drug-producing countries. The eradication of child exploitation ought to be as important to United States foreign policy as combating narcotics, which is terribly important. That is why my legislation would require the United States to vote against loans to countries who have not adopted or refused to enforce their own child labor laws.

There is a more immediate step the World Bank could take. Last year we heard testimony before the Subcommittee on International Relations and Human Rights, on which I sat, that hundreds of children worked on infrastructure improvements on one particular project in India. Who knows how many thousands of children like them work on such projects?

The World Bank and other such institutions should take a more active role in eradicating child labor by requiring that no children work on projects for which World Bank funds are used. Surely U.S. taxpayers do not want their contributions to the World Bank used for development projects that exploit children.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues some success stories in our battle to end exploitation of the children. The first is a project in Bangladesh that would not have been possible without the dedication of U.S. Ambassador David Merrill.

Bangladesh's garment sector began thriving in 1977 and currently exports over $750 million per year into the United States. The industry's main products include shirts, trousers, jackets, T-shirts, shorts, briefs, and sweatsuits.

By 1990, estimates of the number of working 10- to 14-year-old children in Bangladesh were between 5 and 15 million children. The vast majority of these children worked in the garment sector. Typically, garment factories in Bangladesh were dimly lit with poor ventilation. Hours were very long. Workers usually were forced to work without break; the doors are locked during the shift. Only occasionally is a guard with a key near the door. During time of high demand, workers are locked in until their work is finished, often overnight. They work 24 hours a day.

In 1990, the Bangladesh garment manufacturers insisted that children were only in factories to accompany their working mothers who could not afford child care. Not true. Yet the Asian-American Free Labor Institute study showed children walking to factories with their time cards in hand. When that institute probed further, they learned that children really worked at the same factories with their relatives.

In the fall of 1993, Senator TOM HARKIN and Representative George Brown introduced legislation to ban imports made by child labor from entry into the United States. Fearing passage of this bill, the Bangladesh garment manufacturers abruptly fired 50,000 child workers.

Unfortunately, firing the children from the manufacturing centers meant they were forced to look for other work. Many went to work as brickmakers or fish processors, using more dangerous equipment that exposed them to even more risks. Through the hard work of Ambassador Merrill and human rights groups, an historical memorandum of understanding was signed by the Bangladesh garment manufacturers, the International Labor Organization and UNICEF on July 4, 1995.

As a result of this agreement, children are moving from factories to schools while they receive a monthly stipend. The Bangladesh garment manufacturers, UNICEF and the ILO, the International Labor Organization, all contribute to a fund to build schools and educate these children, and that is the solution. That is what we have to be doing. They pay the children one-half of what they would have made in the garment factories.

It is working. We can make progress. We need to be making that kind of progress in other countries. It is wrong to continue exploiting over 100 million children per year.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time. I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] having the patience to wait through this. I would urge my colleagues not only to cosponsor the legislation on human rights for children, but to get involved in this issue seeking a long-term solution.

CHINESE COMMUNIST COMPANY COSCO IS THREAT TO UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] just talked about human rights and he makes many, many good points, and I support the gentleman's assessments.

Let me say that I would ask the gentleman to support us, the attorney general from California and all of the police chiefs in the State of California, and I am sure there are other States that are affected. They brought some pretty gruesome pictures of children being imported from Mexico, we are talking 7-year-olds, 8-year-olds, 9-year-olds and teenagers, across the border to serve in methamphetamine labs across the United States.

One out of four of these exploded in fires, and they had grizzly pictures of these children burned. Not over a period of weeks or months or years, but these children are dying within minutes of breathing in the fumes and the chemicals of methamphetamines.

I will work with the gentleman. We do not have to look very far, and I understand that, yes, there are human rights violations like these, but even within our own borders. I think it is criminal, and we ought to do everything we can to stop it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I thank the gentleman for his concern, which I know is very sincere and his commitment to do something about it. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Let me just say briefly, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman that spoke before, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] talked about the Republicans destroying the environment; and I would like to make just about 30 seconds' worth of comments.

