

absolutely no desire to get anyone. But he has been commissioned, he has been given a mandate, he has been given a responsibility to find out what the facts are. Sometimes that requires issuing subpoenas. If you do not get the facts, you have not conducted an investigation, and you have violated your responsibility and the requirements that have been given to you. If you do not interview the secretary sitting outside the office about what went on there, what kind of investigation is that? What kind of investigation is that? That would be like no investigation at all.

What about this circumstance—some say that his attempt to question the mother of Miss Lewinsky is somehow wrong. Congress makes the laws of the United States. I was a prosecutor for nearly 17 years. I know how the law is written. There is no grant of immunity or protection for a mother for confidentiality of communications under these circumstances. It is not there.

If the Senator from Vermont or other Senators in this body want to change the Federal law to create a protection for that, let them introduce the legislation. Let us have it out right here. Let us discuss it. But that is not the law.

So we have, in the special prosecutor, an individual who is supposed to gather the evidence he can legally gather. Presumably he believes the mother of this young lady has information that she ought to give, and he has every right to ask for it. In fact, to fail to ask for that information would be a failure of the responsibility that has been given to him by the courts and laws of this country.

There are a lot of other things being said, such as why would you dig into his books? I saw a report recently about an individual who was charged with poisoning someone. This is not hypothetical but it is an example, I think, of why subpoenas sometimes are issued. Under the subpoena the authorities discovered and uncovered a book the individual had describing how to make poisons.

I had an occasion to personally prosecute, a number of years ago, a doctor. He was the subject of two national television movies and a book. In the course of that, we discovered a book that he had on deadly poisons and how to commit murder. It was relevant to our case, and it was introduced in the case.

So I do not know what it is that Mr. Starr issued that subpoena for. He cannot defend himself. He cannot run in here and say, "Oh, Senator, let me tell you why we did that. Your remarks are unkind. They're unfair. I had a specific reason for issuing that subpoena. Let me tell you what it is." He can't do that. So he is a victim of these kinds of complaints by those who want to undermine his ability to do the job he has been commissioned to do.

I am really troubled by this. I am very, very troubled that we in this body, and, in fact, the President of the

United States of America and his staff, are systematically trying to intimidate and undermine the legal and moral authority of the commissioned special prosecutor. To my knowledge, that has never happened before in our country.

If there is nothing to hide, why not let him do his job? They say, why doesn't he finish? If they would be more forthcoming, he would have already been finished. How can you finish when people refuse to give testimony? They claim executive privilege and therefore make you go to court to obtain court orders, which takes months to get, to argue over these issues.

The President committed early on that he would be forthcoming, that he would give all the evidence, and the truth should come out. But, as so often occurs with this President, we are finding that not to be the case.

Mr. President, I will just conclude and say that, if nothing else, we need to respect the rule of law. That great hymn, "Our Liberty is in Law," that is the American form of government. We respect the rule of law. We do not use political power or other efforts to undermine that rule. We trust our system to work. We have multiple opportunities to appeal if the system goes awry at any stage. Ultimately we have to accept that. And if we respect it and give ourselves to it with integrity and ability, I think we can get just results.

We may not ever know the full truth in this circumstance. That is not Mr. Starr's responsibility. Mr. Starr's responsibility is to get as much truth as he can get. He can find the truth within the rule of law. So it is really discouraging to me to see when a subpoena is issued to any institution for a specific piece of information, it is to be compared to some fishing expedition. Because I assure you, that is not true. I assure you that that subpoena would not be issued unless there was a sound basis for it.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this President has not defended his actions on the basis that this is a private matter; "it is something between me and my wife and consenting adults," and that sort of thing. He has denied these allegations flat out, and he has placed in dispute, under oath, contradicting statements.

So now we have a mess in this country, and it is a direct result of the actions of the President of the United States. He has gotten himself in a situation in which his statements directly contradicts that of other people's statements, under oath. That is a matter that is not going away lightly.

I will say what is offensive to me and is of concern to me: He has embroiled the Office of the Presidency in this matter. He has used the power, the staff, the people of his office to defend himself and to entwine them into this affair. He has, therefore, during the

course of this activity, in my opinion as one Senator—and I had no intention to speak this morning on this subject, but it has been troubling me for a long time—I think he has dishonored the Presidency in that regard. He has not handled it properly. I wish it were not so. It is not good for this country. It is not the right thing for us to have to be going through today.

There is no one who has any responsibility for it but the President. If he thinks he can go around and claim that is the fault of the person who has been commissioned by an objective Federal court to investigate his activities instead of the President—that is what he is suggesting—then that is not accurate. I am very troubled by this matter.

I think what we need to do is simply to allow the special prosecutor to do his job. He may well find there is evidence of wrongdoing. He may find there is no evidence of wrongdoing. He may find there might be some evidence of wrongdoing but there is insufficient proof to bring charges. I don't know what will happen. I hope we get it over with. I hope the President will cooperate. But I think we need to be respectful of the legal process in this country and not attempt to undermine it, because we don't undermine a part of it without undermining all of it.

Every day, by a prosecutor in America, young people are being tried for drug offenses and other offenses, and they have to accept the workings of that system. Police accept the workings of that system. Mothers and fathers accept the workings of that system when their children are charged with a crime. It is a painful, horrible, difficult time for all, but we have to respect the rule of law. I am very, very troubled by those who, in my opinion, make comments and suggestions to try to attack an investigation and, in effect, undermine the law by political power and political influence. This should not happen. I think it is a matter we need to talk more about in this body.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISING OUR NUCLEAR STRATEGY AND FORCE POSTURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, over the course of the last several months, I have come to the Senate floor 3 times now to discuss this nation's nuclear strategy and forces in the post-cold-war era. In each of those previous statements, I made the central point that I perceive a growing mismatch between our strategy and forces and the