

Fork to settle East Hampton. The town was founded on April 29 with the purchase of 31,000 acres from the Montaukett Indians. The settlers built their huts and cottages along what is now Main Street, and named their new home Maidstone after the English village they left behind. Within a few years, 37 families called Maidstone home.

Like other pioneer towns of the Colonial era, East Hampton grew quickly, attracting many artisans, fishermen, craftsmen and farmers who were overwhelmed by the area's bountiful waters and rich farmland. Soon, the town branched out to the grazing lands of Wainscott, the meadows of Acobonac, the fishing port of Montauk and the harbor at Northwest.

My colleagues, the spirit and handiwork of the original East Hampton residents still lives in the many venerable homes and schools that today stand in the village. Built in 1650, Home Sweet Home is the childhood residence of actor-playwright John Howard Payne, who wrote the famous song the house is named after. Next door is the Mulford House, built in 1680 and also one of Long Island's oldest structures. The Hunting Inn encloses the home built in 1699 for the town's second minister, and the Clinton Academy became New York State's first college prep school when it was established in 1784.

The Main Street home of artist Thomas Moran, whose large canvasses of Yellowstone and Yosemite that helped create the National Park System, is on the National Register of Historic Places. Adjacent to the Moran home is the "Summer White House" used by President John Tyler and his wife, the former Julia Gardiner of East Hampton.

While America's westward expansion continued unabated for the first century, East Hampton grew slowly over its first 200 years. That changed dramatically in the 1870's, when well-to-do New Yorkers looking to escape the city in summer, and artists and writers who were just looking to escape the city, simultaneously discovered East Hampton's bucolic ambience. By the 1880's, East Hampton was a flourishing resort for the financially and artistically gifted. When the Long Island Railroad was extended to East Hampton in 1895, the village's population was fully into its annual summer explosion.

Comprised of the incorporated Village of East Hampton and several smaller hamlets, each of East Hampton's communities has its own district history. The fishing village of Amagansett was home to many great whaling captains of centuries past, including the legendary Captain Josh Edwards. In 1942, an alert U.S. Coast Guardsman spotted four German spies, launched in a rubber boat by a Nazi sub, landing at Amagansett. After a 15-day manhunt, all four would-be saboteurs were captured, and two more subsequently executed for their crimes.

Springs is considered by many the artistic heart of the Hamptons. It most famous resident was the sublime American artist Jackson Pollock. Located on Acobonac Harbor, the denizens of Springs were the original "Bonackers," formerly a derisive term, like calling some one a hick. Today, all East Hamptonites proudly call themselves Bonackers. Few of Long Island's many hamlets have retained their historical charm as well as Wainscott, in the southwest corner of East Hampton. Where else do students still go to school in a one-room schoolhouse.

There is no area of Long Island that has changed less since English settlers first landed here nearly 400 years ago than Gardiners Island. Located in Gardiner's Bay between the North and South Fork of Long Island, the Island was purchased by Lion Gardiner from Wyandanch, the sachem or chief of the Montaukett Indians, in 1639. Today, the crescent shaped isle remains in the Gardiner family's possession, in the same pristine condition as when Lion acquired it.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and emotion that I stand here today and share East Hampton's 350-year anniversary with my Congressional colleagues. Though still just a small, seaside town on the East End of Long Island, East Hampton boasts a proud legacy of achievement and fame that places it among the world well-known communities. I congratulate everyone of my friends and neighbors as they celebrate this historic anniversary.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP:  
CHARACTER, THE ESSENTIAL  
ELEMENT

**HON. PAUL MCHALE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 6, 1998*

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to insert the following speech, which I gave before the Bethlehem Rotary Club on September 2, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP: CHARACTER, THE  
ESSENTIAL ELEMENT

My friends, neighbors and today considering the message I'm going to deliver in just a couple of moments, most especially, my fellow citizens—

I began preparing this speech focusing on character and politics about a month ago. I was watching TV one day when a respected journalist began to discuss the challenges and allegations confronting the President. She said with a note of frustration in her voice, I'm paraphrasing slightly, "We hire public officials like plumbers—to get the job done. We don't expect them to be role models or moral icons." "Character," she finally said, "is largely irrelevant."

