

is a higher instance of mortality and a higher incidence of younger males coming down with prostate cancer.

I also learned that males can have breast cancer as well, so it is not just the prostate check or the genital check, but the complete check-up and an annual physical is very helpful.

The doctor also pointed out to me that Asian Americans have a very low incidence of cancer. Again, the studies are important for prostate cancer because they think, again, generally the Asian population eats the more healthy foods: A lot of fish, salmon, rice, the things that are not high in the different kinds of oils. Olive oil is supposed to be a good one.

I went to my check-up after 3 weeks out of surgery this morning, and I saw Dr. Christensen, who is my surgeon and a great doctor. I pointed out these different foods. I said, how much is there to diet in cancer? He said, DUKE, there are actually certain foods that cause cancer cells to replicate faster. For example, your soy oils and your different safflower and all of those kinds of oils, there have been studies to show that they actually cause the cancer to multiply faster. Olive oil, however, is low in a certain chemical, and so are tomatoes. As a matter of fact, cooked tomatoes allow that particular chemical to get into your system that actually kills cancer cells. Regular tomatoes are good, but he said cooked tomatoes allow that substance to break down.

It also says here about coffee. I drink 3 or 4 cups of coffee a day. Maybe that is the reason I got it in the first place. But I thought the response was good from Dr. Christensen, who had a cup of coffee in his hand, with all the other surgeons sitting there with cups of coffee. Oh, he said oh, no, it cannot be coffee, because we are not giving it up. I am not telling people to give up all the things they like in life, but at least with moderation, they could take a look at how these things affect their life.

As a matter of fact, in this book there is a number that you can order. I would recommend that Members get this book if they have any doubts. What I will do is give my number, at 202-225-5452. If Members want to call my office, I will get the number where they can get this book that tells almost everything that one wants to know about prostate cancer, because I cannot find the number within the book here.

There are other areas: the National Institutes for Health, the Cancer Research Society. If you call, in every State there is a cancer support group. In every State there are groups that meet, groups of cancer patients. I went to one this last weekend. It was very good. Dr. Barken in San Diego has a cancer group. As a matter of fact, there is going to be a cancer awareness, actually, by Israel Barken, M.D., President of the Prostate Cancer Education and Research Foundation, in San Diego, California. Every State and almost

every city has these support groups. I would encourage each and every individual to check in, especially if they are diagnosed with cancer. Again, one of the worst things that you can have happen to you is the doctor look you in the face and say, ma'am, or sir, you have cancer, and it is almost overwhelming in the impact that has on your life.

Through early detection, over 95 percent of prostate cancer victims can be saved with good mortality rates. All of the things that people dread, like impotence, I will say, that is a big factor, and incontinence, all of those things with early detection can be changed and saved. Even if they are not, the techniques they have today can bring about full, meaningful life for married or unmarried men and women in this.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close by saying each man and each woman, whether it is breast cancer, whether it is diabetes or prostate cancer, we need to support the funds for the research, because we are so close in the biotech industries to finding out the answers.

I would also say that the money for prostate cancer is so low, but yet it is the second leading cause in men's death, and in African American deaths it is one of the highest and leading causes, second only to AIDS.

#### PRESSING ISSUES THAT STILL FACE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we just returned to Congress from a recess. We have 5 weeks of working time left, unless there is some extended Congress before the election. I doubt that very seriously.

I also have heard the news today that the Ken Starr report has been delivered to the House of Representatives, and a process is going forward by which the Committee on Rules will determine what will happen to that report and how it could be handled. I am sure that is going to absorb a large part of our time.

There are items on the agenda that have been on the agenda all year long and all during this session of Congress that I hope will not get lost. I think it is very important that the American people, in their commonsense wisdom, understand that there is no need for us to suddenly go on holiday with respect to the pressing issues that face the Congress.

There are still overcrowded schools, schools with coal-burning furnaces. There is still a need for some kind of relief from every area of government, including the Federal Government, for school construction in our big cities. There is still a need to have money to lower the ratio of students to teachers. There is still a need for the wiring of

our schools for technology, to bring them up to the point where they can train young people for jobs that do exist. There is still a need for increasing the minimum wage.

There are a lot of things that mean a lot to ordinary people, and we should not put them in the deep freeze in order to spend all of our time on the one issue of the President's private life and the Ken Starr report.

I have been asked a couple of times today why the black community so solidly supports the President. In poll after poll, no matter how you ask the question, whether you are talking about the job performance of the President or his personal life or any other matter related to the President, you generally get a high approval rate in the African American community.

