

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 Stony 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.

Those who constantly invoke the sentiment of "Who are we to judge?" should consider the anarchy that would ensue if we adhered to this sentiment in, say, our courtrooms. What would happen if those sitting on a jury decided to be "nonjudgmental" about rapists and sexual harassers, embezzlers and tax cheats? Justice would be lost. Without being "judgmental," Americans would never have put an end to slavery, outlawed child labor, emancipated women or ushered in the civil-rights movement. Nor would we have mobilized against Nazism and communism.

Mr. Clinton himself put it well, in a judgment-laden 1996 proclamation he signed during National Character Week, which said that "individual character involves honoring and embracing certain core ethical values: honesty, respect, responsibility. . . . Parents must teach their children from the earliest age the difference between right and wrong. But we must all do our part."

A president's private behavior doesn't matter. In a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57% said that private character doesn't matter at all or matters only if it interferes with his ability to do the job. Of course, if Mr. Clinton did have sexual encounters with Ms. Lewinsky, it involves at least adultery and lying to the public—and probably lying under oath as well. In any event, the attempt to rigidly compartmentalize life in this way is divorced from the real world. A mother would not accept from her son the explanation that his drug habit doesn't matter because he did well on the Scholastic Assessment Test; a police commissioner should not dismiss the raw bigotry of a detective because he has a good arrest record.

Yet in the name of "compartmentalization," many now seem willing to accept raunchier behavior from our president than we would from any CEO, college professor or Army drill sergeant. Housing Secretary Andrew Cuomo put it this way: "Let's remember what's important here. The lives of the American people are more important than the personal life of the president." But Mr. Clinton is a laboratory test case of why private character is relevant. Prevarications typify his private and public life. A seamless web of deceit runs through the man and through his administration.

John Adams held a far different view than Mr. Cuomo does. Adams wrote that the people "have a right, an indisputable, unalienable, indefeasible, divine right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge; I mean, of the characters and conduct of their rulers. Rulers are no more than attorneys, agents, and trustees, for the people; and if the cause, the interest and trust, is insidiously betrayed, or wantonly trifled away, the people have a right to revoke the authority than they themselves have deputed."

To better understand the limits of the "private-public" argument, imagine the storm that would engulf a president who privately supported a whites-only membership policy in a country club. Most voters would rightly deem this private sentiment to be of intense public interest. Why, then, are we supposed to accept a man in the Oval Office whom many parents would not trust alone with their daughters?

The only thing that matters is the economy. "What we should be talking about is that we are going to have the first balanced budget in more than three decades," says one citizen, who voted against Mr. Clinton in 1996. "That's going to impact our children, not this sleaze that is masquerading as news." This sentiment reveals an arid and incomplete understanding of the presidency. More than any other person, the president

symbolizes America. He stands for us in the eyes of the world and of our children, who inevitably learn from his example. Whether or not Bill Clinton escapes impeachment, his legacy will be one of pervasive deceit, squandered trust, a reckless disregard for the truth, heightened cynicism and a nastier political culture.

A ROGUE IN OUR MIDST

This corruption matters a great deal. Even if the Dow Jones breaks 10000. Even if Americans get more day care. Even if the budget is balanced. It matters because lessons in corruption, particularly when they emanate from the highest office in the land, undermine our civic life. Children are watching, and if we expect them to take morality seriously, they must see adults take it seriously. As C.S. Lewis wrote: "We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honor and are shocked to find traitors in our midst."

Today we find not a traitor but a rogue in our midst. Of course, rogues have been with us forever, and the corruption of people in power is at least as old as the Scriptures. But in America today, more and more citizens seem to be complicit in that corruption. One worry of the Founders was that luxury and affluence might dull our moral sensibilities. The next few months will go a long way toward determining how strongly we believe in something we once revered as "our sacred honor."

HONORING JOYCE ARBERMAN

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 Joyce Arberman. Her contributions to our community are incomparable.

Ms. Arberman's service to the community spans almost two decades. She works closely with the Ladies of the Adult Retardate Center (LARC), a program which is nearest to her heart. Currently, she works to organize the Center's annual major fund raiser. Over the years, Ms. Arberman's efforts has lead to the raising of almost over a million dollars for LARC.

Currently, Ms. Arberman serves as State Committeewoman of the 39th Assembly District, a post she was elected to in 1984. She, along with Assemblyman Anthony Genovesi, are the leaders of the Thomas Jefferson Democratic Club in Brooklyn. Clearly, our district has only benefitted from her tireless efforts.

Ms. Arberman's family remains a source of strength for her. She has a son, Jeff, a daughter, Jamee, and is also the grandmother of two wonderful grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Joyce Arberman 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.

WOMEN'S BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1998

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I rise today to commend the Women's Business Development Center, which is located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Women's Business Development Center (WBDC) is a non-profit organization dedicated to the economic empowerment of women. The Center provides services and programs that support and accelerate women's business ownership and strengthen the impact of women on the economy. The Center enables women to launch new businesses and helps those currently in business to remain successful.

The WBDC was formed in July, 1995 with the assistance of a three-year matching fund grant from the U.S. Small Business Administration's Office of Women's Business Ownership. By offering a full range of services and utilizing the expertise of successful women business owners to deliver its programs, the Women's Business Development Center is the Greater Philadelphia Region's focal point for women's economic empowerment opportunities.

To date, the Women's Business Development Center has provided information, business assessment, training and counseling services to over 4,500 potential and existing women business owners. The metropolitan Philadelphia area has 127,100 women-owned business enterprises that employ 448,500 people and generate over \$56 billion in sales. Women-owned business are a viable economic force and WBDC is vital to their continued growth and success.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Ms. Geri Swift, President of the WBDC. Working with the community, business organizations, and all levels of government and the corporate sector, Geri has played an essential role in supporting the growth and development of entrepreneurial business ventures. In addition to being the current President of WBDC, Ms. Swift serves as the national vice president of the National Association of Women Business Owners (NAWBO) and as a director of the National Foundation of Women Business Owners. Geri Swift was also the founding president of the NAWBO, Greater Philadelphia Chapter.

HMO QUALITY DATA: LET THE PATIENT BEWARE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1998

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as the nation moves increasingly toward managed care, a high priority must be to give the patient/consumer reliable, accurate information on the quality provided by HMOs.

On February 26 the chief medical officer of the Medicare agency testified that the popular HEDIS data used to measure how well HMOs