

See, we have this idea that Democrats rejected about 40 years ago, and that is families can do a better job of spending their own money than you do for them.

Now that sounds alien in Washington, DC, but in Little Rock, AR, people are beginning to think maybe that is the way we ought to do things.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas would yield to me?

Mr. PRYOR. I do not have the floor, actually.

Mr. GRAMM. I have to go to a hearing on Legal Services, to let them know the bad news.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would say, the hour of 10:30 having arrived, morning business was to close.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, seeing no other Senators desiring recognition, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed to proceed for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was curious about the question asked by my colleague from Arkansas.

Our colleague, Senator GRAMM from Texas, said that at this fundraiser they were not giving anybody anything. I assume he forgot, probably, that in the vote in the House of Representatives on the Contract With America, just to name one little piece of that, they eliminated the alternative minimum tax for corporations.

You remember those stories in the old days about a big corporation that earned \$3 billion in earned income, net profit, and paid zero in Federal income tax. Well, the Federal Government said they wanted to correct that, so they set up what was called an alternative minimum tax, so you could never zero it out, talking about the real big corporations now.

Well, in the House of Representatives, in the tax bill under the contract, they zero it out and they say, "No more alternative minimum tax. You big companies, you make \$5 billion, it is all right if you pay zero in taxes." But at same time they do that, they say, "But we can give those companies"—incidentally, about 2,000 companies—"the equivalent of \$2 million each in tax breaks. We can afford to do that, but we cannot afford to provide student aid, as we used to, so we will have to ask kids who are going to go to college who do not have any money to pay for it, we will make it harder for kids to go to college because we cannot afford investing in kids who go to college, as we used to, but we do have the money to provide the equivalent of a \$2 million tax break for each of 2,000 corporations by saying to those corporations, You no longer have to worry about a little thing called the alternative minimum tax. You can zero it out, if you like."

I am guessing the Senator from Texas just forgot about that.

And there are a dozen more like it, little old things that I am sure folks

would show up to show their appreciation for, but they are the kinds of things that represent priorities—the priorities that say we really believe in the big interests here, we really think the big interests need a lot more help because if we rain on big interests somehow it will all seep down to the little folks that are trying to send their kids to college. That is what I think has been forgotten in this equation and this discussion between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

Under a previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of a resolution to be submitted the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO].

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I have a resolution which I will shortly be sending to the desk. May I ask, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the resolution to be considered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. I believe we have agreed that there will be no more than 2 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, from the time you bring it up.

Mr. D'AMATO. Will the time start to run as of now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is when the Senator submits the resolution to the desk.

ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND OTHER MATTERS

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I send the resolution to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator DOLE—and I know others would like to join—and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 120) establishing a special committee administered by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs to conduct an investigation involving Whitewater Development Corp., Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan Association, Capital Management Services, Inc., the Arkansas Development Finance authority, and other related matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, Whitewater is a very serious matter. Some questions raised by Whitewater go to the very heart of our democratic system of government. We must determine whether the public trust has been abused. We must ascertain whether purely private interests have been placed above the public trust. The American people have a right to know the full facts about Whitewater and related matters.

After the Banking Committee's hearings last year, many important questions still remain. The American people have a right and a need to know the answers to these questions.

Congress has the responsibility to serve as the public's watchdog. We would be derelict in our duties if we did not pursue these Whitewater questions. The Senate must proceed in an evenhanded, impartial, and thorough manner. We have a constitutional responsibility to resolve these issues.

Mr. President, we now bring before the Senate a resolution that authorizes a special committee administered by the Banking Committee to continue the Whitewater inquiry that was started but not completed during the last Congress.

I thank my distinguished colleague, Senator SARBANES, for his hard work and cooperation in the preparation of this resolution. We have jointly prepared a resolution that is balanced and fair and that will allow the special committee to search for the truth. I am confident that Senator SARBANES and I will continue the Banking Committee's bipartisan approach to the Whitewater matter.

Mr. President, our pursuit of these questions must be and will be fair, straightforward, and responsible. The American people expect and deserve a thorough inquiry committed to the pursuit of truth. That is the American way.

Last summer, the Banking Committee met these vigorous requirements. Our examination of the Whitewater matter was impartial, balanced, and thorough. That is our goal in this Congress. I am confident that we will meet these goals.

During last summer's hearings, many facts were uncovered. We learned that certain top administration officials were not fully candid and forthcoming with the Congress. That is an undisputed fact. The public has a right to expect more from those in positions of trust. We also learned that senior Treasury Department and Clinton White House officials mishandled confidential law enforcement information concerning Madison Guaranty. That is another undisputed fact. Madison is now defunct; it is a defunct S&L at the heart of the Whitewater matter. The failure of this Arkansas S&L eventually cost American taxpayers more than \$47 million.

Mr. President, the American people have a right to know the answers to

many serious questions still remaining about Whitewater and related matters. We have a constitutional obligation to seek the answers to these questions. That is why I am offering this resolution today.

Now I will briefly outline some of the matters that this resolution authorizes the special committee to investigate. We will begin with the handling of the papers in deputy White House counsel Vince Foster's office following his death. Who searched Mr. Foster's office on the night of his death? What were they looking for? What happened to Mr. Foster's papers? Were any papers lost or destroyed? And who authorized the transfer of Mr. Foster's Whitewater file to a closet in the First Family's residence? The public has a right to the answers to these questions.

Mr. President, this resolution encourages the special committee to coordinate its activities with those of the independent counsel, Kenneth Starr. Senator SARBANES and I have met with the independent counsel. Judge Starr has indicated to us that he has no objection to the special committee's plan to inquire into the handling of Mr. Foster's papers. Senator SARBANES and I are committed to coordinating the committee's activities with those of the special counsel.

This resolution authorizes the special committee to pursue answers to other questions raised during the Banking Committee's hearings last year.

We will explore the scope and impact of the improper dissemination of confidential law enforcement information concerning Madison Guaranty. How widely did the Clinton administration officials communicate this confidential information? Did any high-ranking officials inform targets of criminal investigations? If so, did this impact any ongoing investigations? The public has a right to know the answers to these questions.

The special committee will also examine whether there were any improper contacts between the Clinton White House and the Justice Department regarding Madison Guaranty.

We know that Paula Casey, the U.S. attorney in Little Rock, declined to pursue criminal referrals involving Madison. That is an undisputed fact. We also know that Webster Hubbell, who has pleaded guilty to mail fraud and tax evasion, was the No. 3 official at the Justice Department at this critical time. This is another undisputed fact.

The committee will ascertain whether Mr. Hubbell contacted Paula Casey about Madison. And who else, if anyone, knew about these contacts with the U.S. attorney. The public has the right to know.

Mr. President, this resolution authorizes the special committee to explore whether the Resolution Trust Corporation and other officials in Washington tried to interfere improperly with RTC staff in Kansas City responsible for investigating wrongdoing

at Madison. If such interference occurred, who authorized it, and why? The public deserves answers to these questions.

During last summer's hearings, the Banking Committee learned that the Treasury inspector general furnished the Clinton White House, at the White House counsel's request, transcripts of the inspector general's depositions. That is an undisputed fact.

The committee will now look into whether these deposition transcripts were used to coach administration witnesses before they appeared in front of the committee. That would be wrong. The public has a right to know if it happened.

All of these matters that I have discussed so far involve events that occurred after January 1993 when President Clinton took office. There are also serious questions regarding events that occurred in Arkansas in the 1980's when President Clinton was Governor. This resolution also authorizes the special committee to examine these matters. Some of these Arkansas matters are complex and will require the committee's close review of many thousands of pages of documents.

We will review the operations and regulations of Madison Guaranty. Did James McDougal, Madison's chairman and Governor Clinton's business partner, improperly divert Madison's funds to himself and others? Did any of this money find its way into the White House real estate project in which McDougal and Governor Clinton were partners? Did McDougal misuse Madison funds to cover any losses the First Family suffered on their Whitewater investment? The public has a right to know the answers to these questions.

Mr. President, the resolution further authorizes the special committee to examine the Rose law firm's representation of both Madison and RTC, and senior partners at the Rose law firm, including Larry Rodham Clinton, Webster Hubbell, and Vince Foster. The committee must ascertain whether the Rose law firm properly handled the RTC civil claims concerning Madison.

Did the firm have a conflict of interest, and did American taxpayers lose money in the process?

We will also examine Capital Management Services and its president, David Hale, a former Arkansas judge and Clinton appointee. Hale has publicly charged that the President pressured him to make Small Business Administration loans that were used to prop up Madison.

Did this happen? Did Hale also make improper Small Business Administration loans to current Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker?

Then there is the matter of the financing of the 1990 Arkansas gubernatorial campaign. We now know that the president of the Perry County Bank, Neal Ainley, has pleaded guilty to violating Federal laws in connection with the handling of certain large cash transactions for the Clinton campaign.