The gentleman has a right to his opinion, only he states it as fact, and I would say that the gentleman is factually challenged. He has a right to his view, but those from the left that would take all the power in Washington, DC, and control that power, whether it be environmental, whether it be education, whether it be private property, whether it be religious beliefs, and control it within the walls of this body, I disagree with.

Let me give a classic example. The Superfund, which was created to clean up toxic wastesites, over 70 percent of the dollars that we allocate to clean it up go to trial lawyers in litigation. What we are saying is that over 85 percent of the cleanup of these Superfund sites is done by the State and the people within that State.

Now, it is up to your opinion, Mr. Speaker, whether having the money and having it wasted here in Washington, DC, over 70 percent are getting 90 percent of the dollars down to the State, who actually does the cleanup, and focusing the money on the problem instead of bureaucracy. There are two different views there.

The EPA, the dollars go to over 50 percent of the bureaucracy, and we believe on the Republican side, with many of our colleagues on the other side, that it is more important to get the dollars to clean up clean air, more important to get the dollars out of those that pollute the air, and support this country.

With those comments I would like to move on to the title subject tonight, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk about COSCO. Not Price Club, Mr. Chairman, as we know it, not Costco or Price Club, as many Americans know it, but the China Ocean Shipping Company owned and controlled by only one CEO, chief executive officer, and that chief executive officer is Communist China itself.

There is no board of directors, there are no bosses above COSCO or these other corporations set up by Communist China. They all answer and are directed, and if they do not, one can imagine the consequences.

What I want to speak to tonight is that recently, within the last couple of days, a judge, just the day before yesterday, agreed to examine the validity

of the lease made by the Port of Long Beach to a shipping company owned by the Communist Chinese Government.

This is what the COSCO president, a Communist Chinese, says about its shipping company: Call the charges totally false. A handful of U.S. individuals with ulterior motives have made use of the media to fabricate reports that have gravely injured the reputation of COSCO.

In the same article, the newspaper article, and I quote, COSCO's past problems, however, have given its critics ammunition. Six of these ships were cited for safety violations by our Coast Guard last year and considered unsafe. A COSCO ship, owned by Communist China again, recently plowed into a New Orleans dock in December, injuring 116 people. Customs officials found over 2,000 AK–47's being smuggled into Oakland last year by COSCO. The company that makes the AK–47's, the company that distributes the AK–47's and COSCO are all controlled by the same chief executive officer: Communist China, Mr. Chairman.

They also brought in two ships. I remember in the press this year where we had two shiploads of illegal Chinese trying to enter the United States. Mr. chairman, those were COSCO ships.

Now, supporters in the administration will tell us that one of those ship's registrations had expired and they went and asked Communist China, is that still your ship? Well, that is like if I had a car and drove it into Mexico with a load of cocaine and it did not have registration, but it was my car and the Mexican Government came back and said, hey, DUKE, is that your car? I am not going to say, sure, that is my car.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think common sense should prevail.

This is the same company, Mr. Speaker, that shipped nuclear weapons components to Pakistan. This is the same company, Mr. Speaker, that is shipping chemical and biological weapons to North Korea, to Iran, to Iraq, to Syria, and yes, to the Mujahedin, Hamas, and Bosnia, which impacts the safety of every American citizen and free world citizen in this world. We disagree with the Communist Chinese taking over and controlling a United States port.

There is currently, Mr. Speaker, an FBI report reported to us by intelligence. It is current, and it states that as of today even, the Communist Chinese, through COSCO, are deploying both industrial spies and national security spies into every port, whether they are a tenant or whether they control it. that, to me, Mr. Speaker, is a national security threat and must be examined.

I would state that Councilman Roberts from Long Beach said, it broke our hearts when the Navy made its decision to leave Long Beach. This has been an incredible struggle for the city.

Mr. Speaker, Long Beach has lost thousands of jobs. Why? The President's extreme defense cuts and the additional BRAC process, base closing process, closed Kelly Air Force Base in California. It closed El Toro Base in California, it closed Long Beach Naval Shipyard in California, it took out the training center in San Diego and has devastated over 1 million jobs in the State of California, Mr. Speaker.