Certainly I think one of the reasons for that, and I do not pretend to know all of the answers, one of the reasons for that is because we are oriented toward the issues and the problems, and we would like to see the problems and the issues dealt with. We would like to see some of the problems solved and resolved.

Additional polls of African American parents in big cities have shown that large numbers of African American parents are now supporting vouchers for education as an alternative to the public school system. I think that the two kinds of responses are related; that the large numbers of African American parents supporting the vouchers in the school system, it is evidence of a kind of desperation, a kind of fatalism that has set in, that they do not believe anything is going to change in the public school system. They do not think the supporters are there among elected officials.

In New York City we had a surplus of nearly \$2 billion in the budget, and not a penny was spent to deal with the pressing problems of school construction, including removal of coal-burning furnaces. At the same time, in New York State they had a similar \$2 billion surplus, and the Governor turned down a legislative request or vetoed a legislative request for \$500 million for school construction.

So wherever parents in inner city communities look for some relief from the conditions, it appears that government officials are not interested, or have decided to deliberately abandon or ignore the needs of children in our inner city schools. We are talking about millions of children.

The same conditions that exist in the crowded New York City schools exist in many other big cities. Children are forced to eat lunch at 10 o'clock because there are so many, they have to have a relay in the cafeteria, and they have to start early in order to get three or four teams in, three or four sessions in the cafeteria where youngsters eat. Coal-burning furnaces are definitely a threat to every child's health who sits in the school, because the dust that you do not see is still getting into the lungs of young children.

Things that bad are not being addressed by our elected officials at various levels.

The despair about change relates to the support for President Clinton. The one person who has articulated and set forth a program which would address these issues, if he had the cooperation of the Republican-controlled Congress, is President Clinton.

Across the board, when affirmative action was threatened, and hysterical forces surrounding the President were counseling him to abandon affirmative action, it was President Clinton who came up with the statement and the strategy that we should mend affirmative action and not end it.

In very serious matters that affect peoples' lives, including the minimum wage, which does not cost the government anything, an increase in the minimum wage would not cost the government anything, the President supports an increase in the minimum wage. Most of the people in my district would appreciate very much the government taking that step, which will not cost the government anything, but recognizes that the prosperity that we enjoy should be shared.

We could pull up a very good list of concrete reasons why African American people, who the large majority of them are poor, or poor people in general, support this President. We want to see a focus on the duties and functions of government, that government has certain duties and functions, and we would like to see a decrease in the obsession with the private life of the President.

I issued a statement this afternoon to get on the record, since I see a lot of people want to get on the record, and I suppose it would be prudent to back out now, since the Starr report is here, and wait and see what the Starr report has to say, but I choose not to do that.

I very strongly feel that government has invaded an area of individual privacy here, and some of us should marshal all of the energy and resources at our command to fight this kind of intrusion by government, because if they can do it to a President, there is no other individual in this Nation who is not also subject to that kind of intrusion into their private life.

□ 1945

The statement I issued sums it all up for me: As a Member of Congress, I am sorry that there is an escalating hysteria that may lead to the religious lynching of a great President. President Clinton has gone farther than he should have been asked to go in offering a public statement about his intimate personal life. In view of the fact that absolutely no one has charged that a national security issue is involved in this matter, all further government inquiries should be dropped. The Nation has in no way been placed at risk. Certainly nothing took place which touched on bribery, treason, or high crimes and misdemeanors.

For those who continue to expand their detailed probe and to pass judgment through the prism of their hypocritical, Victorian values, we concede their right to wallow in their Peyton Place preoccupations. There is, however, a profound difference between crimes and sins.

It is of utmost importance that we acknowledge and support the spirit of our Constitution which discourages the state from investigating private morality and affirms the right of every American, even the President, to separately negotiate his sins with his God.

This intrusion on the President's private life bodes ill for the future. Every politician is fair game. It bodes ill for ordinary people if government at this level is allowed to move in a way which really knocks down the separation of church and state, because the church, the religious institutions are responsible for private morality and for sin.

If we are going to invade that domain and become the arbiters of who is sinful, who has done what wrong, and who should be punished, then we are on our way to something similar to the Taleban government in Afghanistan. The extreme of what we are doing now can be seen in the way the Taleban behave. You get on that course of giving government the power to interfere, to regulate, to get into the minute details of individual lives and determine who is sinning and who is not, then we can get into a situation where a government like the Taleban government is justified. They determine. They decide women should not only cover themselves in public; they should not go out in public too much. They determine that women in Afghanistan could no longer hold positions of any kind in the government. They determined all that on the basis of their concept of what is moral. The government and the religion are one.