Ainley claims he did so at the direction of campaign officials. The public has a right to know who authorized this activity and why.

Mr. President, this resolution will authorize the special committee to examine these and related matters. We will take every reasonable step to complete this inquiry promptly. We hope that the administration cooperates with us in this regard. But we also intend to be thorough and comprehensive.

This resolution provides \$950,000 to fund the special committee through February 29, 1996. If additional money is needed, the special committee will make a recommendation not later than January 15, 1996, and the majority and minority will meet to determine the time for any vote.

Mr. President, we expect to hold public hearings into the handling of the papers of Vince Foster's office in late June or early July. We will continue our inquiry by subject matter until it is completed. In doing so, we will make every effort not to interfere with the independent counsel's criminal investigation.

Mr. President, the American people deserve to know the full facts about Whitewater and related matters. As I said at the outset, we will conduct this inquiry in a fair, evenhanded, and impartial manner.

That is what the American people want, expect, and deserve. I urge the approval of this resolution.

I see that my distinguished colleague and ranking member, Senator SARBANES, is here. We have allocated up to 2 hours, equally divided.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, may I ask what the time situation is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). There are 2 hours, of which 15 minutes has already been used.

Mr. SARBANES. There is an hour now remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, it is not my intention to use the entire hour. I hope at some point both sides might be able to yield back time and proceed to final consideration of the resolution.

Let me say at the outset that the resolution we are considering today, which authorizes a special committee to be administered by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, is really a carrying out of resolutions that were adopted last year by this body. I think it is important to consider this resolution in the context of those resolutions—actions taken by the Senate last year.

On March 17, 1994, a little over a year ago, the Senate adopted a resolution by a vote of 98-0 expressing the sense of the Senate that hearings should be held on all matters relating to Madison, to Whitewater, and to Capital Management.

Then, to carry out that resolution, at least in part, on June 21 of last year,

the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 229, which authorized hearings to be held into certain areas. Those hearings were done last summer. We had 6 days of public hearings. We had extensive analysis of documents that were provided to the inquiry committee in order to enable it to carry out its responsibilities.

Now, one of the things that was authorized to be looked into by the June 21 resolution was the handling of the Foster documents. That was later deferred, in response to a request from the independent counsel who contacted the committee and indicated that, given the nature of his inquiry, it would be preferable if the Committee did not go ahead with that hearing. Accordingly, we held off.

Now the distinguished chairman has indicated that it would be the first item which will be considered in the hearings that will now take place under the resolution we are considering here today.

So this resolution is in effect a continuation of our earlier work. It authorizes the completion of work specified in last year's resolution, as well as matters developed during and arising out of the hearings that were held last summer, and also a number of matters my colleague has enumerated that carry forth on the sense-of-the-Senate commitment last year to investigate all matters pertaining to Madison.

I want to go through some other aspects of this resolution, just to lay them out on the record. The chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator D'AMATO, has gone through a number of matters that have been provided for in this resolution to be examined by the special committee. The special committee, administered by the Banking Committee, shall consist of all of the members of the Banking Committee plus two members added from the Judiciary Committee. The chairman and ranking members of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their designees, will join with the members of the Banking Committee to constitute the special committee which will be administered by the Banking Committee. So it is essentially—or primarily, let me say—a Banking Committee activity, since most of the areas to be examined clearly fall under the jurisdiction of the Banking Committee. But we did add from the Judiciary Committee last year. A member came on in order to help carry out the inquiry. And there are some matters that are contained in the resolution, to be examined that, it could well be argued, are under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. So, to bring that together, we are bringing on two members from the Judiciary Committee, the chairman and ranking member or their designees. They will be designating someone else to handle this responsibility if they choose to do so, and I do not know at this point what Chairman HATCH and ranking member BIDEN intend to

do in that regard. But obviously we will abide by their decision.

We have also provided in the resolution which is now before us, and which shortly will be adopted, for rules and procedures of this committee which essentially will be the rules and procedures of the Senate, the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the rules of procedure of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. That is, in effect, the rules framework, procedural framework within which we will operate. There are in the resolution sections that cover aspects of the process that the special committee will follow; these are matters it was deemed important that we spell out in the resolution how they were going to be dealt with. Those involve questions of subpoena powers, questions of how the hearings will be conducted—important questions about immunity. I want to underscore that because that is a matter we have had to address before.

We provide that to grant a witness immunity—I want to read this section because it is an important matter. The special committee has the power: "To grant a witness immunity under section 6002 and 6005" of title 18, United States Code, "provided that the independent counsel has not informed the special committee in writing that immunizing the witness would interfere with the ability of the independent counsel successfully to prosecute criminal violations."

We also provide for staffing of the committee. There is power to appoint special committee staff including consultants, assistance from the Senate legal counsel, assistance from the Comptroller General. There is a provision whereby the committee can draw on other Government agencies, Government personnel, and on other congressional staff. And we hope, through a combination of all of these sources, that we will have an adequate staff to carry out a proper inquiry and investigation.

There is also, of course, special provision for the protection of confidential information, since we will be interacting with the independent counsel and others and we think it is important to have such provisions.

Finally, the money asked for in this resolution, just under \$1 million, \$950,000, is to cover the salaries and other expenses of the special committee carrying out this inquiry, beginning on the date of the adoption of this resolution—I assume today—and ending February 29, 1996.

If it is judged that additional money is needed, that the inquiry needs to go forward and additional money is required in order to fund it, the special committee will recommend that. Of course there will have to be a further vote for the providing of additional moneys to the special committee.

Mr. President, let me just make a couple of further, more general observations. I have very quickly gone through the resolution and I think

most of it is straightforward. I think Members of the Senate upon reviewing it will conclude that is the case. Many of the provisions are what one might call boilerplate for such an inquiry, and track previous provisions that have been used in various Senate resolutions establishing committees to carry out inquiries or investigations of the sort that is being authorized here.

I listened to the chairman with great interest and I was particularly encouraged by his very strong statement of the need to conduct impartial, balanced and thorough hearings, which is exactly what I think needs to be done. There are a lot of allegations that are swirling around and there are a lot of questions that are being raised. We see them from time to time raised in the press and in the media. And, of course, one could sit around all day long and conjure up one question after another. It is not difficult, it is very easy. It is not difficult just simply to say, "Well, suppose this happened or suppose that happened; or if this or if that." Of course, one of the purposes of these hearings is to get a good, tough-minded examination of these various allegations to see if there is anything to them. It needs to be appreciated, that it is very easy to make the allegations. Whether the allegations are in fact substantiated by the facts is a tougher question to determine, and that does require an impartial, balanced and thorough hearing. In fact, the President himself has said the best way to address these matters is to look at the facts candidly, and that is what I very much hope and expect that this committee will be able to do.

I do think last summer we conducted hearings that were perceived by all as being thorough and fair and impartial. We went at it, in effect, to find out what the facts were, to ascertain the truth. I think we pressed that issue in a resolute manner, and I would expect the special committee will do so in the case that is—in the instance that is before us.

These hearings will make an effort to get the facts out fully and impartially. We anticipate that the administration will cooperate with this effort. They certainly have indicated that is what they intend to do. Last year they made every document available that was requested, as I recall. I think I am correct in that statement. Now the time has come to move forward, to begin our hearings, to begin, in effect, to examine these various questions and allegations and ascertain with respect to each of them whether there is any factual grounding behind them or whether they simply raise questions that people can ask. And that, of course, is the purpose of the inquiry which we will be undertaking here with this provision of \$950,000 to carry out this investigation in the period between now and February 29. The resolution provides that the special committee shall make every reasonable effort to complete,

not later than February 1, 1996, the investigation, study, and hearings authorized by section 1.

This resolution does provide the basis for carrying out a full and proper, impartial, and balanced hearing.

I think our challenge now is to move ahead in carrying out our responsibilities in the special committee. It is a heavy burden to add to the responsibilities that Members already have but is one that obviously we are charged with responding to.

As I said, we adopted resolutions last year addressing this matter. This, in effect, carries forward on those resolutions. It is a continuation, in effect, of that work. But I hope that if we apply ourselves to it over the coming months, we will be able to work through all of these matters and, in effect, bring this issue to closure in the sense that the Members of the Senate and the American people know that the various questions have been raised and thoroughly examined, that it has been done with a great deal of balance and fairness and impartiality, and that these are what the facts are as a consequence of that investigation and inquiry.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. Will time be equally charged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. SARBANES. I ask unanimous consent to put in a quorum call and that the time be equally charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered. The time will be charged to both sides equally.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. D'AMATO. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina whatever time he needs, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Madam President, I want to begin my remarks by saying that I plan to enthusiastically support the Whitewater resolution.

I think it is a good resolution. I am concerned, however, that a few key things have been left out of it. Nevertheless, I think that before the hearings are over, we will wind up working them in.

