York, establishing a sturdy link between his congregation and the community at large. To this day, he has remained very active in his faith serving on the central Conference of American Rabbis, the American Jewish Congress, the Philadelphia Board of Rabbis, and the Association of Reformed Zionists to highlight just a few of his many efforts.

One of the greatest aspects of this man is that his kind efforts are not simply confined within the Jewish community. Rather, his works extend far beyond his Temple and into the community at large. Rabbi Goldenberg's gracious outreach into the community has been consistent for over twenty-five years. He relishes his role as teacher and friend to troubled young people. He lends his time to countless charities and organizations, and has been showered with accolades including ''Educator of the Year'' and ''Man of the Year.''

And, despite the extraordinary constraints on his time, Rabbi Goldenberg has always remained lovingly committed to his family. The proud father of two exceptional young ladies, one of which is studying Judaism in Israel, Rabbi Goldenberg is an example to fathers everywhere. Recently, the Rabbi and his lovely wife Joyce celebrated their 30th wedding anniversary. Their loving devotion to each other and their family is the premier model of what marriage should be.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Rabbi Irwin Goldenberg for twenty-five years of dedicated and selfless service to the congregation at Temple Beth Israel, the Jewish community, and the people of York, Pennsylvania.

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. JAMES M. TALENT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, it is not my preference or custom to speak on matters relating to the misconduct of others who hold public office. I have never done so before during my time in Congress. I hope never to have to do so again.

But the Constitution confides in Members of this House the obligation to decide whether high officers have acted in a manner that requires their impeachment. Where an official has a legal or moral obligation to judge misconduct and when that obligation cannot honorably be avoided, it is necessary to stand without flinching for what is clearly right.

Those failing to do so become inevitably part of the wrong against which they failed to act. The issue before the House is not whether Bill Clinton has acted with integrity. We all know the answer to that question. The issue is whether we have the integrity to do our duty under the Constitution and laws.

Public men and women commit private wrongs, just like everyone else. And just like everyone else, they are usually called to account for those wrongs in the fullness of time. If they act honorably when called to account, and accept responsibility for what they have done, they can emerge with a measure of their integrity intact. If they act less than honorably and refuse to own up to their actions, they may, and often are judged by the voters.

Their fellow officers in government have no warrant to judge them formally if they at least conform to the minimum standards of law and morality in how they react. But the minimum standards are just that: the minimum that we have the right to expect and insist upon. No one can fall below those standards with impunity. No officer of government can actively subvert the law, abuse the powers of his office and flout the standards of decency without facing the consequences that any other person in a position of trust would have to face.

That is the gravamen of the charges against President Clinton. The genesis of this matter was the President's liaison with Monica Lewinsky. But that affair, however sordid, was a private wrong. The Articles of Impeachment deal exclusively with what the President did to avoid the consequences when that private wrong reached the eyes and ears of the public. When the President was called to account before the people, he lied to the people; when he was called to account before a civil deposition, he lied under oath; and then, to cover up those initial lies, he tampered with witnesses, abused the trust of other officers of government, perjured himself before a federal grand jury, and abused the powers of the Presidency to avert investigations into his wrong doing.

From the record before the House, it is impossible to conclude anything other than that the President is guilty of these wrongs. He is therefore, in my judgment unfit to hold any position of trust, much less the Presidency.

I do not blame anyone for wishing somehow to avoid impeachment. It is a terrible thing to have to participate in the shipwreck of a person's reputation and public career, and it is not a sign of health for our country that two Presidents within a generation must face removal from office. But none of the arguments offered in defense of the President present an honorable alternative to impeachment. I will discuss them one by one:

(1) Some suggest that the misconduct in question does not meet the Constitutional standard for impeachment. But I believe the President's actions not only qualify as high crimes and misdemeanors; they present a classic example of what the term signifies, fully within the intentions of the Framers and the precedents of history.

The term ''high crimes or misdemeanors'' means a deliberate pattern of misconduct so grave as to disqualify the person committing it from holding a position of trust and responsibility. The President's misconduct qualifies as such an offense according to the commonly accepted understandings of civic responsibility, never before questioned until this controversy arose. No one would have argued a year ago that a President could perjure himself, obstruct justice, and tamper with witnesses without facing impeachment, and no one would argue that a business, labor, educational, or civic leader should stay in a position of trust having committed such misconduct. Congress has impeached and removed high officers for less than the President has done. Are we to lower the standards of our society because the President cannot live up to them?

(2) Others have suggested that the House censure the President. But the alternative of censure would constitute too small a penalty for Mr. Clinton's gross misconduct and too great a danger to the Presidency, suggesting that the House of Representatives has a power, never contemplated in the Constitution, to harass future Presidents for behavior not rising to the level of high crimes or misdemeanors.

As many have pointed out, this is not a parliamentary democracy. It is a constitutional republic with separate branches of government. The House may act formally against a President only when the Constitutional standard of impeachment has been met. If censure is intended as a meaningless action, a cover for those who for other reasons want to do nothing, it should be discarded as a sham. If it is intended as a formal and real punishment, it represents an extra—constitutional action, a power arrogated by the Congress to itself, with more potential for harm in the future than good for the present. I would prefer that the House do nothing rather than that—better not to act at all then to twist the Constitution because we are unwilling to enforce it.

(3) Finally, some have argued that impeachment is too traumatic for the country to endure. I believe the opposite is more nearly true. Hard as impeachment may be, to ignore misconduct so grave and notorious would be to suggest that the importance to the country of an office can place the holder of the office above the country's laws.

Mr. Speaker, this whole affair, distasteful as it is, presents an opportunity for the House to make a clear statement. There is such a thing as right and wrong. No society, and certainly not a constitutional republic like America, can endure without acknowledging that fact; and if we believe in right and wrong, we must give life to that belief by trusting that the right thing will be the best thing for our country. I urge each member of the House to do his duty today in the faith that only in that way can America emerge stronger