

one." I appreciated my mom's advice, but, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that mom is not a certified public accountant, and the fact is today, Mr. Speaker, as we know, for many people, two cannot live as cheaply as one, especially when it comes to tax policy in this country.

As the first Arizonan to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means, not only our personal experience with the institution of marriage but hearing from many of our constituents, we know what a challenge it is. Many people write us to say that marriage actually has proven to be a financial disadvantage, that tax policies have proven to serve as a disincentive to the institution of marriage.

Indeed, sadly, we have a tax code, Mr. Speaker, which has grown so expansive, so often working at cross purposes that, perhaps unintentionally we as a Nation have proscribed penalties against those very things that we should value as a society.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, on this special day in the Hayworth household I am pleased to rise not only to that point of purely personal privilege, but also to make this policy statement, that to really cherish families, that to really cherish the institution of marriage, we as a Congress, for our constituents, for our families, for the institution of marriage, should eliminate the marriage penalty that exists, should eliminate those things in the tax code which actually serve as a disincentive to the institution of marriage.

There are many tasks which confront us in this Congress, but we should remember that, in representing all families, we need to move to maximize the fact that those families across this country should hang on to more of their money, to save, spend, and invest as they see fit, not to have those funds confiscated by a government in Washington trying to redistribute wealth, because the families know best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MEDIA BIASED AGAINST KENNETH STARR

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, today on Good Morning America, I saw the most biased, most slanted, least objective interview I have ever watched. The interview was conducted by a woman named Lisa McCree, and she was interviewing Monica Lewinsky's lawyer, William Ginsberg.

Before I went to law school, I got my undergraduate degree in journalism. While this does not make me an expert, it does cause me to notice words or expressions that others perhaps may overlook. Seldom have I seen any commentator make his or her view so obvious to color an interview while trying to at least give an appearance of objectivity.

I do not have the transcript, so I cannot quote word for word, but Ms. McCree's most obvious bias was in regard to Kenneth Starr, the Independent Counsel. Her every word, every nuance, every expression indicated that Judge Starr, in her opinion, had exceeded his authority, was unethical, and just a generally horrible person. Ms. McCree made it very clear that she seems to think that Judge Starr is almost the devil incarnate.

Then when it came to Monica Lewinsky, she kept referring to her by her first name, Monica this and Monica that, and once referred to her as this girl, wondering if Mr. Starr was going to prosecute this girl.

Well, first, Ms. Lewinsky is 24 years old. I used to be a criminal court judge trying the felony criminal cases all across this Nation. Many, perhaps even most, defendants in adult criminal courts are 24 years of age or younger.

Secondly, the polls tells us that a large majority of the people believe that the President had an affair with Ms. Lewinsky starting when she was 21. Thus, if Mr. Starr is trying to take advantage of Ms. Lewinsky, millions of Americans apparently believe the President took advantage of her in a much worse way when she was even younger than that.

I switched stations after this interview by Ms. McCree, and I saw Tim Russert.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to avoid personal references to the President.

Mr. DUNCAN. I saw Tim Russert of Meet the Press, and he was talking about the same subject. He asked, why all the smoke? Why all the cover-up? He asked what is the truth, Mr. President?

I was a criminal court judge for seven and a half years prior to coming to Congress. I tried the felony criminal cases. Offenses like subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice are very serious offenses. If anyone lied under oath in a major case, even at the deposition stage, that is very serious.

The American people have a right to know the truth. Yet, today, we learn that the White House is now hiding behind executive privilege. They do not want the Secret Service to testify. They do not want top officials at the White House to testify. Even the President's own press secretary says this is all going to be very hard to explain and that the people may have a hard time accepting some of what may come out. Judge Starr is doing exactly what he is required by law to do.

□ 1615

He has already gotten more convictions than any independent counsel in history, including convictions of some of the President's closest friends like Webster Hubbell, formerly the Number 2 man at the Justice Department, and Jim Guy Tucker, the former Governor of Arkansas.

Judge Starr was the Solicitor General of the United States. He represented the Federal Government before the Supreme Court. He was a judge of the Federal Court of Appeals. He was one of the most respected lawyers and judges in this Nation until he started going after the President.

If we had a conservative President in office, most of the media and most liberals would be attacking Mr. Starr for not being aggressive enough, yet Ms. McCree, in her interview, asked Mr. Ginsburg if Mr. Starr should be sued. Sued for what? For doing his job?

Bernard Goldberg of CBS Television, in a column in the Wall Street Journal a couple of years ago, said the very liberal bias of the national news media is now so obvious that it is hardly worth mentioning. This from a veteran news man like Bernard Goldberg.

Mr. Speaker, I think the thing that concerns me the most out of this whole situation is the message that we are sending to our young people. We seem to be saying that everyone is having affairs and that everything is all right and that there is not a real difference between right and wrong anymore. I can tell my colleagues that there is still a difference between right and wrong and not everyone out there is having an affair.

I can say that it is interesting to me that women rate a very high percentage of men as having affairs. But if the same women were asked: Do you think your fathers ever had affairs or your husbands, that percentage drops way down. And I think the truth is I know millions of people have had affairs, but far fewer than many people seem to think. We need to send a better message to the young people of this country.

#### TRIBUTE TO JULIE ROGERS

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, Southeast Texas said good-bye to Julie Rogers last week. Julie Rogers, and her late husband, Ben, displayed the finest example of citizenship throughout their lives that I have ever known.

"Extraordinary" is the only word our language provides us to describe the qualities Julie Rogers displayed throughout her 83 years. In an era where women were supposed to stand in the background, Julie's intelligence and talent stood out. She was born and grew up in Chicago. She finished college at age 16 and earned her law degree from DePaul University when she was only 19 years old.