Nothing in this resolution allows us to probe the circumstances surrounding the death of Vince Foster. When we held the hearings last year in the Senate, a key witness, Captain Hume, sim-

ply did not show up at the hearings the day he was supposed to be there. The hearings had been planned for months. Captain Hume was out of town that day. He was supposed to be there. Our ranking member at the time demanded that they bring him back for several days. But they did not bring him back. The hearings adjourned and we never heard from him. I do not think this was a thorough airing of the issues, and I think we need to do it again.

I understand that Mr. Starr is looking at this again. I hope that he will, given the miserable job that Mr. Fiske did of investigating.

Madam President, the Congress also needs to probe the \$100,000 profit in the commodities market that came to Mrs. Clinton courtesy of Red Bond and Jim Blair, the general counsel of Tyson Foods. This is not mentioned in the resolution, and it should be.

Just recently, I discovered that a friend of the Clintons, Barbara Holum, was conveniently installed as acting head of the CFTC before the story of Mrs. Clinton's commodity trades broke.

There are many confusing issues. Now we find that Red Bond, who did the commodity trading, who is practically bankrupt, was able to pay off \$7 million in back taxes just 2 months before the commodity trading story became public. To me, the evidence on this is just too much to believe that all of this is a coincidence.

Madam President, this resolution does not allow us to probe the failure of First American Savings & Loan in Illinois.

If you can believe this, Vince Foster and Mrs. Clinton were hired by the Federal Government to sue Dan Lasater. The same Dan Lasater that was a close friend of the Clintons. That is right, Mrs. Clinton was hired by the Federal Government to sue Dan Lasater in connection with the failure of First American Savings & Loan in Illinois. Mrs. Clinton participated in the decision to lower the amount of money the Government would recover from Dan Lasater from \$3.3 million to \$200,000, and we do not know yet what percentage of that went to her as attorney's fee because the records were sealed.

The Government spent over \$100 billion to resolve the savings and loan crisis. With crooks like Dan Lasater involved and with Mrs. Clinton acting on behalf of the taxpayers, suing a friend, it is no wonder the cost was so high.

I want to again state my strong support—and I say this not necessarily in the language as we often use in the Senate—but of my good friend, fellow member of the Banking Committee and our chairman, ALFONSE D'AMATO. He truly is a good friend, and he has given us the leadership we need.

I hope, and I know that before this hearing is over, under his leadership, we will have probed all aspects of Whitewater in a fair manner so that the American people understand what

happened, when it happened, and who knew it when it happened. I look forward to the hearings.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. D'AMATO. Madam President, I know of my good friend, Senator FAIRCLOTH's concern that there be ample scope to look into all of the matters that are relevant, and I share that concern. I think that this resolution very fairly embodies us with the authority—and I would refer to page 4.

As my friend raises, we did not attempt to spell out every single area. Page 4, line 12, says:

Subsection 3. To conduct an investigation and public hearings into and study all matters that have any tendency to reveal the full facts about . . .

Then we go through all of the various areas. There are other Senators who are going to speak, but I believe it is important to summarize those areas. Senator SARBANES has. The fact is that we include the ability to look into the bond underwriting contracts between the Arkansas Development Finance Authority and Lasater & Co., and all of those activities to which my friend has referred. But there must be a connection, and if there is a connection, well, then, we will look into the area, and I will touch on these areas in more detail before our time is up.

So I share my friend's concern. This will be thorough. It will be thoughtful. And when subpoenas are issued—and I must tell you that the specific instance that he raises is troubling, that of a witness who failed to respond to a subpoena, especially one who works for the Government, who was given notice, and who gave the committee, either the majority or the minority or our staff, no reason to believe that he would not be there. That will not be tolerated. If we run into a situation like that, I can assure you, and I know that the ranking member shares this same concern, we want people to respond to subpoenas. We will not issue them frivolously.

I think in that case a subpoena might not have even been issued because we assumed that he was going to be there. So it is not a bad track record to have almost everybody respond, including even those who were not subpoenaed. But, we will remain vigilant in seeking this kind of cooperation.

I see that Senator BOND is in the Chamber, and he is on the Banking Committee and was an integral part of last year's hearings, and I yield to him 10 minutes from my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I thank my good friend, my colleague from New York.

Madam President, as we begin the debate on this resolution authorizing a second round of Whitewater hearings, I thought it would be helpful to review why the Senate and the committee need these issues to be aired.

I wish to summarize for my colleagues some points that are particularly important to me and have come from my experience with the first round of hearings and also with the hearing back in February where we asked the questions that began some of the process in finding out what has gone on in the administration.

As most of the Nation now knows, Madison Guaranty was a Little Rock savings and loan which went belly-up at the cost of nearly \$50 million, and was owned by James McDougal—the business partner of the Clintons' in the Whitewater real estate deal.

Madison Guaranty was the classic S&L story of insider dealing, reckless loan policies and ultimate failure with the U.S. taxpayers picking up the tab. It is a part of the \$105 billion cost of the S&L debacle, and in that way is a story repeated in many communities around the country.

But one part of this case has made it famous—many of its borrowers, directors, and counsel were prominent figures in Arkansas politics and government.

The tangled web of Madison, Jim McDougal, and the Clintons has led to two sets of criminal referrals, an ongoing civil liability investigation by the RTC, a potential conflict of interest case for the First Lady's former law firm, a conviction of a Little Rock judge who improperly loaned SBA money to McDougal and Whitewater, several other recent guilty plea agreements and an ongoing investigation by independent counsel Starr.

Since these issues first came to light, I have said over and over that the American people have a right to know what happened to the millions of dollars lost, and we, in Congress, must fulfill our obligation and get the facts out into the open.

Last year the Senate was engaged in a lengthy struggle over what questions and areas the Banking Committee would be allowed to address as Whitewater—Madison hearings begin. Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership at that time did everything in their power to limit the scope of the hearings, and to block our efforts to get at the truth—particularly as it relates to what Clinton administration officials have done to control or interfere with investigations.

The questions we asked last year remain as relevant today as they did last May:

Did Whitewater Development Corp. benefit from taxpayers insuring of Madison Guaranty deposits?

Did any of Madison's federally insured funds go to benefit the Clinton campaigns?

Were the bank regulatory agencies operating in an impartial and independent manner as they handled Madison Guaranty?

How did the Resolution Trust Corporation handle the criminal referrals on Madison—both under the Bush administration as well as the Clinton administration?

How did the Resolution Trust Corporation and the FDIC handle potential civil claims against Madison—both under the Bush administration as well as the Clinton administration?

How did the Department of Justice handle the RTC criminal referrals it received, again both under the Bush administration and the Clinton administration?

What were the sources of funding and lending practices of Capital Management Services, and how did the SBA regulate and supervise it, particularly as it related to loans to Susan McDougal and her company, Master Marketing.

Full hearings on the Whitewater-Madison affair are needed so that all these questions can be fairly asked and answered. What happened in Arkansas, what happened in the 1992 Clinton campaign in their efforts to keep the lid on about the actions in Arkansas, and what has the administration done to manage the Madison-Whitewater issues since they took office.

If we are to finally get to the bottom of the story as to what happened with the criminal referrals, I believe that we need to start with the first criminal referral on Madison Guaranty which was already in the Justice Department awaiting action when the Clinton administration took office.

Remember, Madison Guaranty had failed in 1989 and had been first taken over by the FDIC, and then in August 1989 when Congress passed the S&L bailout bill the newly created RTC took over Madison.

The RTC's mission was to close down failed thrifts, sell the assets, pay off the depositors and then seek out criminal or civil wrongdoing that may have occurred. If they found criminal wrongdoing—fraud, or attempts to enrich, they referred their findings to the Department of Justice for further action.

If they found civil wrongdoing—for example, law firms or accounting firms who helped institutions stay open by providing misleading, incomplete or incorrect information to regulators or the S&L's board members—the RTC would pursue those cases.

Thus from August 1989 the RTC had Madison Guaranty on its plate. No action was taken by the RTC on potential civil claims, but several criminal referrals were developed. In one case Jim McDougal and two others were accused of fraud, but were acquitted, in another case a board member plead guilty to falsifying documents.

Then came March 1992 when the New York Times reported a series of potential misdealings in Madison Guaranty and spurred the RTC to take another look at the institution. This second look caused the first criminal referral to be sent to Justice in the fall of 1992, and it was this referral which awaited final action when the Clinton administration came into office in January 1993.

I give this brief history in order to put things into perspective. Last year,

Senator SPECTER and I offered amendments to the Whitewater Committee resolution which would have allowed the Banking Committee to pick up story at this point, and follow the trail of the first referral as it made its way through the Government, and then to follow the trail of the second referral as it was developed throughout 1993, up to and including the improper contacts by Treasury officials with White House staff. This of course would entail questioning the RTC officials involved, Justice Department officials involved, as well as Treasury and White House staff.

Because we must remember that on the day that the Clinton administration officials walked in the door on January 21, 1993, a criminal referral on Madison Guaranty was sitting in the Department of Justice.