That is the way we are headed in a country which prides itself on separation of church and state. Why is the state spending millions of dollars in order to pursue what is probably someone's sin? Not probably; we have reached the point where the President has admitted, apologized, et cetera. It is a fact. A sin was committed in accordance with the standards of this Nation and the standards of the President himself. So sin is what we are talking about. Where are the high crimes and misdemeanors? Where is the bribery or treason or anything of that kind?

I would like to certainly see the Starr report as soon as it is available to Members of the House. I certainly will read it and I will be looking for a statement on bribery, treason, or high crimes and misdemeanors. Where is it in that Starr report? Why are we even going to bother with the report if it does not contain charges of bribery, treason, or high crimes and misdemeanors?

I think that in 5 weeks it is expected that the President will become paralyzed, that nothing of substance will be

done. I am hoping that the common sense of the American people will send a message to this Congress and send a message to the commentators and the reporters, the media, and the press. They have driven this thing very hard. They have looked at the response of the American people and decided they will not accept it, that they are going to change it. So the press and the media have become a force for changing people's minds. They are going to make us believe that this is the most important issue in the world.

One reporter, one veteran reporter who covers the White House, said this is the most important story because it is a human story. There are a lot of human stories. Jerry Springer has a lot of human stories on every day. Pulp magazines are full of human stories. If we are going to consider human stories to be stories about sex, then there are many of those human stories.

I do not think the intimate sex lives of human beings are particularly the kinds of things that define human beings. Animals of all kinds have sex. Why does the human story have to be related to a sexual relationship? Why can the human story not be about the fact that the human beings in Northern Ireland cheered the President as a hero? They cheered the President as a hero because they have faced life-and-death issues. They have faced life and death. They have died. They know this President went out of his way, an uncommon procedure of an American President, and became intimately involved in the negotiating of the peace that Senator Mitchell brokered, that led to the present situation.

They know this President has been intimately involved in a life-and-death matter and lives will be saved, important things are going to happen as a result of his intervention. They understand what President Clinton meant when he called this Nation an "Indispensable Nation." And I think the President in certain situations has seen himself as the indispensable person to make things happen. In the case of Northern Ireland, this was the case.

In the case of the rescue of Haiti from a bloodthirsty, armed occupation by its own army where people counted bodies every morning when they came out to go to work, the President, against public opinion, public opinion was running two to one against intervention in Haiti, on the floor of the Congress two-thirds of the Members of Congress were against intervention, but the President made a decision and he freed the people of Haiti. He took the bloody yoke off of Haiti. That legacy will stand. As a result of his actions in Haiti, the President, I think, found himself and understood the kinds of decisions he would have to make in the future.

It was possible, because he made a definite, right decision in Haiti, it was possible for him to follow through in the case of Bosnia and Yugoslavia and make similar decisions. The public

opinion polls were running two to one against intervention in Bosnia, intervention in the whole Yugoslavia-Serbia-Croatia situation. But the President felt that we were the indispensable nation, the indispensable element that had to become involved, and he made that decision.

The children dying while they were running to go to the well, all the horror stories that we saw in connection with Sarajevo, the genocidal death pits, all of that would be going on still if it had not been for the fact that this President made a decision that as an indispensable nation and as the indispensable leader at this point that he was going to take action, and he led us into Bosnia.

It so happens that I disagree with the length of time we have spent there and the amount of money that we have spent there, but the decision was vital in order to turn the situation around. So Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia, all of those elements are still struggling.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the United States should stay there forever to help them put things together. I think the horror is gone and they will never go back to the horror. I think all the fighting factions there are glad to be relieved of the need to perpetrate one horror after another against one another. This President, he has a legacy there that no one can take away.

Mr. Speaker, I think that those who press the issue of destruction of the legacy of the President by his personal actions, it is one argument being used by the press and the heavy-handed commentators that seem persuasive to a lot of people. How can he go down in history? How can he salvage anything for the next 2 years with all of the present exposure of his personal life?

Well, I think we ought to go way back in American history and recognize some things that people do not like to talk about. One of the greatest American Presidents, I certainly would place him in the top three or four American Presidents, was challenged in his first term by the press and a journalist that actually had been a friend of his, named James Calendar. He wrote a story and started a whole series of stories about the life of Thomas Jefferson and the fact that Thomas Jefferson had a slave mistress who had several children by Thomas Jefferson. This is not a rumor. There are newspapers and cartoons and factual evidence. It happened.

James Calendar made the charge in the article. The other papers picked it up. The cartoons ridiculed Jefferson for his black bride. All kinds of pressure was brought to bear on Thomas Jefferson in his very first term. This is a President who served 8 years. In his first year, these were the kind of pressures that were unleashed on Thomas Jefferson.

Without going into an argument about whether they really were his kids or not, or whether he was really involved with Sally Hemings as

charged, the pressure was there. The story was there. The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, who was a distant relative of Jefferson's and did not like him, he chimed in until one of the newspapers stated that the Chief Justice had several children by slave mistresses also, and then he backed away.

But it was a big scandal. I am not going to go into much greater detail. It just so happened that there is a very interesting ending. The woman, Sally Hemings, who was supposed to be Jefferson's mistress, stayed at Monticello when Jefferson left the presidency. She stayed for 30 years. Sally Hemings and the President were in the same house. Only Sally Hemings was ever fingered and pointed out to be a mistress of Jefferson.

But the important thing is that Jefferson went on to effect the Louisiana Purchase. Where would the Nation be if there had been no Louisiana Purchase, the opening up the direction of the West, the removal of Spain and France who were lingering around the edges of the United States, dying to establish some kind of beachhead? All of that was swept away in one fell swoop.

The Louisiana Purchase, which was engineered by Thomas Jefferson almost alone, because there was no great debate about what to do, he outmaneuvered Napoleon. Napoleon wanted Jefferson and the United States to get involved in the war in Haiti and expected the United States to come to his aid. Jefferson refused to do that. Napoleon lost the war in Haiti and he expended a great deal of funds in the process and was broke. So he sold the Louisiana Territory to the United States at a very, very bargain price. But Jefferson maneuvered all of that, despite the fact that he had been put under great pressure in his first year. They went away. The charges and the people who attempted to ridicule him finally shut up.

Throughout the course of the entire ordeal, Thomas Jefferson refused to comment at all. He never said a word one way or another. The American people at that time, the ordinary people out there, the innkeepers, the carpenters, and the various ordinary workers out there, who adored Thomas Jefferson, were never that concerned. It was always the press, always the cartoonists who pressured and pressed to get answers about the private life of Thomas Jefferson.

So, Mr. Speaker, he was one example. I can give many others where the legacy, the individual legacy is not injured by the personal life. The ability to achieve things is not injured by the personal life of public people.

It is quite amusing to hear people talk about a legacy being destroyed because of private behavior. We would have legacies destroyed right down through American history of quite a number of other presidents. I heard the other day on National Public Radio an irate listener call up and said some-

body tried to tarnish George Washington, was smearing George Washington in order to protect Bill Clinton. I do not think it is a smear of George Washington to point out that there was at least one factual account of an extramarital relationship and rumors and some historians talk about other things. Remember, this is a George Washington who refused to be crowned the king. This is the George Washington who would not run for a third term.

□ 2000

Nobody can take away from George Washington the nobility and the greatness of those kinds of actions regardless of what the historians pinpoint.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is among the greatest of the three or four greatest Presidents. The man who probably has to be credited with stopping Adolph Hitler from ruling the world. Very few intellects, very few imaginations, very few courageous spirits can match Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Yeah, he made a few mistakes here and there. He interned the Japanese at the beginning of World War II.

Every President makes mistakes. He did not move fast enough, as fast as he could have, to integrate the armed forces. There are a lot of mistakes. But when you measure the mistakes against the achievements, there is no question about the legacy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will ever be taken away. Nobody can ever deny him his place of one of the greatest American Presidents.

But it is a fact that he had some extramarital relationships in his public life, more than one. It is a fact. They are not disputed. It did not mean that he could not meet day after day and night after night with Winston Churchill in the early days when the United States declared war on Germany and Japan when Churchill came over here. It did not mean he could not rise to the occasion whatever his personal life was like, whatever he was doing in his personal life. It certainly did not mean that publicly he could not perform.

This notion that they go together or the human story must be told because the human story tells us what a person is all about is a soap opera notion. It is soap opera.