We vowed to the people of Long Beach and those other cities that have been devastated by those cuts by the administration that we will do every single thing we can to help, but not at the cost of letting and having a national security threat, a known threat to this country, the Communist Chinese. Even though we are involved in trading negotiations, to think that they are our ally or our friend, in my opinion, is foolhardy.

□ 2000

What is that opinion based on? That opinion is based on my service on Seventh Fleet staff, responsible for all Southeast Asia exercises and defense of those countries, including planning the invasions of those countries in time of war. It also was gained at Naval Fighter Weapons School, and planning the invasions and defense of those countries.

Just today in the newspaper, Mr. Speaker: ''Geneva—After an intense lobbying campaign marked both by threats and tantalizing promises, China succeeded once again yesterday in blocking U.N. criticism of its human rights record.''

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] spoke of children being in slavery, and used. It is also done in China, not just India and other countries, Mr. Speaker.

If we take a look at the threat, when that U.N. resolution was blocked by Communist China through threats, they followed through with that threat. Here is another article in today's paper: ''U.N. consideration of resolution condemning its human rights record.'' ''The Chinese government took diplomatic retaliation against Denmark for sponsoring the measure,'' just for sponsoring and speaking their feelings.

''Accusing the Danish government of hurting the feelings of the Chinese people, China announced that it will suspend bilateral state visits with Copenhagen. The motion urged China to relax controls on freedom of expression and religion and release political prisoners, and improve its judicial system.'' yet China retaliated against a country that expressed its opinion on human rights.

We look at the terrorism threat in Bahrain, shipped in by Cosco and the Communist Chinese. We look at the murders that took place in Germany and France and England and the World Trade Center. Many of these materials were shipped by Cosco ships to the terrorist countries that are a direct threat. We look at North Korea, threatening withdrawal from the nuclear agreement with the United States. Cosco also delivers nuclear weapons materials to North Korea.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that why would the people of Long Beach, some of them, and many do not, but we are getting calls every day from all over the United States and all over the world in outrage of this country allowing a Communist Chinese-run shipping company to take over the port.

But if we take a look at the devastation that has gone on in these bases and with these people, they are worried about putting bread on the table, about putting their children through school. They are concerned. So are we, Mr. Speaker.

I would say that President Clinton took a personal role in promoting the interests of Cosco, and at the same time he was cutting over 100 warships out of national security for this country. That is a 23 percent cut. The symbolism could not be made more stark. Richard Fisher, a senior policy analyst of the Asian Studies Center, noted the real, very real security concerns of the Long Beach deal in a Washington Times column of April 3rd.

His main point is given: ''If it so desires, the Chinese leadership can direct that Cosco's assets be put at the disposal of the Peoples Liberation Army (the PLA), or the main espionage organ, which the FBI has reports that it is currently doing, the Ministry of State Security, the MSS * * *. Do we really want a subsidiary of the Peoples Republic of China to have such a large presence'' in the port?

Mr. Speaker, Cosco has had a position at Long Beach for many years. I have no problems with that. They can be a tenant and I will not object, Mr. Speaker. But to give a Communist Chinese-operated shipping company, with its past violations, full access, and they control everything that comes into the port, they control who sees what containers that go out in the middle of the night, they control what goes out of this country. Mr. Speaker, they will ship in illegals, they will ship in illegal arms, they will ship in intelligence officers, as they do around the rest of the world. We must be vigilant, Mr. Speaker, on stopping that.

Russia told the United States, air defense arms are not sold to Iran, but we find out, yes, they are. I think if we have a bright star in the Clinton administration, it is Madeleine Albright, because I would say, Mr. Speaker, that she is tough, and I think that this gentlewoman has the pizzazz, if you want to use that word, to stand up for American workers' rights.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that under Republican administrations and under Democrat administrations the weakling of our foreign policy has been our State Department. They will not stand up for our workers' rights, and I think Madeleine Albright is the person to do that.

Let me give the Members a quick story. When the world first started trading with China, with sails and

wooden ships, and this is a true story, Mr. Speaker, one of the sailors from a ship threw over a bucket on a line, and it so happened that there was a sanpan down below it, and it impacted a lady, by mistake, on the head, and it killed the lady.

