be deceptive, but if you can show it's true under a magnifying glass tilted at a certain angle, you're OK.''

But even that distortion, he believes, does not reach the high bar the Founders set for imposing on presidents the political equivalent of capital punishment.

''It would be a disastrous precedent to say that when one's concept of truth makes it harder for people to trust you, that that fuzzy fact is enough to say there has been impeachable conduct,'' Professor Tribe says. ''That would move us very dramatically toward a parliamentary system. Whether someone is trustworthy is very much in the eye of the beholder. The concept of truth revealed in his testimony makes it much harder to have confidence in him, but the impeachment process cannot be equated with a vote of no confidence without moving us much closer to a parliamentary system.''

Professor Kmiec does suggest that something stronger than simple ''no confidence'' might form the possible basis for impeachment. Call it ''no confidence at all.'' ''It is possible that one could come to the conclusion that the president's credibility is so destroyed that he'd have difficulty functioning as an effective president,'' Professor Kmiec says, ''But the public doesn't seem to think so, and I don't know that foreign leaders think so,'' given the standing ovation Mr. Clinton received at the United Nations.

In the end, Professor Howard says that he opposes impeachment under these conditions not only because the past suggests it is inappropriate, but also because of the dangerous precedent it would set. ''Starting with the Supreme Court's devastatingly unfortunate and totally misconceived opinion [in Clinton v. Jones, which allowed Ms. Jones's suit to proceed against the president while he was still in office], this whole controversy has played out in a way that makes it possible for every future president to be harassed at every turn by his political enemies,'' Professor Howard warns. ''To draw fine lines and say that any instance of stepping across that line becomes impeachable invites a president's enemies to lay snares at every turn in the path. I'm not sure we want a system that works that way.''

The other ''jurors'' on this panel of constitutional law professors were:

The one essentially abstaining ''juror'': Michael J. Gerhardt, of the College of William and Mary, Marshall-Wythe School of Law.

Douglas Laycock, of The University of Texas School of Law.

Thomas O. Sargentich, co-director of the program on law and government at American University, Washington College of Law.

Suzanna A. Sherry, professor at the University of Minnesota Law School.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1853, CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. Goodling submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act:

CONFERENCE REPORT (105–800)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1853), to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Amendments of 1998''.

(b) AMENDMENT.—The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

''(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the 'Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998.

''(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows: