both for the service he has given in dentistry and his commitment to civic concerns. He has taken on responsibilities as the President of the Burbank Chapter of the American Cancer Society, as a member of the Burbank Chamber of Commerce, and as a Member of the Palos Gardens Civic Association.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud Dr. Lamacki on behalf of the many people he has treated and befriended in his years of practicing dentistry. I would like to extend my very best wishes for continued success and happiness in retirement and in the years to come.

HONORING ROBIN HUNTER-BUSKEY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1998

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the skill and achievements of Robin Hunter-Buskey. Her contribution to the health care community is incomparable.

A native New York, Robin attended the State University of New York at Stoney Brook, where she completed the Physical Therapy and Physicians Assistant Programs. She has practiced in a variety of healthcare settings including: HomeCare, Emergency Medicine, OB/GYN, Substance Abuse, infectious Disease, Rehabilitation, Internal Medicine and Geriatrics. In her current role, Robin brings her urban medicine experience into a growing suburban community.

As a dedicated member of various professional organizations, Robin has been a consultant to the New York State Board for Physical Therapy and a public member of the Board for Professional Medical Conduct. She is a clinical instructor and mentor to physician assistant students, medical students and others interested in the health professions. Also, Robin has given countless hours toward ensuring increased minority recruitment and retention in health professional programs. Though Ms. Hunter-Buskey has moved to North Carolina, I know her work in the community will always be appreciated.

As a mother of two, Veronica and Bennett, family involvement and support has given deeper meaning to Robin's commitment to helping others. Raising a developmental challenged child has helped her provide motivation for others.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Robin Hunter-Buskey for all of her achievements, for being a woman who dares to be different, and for showing young women everywhere that they can do and accomplish anything.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE VACANCIES CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1998''

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1998

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the ''Department of Justice Vacancies Clarification Act of 1998.'' This legislation will end the practice of appointing acting personnel for indefinite periods of time to important jobs in the Department of Justice. For too long, the Department of Justice has used this method to evade the political accountability provided by the Senate confirmation process.

In 1988, Congress reenacted the Vacancies Act to prevent the filling of Executive Branch positions with acting personnel for long periods. Generally speaking, the Vacancies Act says that a person may serve as an acting head of an office for no more than 120 days. 5 U.S.C. §3348. (These times are tolled while a nomination is pending or when Congress has adjourned sine die.)

Most organic statutes for government departments have language that says the head of the agency may delegate his functions to anyone within the Department. See, e.g., 28 U.S.C. §§509–10 (language for the Department of Justice). Both Democrats and Republicans in the Executive Branch have interpreted this kind of language to be an alternative method of filling vacancies that is not subject to the 120-day period provided in the Vacancies Act. That interpretation effectively nullifies the Vacancies Act.

The Department of Justice Vacancies Clarification Act of 1998 would make it clear that the general language in the Department of Justice statute is not intended to override the Vacancies Act and that the Vacancies Act is the only method for filling vacancies in the Department of Justice.

In addition, to insure that the language is not ignored, the Act provides that when any acting person serves beyond the time provided in the Vacancies Act, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will step in to appoint someone to fill the job until someone is nominated and confirmed. The Court could not appoint a person who had previously served as an acting head for that particular vacancy or a person who was nominated, but did not get confirmed. This is similar to language that already exists with respect to United States Attorney positions. 28 U.S.C. §546. My intent is not so much that the Court ought to make such appointments, but to give the Executive Branch an incentive not to let the time lapse.

I believe that this legislation will clarify the law, vindicate our system of checks and balances, and be to the advantage of all concerned. I hope that all of my colleagues will support it.

WHY IT MATTERS

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1998

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those who missed it, I would like to bring an opinion piece from the March 6th Wall Street Journal to the attention of my colleagues. William J. Bennett has once again provided an insightful analysis on recent developments in the White House that demands the consideration of Congress and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following column by Mr. Bennett to the attention of all interested parties.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 1998]

WHY IT MATTERS

(By William J. Bennett)

In the matter of Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky, almost everything points to the conclusion that something unseemly happened: the tapes; Ms. Lewinsky's 37 visits to the White House; Mr. Clinton's morning-after-the-deposition meeting with his secretary, Betty Currie; the gifts; the talking points; Vernon Jordan's many activities; the job offer from United Nations Ambassador Bill Richardson; the president's stonewalling; his initial, unconvincing denial; his refusal to explain what happened; Press Secretary Mike McCurry's remark that the relationship is probably ''very complicated''; and White House surrogates' declaration of ''war'' against the independent counsel.

Nevertheless, many Americans think the scandal—even if true—is either ''none of our business'' or not worth the effort to inquire about. This apparent indifference is surprising and unsettling. It is therefore important to respond to the most common arguments made by those who believe that a president's sexual involvement with a 21-year-old intern, and the ensuing suspected coverup, are essentially irrelevant to our national life:

We shouldn't be judgmental. At a recent speech before an organization of religious broadcasters, I criticized the president's unwillingness to explain what happened in the Lewinsky matter. A member of the audience took me to task for ''casting stones.'' I responded that it shows how far we have fallen that asking the president to account for possible adultery, lying to the public, perjury and obstruction of justice is regarded as akin to stoning. This is an example of what sociologist Alan Wolfe refers to as America's new ''Eleventh Commandment: Thou shalt not judge.''

LOST ITS WAY

Even the Rev. Billy Graham declared yesterday: ''I forgive him. . . . I know how hard it is, and especially a strong, vigorous, young man like he is; he has such a tremendous personality. I think the ladies just go wild over him.'' Mr. Graham, perhaps the nation's most admired religious figure, apparently is willing to shrug off both adultery and lying, without any public admission or apology on Mr. Clinton's part. This is what the theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer called ''cheap grace.''

All of us are in favor of tolerance and forgiveness. But the moral pendulum in America has swung too far in the direction of relativism. If a nation of free people can no longer make clear pronouncements on fundamental matters of right and wrong—for example, that a married, 50-year-old commander-in-chief ought not to have sexual relations with a young intern in his office and then lie about it—it has lost its way.

The problem is not with those who are withholding judgment until all the facts are in, but with the increasing number of people who want to avoid judgment altogether. For it is precisely the disposition and willingness to make judgments about things that matter that is a defining mark of a healthy democracy. In America we do not defer to kings, cardinals or aristocrats on matters of law and politics, civic conduct and moral standards. We rely instead on the people's capacity to make reasonable judgments based on moral principles. Our form of government requires of us not moral perfection but modest virtues, and adherence to some standards. How high should those standards be? Certainly higher than the behavior alleged in this case.