I think the private domain sometimes can be legitimately invaded. I think Presidents ought to report on their health correctly. I think the French are right and that Francois Mitterand, when it was disclosed that Francois Mitterand, the President of France, had cancer before he died, he died of cancer, the French appointed investigators to find out when did he know that he had cancer, how serious was it. They felt it was an important thing to know.

Was he incapacitated and unable to carry out the business of the state. That is all they wanted to know. They did not want to know about his mistress and his children by his mistress. But they thought it was important to

know what kind of person with what kind of mental capacity was, or physical capacity was in charge of the state.

There are some things a state should know. There are things that the state may also disapprove of. But the fact that the state disapproves of certain kinds of private behavior does not mean the state should become the prosecutor, the arbiter.

I mean, where is the church, where are the priests, where are the ministers, where is their function if we are going to have the state become the agency for monitoring sin and regulating sin?

I want to read some excerpts from a column that appeared in the New York Times yesterday by Anthony Lewis. And I think the very strong statement here is one that I certainly would agree with 100 percent, and I invite you to get a copy of the Anthony Lewis column of September 8, 1998.

It starts as follows:

Senator Joseph Lieberman struck a cord in the country because of the way he criticized President Clinton's behavior. He ground no political ax. He was not holier than thou. He gave us no prurient sanctimony. Simply and directly, he expressed what most people feel: Sadness and outrage.

But on one point he went too far when he said that no President today can have a private life. The reality is it is in 1998 that a President's private life is public, Senator Lieberman said. Contemporary news media standards will have it no other way.

I am quoting from an article by Anthony Lewis.

Must every President from here on live with a press driven downward by competition and morbid curiosity? Beyond that, can no President ever again be assured of confidence in his talks with advisors? Must every President look at his Secret Service guards as potential witnesses?

I cannot imagine any ordinary person who wanted to live under such conditions. Total exposure or the fear of it would put an intolerable strain on us.

Privacy is an essential ingredient of civilized human existence. The reason was explained in a superb article last month in the London Times Literary Supplement by Thomas Nagel, professor of philosophy and law of New York University.

I am still quoting from Anthony Lewis' column.

To quote Professor Nagel, "each of our inner lives is such a jungle of thoughts, feelings, fantasies, and impulses that civilization would be impossible if we expressed them all or if we could all read each other's minds. Just as social life would be impossible if we expressed all our lustful, aggressive, greedy, anxious, or self-obsessed feelings in ordinary public encounters, so would inner life be impossible if we tried to become wholly persons whose thoughts, feelings, and private behavior could be safely exposed to public view."

Professor Nagel correctly saw the destruction of Presidential privacy as part of a larger trend, quote, "a disastrous erosion of personal privacy in the United States over the past 10 or 20 years. We are in the age of letting it all hang out and of rewards for exposing others."

We can't limit the choice of political figures to those whose peculiar inner constitu-

tion enables them to withstand outrageous exposure or those whose sexual lives are pure are simon-pure, Professor Nagel wrote.

It is important to understand that the Clinton case is special. Last February, I wrote, to quote Anthony Lewis,

President Clinton was on notice, years of notice, that his sexual behavior was in issue. If he ignored the warnings and then went on television to deny the truth, he will be judged by the American people in those terms, and should be.

But in general, we as a country are better off not knowing about the private lives of our leaders and not lusting to know. Would America be a better place if the supposed sexual adventures of John F. Kennedy lately retailed had been reported at the time? If the press, which in those days was far more restrained, had published the material leaked by J. Edgar Hoover about Dr. Martin Luther King's sexual straying?

The great Italian playwright Luigi Pirandello in the play "Right You Are If You Think You Are" showed the price of community pays when it is driven by gossips to find out the truth about people's private lives. It is not an accident that both Linda Tripp and Kenneth Starr justify their relentless behavior as demanded by the truth.

We should not ferret out the secrets of private lives; least of all should we do so by the terrible power of the criminal law. My hope and belief are that, however the Clinton story ends, the country and Congress will see to it that never again will a prosecutor thus damage the Presidency. For the good of the country, a President needs what Justice Brandeis call the right to be let alone, the right most valued by civilized men.

This is the end of the quote from Anthony Lewis in the New York Times on September 8. I invite you to get a copy for yourself. I think it is a brilliant statement there of what the present situation means in terms of overall civilization and our values in this civilization.

I am not a lawyer or a legal scholar, but I really would like to hear a legal discussion of what the present situation means in terms of separation of church and state. If the state can invade the personal domain and personal behavior and charge itself to deal with people's sins, where are we going in terms of separation of church and state?