I for one still want to know:

How did the Department of Justice handle this referral?

Was the White House informed and if so when and by whom?

Who in Justice was assigned to monitor the Madison case, and what actions did they take?

And then, as we know now, just months after taking office, a second set of referrals was being developed—and it too was sent off to the Clinton Justice Department by RTC officials in Kansas City.

I want to know why the RTC decided to stay on the case. What happened to get a series of RTC officials reassigned and taken off the case? Is there a pattern of special treatment for politically sensitive cases? And again, how did the Department of Justice handle the second referral?

I want to know why did the Clinton appoint Little Rock U.S. attorney Paula Casey, along with Webb Hubbell, delay their recusals until after the decision not to prosecute Madison was made? I also want to know the details about Paula Casey and Webb Hubbell's phone contacts during the period when Casey was deciding what to do with the referrals, and did either one of them have any contact with the White House on the referrals at any time?

And now, just in the past weeks we have seen reported by the Associated Press that:

Preparing for televised Whitewater hearings last summer, White House attorneys consulted confidential depositions from a Treasury investigation in an effort to reconcile differing accounts of administration officials who were about to testify.

Former White House counsel Lloyd Cutler acknowledged this week that the depositions were used to identify discrepancies in the recollections of presidential aides before the congressional hearings.

White House lawyers would then "confront" the aides with information they had obtained from the depositions without revealing the sources, he told The Associated Press.

"If we found inconsistencies, we would go back to White House officials, and go back over testimony they gave us," Cutler explained. "and then we would say 'we have heard other reports.'"

This of course brings into play several other issues which I have been following since the close of the hearings last August. As we know now, confidential information was again turned over by Treasury to the White House—this time under the guise of a Treasury Department inspector general's investigation.

This calls into question not only the independence of the IG, but also the willingness of this administration to politicize what is supposed to be an internal watchdog.

It also calls into question the entire testimony offered by White House officials before the Senate Banking Committee—as they were given another heads up in order to best tailor their testimony to help the boss.

Last November I wrote to then Chairman Riegle and ranking member D'AMATO about what I had discovered. In my letter I stated:

As you know, over these past several months I have continued my efforts to resolve outstanding questions which were raised during the Banking Committee's Whitewater hearings. Initially I became concerned upon discovering during our hearings that the Treasury Inspector General had turned over to the White House—at Lloyd Cutler's specific request—transcripts of all the testimony taken by the investigators a full week before the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) report was made public. At the time we learned this, several former Inspectors General expressed amazement at this unprecedented action. However, no further review of the incident was undertaken.

During my investigation of this disclosure, I discovered that not only were the documents released to the White House at the specific request of White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler, but, in doing so, the Treasury turned over confidential RTC information to the White House.

On Saturday, July 23, 1994, the Department of the Treasury gave the White House all of the sworn depositions of Treasury, White House, and RTC personnel. These depositions were unedited.

According to the RTC, it was not until July 26 or 27 that the RTC became aware of the fact that RTC depositions had been provided to the White House.

July 26, after reviewing the information provided by the Treasury I.G., Lloyd Cutler testified before the House Banking Committee.

July 28 and 29, Counsel to the RTC Inspector General Patricia Black redacted all the Treasury, RTC, and White House depositions in order to remove confidential RTC information.

July 31 the OGE report, with edited testimony, was provided to Congress and subsequently made public.

Given that the focus of our hearings this past August was the improper transmittal of confidential information from the RTC to the White House regarding Madison Guaranty and the Clintons, I must tell you I am appalled that the same Treasury Department, acting under specific direction from Secretary Bentsen, would again provide nonpublic information about the Madison Guaranty case directly to the White House.

In addition, I found it extraordinary that the White House, which was itself under investigation, would be given nonpublic information prior to Congressional hearings—particularly when Congress itself was not given the information.

And now of course we have discovered that Mr. Cutler and others used this information not only to assist in the drafting of Mr. Cutler's testimony—but to help White House staff with the inconsistencies in their own stories.

I find this entire episode just another example of the extraordinary lengths the White House was willing to go to keep the facts from Congress, keep the facts from the American people, and ultimately to protect the administration.

As I have said on this floor before, breaching the public trust is as serious an offense as committing a crime, or being found liable for financial penalties. Governments in free societies have a fundamental pact with the governed. In exchange for the powers and responsibilities which is given the Government, the people expect fairness, evenhanded justice, impartiality, and they held the innate belief that those in power can be trusted to be good stewards of their power.

Our form of democracy relies on checks and balances to keep too much power from ending up in just one place—and Congress, as the people's closest link to their Government has the responsibility to keep a sharp eye out for abuses and breaches of the people's trust.

Thus every Member of Congress takes an oath of office, to uphold the Constitution—and certainly part of that duty to be ever watchful for abuses of power. Interestingly, and not surprisingly, it nearly always falls to the party out of power to be the more diligent in watching out for abuses.

No one disputes this.

But one other fact should also be noted. As important it is for the general public to believe in and trust that their elected leaders are performing their jobs in an ethical, truthful, and fair manner—we, in Congress, must also believe that those in high positions of responsibility are telling us the truth. When we ask questions or make inquiries we must trust that administrations will tell the truth, will be honest, and that when we get an answer, it is a full and complete one.

Unfortunately, Madam President, it is this standard that inevitably some administration officials seem unable to comprehend.

Instead of cooperation and truthfulness we have seen evasions, omissions, misstatements, and possibly outright lies.

And the story of potential abuse of the public trust, the politicization of independent agencies and investigations, the use of confidential material for political gain—it only seems to get worse the deeper you look.

Madam President, the next rounds of hearings will go a long way toward clearing the air, and I commend the chairman of the Banking Committee for brining this matter back into the public eye.

I reserve the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Thank you, Madam President, and I thank my colleague from Maryland.

Madam President, let me begin these brief remarks by commending our colleagues from New York and Maryland for what I think is a very fair and balanced resolution. Obviously, matters such as this are a source of deep controversy and can get out of hand. The fact that they have presented us with a resolution that is balanced and fair is a credit to both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from New York. Any discussion of this ought to begin with an expression of appreciation on the part of all of us in this body, particularly those of us who will serve on the special committee and who will be working during this calendar year to carry out the mandates and requirements of this resolution. Now I would like to make a few brief observations about the resolution.

As my colleagues know, Madam President, there was a vote by 98 to 0 on March 17 of last year to look into these matters, and what we are talking about here is a continuation of that process. This resolution is simply another step in a process designed to help the American public know the facts about Whitewater.

Second, I would like to point out, Madam President, that the President has fully cooperated in this process. We ought to commend him for this unprecedented level of cooperation.

Many of us recall other Presidents who, when confronted with similar situations, have clogged up the courts of this land, fighting everything along the way. This administration has not done that. In fact, the administration has been entirely forthcoming.

As we discuss these matters, it is important to make it clear that, unlike previous situations where there was a constant conflict between the executive branch and the legislative branch over documents and testimony, that has not been the case here. The administration has complied with every document request, answered every question that has been submitted to it, and I am confident is ready and willing to cooperate in this second stage of the proceeding.

I think that is an important point to make because, as we look down the road, there is the potential for a prolonged and nasty conflict between the executive and legislative branch.

Third, Madam President, I think last year's hearings, despite moments of passion and emotion, were credible and fair. I think it is important to point out and to state emphatically that it was the conclusion of the committee

last year that there had been no violation of criminal statutes or ethical standards.

Of course, individual Members may have their own particular opinions on those matters, and certainly that is their right. But, as a conclusion of the committee, let me restate, Madam President, there were no violations of any criminal statute or any ethical standards. That was the conclusion of last year's hearings.

Now we are going to go to a second phase. I have listened to some who are suggesting that there must have been some wrongdoing, or, even worse, they have already reached the conclusion that there was wrongdoing. Quite simply, that is inappropriate. The purpose of the hearings is to determine whether there was wrongdoing—we must not prejudge the matter.

We do not want to end up appearing like that famous character from the West, Judge Roy Bean. Everyone will remember Judge Roy Bean. He used to say, "We'll hang 'em first and try 'em later."

Sometimes that can happen in congressional proceedings, and I know it is not the intention of anyone on the committee to have that be the case.

So let us avoid partisan wrangling and get the facts on the table. Now the presumption of innocence may not apply to congressional hearings in the same way as in our court system, but there ought to at least be an effort to fully consider matters, and let people have their say, before we reach any conclusions.

Last year, the Senate held thorough hearings, as I mentioned earlier. The committee heard from 30 witnesses, generating 2,600 pages of testimony; 38 witnesses were deposed, generating some 7,000 additional pages of testimony.

It is very difficult to sort through that much material and I want to thank the staff for the work they did. That was a herculean effort. Both the majority and minority staff had to work extremely long hours on this matter, Madam President, and they deserve our appreciation.