I listened to that statement and realized that I disagreed with it so profoundly, so deeply, that it was so contrary to everything that had brought me to public service two decades ago, I know that at some point in some forum, I wanted to respond—not merely to rebut her statement, certainly not to challenge her personally, but to present a very different point of view. Her opinion, in my judgement, is directly at odds with the most important lessons of American history. We *do* expect our public officials to be role models and moral leaders. That expectation is neither naive nor unrealistic.

Theodore Roosevelt was one of the truly great presidents of the United States, a man whom I admire tremendously, a man normally considered one of the five greatest presidents in American history. In some ways it's unfortunate that President Theodore Roosevelt has become almost a caricature because he was a man of extraordinary substance. That caricature often misleads us in terms of the lessons that he had to teach. Let me read to you, if I may, a quote from Theodore Roosevelt on the subject of character and politics: "Sometimes, I hear our countrymen abroad saying, 'Oh you mustn't judge us by our politicians.' I always wanted

to interrupt and answer, "But you *must* judge us by our politicians, not merely by their ability, but by their ideals and the measure in which they realize these ideals, by their attitude in private life and much more by their attitude in public life both as regards their conception of their duties toward their country and their conception of the duty of that country embodied in its government towards its own people and toward foreign nations..."

He continued: "Each community has the kind of politicians it deserves. . . . The most important thing for you to know is how the man you choose will conduct himself in the office to which he is elected. Now to know this, you must not only know his views and his principles, but you must also know how well he practices and corresponds to those principles. This is the all important fact. Far more important than the candidate's words is the estimate you are able to put upon the closeness with which his deeds will correspond to his words."

Roosevelt spoke in the language of his time. He is gender specific to "men" and I would, if I could, edit his transcript and insert "men and women" but the basic lesson remains true. He continued: "What you need in a man who represents you is that he shall show the same qualities of honesty, courage and common sense that in private life make the type of man you are willing to have as a neighbor, that you are willing to work for, or to have work for you. While the private life of a public man is of secondary importance, it is certainly a mistake to assume that it is of no importance. Of course excellence in private conduct, that is domestic morality, punctuality in the payment of debts, being a good husband and father, being a good neighbor, do not, taken together, furnish adequate reason for reposing confidence in a man as a public servant. But lack of these qualities certainly does establish a presumption against any public man. One function of a great public leader should be to exert an influence upon the community at large, especially upon the young men of a community. And therefore, it is idle to say that those interested in the perpetuity of good government should not take into account the fact of a public man's example being something to follow or to avoid, even in matters not connected with his direct public services. No man can be of any service to his state, no man can amount to anything from the standpoint of usefulness to the community at large unless first and foremost, he is a decent man in the close relations of life. . . . Jefferson said that the whole art of government consists in being honest. . . . You cannot be unilaterally honest. The minute that a man is dishonest along certain lines, even though he pretends to be honest along other lines, you can be sure that it is only a pretense, it is only expediency. And you cannot trust to the mere sense of expediency to hold a man straight under heavy pressure." (emphasis added)

That was a lengthy quote. It consumed a significant amount of time, but it also reflected a significant lesson in history. We can't separate a president's character from his performance in office. Indeed, what he does in office finds its initial motivation in the wellspring of his character. There is no such thing as character "compartmentalization."

The Constitutional powers that were assigned to the Presidency were shaped, in part, by the expectation of what type of person would be elected Chief Executive. Let me quote from a book by William Peters, *A More Perfect Union: the Story of the Constitutional Convention*. Fifty-five delegates at various times over the summer of 1787 gathered in Philadelphia (not very far from

where we meet today) in order to define the Constitution, the structure of government under which we today remain privileged to live. When it came time to define the Presidency under Article II of the Constitution, political power was assigned to the executive office with a clear-cut expectation of the personal moral decency, the integrity, the kind of character that each president would bring to the decision-making process.

This is from *A More Perfect Union*: "[At the Constitutional Convention,] Dr. Franklin rose to express his agreement, and in doing so made clear his belief that Washington would be the Country's first executive. 'The first man put at the helm will be a good one,' he said, 'nobody knows what sort may come afterwards.' This expectation that Washington would be the first at the helm was in fact shared by most if not all of the delegates and it influenced not only the way they envisioned the future presidency but the powers they were willing to assign to that office. As Pierce Butler, one of the delegates, would write to a relative in England a year later, the powers of the President 'are full, great and greater than I was disposed to make them, nor do I believe that they would have been so great had not many of the members cast their eyes toward George Washington, who was the presiding officer, as president and shape their ideas of the powers to be given a president by their opinions of his virtue.'" (emphasis added)