The Chinese, much like in the movie ''Sand Pebble,'' stormed the ship and tried to take the sailor off the ship. The crew stood with arms protecting the sailor, and would not let him go off the ship, because the Chinese wanted to execute the individual right there. They waited three days. The Chinese emissary came back to the ship and threatened the fleet, to withhold all trade to those fleets.

That day the fleet gave over that sailor, Mr. Speaker, and the Chinese executed him, for an accident. So many times when our countries are threatened with economic power of foreign countries, our State Department does not stand up for our rights, does not stand up for our workers, and we need to be more vigilant in that.

I believe in trade. I supported NAFTA. I supported GATT. But all of our fears on both sides of the issue were that we would not make it be fair trade, and more and more we are finding that that in some cases is the case.

I have an article here that says ''Marines Lost Bid for Site to China Cosco Firm.'' The United States Marine Corps wanted the facility at Cosco, and the Clinton administration allowed it to go to a Chinese Communist-controlled company. As Members know, as the Chinese Ocean Shipping Company, Cosco, while it is true that Cosco has been a tenant at Long Beach since 1991, the agreement would turn over 145 acres.

It was a Cosco ship *Empress Phoenix* that shipped in the 2,000 AK–47 automatic rifles into San Francisco base a year ago. Mr. Speaker, these are the same type of weapons that were recently used in Los Angeles in the bank hold-ups which placed in jeopardy the lives of our law enforcement agencies. Yet, the President says, I do not want any assault weapons in this country. These are truly fully automatic weapons of war and assault weapons. There was a shipment of M–2's that we recently stopped at the border in San Diego, fully automatic weapons. We need to stop that, Mr. Speaker. The Chinese regime is not a steady United States ally.

On July 24, 1996, the U.S. Times reported warnings by the former United States Ambassador Charles Freeman quoting a Chinese official that China could intimidate Taiwan because United States leaders would care more about Los Angeles than they do Taiwan.

What was that about? Remember when China fired missiles at Taiwan this last year? When the United States fleet started going through the straits, Communist China responded with a nuclear threat on the city of Los Angeles, and made the statement, ''Do you prefer Los Angeles more than you do Taiwan?'' And do you think that Taiwan is a possible conflict in the next year? Absolutely, it is.

With American aircraft in the straits, the Chinese official had conveyed an anonymous message to Tony Lake, Anthony Lake, President Clinton's national security adviser, that American interference in Beijing's effort to bring Taipei to heel would result in a devastating attack on the city of Los Angeles. Yet, we are going to allow this same Communist control in Long Beach Naval Shipyard. The San Diego Union Tribune, 3/31/96.

Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal, one of the most strategic locations in the world for the United States, the Panama Canal, that we paid for with blood and sweat and tears and American citizens digging the canal, was recently turned over to Hutchinson, out of Hong Kong, a controlled Chinese Communist country, both ends of the Panama Canal.

Now, why? The major export to China from the United States is wheat. Why do they not go around the horn? For the same reason sailors have not for 200 years, especially with cargo ships, container ships: The weather. They go through the Panama Canal. Yet the Chinese took over control of both ends of it.

The major export port for wheat going to China is where? Guess where, Mr. Speaker? Long Beach Naval Shipyard. They will control price-fixing of our agriculture interests. They will not only have a national security threat, they will have an economic threat to this country.

In the President's budget, he just gave $50 million to Communist China. Maybe $50 million is not very much to a lot of people, but it is to most. In his budget he cut impact education aid, but he gives $50 million to the Communist Chinese for a coal-burning plant in Beijing.

The President also gave China, after the elections, over $100 million to build Cosco ships in a non-recourse loan to Communist China, a loan to Communist China which takes away our Title XI money for our own shipbuilders to build American ships. Those same ships are not going to be sailed by U.S. sailors, they are going to be sailed by Chinese sailors. Those exports, under the control of price-fixing, will go out of the United States.

That is what I talk about regarding our State Department, Mr. Speaker. If we do not speak from a position of strength, instead of a position of weakness, then the United States and America loses again, just another reason why we are in opposition to this move.