Obviously, Madam President, the Senate's integrity and credibility are at stake. The American public has a right to know the facts about Whitewater and the Senate has a constitutional obligation to see that they do.

Last year, the facts were presented fully and impartially. That must be our goal this year. The public, in my view, is fed up with the partisanship that seems to cloud every issue.

As we go through this process, I urge my colleagues to avoid that partisan pitfall. Because we are entering a presidential campaign cycle, that may be difficult for some. But we must all try. The President is sadly correct, and I suspect most of my colleagues, regardless of their political persuasion, would agree when he says that the politics of personal attack are alive and well. I

agree with the President that the best way to put this matter behind us is to address the facts candidly.

Madam President, I ask for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield whatever time the Senator requires.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague. I will wrap this up.

Madam President, the public wants us to present the facts impartially, come to our conclusions and then move on. And it bears repeating that after going through such a process last year, the Banking Committee concluded that there had been no violation of criminal statutes or ethical standards.

During this next stage, we must not get into political diversions and drag this thing out. The American people want us to get on with the business of creating jobs and expanding economic opportunity, of dealing with health care issues and education. They want us to tackle the hard problems that they face every day.

I think it was there sense of frustration with politics as usual, more than anything else, that created the changes in the Congress. We now have a Republican leadership, and every committee is chaired by that party. They now have an even greater responsibility to the public. They must elevate the good of the nation above politics and I hope that they will do so in proceeding with this matter.

Once again, I commend Senator D'AMATO and Senator SARBANES for putting together a fair resolution and for stating their determination to wrap this matter up by February of next year. I hope we can stick to that schedule and finish this job efficiently.

Finally, while the subject of the independent counsel statute is not the subject of this particular resolution, Madam President, I want to suggest that we revisit that legislation as soon as we can.

The idea of appointing an independent counsel was to keep politics out of these issues. Unfortunately, it seems that the statute may invite fishing expeditions. We need to be very careful about spending the taxpayers dollars in this way. Otherwise we will have some questionable expenditures. I was told the other day that someone was looking at a witnesses' grade school and high school transcripts. I hope that report is inaccurate because there is just no way to justify that kind of expenditure.

There is the potential for an independent counsel to run wild and we need to carefully monitor these matters. I caution those who would like to use independent counsels for political gain—regardless of whether it was a previous administration or this administration—that whatever goes around comes around. We would be well advised, in my view, to take a hard look at how some of these operations are being run.

Of course, Congress spends a great deal of money on these investigations.

The Banking Committee spent about \$400,000 last year, and this resolution authorizes another \$950,000. But even that amount is only a fraction of what the independent counsel is spending. We are looking at almost \$10 million spent by the independent counsel and that is just the beginning of it. That figure will go higher.

Of course, the Federal Government must investigate serious accusations of wrongdoing to maintain the public trust. But when it appears there are more Federal agents operating in Little Rock than there are in high-crime areas in certain parts of our country, then one ought to pause and look carefully at what we are doing.

Again, I know that the independent counsel statute is not the subject of this resolution. I do not want to inject a whole new subject of debate. But I think we ought to take another look at that law and make sure it is operating properly.

Again, I commend the chairman of the Banking Committee, my friend from New York, Senator D'AMATO, and my colleague and friend from Maryland, Senator SARBANES, for the fine job they have done in working out this resolution. We have a very difficult job in front of us. Hopefully, we will conduct our work thoroughly, fairly, and promptly, and in a manner that brings credit to this great body. I look forward to the effort.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Madam President, at this time, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. D'AMATO. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 10 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time. I support the resolution and commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Banking Committee for presenting a resolution which I understand will have wide bipartisan support.

I believe it is important to have a congressional inquiry on this in the broad terms which are described in the resolution. It is with some regret, I note, that it has taken us more than a year to get to this point. But it is better late than never, and these are matters where congressional oversight is important.

I recognize the sensitivity of a congressional inquiry on a matter which is being handled by an independent counsel, also known as the special prosecutor. But the functions are very, very different where you have an investigation which is handled through grand jury proceedings which are secret and which are directed at indictments. I know that field with some detail, having been a district attorney myself and

having run grand jury investigations. That is very, very different from a congressional inquiry where we are inquiring into matters in the public record for the public to see what is going on in Government with a view to legislative changes.

The thrust and focus are entirely different between a grand jury investigation conducted by independent counsel and a congressional inquiry which will be handled through the Banking Committee. I am glad to see that the composition of the committee will be expanded to include the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, or their designees.

Madam President, the issues involved here have long been a concern of many of us in this Chamber, and I refer to statements which I made last year dated March 17, June 9, June 16, and June 21. I will not incorporate them because that would unduly burden the RECORD, but a good many of my thoughts were expressed last year on the matter.

I was particularly concerned about issues involving the RTC as to their inclusion, which was not handled last year, and I am glad to see that the Resolution Trust Corporation is included in the scope of the inquiry which we are about to undertake.

This matter was one that I focused on when we had an oversight hearing on the Department of Justice on July 28 of last year, and I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that a number of documents be printed in the RECORD which have not been made a part of the RECORD heretofore: My letter dated July 26, 1994, to Attorney General Reno; the attachment of a list of documents which I had wanted to inquire into during the proceedings before the Judiciary Committee; the response which was made by Robert Fiske, who was then independent counsel; and a portion of the transcript dated July 28, 1994 before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, these documents will show on their face concerns which were on the record and which were apparent from such documents: that there were considerable issues to be investigated in the RTC at that time. It is unfortunate, in a sense, that there has been the long delay, because we all know, as a matter of investigative procedure, that leads grow cold and witnesses' memories diminish and that the best investigation is a prompt investigation. But the time factor is something that cannot be altered at this time, and at least now we will have a congressional inquiry which will move forward into these very, very important matters.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut when he talks about the presumption of innocence. I think that is indispensable as a matter

of fairness to all concerned. But these are questions which need to be answered, and questions do not imply an answer of any sort; they raise issues which ought to be answered. We ought to let the chips fall where they may. And in a Government based on a Constitution which elevates the separation of powers among the Congress in article I, and the executive branch in article II, and the judiciary in article III, the congressional oversight function is a very, very important function. Now, finally, we will be in the context where we will be able to inquire into these matters and to find out what those answers are.

I am confident that there will be a fair, judicious, quality inquiry conducted by the committee, and this resolution is one which I think ought to be supported broadly by the U.S. Senate.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
WASHINGTON, DC, JULY 28, 1994

(The following is a partial transcript of the above proceedings)

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Attorney General Reno, as you know, I had intended to ask you questions about the handling by the Department of Justice in the matter involving David Hale in this oversight hearing, and I may be able to cover the principal points of my interest without undue specification, or at least undue specification from your point of view.

At the outset, I would like to put into the record my letter to you dated July 26, 1994, together with the chronology of events and all the attachments which I sent over to you, except for numbers 20 and 21. I may get into 20 and 21. I think the balance have been in the record in one form or another, and even if they haven't I think they are appropriate for the public record.

[The letter referred to follows:]

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 26, 1994.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: I have just noted that you are scheduled to testify before the Judiciary Committee on Thursday, July 28, at 2:00 p.m. at an oversight hearing.

In that hearing I intend to ask questions on the Justice Department's role in investigations of Madison Guaranty and/or "Whitewater." While I have not had access to many of the relevant documents, I have seen a few and am alerting you to those documents which will formulate at least some of the basis for my questions.

Some of the documents are referred to in my floor statement on June 21. Other documents that I may refer to are listed on the attached index.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

Senator SPECTER. I would also want to put into the record the faxed letter from Robert Fiske, Independent Counsel, to me, dated July 27, 1994.

[The letter referred to follows:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL,
Little Rock, AR, July 27, 1994.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: The Department of Justice has sent over to me a copy of your letter of July 26, 1994 to Attorney General Reno, together with the index of documents enclosed with it.

It is apparent from a review of the documents on that index that they relate to the handling by the Department of Justice of a particular criminal referral from the RTC. Based upon interviews we have had with representatives from the Kansas City Field Office of the RTC, we are currently actively investigating this matter. Accordingly, I would respectfully request that you not go into this subject with the Attorney General at your hearing tomorrow since to do so might prejudice our ongoing investigation. (For similar reasons we request that you not go into the matter referenced by documents #20 and #21.)

We have made a similar request to both the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs which, as you know, are in the process of conducting Whitewater hearings. Both of those Committees have agreed not to go into this subject until we have completed our investigation.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT B. FISKE, Jr.,
Independent Counsel.

Senator SPECTER. At the outset, I want to say for the record that I do not agree with the deference which the Congress has accorded the independent counsel because I believe that Congress has independent status, and at least equal status, if not more important status, on matters of public policy than the criminal prosecutions. But the Senate has decided otherwise as a political matter, in my opinion.