When the Constitution was written, those who gathered to draft Article II realized full well what an extraordinary man George Washington was. And while I doubt that they expected every subsequent president of the United States to have the character of our first, they did, indeed, have an expectation—one that we must realize in succeeding generations—that presidents of the United States would certainly possess "virtue" perhaps not of the magnitude possessed by George Washington, but that, at a minimum, there would be decent men and women who would later occupy that office and bring to it at least a sense of integrity paralleling that of our first President. And clearly when they defined the powers of the office, powers that would exist long after the presidency of George Washington, they had the expectation of "character" as a permanent element of leadership resident within the office of the president of the United States.

Let me read to you briefly two other quotes from presidential scholars who speak far more eloquently than I can about these subjects. The first is James Barber, who has written extensively on presidential character: "When a citizen votes for a presidential candidate, he makes in effect a prediction. He chooses from among the contenders the one he thinks, or feels, or guesses would be the best president. He operates in a situation of immense uncertainty. . . . He must choose in the midst of a cloud of confusion, a rain of phony advertising, a storm of sermons, a hail of complex issues, a fog of charisma and boredom and a thunder of accusation and defense. . . . to understand what actual presidents do and what potential presidents might do, the first need is to see the man whole . . . as a human being like the rest of us a person trying to cope with a difficult environment. To that task he brings his own character, his own view of the world, his own political style. . . . If we can see the pattern he has set for his political life, we can, I contend, estimate much better his pattern as he confronts the stresses and the chances of the presidency."

"The presidency," he went on to say, "is a peculiar office." James Barber continued: "The Founding Fathers left it extraordinarily loose in definition partly because they trusted George Washington to invest a

tradition as he went along . . . The Presidency is the focus for the most intense and persistent emotions of the American polity. The president is a symbolic leader, the one figure who draws together the people's hopes and fears for the political future. On top of all of his routine duties, he has to carry that off or fail." (emphasis added)

Richard Neustadt is probably the most highly acclaimed, perhaps the best respected presidential scholar in the United States. He was writing of the president's professional reputation when he drafted the following words in his classic work, *On Presidential Power*: "The professional reputation of a president in Washington is made or altered by the man himself. No one can guard it for him, no one saves him from himself. Everything he personally says and does (or fails to say, omits to do), becomes significant in everyone's appraisal regardless of the claims of his officialdom for his words. His own actions provide clues not only to his personal proclivities, but to forecast an asserted influence of those around him. . . . A president runs the risk by being personally responsible for his own reputation." (emphasis added)

Let me make it clear, in my judgment no candidate for president should be required to pass through a star-chamber of inquisition concerning matters of genuine privacy, most especially in areas of past sexual activity; but to respect privacy does not require that we abandon character, rationalize misconduct, or accept an imaginary compartmentalization of a president's moral judgement and his stated public policies.

We have, I think at most times, a healthy understanding of privacy even with regard to the presidency. Herbert Hoover, with some sense of frustration and certainly with a sense of humor, said in May 1947, "there are only two occasions when Americans respect privacy, especially the president's—those are prayer and fishing." Now I suspect that the scope of privacy is a little bit broader than that. I like to believe that it is. Biographical profiles sufficient to evaluate a candidate's character need not contain salacious detail. A legitimate requirement that we evaluate the whole candidate—his temperament, honesty, demonstrated decency and public policy positions need not and ought not be used to rationalize the journalists' equivalent of a "Peeping Tom." Responsible reporters and a tolerant citizenry usually know where to draw the line.

Unfortunately, by claiming the right of privacy to shield an immoral predatory relationship, a relationship between the president and a twenty-two-year-old intern conducted in the Oval Office and subsequently denied under oath, President Clinton has damaged the genuine right of privacy which many of us defend, the right to be let alone as defined one hundred years ago by Louis Brandeis.

The demand for character is not constant in a president or in any other office-holder. I have had the privilege to serve in public office for about a decade and a half. I have been involved in political activity for almost two decades. There are some days when there are not a lot of pressures upon you in public life. There are days when you simply go about the business of serving the people and you don't have to struggle on that particular day with your conscience, you don't have to reach for moral courage. Those are the routine days of political life for a Member of Congress—a public servant and ordinary citizen.