I have heard all kinds of speeches made in the name of raising the flag of morality in America. There have been numerous reporters who have stated that the country's values have gone downward, and we have degenerated in terms of morality over the last 25, 30 years.

I challenge that. I challenge that very much so. I challenge it first in terms of the fact that the private lives of several Presidents I mentioned, John F. Kennedy, Franklin Roosevelt, private lives of those people and the things that we might not approve of that happen in their private lives were known to members of the press and members of the establishment here in Washington. They were not so secret that they were not known.

The fact that no one felt so morally compulsive as to come forward and

make a public issue out of the private life of Franklin Roosevelt or the private life of John F. Kennedy, what does that mean? They were less moral? Maybe they were.

Maybe our indignation and the fact that the press feels it has a right to discuss these matters and to pass judgment and to wage an editorial crusade to change the mind of the American people and make them prosecute the President for his sins, that is new. It evolved, as Professor Nagel said, in the last 10 or 20 years. Does that mean that we are more moral because we lay those issues out on the table?

I heard a commentator on a C-SPAN show who spoke very forcefully about this moral issue, how we have to deal with saving the morality of America, how the children are watching, and we must set the best examples, all of which separately make a lot of sense. I think we should set the best possible examples as public officials. I think this scandal is very damaging.

But the same commentator was asked a few minutes later, have you discussed this with your teenage children? He wants to save America. He wants to guarantee that the moral standards of the President and the public officials are the highest. But when he was asked have you discussed this with your teenage children, he said no. He said I have not. I am a little afraid to tackle that. I am afraid of what they might say. I am afraid.

Here is a man who wants to save America, but he will not talk to his own children. If there is a moral problem in America, then the moral problem is parents who will not talk to their children about something they consider so important that they take very intense public positions about.

He is afraid. Is afraid that they might say we do not think it is that important. He is afraid. Let me not put thoughts in his mouth. I do not know what he is afraid of. But certainly the refusal to talk to your own children about it says a great deal about your convictions as to the morality of them.

Are we afraid because children understand that people tell lies all the time? And when they hear adults railing about how awful it is to have a lie, a lie about something you have done, children, by the time they are teenagers, they are ahead of us.

They have gone through the discovery that there is no Santa Claus. They know that storks do not bring babies, or you do not pick babies up in packages at the hospital. There are all kinds of little lies that have been told them that have been exposed. I assure you they are way ahead and listening all the time for those kinds of untruths, as innocent as they may be.

□ 2015

Children may know what was recently stated by a priest in a contest that was held. It was a big contest held about America's wisdom, and a priest was in the contest with three other contenders and he won.

The question was: Is it always important to be honest and tell the truth; must we always be honest and tell the truth? And the priest was selected as having the best answer because he said it is not always important that we tell the truth. And he laid out a whole series of situations where innocent people would be hurt if we were to tell the truth.

There is no absolute standard which says we must always tell the truth and that any lie is equal to any other lie. Goebbels' lying about the concentration camp is equal to somebody lying about their personal behavior. Moral standards are something that always relate to sex or relationships between men and women.

Adolf Hitler would not allow his picture to be taken in short pants because he thought it was indecent. Adolf Hitler, responsible for more murders and more death and more suffering and more horror than this planet has ever experienced. No matter how far we go back, the scale of Hitler's murderous ventures cannot be matched, and yet he would not have his picture taken in short pants because it was immoral, obscene.

Charles Keating, head of a savings and loan association out in Arizona which cost the taxpayers more than \$2 billion when it went under, Charles Keating is a crusader against pornography. And yet he swindled the American people. Through the schemes related to the savings and loan association, he swindled us out of \$2 billion. And when he could not get any more through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, he went out into the lobby of his bank and sold securities to people without any Federal deposit insurance, and they lost everything. This is the kind of monster we are dealing with.

Morality in America. Where was the press, where were the reporters and the editorials when the savings and loan swindle was exploding? I could not believe the degree to which the press, the media, ignored a swindle of the magnitude that the world had never seen before, the savings and loan association swindle.

And there were other banks involved, too. The whole process by which they used the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to cover for the draining of billions of dollars from the banks was never treated by the press the way the private behavior of the President is being treated now. There was never any passion in the editorials. There were long stretches of silence.

There were books that were written that suddenly disappeared. And even now it is difficult to get hard facts that are clear as to exactly how much money did the American taxpayers lose. The estimate is \$500 billion by some economists at Stanford University, that the savings and loan swindle in the end will cost the American taxpayers \$500 billion.