As I reviewed the charter of Mr. Fiske, it seemed to me that questions about oversight on what happened with David Hale were not within his charter, his charter being to investigate matters of possible criminal or civil wrongdoing. I am advised to the contrary on that, and we may get into that in some specificity.

So let me start in an effort to ask the questions in a generalized way, but candidly as they arise on David Hale's matter. I refer to a memorandum from RTC investigator Jean Lewis to Richard Iorio which quotes officials within the Department of Justice, which is why I ask you about this; specifically, Ms. Donna Henneman in the Office of Legal Counsel. Without making anything more specific as to the Hale matter, my question to you as a general matter is, any time a referral comes in to the Department of Justice that would make the Department look bad or has political ramifications, it goes to the Attorney General. Is that true?

Attorney General RENO. I don't know whether any time something comes in to the Department that would make the Department look bad it comes to the Attorney General.

Senator SPECTER. Well, if you don't know, who does, Attorney General Reno?

Attorney General RENO. I would suspect that each one of the 95,000 people who hear something that might make the Department look bad. I think your question is a little bit broad. I cannot answer it. As I have tried to say from the very beginning, when I appointed Mr. Fiske I tried to make sure that he was as independent as possible. I have continued to try to do that, and I think the

worst thing that I could do would be to comment or talk about matters that he is pursuing. I should be happy, because I have great respect for the Senate and for you, at the conclusion of the matter to try to respond to anything, including the specifics.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I don't think that is sufficient, Attorney General Reno, because I think this is a legitimate matter for Judiciary Committee oversight, and we don't have very much of it. But I accept your point that my question was too general, so I will be specific.

The investigator, L. Jean Lewis, of RTC, had many conversations with representatives of the Department of Justice, as reflected in the number of the memoranda which I sent on to you. So if it is too general as to whether any time a referral comes in that would make the Department look bad or has political ramifications it goes to the Attorney General, I would ask you, were you personally informed about the referral from the RTC on the check kiting case involving Madison Guaranty?

Attorney General RENO. As I indicated to you, Senator, I made a determination when I appointed Mr. Fiske that I would not comment or make any comment. He has expressed to you that he would prefer that I not comment on the specific matters. I do not want to do anything that would impair his independence. I do think you have an oversight function with respect to the Department of Justice, and when it would be appropriate for me to comment I would look forward to the opportunity to do so.

Senator SPECTER. Well, tell me, Attorney General Reno, has would it impair Mr. Fiske's investigation or prosecution for you to answer a question as to whether you had personal knowledge of a referral to the Department of Justice?

Attorney General RENO. I can't tell you, sir, because I have tried to do everything in my power to make sure that Mr. Fiske's investigation is independent and I don't know what his investigation involves. Therefore, I am not going to say anything that could possibly interfere with his investigation.

Senator SPECTER. Well, my question to you is how could it possibly interfere with his investigation to answer a question as to when you had knowledge of a referral to the United States Department of Justice.

Attorney General RENO. I don't know, sir, because I am not going to take the chance of interfering with it. You would have to ask Mr. Fiske because I don't want to do anything at this time that would interfere or impair that investigation. I do not know the nature of the process of that investigation and it would be inappropriate for me to comment, but I do—

The CHAIRMAN. Put another way, Senator, how would it shed any light in this oversight if the Attorney General answered that question? What the hell difference does it make now?

Senator SPECTER. Well, the hell difference that it makes now is on an earlier question which I asked that whenever there is a matter with political ramifications that it goes to the Attorney General—and I asked that question in its broadest terms and was told that it was too general, so that is when I came back to the specific question.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask the question the other way to the Senator. Mr. Fiske's investigation in this matter is likely to be wrapped up. He has been moving expeditiously. Does it matter to the Senator whether or not the Attorney General speaks to this issue today or in two weeks or a month, or whenever it is when Mr. Fiske settles this part of his investigation? I don't know when he is going to settle that, but I mean he has been moving very rapidly.

In terms of oversight for next year's budget and last year's actions, it seems to me the Senator would have plenty of time to ask these questions as it would impact on the outcome of the Senator's view as to what the Attorney General should or shouldn't do in the future.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I would be glad to respond to the chairman. It does make a difference to me, and it makes a difference to me because this is an oversight hearing and the request to the committee chairman to have oversight on these matters was declined. There has been a charter which is very, very narrow before the Banking Committee, and this does not involve, to my knowledge, a matter which is within the charter of Mr. Fiske until when I sent a letter to the Attorney General, I suddenly find a reply from Mr. Fiske.

I had two detailed conversations with Mr. Fiske, the thrust of which—and I would be glad to detail them—led me to the conclusion that there was absolutely no interference with the criminal prosecution, a subject that I have had some experience with.

So when I asked the Attorney General a question as to when she has knowledge of a referral, I can't conceive that it interferes with an investigation, and that is why I am asking an experienced prosecutor who is now the Attorney General how could it conceivably interfere with a pending investigation.

Attorney General RENO. An experienced prosecutor, Senator, doesn't comment about something that she doesn't know about. I don't know about the details of Mr. Fiske's investigation. But if Mr. Fiske doesn't have any problem with it, what I would suggest that we do is prepare the questions, submit them to Mr. Fiske. If he has no objection to my answering them, then we will try to answer them because I honor your oversight function and I would want to be able to honor that and to not interfere with Mr. Fiske's investigation.

Senator SPECTER. Attorney General Reno, I did not say that Mr. Fiske did not have a problem. He specifically told me that he would like the field to be totally left alone. What I said to you was that after talking to Mr. Fiske, I had no doubt that these questions were appropriate, in my judgment, on oversight by the Judiciary Committee.

Let me ask you this, Attorney General Reno. In terms of the charter that Mr. Fiske has about investigating matters which may involve a violation of the criminal or civil law, is the handling by the Department of Justice of David Hale's matter something that falls within that charter?

Attorney General RENO. I have tried to, again, let Mr. Fiske define that based on the charter that we described so that I would not in any way impair his independence.

Senator SPECTER. Well, do you have any interest in whether any current employees of the Department of Justice are subject to an investigation which might be within Mr. Fiske's charter for possible criminal wrongdoings?

Attorney General RENO. Yes.

Senator SPECTER. Well, if that were so, would you have a duty as the head of the Department of Justice to take some action on those matters before a long investigation was concluded?

Attorney General RENO. It depends on what they are, sir.

Senator SPECTER. Well, suppose they were obstruction of justice?

Attorney General RENO. It depends on the nature of the facts and the circumstances, sir.

Senator SPECTER. Well, do you know anything about that on the Hale matter?

Attorney General RENO. Again, sir, I can't comment on the Hale matter.

Senator SPECTER. I am not asking you to comment on the Hale matter. I am asking you whether you know anything about the Hale matter.

Attorney General RENO. That would be commenting, sir, and what I would suggest, if we want to pursue this, is that you pose the questions and then let's see whether Mr. Fiske thinks that they would in any way interfere with the investigation. I am delighted to answer them if they don't interfere.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I am not going to follow the way you would like me to proceed. I make a judgment as to what I think a Senator ought to do by way of oversight, and if you have a concern about that I am prepared to discuss it with you, but I am not prepared to take your instruction or your suggestion.

The question that I pose on an investigation by Mr. Fiske as independent counsel within his charter to investigate crimes, obstruction of justice, within the Department of Justice is not something which bears on anything which could conceivably implicate the underlying facts on what David Hale is doing.

Is Ms. Paula Casey—I understand that she is, but can you confirm for me that she is still the United States attorney?

Attorney General RENO. Yes, sir, she is.

Senator SPECTER. Is she the subject of a criminal investigation by Mr. Fiske?

Attorney General RENO. You would have to talk to Mr. Fiske.

Senator SPECTER. Do you know whether or not she is the subject of a criminal investigation by Mr. Fiske?

Attorney General RENO. You would have to talk to Mr. Fiske. I have avoided having anything to do with Mr. Fiske's investigation in terms of any information that he may have so that I do not impair his independence.

Senator SPECTER. Would you continue a United States attorney operating actively if that United States attorney were the subject of a criminal investigation?

Attorney General RENO. It would depend on the circumstances.

Senator SPECTER. Well, under what circumstances would you terminate such an attorney?

Attorney General RENO. It would depend on the circumstances. Again, you get into a situation of hypotheticals and it is far better that we look at the actual facts, and I would be happy at the appropriate time to do that with you.

Senator SPECTER. Well, Attorney General Reno, I consider your responses, as I see them, totally unsatisfactory, and I consider them totally unsatisfactory because I am not asking you anything about a pending investigation. I am asking you questions as to what came to your knowledge as the Attorney General of the United States Department of Justice.

I am asking you questions about what you know and about what your policy would be if there were charges of criminal wrongdoing, and I don't ask these questions in a vacuum or for no purpose. I ask these questions in the context of having initiated an inquiry on oversight on something which is outside the charter of the independent counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. In your opinion, Senator, right, is that correct? In your opinion?

