

Mr. President," came The Voice, trying in vain to suppress a chuckle. "I have vowed to speak the truth so I had no choice in the matter." Much laughter. They both knew who they were and why they were leaders. They were two warriors who had fought a hundred battles against each other. They knew the game, how it was played, no quarter given, no quarter asked in the public arena. But when the day was done, they sat around the campfire, as it were, to recount the details of the fight over a flagon of fine refreshment. They both knew that each needed the other, and the country needed them both. If they fumed and fussed, determined to wound and kill the other, no ultimate good would come of it. The land they served would be agitated and stunted by stalemate. They both understood the meaning of "duty" to the nation, and they knew that compromise was not an ignoble word.

The president would say, "Now, Everett, I need three Republican votes on my civil rights bill, and, dammit, you can get them." Dirksen would ponder that somberly, and then pull a sheaf of papers out of his inside pocket. "I have here, Mr. President, some potential nominees to the FCC, the ITC, the SEC" and so on through the catalog of acronyms wherein the nation's regulatory labors get done.

LBJ would sigh, and say, "Jack, take down the names and see if Mr. Hoover (J. Edgar) will certify them." Dirksen would smile broadly, sip his drink. LBJ would do the same. After more intimate joshing between them, Dirksen would depart. There was no mention of a deal. There was no formal commitment. But each knew the pact was struck. Each would redeem the unspoken pledges given. And there was no leakage to the press. Moreover, the warriors' code was intact. Neither gloated in a supposed triumph over the other.

By whatever mutations the gods of politics brew, there has to be a return to political civility, whose end result is to the nation's benefit. Neither LBJ nor Sen. Dirksen lost their honor or abandoned their crusades when they talked. Nor did they lose their bearings. For they knew such damage would diminish them both, and most of all the country, whose people they had by solemn oath sworn to serve, would be the loser. They did their duty.●

TRIBUTE TO THE STUDENTS OF MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize students from Milford High School in Milford, New Hampshire for their outstanding performance in the "We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution" program.

On May 1-3, 1999, more than 1200 students from across the United States will be in Washington, D.C., to compete in the national finals of the "We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution" program. I am proud to announce that the class from Milford High School will represent the state of New Hampshire in this national event. These young scholars have worked diligently to reach the national finals and through their experience have gained a deep knowledge and understanding of the fundamental principles and values of our constitutional democracy.

The "We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution" program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The three-day national competition is modeled after hearings in the United States Congress. These hearings consist of oral presentation by high school students before a panel of adult judges. The students testify as constitutional experts before a "congressional committee," that is, the panel of judges representing various regions of the country and a variety of appropriate professional fields. The student testimony is followed by a period of questioning during which the judges probe students for their depth of understanding and ability to apply their constitutional knowledge.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the "We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution" program has provided curricular materials at upper elementary, middle, and high school levels for more than 26.5 million students nationwide. Members of Congress and their staff enhance the program by discussing current constitutional issues with students and teachers and by participating in other educational activities.

The student team from Milford High School is currently conducting research and preparing for the upcoming national competition in Washington, D.C. As a former history teacher, I recognize the importance and value of this unique educational experience. I wish the students and their teacher, Mr. David Alcox, the best of luck at the "We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution" national finals. I look forward to greeting them when they visit Capitol Hill, and I am honored to represent them in the United States Senate.●

ST. PAUL'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF LANSING 150TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to St. Paul's Episcopal Church of Lansing, Michigan, and its members who are currently celebrating its 150th Anniversary. The congregation can be proud of the founding members' faith and devotion which brought about the organization of this church in 1849.

Members of St. Paul's Church met in Michigan's Capitol building for a decade until the continued growth of the congregation required that a separate building be constructed. Further growth necessitated the completion of a newer church in 1873, and again in 1914. As our country begins to rediscover the importance of family and personal values, the building of faith by St. Paul's Episcopal Church is of great significance to us all.

I extend my warmest regards and best wishes to all of the members of St.

Paul's congregation as they celebrate this great achievement.●

SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week the Senate, sitting as a court of impeachment, voted on Senator BYRD's motion to dismiss the articles of impeachment brought by the Managers from the House of Representatives. I voted in support of this motion, and would like to briefly state my position on this important question.

While the motion failed, it received the support of forty-four senators—eleven more votes than needed to acquit the President of the charges made by the Articles. Therefore, this vote demonstrates to a near certainty that there are insufficient votes to support the Managers' position that the President should be convicted.

This result comes as a surprise to no one—including most if not all of those who support the President's removal. These Articles should never have been presented to the Senate. The President's actions were undoubtedly reprehensible. They deserve condemnation and may warrant prosecution after he leaves office. But they do not warrant removal—a sanction unprecedented in our nation's history, and one that the Framers of our Constitution envisioned would be used in only the rarest of circumstances to protect the country.

The case presented by the Managers is fatally deficient in three respects:

First, the facts presented, even if viewed in the light most favorable to the Managers' case, do not allege conduct that meets the high standard laid out by the framers for the impeachment, conviction, and removal from office of a president.

Second, the articles as drafted are vague and contain multiple allegations—denying the President the fairness and due process that is the right of every American citizen, and depriving senators of the clarity that is essential to discharging their responsibility as triers of fact.

Third, the Managers have failed to present facts that meet their heavy burden of proving the allegations contained in the Articles.

Let me address these points in turn.

The conduct alleged by the Managers to be worthy of conviction arises out of a private, civil lawsuit and a private, consensual, yet improper relationship between the President and Ms. Monica Lewinsky. It is the President's conduct in that lawsuit and in that relationship that are the basis of the charges at issue here. No charges arise from his official conduct as President.

(It is worth noting that, with regard to the Jones matter, the Supreme Court itself considered the conduct alleged therein to be private. The Court ruled that, while the President may