Johnny Chung, a Chinese American businessman from California, gave $366,000 to the DNC, the Democratic National Committee, that was later returned on suspicion it illegally came from foreign sources. Guess what? Mr. Chung brought six Chinese officials to the White House last year to hear President Clinton make his weekly radio address.

Mr. Speaker, guess who two of those guests were: The person that owned Cosco, how Chinese shipping was set up, he was the head of it, controlled by Communist China. And one of the others was the very gun runners that smuggled in 2,000 AK–47's into the United States, and after being caught they were penalized and put in prison. Do you know why they were putting the AK–47's into this country? To disrupt our inner cities in the United States, and to go to our gangs.

The M–2's going to Mexico, during the next 90 days Mexico has critical elections. Do we want a left-wing Communist legislature in Mexico City? No. We want a pro-American, we want a pro-reform Mexican legislature, and not to have some Communist country disrupt the elections of countries next to us, whether it is Mexico or Canada.

□ 2015

On the campaign trail last year and in a White House meeting in 1995, President Clinton endorsed a proposal to transfer Long Beach Naval Shipyard to COSCO. A COSCO adviser was among the Chinese businessmen invited to hear the President in the Oval Office.

Over the past year, a COSCO ship recently plowed, if you remember, Mr. Speaker, it was a COSCO ship that totally destroyed the pier in New Orleans. Not only shipping two shiploads of illegal aliens, they are not only shipping in AK–47's, they have not only been violated six times by our Coast Guard, they took out an entire pier, injuring over 116 people, causing millions of dollars in New Orleans and declared unsafe. This is the company that we want controlling and having access within the United States? Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, that is ludicrous.

We want to make it clear, as the Heritage Foundation, Asia analyst, Richard Fisher said, Increasing trade with China should not be pursued at the expense of U.S. national security. We believe there is enough evidence of these COSCO transactions presenting a threat to U.S. national security, particularly when the Clinton administration has been intimately involved throughout, that Congress should exercise its responsibility with prudent and robust oversight.

We plan to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if the United States does not get involved in trade, including with China, that economically we are going to die. But as many Members on both sides of the aisle are afraid of, that should be fair trade, not trade with the United States having the largest, largest trade deficit in the world with China.

We want fair trade. We want the Chinese and our State Department, along with the President, must demand, not should demand, must demand that, first, that Christians quit being abused

in Communist China, that weapons to our enemies, our real enemies, terrorists of Iran, Iraq, Syria, and North Korea cease now, that they quit supplying areas like Bosnia that can be used against our troops, that they quit shipping in weapons to nations close to the United States like Mexico, that the human rights violations be moved on, not thwarted in the United Nations with threats to other countries. And that is another reason, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations should be and must be changed.

The Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, was correct in his recent trip to Asia and China. He said that perhaps one of the first signs that China can make is how the handling of the turnover of Hong Kong to the Communist Chinese looks. The next step should be its policy toward Taiwan as a free nation. And yes, I think that our State Department and our President need to focus on the trade deficit, not only with China but other countries as well.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] said, its utilization of children, we are not talking teenagers, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 5- and 6- and 7-year-olds working 14 hours a day just to survive for a handful of rice. And then guess what? Those products come to this country, but our businesses out of business because we cannot meet that labor cost.

We need to take a look at Long Beach and the biodiversity that the interest groups are currently looking at, including the Audubon Society, Mr. Speaker.

I would be happy to sum up by saying that I will not object to Long Beach having COSCO or other nations as a tenant, but, Mr. Speaker, let us not give them control and complete access of a former national security base, not with the record of COSCO, not with the current threat from the Chinese Communists who just increased their defense by 30 percent and bought 250 SU–27's, which are better than our F–14 and F–15 Strike Eagles, our aircraft, and not with the current China shipping arms to our enemies.

Let us be tough. Let us talk softly and carry a big stick, Mr. Speaker. But when the time comes, I would ask the President, the State Department, and this body to be able to speak with a strong voice and be willing to use that stick. And God bless America.

PRIDE IN THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on an issue that is not only important to me but also I think very important to this Chamber and also very important to the people of America.