Senator SPECTER. Everything I say is in my opinion. You can add that to everything. I don't speak for anybody but myself, but I do speak independently for myself.

I took a look at an extensive series of correspondence which has gotten to the Department of Justice and gotten to the FBI and gotten to the United States attorney's office and gotten to the executive office and gotten to the Office of Legal Counsel, according to these documents, which I sent to you as soon

as I knew there would be this hearing so you would have an opportunity to review them. I promptly advised the chairman as to what I intended to do there would be no surprises about it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Senator SPECTER. When I pursue the matter and find I have a telephone call and a letter from the independent counsel, I call him and then I am told that it is within his charter, that there is an investigation which is underway for obstruction of justice.

As I review the facts of this matter, I am struck with wonderment as to how officials in the United States attorney's office decline to have immunity granted to David Hale, and then independent counsel comes in and in a short time has a grant of immunity. Then officials in the United States attorney's office in Little Rock recuse themselves in a later matter, and I wonder how can they recuse themselves in a later matter without having recused themselves in an earlier matter, given their relationship to subjects of the investigation.

I ran a big office myself as a prosecutor, and if I had any reason to believe anybody in my office had any problem, I wouldn't wait for anybody to cleanse it totally and thoroughly and immediately. I do not believe that the charter to the independent counsel takes away any of the authority or the responsibility of the Attorney General to act in that circumstance.

In my opinion—everything I say is in my opinion—the questions which I have asked you are entirely appropriate questions, and I give some additional background because I think these are matters which ought to be answered, and I intend to pursue them and I don't intend to wait.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

General, I think you have answered totally appropriately, in my opinion. I think were you to do otherwise, in light of Mr. Fiske's comments, you would be excoriated by Mr. Fiske and anyone else. I guarantee you, you would have an article saying that you have interfered if you went in and, quote, "cleansed," were there a need to cleanse. You would be accused of whitewashing to avoid Mr. Fiske being able to fully look at the matter.

You are answering, in my opinion, totally appropriately, and you have done what I don't know many others have been willing to do. You have said to this committee, without having to have some big show on the floor, that when Mr. Fiske says he is finished with this phase of the investigation you will come back and you will answer questions. It seems to me you are being totally appropriate, but that is why there are Democrats and Republicans, chocolate and vanilla, good and bad, right and wrong, different points of view. Our opinions are different.

I respect this man. He did notify me. Stick to your guns, don't answer his questions, in my opinion.

Senator SPECTER. If I might have just one sentence?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. You may have more than one sentence.

Senator SPECTER. I don't think this matter has anything to do with good and bad or chocolate and vanilla.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it may not have to do with good and bad, but it has to do with what one considers to be the appropriate way for you to respond. I think you are responding appropriately because I think you are in the ultimate catch-22 position. At the request of all of us in the Senate, you appointed a Republican named Fiske. Now, the Republican named Fiske tells you, please don't respond to anything having to do with this. You are being asked to respond to

something having to do with this, and if you respond or don't respond, you are in deep trouble in the minds of whoever wants to view you as being in trouble. I think you are doing just fine. My view is worth no more, probably a little less in this circumstance, than the Senator from Pennsylvania's, but good job, General.

INDEX

1. RTC Chronology of Criminal Investigation.

2. Letter of September 1, 1992 from L. Richard Iorio (RTC-KC) to Steve Irons (FBI) transmitting criminal referral.

3. Letter of September 1, 1992 from L. Richard Iorio (RTC-KC) to Charles A. Banks (DOJ) transmitting criminal referral.

4. RTC Internal Memorandum, May 3, 1993. Background remarks and conversation with AUSA Bob Roddey's Office re: Madison Guaranty Savings referral.

5. RTC Internal Memorandum, May 19, 1993. Additional conversation with Office of Legal Counsel for U.S. Attorney's U.S. Justice Department, Washington, D.C. No record of Madison criminal referral at Washington DOJ.

6. RTC-KC E-Mail, May 19, 1993. Madison matter forwarded to Donna Henneman in "Legal Counsel." Referral submitted to that office "because of the political ramifications and political motivations."

7. RTC-KC E-Mail, May 26, 1993. Follow-up call from Donna Henneman (DOJ). RTC advised by an FBI agent in Little Rock that it was a "very solid case of check kiting, and was highly prosecutable." Henneman was growing increasingly frustrated by the situation, because she had seen the information, knew that it had come in, and couldn't understand why she was having such a hard time tracking where the referral and exhibits had gone.

8. RTC-KC E-Mail, June 8, 1993. Conversation with Donna Henneman (DOJ). Madison Referral has reappeared on her desk. Criminal Division has sent memo to Doug Frazier (in Depty. Atty. General Heyman's office) advising him that there was "no identifiable basis for recusal of the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas." Referral sent to Frazier for review and final decision.

9. RTC-KC E-Mail, June 23, 1993. Conversation with Donna Henneman (DOJ). Package returned from Frazier. Frazier appointed U.S. Attorney in Florida.

10. RTC-KC E-Mail, June 23, 1993. Further conversation with Donna Henneman (DOJ). Spoke with Doug Frazier. Decision made to return the referral back to the Arkansas U.S. Attorney. No basis for recusal.

11. RTC-KC E-Mail, June 29, 1993. Source indicates Madison referral has been returned to Little Rock. Acting U.S. Attorney will not act on referral. It is being held until U.S. Attorney designee Paula Casey takes office.

12. RTC-KC E-Mail, September 23, 1993. Conversation with Donna Henneman (DOJ). Washington DOJ would like to be copied on all future transmittal letters concerning Madison referrals with an additional one paragraph summary of the content of the referrals with the transmittal letters, so that Henneman will be aware of those with "sensitivity issues."

13. RTC-KC E-Mail, September 29, 1993. Conversation with Donna Henneman (DOJ). DOJ would like copies of all future Madison referrals sent to Washington in addition to sending to U.S. Attorney in Little Rock. Henneman will confirm this in writing.

14. RTC-KC E-Mail, September 29, 1993. Conversation with Donna Henneman (DOJ). Washington DOJ withdrawing request for referrals to be sent directly to Washington, but would still like copies of transmittal letters with addendum summary paragraph.

15. RTC-KC E-Mail, October 27, 1993. Conversation with Donna Henneman (DOJ). Inquiry on whether declination letter had arrived from Little Rock U.S. Attorney.

16. Letter of October 27, 1993 from Paula J. Casey (U.S. Attorney) to L. Jean Lewis (RTC). Declination letter on the Madison referral.

17. Letter of November 1, 1993 from L. Jean Lewis (RTC) to Paris J. Casey (U.S. Attorney). Confirmation of declination letter and the stipulation from October 27th letter that the matter was concluded prior to the beginning of Paula Casey's tenure and that the RTC had never been advised of such result. Chronology of correspondence between RTC and DOJ.

18. RTC-KC E-Mail, November 15, 1993. Transmittal of white paper outlining chronology of events related to 1992 Madison referral. Challenges news article indicating that decision to decline Madison referral had been prior to Paula Casey's appointment.

19. RTC-KC E-Mail with attachment, January 6, 1994. Discussion of contact with reporter.

20. Letter of September 15, 1993 from Randy Coleman (David Hale Attorney) to Paula Casey. Coleman has been trying to negotiate a plea and senses that Casey is reluctant because of "political sensitivity."

21. Letter of September 20, 1993 from Randy Coleman to Michael Johnson. Reiterates interest in plea negotiations, offering David Hale's information and willingness to participate in undercover activities.

Mr. SARBANES. What is the time situation, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 31 minutes; the Senator from New York has 20 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, we have come to a point in this debate when we are about to vote on this particular resolution. If I might, I would like to talk for a few moments about the public's right to know, as the distinguished chairman of the Banking Committee from New York has made reference to.

He says the public has a right to know what happened in the Whitewater matter. The public has a right to know who did what, when, and whatever. I can assure you that the Senator from Arkansas does not disagree.

But I think also the public has a right to know something else. I think the public has a right to know in this case exactly how much money of the taxpayers' dollars we are spending in the so-called Whitewater matter. I think the public has a right to know that with this resolution, if it passes and if the funding goes through—and we all assume it will—the Senate alone will have spent, up through January or maybe February of next year, in the Whitewater matter \$1.350 million of Senate money to investigate this matter. I do not have available the amount of money the House of Representatives has spent and will spend in the future. And we do not know exactly how much the cost of the independent counsel will be. But here are some figures I might throw out for the RECORD at this time. To the best of our knowledge, Mr.

President, thus far, as of August 31, 1994, the independent counsel, Mr. Starr and Mr. Fiske, combined, spent \$1.879 million. Projected funding for the independent counsel for the 1995 fiscal year is \$6.3 million, which is a subtotal of \$8.129 million, and a total, adding all the figures up, Mr. President, for both the Senate and the independent counsel to investigate so-called Whitewater, comes to almost \$10 million in taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. President, I think there is something else the public has a right to know. I think the public has a right to know that this White House, this President, this First Lady, this administration, has never one time been accused of lack of cooperation. In fact, our President has pointed out, as one of our colleagues has already mentioned, that to be candid and truthful in this matter is going to be the quickest and best way to get to the bottom of it.

