Similarly, in Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi and her democratic movement is at long last standing up to the SLORC dictatorship.

Both in Cambodia and in Burma, those ruthless gangsters who run those countries who are tied in with drug lords and have made international deals with the Communist Chinese should understand that, if they commit murders in order to maintain their power, if Aung San Suu Kyi is hurt or hundreds of people are murdered in Cambodia, those individuals in those governments, like Mr. Hun Sen and the military leaders in Burma, will be held accountable, and they will be treated as war criminals in the United States and the other democracies.

Because the struggle for freedom in Southeast Asia is reaching a crescendo, the Burmese people could free themselves. The people of Cambodia, if they remain courageous, could free themselves from Hun Sen and his dictatorship and his iron-fisted rule.

The United States, those of us in Congress, while we are going through our own crisis at home, have not lost site of our ideals. And as we speak, we should send a message to the people in Southeast Asia struggling for freedom and the people in China struggling for freedom we are on their side. Have courage. The American people will not let you down. We are on the side of freedom and democracy and opposed to dictatorship just like you.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR SITTING IN JUDGMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor tonight because I think it is very important that a Member of this body speak out with respect to some of the inferences or suggestions that have been made that are in a way somewhat related, although I would suggest very immaterial and extraneous, to the allegations that have been made against the President.

I do not think that any Member of Congress could possibly relish the tremendous responsibility of potentially sitting in judgment on the President of the United States, but it appears in the coming days, the coming weeks, the coming months that will be the case with this Congress and potentially the next Congress.

As each of us struggles to uphold our constitutional responsibility to define what constitutes a high crime and misdemeanor and to decide whether or not the material, the evidence amassed in the independent counsel's report to the House which presumably will be made public tomorrow, constitutes impeachable offenses.

□ 1800

But the reason I wanted to stand up and speak tonight on this particular issue is because I noticed, I have noticed in recent days, and with increasing concern, that there are Members of this body that would endeavor to lower the very solemn and dignified tone that I think is necessary to have a debate on these momentous issues by inferring that ''everyone does it''.

Everyone does not do it. I am here tonight to flatly say that most Members of Congress take very seriously the responsibilities of their office, and are honorable, decent men and women who also take very seriously their marital vows.

What caught my eye was a remark made by Tim Russert, the Washington Bureau Chief for the NBC News Network, when he said, a lot of Congress people I have talked to over the last few days are talking about the MAD doctrine, M-A-D doctrine, mutual assured destruction, and they do not want any part of this.

Now, Mr. Russert goes on to quote the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JOHN CONYERS), the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the principal member of the minority party who will be involved in the deliberations at the committee level over the independent counsel's report. Tim Russert quotes the gentleman from Michigan as saying, in effect, that if every Member who has lied about his or her sex life had to recuse themselves from voting on the President, they would not have a quorum.

Well, I think that completely misses the point. This is not just about sex or a sexual relationship, it is all about potential, and I underscore potential, perjury and obstruction of justice. It is about 7 months of concealing the truth from prosecutors and the American people.

But I take real offense at the suggestion implicit in the statement of the gentleman from Michigan.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The Chair would advise the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) that he should not allude to charges against the President.

Mr. RIGGS. I will do that.

As I was saying, though, I think someone has to challenge the statement of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). Everyone does not do it. And for him to suggest that, I believe, is degrading and insulting.

And the point, again, that I wanted to make here on the floor tonight is that most of us recognize that we have to be exemplary in our personal lives; that our personal lives are, to a very large extent, simply an extension of our public lives and the public offices that we hold. We realize that we are in the public eye, that we are highly visible, and that we have to, to the extent humanly possible, by our every word and action, try to uphold the trust that has been placed in us. We realize that the office that we hold carries with it a very special responsibility to be a role model and to be a moral exemplar for the people of our country, our constituents, and especially our children.

So, again, I simply wanted to take the floor tonight to encourage my colleagues not to make suggestions that ''everyone does it,'' and to remind Members, as well as our constituents, that most Members of Congress, again, take very seriously the responsibilities of their office and seek at all times to honor their marital vows as well.

JOB CORPS: ONE OF THE MOST WASTEFUL, LEAST EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in a few days we will be asked to vote for the annual Labor-HHS appropriations bill. I have voted for this bill every year because it contains some very good programs. However, one of its programs has become one of the most wasteful and inefficient in the entire Federal Government and should either do much, much better or be abolished. Yet this agency, because on the surface it appears to be one for young people, seems to believe it should be immune from criticism and simply get one increase after another.

I am speaking of the Job Corps. Today, it costs over $26,000 per year per Job Corps student, according to the GAO. We could give each Job Corps student an allowance of $1,000 a month, send them to some expensive private school and still save money. If we did, these young people would probably think they had gone to heaven or hit some type of lottery. These Job Corps students would probably be shocked if we told them we were spending $26,000 per year on them, because the people who get the big bucks out of this are the fat cat contractors and the bureaucrats who run the program.

Programs like the Job Corps are really, in the end, harmful to young people, because they just take more money from parents and children and give it instead to bureaucrats and contractors. And we are not talking about small change here. This year's proposed appropriation is $1.246 billion, an increase of $61 million over last year, $1.246 billion for one of the most wasteful, least effective programs in the entire Federal Government.

According to a 1995 GAO report, the Job Corps is the most expensive program that the Labor Department administers, spending on average four times as much per student as the JTPA. In fact, the Workforce and Career Development Act of 1996, which passed the House by a vote of 345 to 79, included report language calling for five Job Corps centers to be closed by September 30, 1997, and five more to be closed by September of 2000.

Yet the number of Job Corps centers has actually gone up since 1996 from 112