However, there are other days which prove to be much more challenging for a Member of Congress, and similarly, for the president of the United States. During periods of relative tranquility and prosperity, such as we have enjoyed during most of this decade in

no small part thanks to the efforts of President Clinton, you need only administer and command. There are certain powers granted to a president under Article II of the Constitution. Those powers have been enhanced by subsequent legislation enacted by the Congress. Those are the levers of authority that are the president's by virtue of his elected position. But during a period of national crisis, a president can't merely administer and command, he must lead and inspire. The Civil War, World War I, World War II, The Great Depression and the 20th Century Civil Rights Movement all demanded a substantial level of applied, not merely rhetorical presidential character. None of these challenges could possibly have been met merely by a series of dry presidential position papers. That is why Franklin Roosevelt stated that "(the presidency) is pre-eminently a place of moral leadership."

We don't expect sainthood from our presidents. I know very few saints in public life. I suppose there are a few, but I have not met many of them. We expect ordinary people in times of crisis to rise to the challenge of superior leadership based on patriotism and moral decency, where the contribution they make may even be beyond their own expectations. Perfection is not the standard, but neither should we abandon the fundamental test of character in determining who shall lead us as a people and as a nation.

During the past few minutes, I have spoken on presidential character and the vital role it plays in the process of shaping and implementing our nation's public policies. In the closing minutes of my presentation, I want to apply the concept of presidential character to the troubling, genuinely disheartening presidential misconduct which will soon be brought before the Congress of the United States.

I want my strong criticism of President Clinton to be placed in context. I voted for President Clinton in 1992 and 1996. I believed him to be the "Man from Hope" as he was depicted in 1992. As a member of Congress, I voted for more than three-fourths of the President's legislative agenda and would do so again. I have strongly supported President Clinton's proposals in such areas as Social Security reform, child care, environmental protection, campaign finance and the continuing effort to curb the tobacco industry and discourage teenage smoking. My blunt criticism of the President has nothing to do with policy. The President has always treated me with courtesy and respect and he has been more than responsive to the concerns of my constituents. I do not feel a shred of animosity toward the president of the United States. Unfortunately, he is an exceptionally bright man who is now guilty of extraordinary misconduct.

I must tell you, in complete candor, that I am saddened and dismayed by his actions. I now have an obligation as a member of the United States Congress to evaluate that conduct not as a puritan, but as an elected representative with duties of my own under Article I of the Constitution, to hold this president accountable, as I would hope every Congress would hold any president accountable for misconduct of this nature. Finally, I also want to note that in my judgment Kenneth Starr was wrongly appointed as independent counsel, possessing a background far too partisan and demonstrating personal political ambition inconsistent with the neutral role of a special prosecutor. Nonetheless, only the President is ultimately responsible for his own reprehensible and tragic misbehavior.

Unfortunately, the President's proven misconduct has now made immaterial my past support or my agreement with him on issues. Last January 17th, the president of the United States attempted to cover-up a sordid

and irresponsible relationship by repeated deceit under oath. Contrary to his later public statement, his answers were not "legally accurate," they were intentionally and blatantly false. President Clinton was untruthful at length and untruthful in detail. He allowed his lawyer to make arguments to the court based upon an affidavit that the President knew to be false. The President was present in the room at the time when his lawyer made those unethical arguments to a federal judge who was also physically present. The President later lied to the American people and belatedly admitted the truth only when confronted, some seven months later, by a mountain of irrefutable, conflicting evidence. I am convinced that the President would otherwise have allowed his false testimony to stand in perpetuity. Judge Susan Weber Wright may yet hold the President in contempt of court. If the President avoids a perjury conviction he will be lucky, not innocent.

What is at stake, my fellow citizens, is really the rule of law. When the President took an oath to tell the truth, he was no different at that point from any other citizen, both as a matter of morality and as a matter of legal obligation. We cannot excuse that kind of misconduct because we happen to belong to the same party as the president or agree with him on issues or feel tragically that the removal of the president from office would be enormously painful for the United States of America. The question is whether or not we will stand true to the rule of law. The question is whether or not we will say to all our citizens, including the president of the United States, when you take an oath you must keep it. It was four centuries ago that Sir Thomas More gave up his life rather than swear to a false oath. Now perhaps that's the saintly ideal, but we ought not abandon our nation's historic commitment to the sanctity of the judicial oath, based upon the dangerous rationale that we are all less than perfect.

