

standing in the place of the voters who re-elected the President two years ago.

In this case, the prevailing public opposition to impeachment has particular relevance, for it provides substantial evidence that the President's misconduct, while harmful to his moral authority and his personal credibility, has not been so harmful as to shatter the public's faith in his ability to fulfill his Presidential duties and act in their interest. Nearly two-thirds of them say repeatedly that they approve of the job that President Clinton is doing and that they oppose his removal, which means that, though they are deeply disaffected by his personal behavior, they do not believe that he has lost his capacity to govern in the national interest.

In reaching my conclusion, I first had to determine that the request of the House Managers to bring witnesses to the floor would not add to the record and the arguments that have been made, or change my conclusion or the outcome of this trial, which most Senators and observers agree will not end in the President's removal. It is true that witnesses may add demeanor evidence, but they will subtract from the Senate's demeanor, and unnecessarily extend the trial for some time, preventing the Senate from returning to the other pressing business of the nation.

Am I content to have this trial end in the articles failing to receive the required two-thirds vote of the Senate for removal? The truth is that nothing about this terrible national experience leaves me comfortable. But an unequivocal, bipartisan statement of censure by Congress would, at least, fulfill our responsibility to our children and our posterity to speak to the common values the President has violated, and make clear what our expectations are for future Presidents. Such a censure would bring better closure to this demeaning and divisive episode, and help us begin to heal the injuries the President's misconduct and the impeachment process's partisanship have done to the American body politic, and to the soul of the nation.●

#### MOTION TO TAKE DEPOSITIONS OF WITNESSES IN COURT OF IMPEACHMENT OF WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, there is a lot about this impeachment process that is new and unfamiliar to all of us. That is all the more reason why we should allow ourselves to be guided by the Constitution and historical precedents in deciding how we proceed. The Constitution's requirement that the Senate "shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments" certainly suggests that the Senate will ordinarily do more than simply look at the record made by the House in deciding whether

to send us Articles of impeachment, and that has generally been the Senate's practice.

Moreover, the Senate sitting as a court of impeachment is charged with seeking the truth in this trial. If any Senators reasonably believe that hearing witnesses would assist in finding the truth, then I believe both the President and the House should have the opportunity to call witnesses. Based on the record before us and the arguments we have heard, it is clear that at least on some of the House's charges, there are factual issues in dispute that the witnesses whom this motion proposes to subpoena for depositions could help us resolve.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I support the motion to allow both sides to depose these three witnesses. I do not see why this limited discovery should in any way cause this matter to be drawn out for any extended period of time. Rather, I believe it can be conducted very expeditiously without in any way jeopardizing the Senate's ability to conduct other important legislative business.●

#### RCRA REFORM LEGISLATION

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for years the Administration has expressed a need for targeted legislation which will provide necessary, regulatory flexibility for successful cleanup goals of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has unsuccessfully tried several times to address those needs through regulatory reform. While those efforts have attempted to speed cleanup and make more rational requirements, these attempts have repeatedly been met with legal challenges. These challenges severely limit the Agency's ability to effectively address this concern. Furthermore, a General Accounting Office (GAO) study concluded that EPA cannot achieve comprehensive reform through the regulatory process. GAO also believes that such reform can best be achieved by revising the underlying law.

Indeed, my colleagues and I have been working with the Administration and stakeholders for several years to try to give EPA the flexibility it needs. We recognize that Americans are fed up with ineffective environmental programs that do little for cleanup. Americans want their hard-earned dollars used wisely and effectively.

RCRA's goals are very important. RCRA involves cleanup of properties contaminated with hazardous waste, at more than the 5000 sites. Therefore, the barriers to cleanup are a great concern. The GAO report echoes these concerns, noting that EPA believes that current RCRA requirements can lead parties to select cleanup remedies that are either too stringent or not stringent enough—given the risks posed by the wastes. Ul-

timately these requirements can discourage the cleanup of sites.

The current RCRA cleanup program potentially affects all state cleanups, including the cleanup of "brownfield sites." Brownfields are abandoned, idled, or under-used industrial and commercial facilities where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination. As Brownfield redevelopment activities have increased, it has come to our attention that the hazardous waste management and permitting requirements under RCRA either preclude the redevelopment of these properties altogether or significantly add to the cost and time of their redevelopment.

Late last year, EPA attempted once more to address the need for regulatory flexibility to speed effective RCRA cleanups. This new rule, called the Hazardous Waste Identification Rule, addresses several of the disincentives to clean up. We applaud the Agency for its efforts. Nonetheless, EPA notes with certainty that additional reform is needed.

The Administration is sending a clear message. RCRA reforms are desired. EPA will do what it can, and should be commended for their most recent effort. However, legislative reforms are needed this year.

I commend Senators CHAFEE, SMITH, LAUTENBERG, BAUCUS, and BREAUX for their past efforts to address this problem. I have given them my full support in their plans to definitively fix the problem and given certainty to recent agency actions. Thank you for your leadership in recognizing the need for action. This effort addresses a real need, focusing on expediting clean ups. This need can be readily met if we continue to work in a bipartisan manner.●

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, there are over 6000 contaminated sites across the country waiting to be cleaned up under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). These sites include active industrial facilities, unused urban lots well suited for redevelopment, and many other sites that have contaminated soil or groundwater. No one disputes that these sites should be cleaned up. But RCRA itself, and certain regulations implementing RCRA, are making it difficult—and unnecessarily costly—to get these sites cleaned up. As a result, cleanups at many sites are delayed for years and, in a number of cases, not performed at all. The waste remains in place, untreated and untouched.

This is an issue where legislative action can both improve the environment and save money. The Government Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report in late 1997 that identified three key requirements under RCRA that pose