Now, the savings and loan swindle was the beginning of something which

continues today. The savings and loan swindle was based on crony capitalism and banking socialism. The socialism part came because the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the American taxpayers' money, insured every depositor who had placed \$100,000 or less in the bank. So it was a kind of socialist protection.

The cronyism came because banks did not follow the regular procedures of lending. They lent millions of dollars on the basis of friendship. Cronies. The crony capitalism and the banking socialism pattern that started with the savings and loan associations of America is exactly what happened in Mexico, only they did not have the safeguards of a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the degree we have, so individuals in Mexico lost much more.

It is the same pattern of Indonesia crony capitalism, where there are no real standards or real requirements for collateral or a sound business plan or all the things we would confront if we went to the bank to ask for a \$10,000 loan or a \$20,000 business loan. We would have to fill out reams of paper and go through a whole process. Well, there is a stratum in the business world where they do not do that. It is on the basis of friendship that loans are made.

And the pattern that the savings and loan associations established, Mexico picked up on it, Korea was run the same way, Indonesia, all across the Asian Tiger countries we have this pattern of crony capitalism and government now stepping in to help bail the situation out, because government in these areas played a major role in providing the capital to the banks that did the lending to their cronies. Overnight, economies like Korea and Malaysia, boom.

I visited Korea for a week and was in Seoul, the capital of Korea, and I was astonished at the number of office buildings. We visited about three office buildings, high-rise buildings, beautiful buildings on the outside. Inside the buildings, most of the offices were empty. They got the money to do the building and whatever the financing was, but they did not need the buildings.

Just as during the savings and loan swindle days they had all these developments in Texas that the builders had gone and borrowed the money, made the first effort of digging foundations, doing a few things, and therefore it qualified for the loans. They were scot-free. They said that the developments failed for economic reasons. Nobody was convicted in most of these cases. They just walked off scot-free. That kind of crony capitalism, backed up by banking socialism, was never attacked as being immoral; the kind of day-after-day, relentless pursuit.

On ABC, Cokie Roberts has been around for a long time. She has seen a lot of things happen in Washington. She ought to know better when she talks about this being one of the most

important things in the world morally. Where were their voices during the savings and loan swindle? Immoral, costly, a lot of criminality took place, the Mafia made a mint, and the response morally was not there.

Let me just sort of sum up what I am saying. A nation that cannot identify what is morally most important, cannot set priorities, cannot see that it is immoral at a time like this, when we have a budget surplus, to keep sending children to unsafe schools and overcrowded schools. It is immoral to send them to schools that have coal-burning furnaces. That is immoral, not to have the leadership being willing to invest in safety and health.

It is immoral not to take this opportunity, when the money is here, to invest in education in greater amounts. A nation that cannot see that, a nation that prefers to spend \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year on a prisoner, a prisoner in a prison cell, and will not do anything about the expenditure of less than \$5,000 a year on children who go to inner city schools is immoral. That is an immoral act.

There are all kinds of judgments that need to be made about what is important and what is not important. What are we here for, for 5 weeks? Should we not do things that make a difference for people in the Nation or people anywhere in the world? For 5 weeks the power is here to do a great deal if we were to see ourselves as President Clinton described us in his inaugural address, if we were to see ourselves as an indispensable nation.

We have all kinds of problems throughout the world. The economies are in serious trouble. That is obvious. The global warming now is pretty much a fact with a lot of implications. And with the tumultuous kinds of weather we have been having recently, if global warming is going to make that worse, we are in serious trouble. There is a whole lot of planning and a whole lot of leadership needed.

We are the indispensable nation. We are the ones who at this point are economically most secure. We are the Nation that the world looks to. They value our leadership. The American colossus does not rule with armies, does not have to administer colonies. It is the goodwill of America.

It is the fact that American men died on the beaches of Normandy to defend the concept of freedom. Our homes were not immediately threatened by Hitler. Those great sacrifices were made in the Battle of the Bulge and on the beaches of Normandy by people who had some idealism. And the country was driven by idealism. We get a return on that.

The whole world, despite what we hear here and there, the whole world looks to America for leadership, admires America. We have terrorists who will hate us just because we are admired. We have many enemies, but to be admired means we are going to have enemies.

So this great America of ours is at the pinnacle of its power and it is an indispensable nation and we ought to behave like an indispensable nation. Instead of being preoccupied with Peyton Place-type activities, we should look to where are we now and what can we do with our enormous power and wealth to make the world a better place for our constituents, to deal with some immediate problems.