I could not help but take note of the statements of our previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] on the problems that we are having right now with China, with the influence peddling.

Of course, Mr. CUNNINGHAM brought up some very good points but also some very disturbing points about possible influence that Communist Chinese have been seeking in the United States of America.

We, of course, have been reading with horror over the past few weeks some of the concerns about investigations of people looking into scandals on whether this White House actually sold access to the Communist Chinese. That is something that we all have to be paying very close attention to, especially in this body, because of the constitutional role that we play, the oversight that we play. Nothing has been proven yet. I think that is very important to say. But at the same time the gentleman from California brings up some very good points and some points that we have to be concerned about.

I do want to say that one of the things that has disturbed me over the past few months, as we have been talking about some of the scandals that have been arising concerning the dealings with China and concerning other scandals that have just been absolutely horrifying to me as a United States Representative and as an American and as a father, are some of these moral equivalency arguments that have been trotted out there.

At times we have been told that the possibility of selling access to China, the possibility of a lot of these other things that have been going on somehow is morally equivalent to what the Speaker was charged with earlier. I have been outrages for quite some time at that, because history will plainly show, and the Speaker's critics certainly know this even though they make disingenuous arguments, that there is no moral equivalency.

The Speaker submitted 50,000 documents to the Ethics Committee, told the truth in those documents, but the fact is that one of those 50,000 documents contradicted another statement that he had made in the document production to the Ethics Committee. Because of that, he agreed to a fine that today he decided to take care of.

Let me just say that I am here today to praise the Speaker of the House for what he decided to do in bringing, I believe, honor on this House. I can tell you right now, the Speaker and certainly others know that I have always spoken my mind when addressing the Speaker of the House.

Two weeks ago, I did it in a very, very public way, in a very public confrontation. And I even suggested that if things did not change regarding the direction of the House leadership, that we might have to look in new directions. I have been very pleased with what has been going on for the past few weeks, but I also have said that if things go wrong again in the future, I will speak my mind again.

So tonight I come here not as a mindless cheerleader of the Speaker, not as a political lap dog or a party line parrot, but instead as a U.S. Congressman, as an American citizen, and as a father who is proud of what the Speaker of the House did today.

I believe in his actions today that his character really did shine through, and it is so difficult teaching my two boys about character when there seem to be so few people in public view that seem to be worthy of emulating. But when I teach my 9-year-old boy, Joey, and my 6-year-old boy, Andrew, about accountability and personal responsibility and stepping up to the plate and looking somebody in the eye and being straightforward with them and taking full accountability, I will give the example of what the Speaker of the House did today on April 17, 1997.

I wanted to read a release that talks about what he did. It said, in an example of accountability, NEWT GINGRICH announced that he will reimburse taxpayers in full, using $300,000 of his own personal funds. In order to fulfill his promise, GINGRICH has secured a loan from Bob Dole to be repaid in full in a timely manner. The Speaker said, my wife and I, Marianne, decided that whatever the consequences, we had to do what was best, what was right, morally and spiritually. We had to put in perspective how our lives had been torn apart by the weight of this decision. We had to take into account the negative feelings that Americans have about Government, Congress, and scandals. We had to take into account the responsibility that the Speaker of the House has to a higher standard, and that is why we came to the conclusion of our own choice, without being forced, that I have the moral obligation to pay the $300,000 out of personal funds and that any other step would simply be seen as one more politician shirking his duty and one more example of failing to do the right thing.

Now, let me just say that as a practical matter, I do disagree with what the Speaker did today. But let me qualify that. I disagree because of the precedent that it might set. But at the same time I am very proud that he recognized that it might set a bad precedent in the future and, therefore, he wants to bring about a resolution that would take care of that, but, more importantly, for he and his wife and his family's future, this could have some very devastating consequences. But he decided that at this point in history, that it was the best thing to do, not for himself, not for his party, but for the U.S. Congress and for America.

We do live in a very, very cynical age. I am absolutely horrified when I read accounts in the newspaper of how Americans believe that White Houses have always sold access to the Lincoln bedroom. I am absolutely shocked when I hear that Americans believe