

"As one of the authors of the original Independent Counsel Act, I never dreamed that a special prosecutor would be using his enormous powers to investigate accusations about a president's private (and legal) sexual conduct. Starr is manufacturing the circumstances in which criminal conduct may occur. . ."

Moreover the investigation and prosecution of Mr. Starr using methods short of due process has undermined the credibility of the fact-finding process itself. The President of the United States should be as protected by the Bill of Rights as any person, or else faith and confidence in our law will be seriously damaged.

Upon assuming office, President Clinton took an oath, as provided by the Constitution, that he would faithfully execute the Office of President and that he would preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution.

Since the president is elected by all the people to a four-year term of office, the framers made it very difficult for him to be removed from office. According to Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution, the president may only be removed from office upon impeachment and conviction for "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." The term "high crimes and misdemeanors" had a very clear meaning for the framers. It meant a serious abuse of the president's official power or a serious breach of the president's discharge of the official duties of office. Those duties are set forth in Article II, Sections 2 and 3 of the Constitution. The framers were acutely aware that abuse of the impeachment process by Congress would upset the balance of power between the three branches of American government if any president could be toppled at will by the Congress.

The Supreme Court determined in the Paula Jones case that a distinction must be drawn between incidents involving the president in his capacity as a private citizen and those occurring in the course of the exercise of his constitutional duties. Everything connected with Monica Lewinsky and Paula Jones involved the president as a private individual and had nothing whatsoever to do with the presidential office. As President Theodore Roosevelt cogently observed, "in the United States, no person can be above the law but no person can be below the law, either." The president must therefore be judged according to constitutional principles and the rule of law, nothing else.

There has been no suggestion that anything the independent counsel is investigating involves the president's constitutional duties. Unless the independent counsel has substantial evidence that President Clinton has violated his constitutional duties, Mr. Starr has no basis whatsoever for making a report to Congress suggesting that impeachment be contemplated. Any suggestion that the president could be impeached for conduct occurring as a private individual or because some members of Congress might dislike his character or image and consider him "unfit for office" is clearly contrary to the intent of the framers and the explicit language of the Constitution.

We must resist as vigorously and effectively as possible any effort by the independent counsel to rewrite the Constitution to serve a palpable political end. The ultimate sacrifice made by millions of men and women to preserve the integrity of the Constitution for more than 200 years requires nothing less.

There has been a tabloidization of the whole range of the American press and tele-

vision. In a full self-mesmerized frenzy on the possibilities of titillation, the constitutional requirements of due process in grand juries, investigations and impeachments have been ignored, and fairness has been subordinated to a persistent partisan political purpose. Trial by and for the sex-focused press has displaced decency, dignity, civility and respect. Unless the Constitution and rule of law genuinely prevail, the country will inexorably move to continual constitutional crises and indeed, disunity and disintegration. Only a citizenry aware of the Constitution's priorities can prevent the unraveling of the nation and preserve its sovereignty. Our Constitution will not survive the criminalization of the privacy of a president.

In a democratic non-totalitarian country that protects the liberty, privacy, and dignity of a person, there can be no crime of perjury for failing or refusing to answer question about sex, questions the government has no right to ask. As a 34-year veterans member of Congress, John Conyers of Michigan, devoted constitutionalist and Democratic leader of the House Judiciary Committee, put the question before Congress and the country: "The issue is not Mr. Clinton; the issue is to preserve, protect, and defend the rule of law and the integrity of the Constitution. Without law, there is tyranny and anarchy."

TRIBUTE TO CALVIN JERRY
POWELL

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1999

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and work of Corporal Calvin Jerry Powell. Corporal Powell, a member of the Jasper Police Department in Northern Florida, was killed in the line of duty in late September of this year. He lost his life after being hit almost head on during a high-speed car chase. Needless to say, his death has grieved the entire Jasper community.

Corporal Powell, 27, was a two year veteran of the department, and had been promoted to Corporal one month prior to his death. Jasper Police Chief Frank Osborn shared with me that Powell put himself through school to become an officer, and while he was only on the force for two years, he carried himself as though he was a ten year veteran. Corporal Powell loved his job and was very well liked by the entire force, he will be sorely missed.

There are many lessons we can take from the tragic and senseless loss of Corporal Powell. Police officers put their lives at risk every day in order to ensure our safety, security and peace of mind. When a death such as this occurs, particularly in a closely knit community like Jasper, it shakes us to the core. Each day, we need to reflect on the sacrifices made by our officers and truly appreciate just how vital the role of these brave men and women are to our own lives.

Mr. Speaker, we mourn the loss of Corporal Powell along with his family and the Jasper Community. Our prayers are with his wife and two children during this difficult time. He will be missed beyond any expression of words.

TICKET TO WORK AND WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the House passed a consolidated appropriations act funding a number of agencies for fiscal year 2000.

Among the legislative items attached to that measure was a provision imposing a moratorium on the Administration's organ allocation regulations. Under the legislation we passed earlier today, that moratorium extends for 42 days.

That moratorium is not a sufficient amount of time for Congress to complete its work in legislating changes in the National Organ Transplant Act.

Accordingly, the legislation we currently have under consideration, the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999, goes a step further. This legislation extends the moratorium an additional 90 days. I fully expect that President Clinton will sign the consolidated appropriations measure into law in the near future. When he does so, under the terms of that law, the first moratorium of 42 days will begin.

I further anticipate that the President will sign the Work Incentives legislation after he signs the appropriations bill. When he does so, it is my firm belief that H.R. 1180's 90-day moratorium will then begin. As the legislative language of the bill states: "The final rule entitled 'Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network', promulgated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on April 2, 1998 (63 Fed. Reg. 16295 et seq.) (relating to part 121 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations), together with the amendments to such rules promulgated on October 20, 1999 (64 Fed. Reg. 56649 et seq.) shall not become effective before the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act." As the Chairman of the Committee with exclusive jurisdiction of the matter, and the author of this provision, my legislative intent is that, when the Work Incentives legislation is signed into law, it will begin a new 90-day moratorium period.

In the unlikely event that President Clinton signs the consolidated appropriations measure after the Work Incentives measure, I also want to be clear about my legislation intent. Because Congress acted on the appropriations measure first, the Secretary of Health and Human Services should view the moratorium set forth in the Work Incentives measure as Congress' last statement. In other words, if the Work Incentives measure is signed after the appropriations bill, Congress' intent is that a 90-day moratorium remain in effect from the date of enactment of H.R. 1180.