I do not want to have to go back to my constituents and say, look, we have no hope. The relief of the overcrowding schools, the coal-burning furnaces, these are relatively small things, but we are not going to get any help with them. I do not want the despair which drives people to choose vouchers, which is a ridiculous way to go because only a handful of children can ever be served through that method. And vouchers to private schools, there are just not enough out there. It is the public school system that will continue to educate most of our children and we have to stay with the public school system.

We can experiment more with charter schools, which are public schools, there are a number of things we can do to try to improve the schools, but we cannot spoon-feed the process or put Band-aids on. We really need to do something dramatic about guaranteeing that every youngster has a clean, safe school with an atmosphere that is conducive to learning; that every youngster is in a classroom where the teachers are not overwhelmed because there are so many children.

There are a lot of very small things that a mere stroke of the pen on some appropriations bills could put in place. But yet we choose not to live up to the calling or the responsibility that history has thrust upon us.

I want to read, in closing, a statement that I made on February 4, 1997, following President Clinton's inaugural address and I put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's inaugural address was not a State of the Union speech obligated to provide substance for general proposals. Appropriately, the President used his second inaugural statement to set a tone for the next 4 years, the prelude to the 21st century. America is a great country blessed by God with wealth far surpassing any nation on the face of the Earth now or in the past. The Roman Empire was a beggar entity compared to the rich and powerful Americans. God has granted us an opportunity unparalleled in history.

President Clinton called upon both leaders and ordinary citizens to measure up to this splendid moment. The President called upon all of us to abandon ancient hatreds and obsessions with trivial issues. For a brief moment in history we are the indispensable people.

Other nations have occupied this position before and failed the world. The American colossus should break the historic pattern of empires devouring themselves. As we move into the 21st century we need indispensable leaders with global visions. We need profound decisions.

I conclude with a poem of my own.  
"Under God

The indivisible indispensable nation  
Guardian of the pivotal generation  
Most fortunate of all the lands  
For a brief moment  
The whole world we hold in our hands  
Internet sorcery computer magic  
Tiny spirits make opportunity tragic  
We are the indispensable nation  
Guardian of the pivotal generation  
Millionaires must rise to see the need  
Or smother beneath their splendid greed  
Capitalism is king  
With potential to be Pope  
Banks hoard gold  
That could fertilize universal hope  
Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, King  
Make your star spangled legacy sting  
Dispatch your ghosts  
To bring us global visions  
Indispensable leaders  
Need profound decisions  
Internet sorcery, computer magic.  
Tiny spirits make opportunity tragic.  
We are the indispensable nation,  
Guardian of the pivotal generation  
With liberty and justice for the world  
Under God.

□ 2030

Instead of being preoccupied with a soap opera and the human story of one man's fragility, we should look to our role as the indispensable nation, we should look to our role as the generation within this indispensable nation that has a golden opportunity to turn things around.

I started by saying that in the African-American community there is strong support for President Clinton despite all of the revelations. And I certainly know from firsthand information gathered in my district that it is very strong. I made it my business to question ladies of the church and find out where they stood.

And I think there have been many reasons that have been said before why blacks support this President. We are afraid of what happens when he is no longer there. We appreciate the fact that he has stayed with the issues that matter most.

But I think, also, there is a wisdom in the African-American community by these church ladies and other people who have been raised on the Bible. They know the legacy of King David is not wiped out by his weakness in connection with Bathsheba. They know that Sampson is still a symbol of strength despite the fact that he had a weakness and was vulnerable.

They looked over the whole pattern of history and they know that the good that men do often dies with them, and it is not fair.

We are in a situation now where trivialities may smother America, trivialities. We have opened Pandora's box. If a President's life can be invaded by the government, trivialities will smother us all. Who will be next and how many dramatic human stories will television have to play with along the way?

I hope that for the next 5 weeks we can turn away from preoccupation with the personal life of one man and deal with preoccupation with the life of the Nation. We are an indispensable na-

tion. We ought to behave like people who are a pivotal generation within this indispensable nation.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). While the Chair did not interrupt the Member, the Chair would remind all Members to avoid specific personal references to the President even as a point of reference or comparison to a more general standard of conduct.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (at the request Mr. ARMEY), for today and for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, on September 10.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KIND.

Mr. ETHERIDGE.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Mr. SANDLIN.