As we gather here today, eight blocks from where I live, my wife is on jury duty in Philadelphia. Kathy was called to jury duty in federal court. She, right now, is sitting in a courtroom in Philadelphia hearing a sexual harassment case. She and her fellow jurors will have the legitimate expectation that every witness who comes before the court will, to the best of his or her ability, tell the truth. There may indeed be mistakes in recollection; nobody's memory is perfect. But Kathy and every other juror will necessarily conclude, in the absence of conflicting evidence, that the facts presented by witnesses in testimony under oath will be truth-

ful. That is the linchpin of our legal system's search for justice.

I have had the privilege to serve in public life at the local, state and federal level. I started out on the Planning Commission of the Borough of Fountain Hill, served in the state legislature and have now represented you for three terms in the Congress of the United States. I have voted thousands and thousands of times over the last twenty years, but I tell you from personal experience that the venue where the law really takes on meaning is in the courtroom. We can vote for magnificent pieces of legislation in the Congress of the United States, but it is only when that law enters the courtroom that it takes on true meaning for the individual citizen. Whether it's a custody matter, a domestic relations conflict, a contract dispute, an accusation of criminal misconduct, it is in the courtroom that life enters the law. I see Tom Murphy seated in the audience, one of our District Justices. Tom is a former police officer and, I'm confident, fully understands what I am saying. You can pass a great bill in Washington, but if you are unable to equitably enforce it because individual witnesses are untruthful under oath, then the courtroom becomes a sham. Nothing is more important to our democratic system of government than the obligation of citizens to tell the truth when the law is applied to a given set of facts.

Having deliberately provided false testimony under oath the President, in my judgment, forfeited his right to office. It was with a deep sense of sadness that I called for his resignation. By his own misconduct, the President displayed his character and defined it badly. His actions were not "inappropriate." They were predatory, reckless, breathtakingly arrogant for a man already a defendant in a sexual harassment suit, whether or not that suit was politically motivated. In light of his own misconduct, how can this President now speak with moral authority on issues such as teenage pregnancy, male responsibility for children born out of wedlock and the duty to treat women with dignity, equality and not merely as objects for male gratification? How can he lead, not merely command, our men and women in uniform, knowing that his actions would in a military environment result in a court martial? How could I defend the President knowing that I would fire an employee under similar circumstances?

And if in disgust or dismay, we were to sweep aside the President's immoral and illegal conduct, what dangerous precedent would we set for the abuse of power by some future president of the United States? And are we really prepared to substitute polling

data for the rule of law? For our country's sake, I hope not. But if we sweep this aside, that is the precedent that we will inevitably establish. All of us, I think, have been repelled by the detail of reporting in terms of the President's specific activity. I have heard all that I need to hear.

But if we are so repelled by the facts as they have now become known that we push this presidential misconduct aside, I assure you that twenty-five, fifty, one hundred years from now there may well be some other temporarily popular president of the United States who will choose to violate his oath of office and perhaps provide false testimony to a court believing and relying on the precedent that if you are popular enough, somehow you are different from and superior to your fellow citizens, that somehow you too may be excused when you lie under oath. That is a dangerous precedent we can ill afford to set as a nation. It is a precedent that would ominously outlive every person in this room.

We cannot define the President's character—he correctly noted that reality a few weeks ago. He alone has that power and that responsibility. But we *must* define our nation's. That is the challenge that we face today.

I have had the opportunity on many occasions, particularly during this presidency, but also on a few occasions beforehand to visit the White House. I would encourage you to do that. If you can enter the White House and not be inspired, you have a tougher set of emotions that I do. Every time I enter that building and the one where I work, the Capitol, I am overwhelmed by the sense of history and the obligation that that history imposes on us, we who serve today.

On many occasions, I have spent time in the White House State Dining Room. I think it was on my first visit to that dining room, probably on the public tour, that I noticed that there is in that room a wonderful fireplace and carved into the mantle of that fireplace, a prayer. The prayer goes back to the days of John Adams who first voiced it on November 2, 1800, nearly two hundred years ago. His prayer remains centrally relevant to the issue of character and politics today. John Adams' prayer for those who would later occupy the White House may be read upon the mantle as follows: "I pray Heaven bestow the best of blessings on this House and all that shall hereafter inhabit it. May none but honest and wise men ever rule under this roof."

John Adams was wrong in his gender limitation, but he was unquestionably right in his eternal hope.