In the first round of hearings last summer, the committee heard from 30 witnesses generating 2,600 pages of testimony, deposing 38 witnesses, generating 7,000 pages of testimony.

The administration has produced thousands of pages of documents for committee review. This administration has complied with every document request. They have answered every question posed to it. The administration is ready and willing to cooperate on this second round of hearings and it bears emphasis, I think, that after the long days of hearings and pages of documents reviewed, that the Banking Committee concluded at the end of this hearing, in phase 1, that there had been no violation of a criminal statute and no violation of an ethical standard.

Mr. President, I think, too, it needs to be added that at no time during any of these investigations or any of these hearings, whether it be in Little Rock or Washington, the Banking Committee or the special counsel, wherever, to the best of our knowledge, not one witness, not one person has taken the fifth amendment.

I think that this speaks loudly and clearly about this administration's position, wanting to get on with the important business of our country.

Mr. President, let me compliment our friend, Senator SARBANES, for working out what I think—and going forward with—is a fairly reasonable proposal in trying to attack this problem and to set up these hearings. I think that there are some things, however, that I must state that I do not feel are fair. I do not feel that it is fair for one of the members of the committee, as he did earlier in this debate, to come to the floor and say what should have been within the scope of this hearing and then start talking about those particular issues as if to condemn them, even though they are not in the scope of these particular hearings.

Mr. President, I think for a Senator to come to the floor who is a member

of the Banking Committee and to make a statement like he knows for a fact, or he has knowledge that Kenneth Starr, the special counsel, is now going to reinvestigate the death of Vince Foster, I think the public has a right to know how that particular Senator from North Carolina has knowledge of this so-called fact, Mr. President. I think the Senator from North Carolina needs to explain how he knows Mr. Kenneth Starr is now looking or relooking at the death of Vincent Foster.

Mr. President, we hope that these hearings will be fair. We hope they will be soon. We hope that they will be done in a very efficient manner. I am just hoping above all, Mr. President, that in this hearing, these issues are not going to be bogged down in the political morass that we have seen some other hearings conclude with. I would like to say, also, Mr. President, that I think for us to go back to the 1990 Governor's campaign, I think is stretching it a bit. I do not know what that has to do with Whitewater. I think some of my colleagues would like to see us investigate Bill Clinton when he was the attorney general of Arkansas. Maybe we would like to go back to look at his campaign of 1974 when he ran for the U.S. Congress and was defeated. There might be some who have no limits on how far back in time we should go.

I hope we can keep our eye on the ball. I am hoping, Mr. President, that we can keep our eye focused on the issue of Whitewater and the particular mission under which carefully this resolution has basically pointed out would be the scope of this particular hearing.

I am also concerned that one of our colleagues has referred to the "the miserable job of Mr. Fiske." Those remarks were made earlier on this floor. Of course, they refer to Mr. Fiske, who was allegedly fired from this investigation as special counsel because he was not finding out enough, bringing forward enough, to satisfy some of our colleagues.

Mr. President, I will conclude once again, as I have done other times on this floor, by quoting a note that Vince Foster wrote. It is his last note. It was his last sentence in this note, when he said "Here"—reference to Washington—"ruining people is considered sport." Those were the words written by the late Vincent Foster.

I am hoping, Mr. President, that when this investigation begins, every person involved with that investigation, from top to bottom, will realize these are human beings; they have families; they have hopes and desires; they have beliefs; and they have reputations. Hopefully, we will not treat lightly those reputations, and hopefully we will make certain that the character and the nature of these hearings seek fairness and justice.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member. Let me

say, I did not have the opportunity to hear all of his remarks, but let me commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for what I have heard him say. Let me associate myself with each and every one of his words. He speaks from the heart, and he certainly speaks for all Members in representing what we hope will be the ultimate goal of this committee as we begin this ever once more.

This resolution provides a sum of \$950,000 for the purpose of completing the work on the Whitewater matter. I think it needs to be emphasized again, as we consider the funding, that this resolution includes every issue related to Whitewater that has any credence whatever. There ought not be any question about its work, its scope, and the effort undertaken after today by the Banking Committee.

The funding will expire on February 29 of next year. It is an adequate amount to fund and an ample allowance of time to permit comprehensive and thorough hearings, while providing also for the completion of this issue.

In the 103d Congress, the Senate voted on March 17, 1994, on a bipartisan vote of 8 to 0, to authorize hearings on the Whitewater matter. Senate Resolution 229, adopted in June of last year, authorized a first round of hearings which were subsequently held by the Banking Committee.

The new resolution creates a special committee, administered by the Banking Committee, to conduct the final round of these hearings. The committee will be comprised of the full membership the Banking Committee, with the addition of one Republican and one Democratic member of the Judiciary Committee.

Chairman D'AMATO will also chair this special committee. Senator SARBANES will serve as the ranking member.

Last year, the Banking Committee heard from a substantial number of witnesses and took thousands of pages of testimony. Last year's hearings were thorough, fair, and bipartisan. They are the model which this year's hearings must emulate.

The majority, which conducted the hearings last year, were fair and judicious in their approach. The new majority in this Senate has the obligation to follow that record in exactly the same manner.

It is important to be thorough and comprehensive, because the American people have a right to know all the facts about this matter; but it is equally important that hearings be fair and responsible. We must all strive to remember and draw the distinction between an unproven allegation and a known, verifiable fact.

What is at stake is the integrity and credibility of the U.S. Senate. The last Senate recognized this by voting unanimously to authorize hearings when questions were raised that deserved examination. This Senate should follow that example.

The Senate has the constitutional obligation to see that the facts are brought out. It has the moral obligation to do so fully and impartially. If we do less, we risk reinforcing the unfortunate impression that Senators care more about partisanship than about conducting the Nation's business in the best interests of all the people.

The President has said that in an era of attack politics, the best way to put this matter behind America is to address the facts candidly. He is entirely right.

The administration cooperated fully and extensively with hearings last year and stands ready to do so again this year. Last year, the President ordered his administration to cooperate and all parties did so. Every document request was honored. Every question raised by the committee was answered.

Americans have the right to know the facts of Whitewater. But Americans care about other matters which are also on the Senate agenda a great deal more than they do about this.

Americans are now facing a budget which seeks to dramatically alter Medicare and student aid programs, as well as virtually every other thing the Government does. They are anxious about the future, because so many millions of Americans are either Medicare enrollees or have parents who are Medicare enrollees. They are anxious to see the Senate begin the debate over the budget soon.

Americans expect the Senate to devote the bulk of our efforts to the issues that are of most importance to the majority of American people. I agree. That should be our priority. Today, no issue is more critical than resolving the budget debate.

Mr. President, I urge prompt action on this resolution. I hope it allows for completion of this matter with fairness and impartiality, so that Senators can focus their attention on the issues that deserve it most, the problems facing the American people.

I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I did not mean to unduly delay acting on this resolution, because I think most things that have been said summarize where we are at, what we are attempting to do, and the scope of the investigation and the manner in which we hope to conduct it.

I think it is important to point out that what one of my colleagues, the Senator from North Carolina, Senator FAIRCLOTH, pointed out is a matter of public record. That is that Judge Starr is reexamining all matters reviewed by Special Counsel Fiske, including Vincent Foster's death.

I think he alluded to that, and I think he did so in that context. That is not an area we intend to revisit unless there are some very special circumstances, which I certainly do not envision. However, I think we have to at least put it in that context.

As it relates to what the committee did and did not find last year, I think

it is important to note that the Republican minority did make findings on the three major areas where there were questions of misconduct and malfeasance. I will not attempt to enunciate all of them now, but that was a very strong finding.

I would also like to point out that the majority made some findings and recommendations as it related to the need to indicate very clearly that before Congress, all executive branch members and others who testified are "required to be fully candid and forthcoming," and testify "truthfully, accurately, and completely."

The committee recommends that the President issue an Executive order reinforcing this obligation and setting forth procedures requiring the prompt correction, amplification and/or supplementation of congressional testimony to ensure that it is accurate, thorough and completely responsive.

Why did they do that? Without going through the entire history, it was because it was clear and evident—and, by the way, we have sent to Mr. Fiske and to his successor, Mr. Starr, those areas, we being the Republicans on the committee, the minority—that those areas of concern, that, at the very least, there was testimony that was disingenuous, if not outright false. And that is being reviewed.

So, to say that there were no findings of any wrongdoing, that everything was OK, or to imply that there was nothing wrong, is simply an oversimplification and is not an accurate or fair representation of the situation.

Now, I do not intend, nor is it my job and duty, to defend the work of the special counsel. The special counsel was appointed because the Attorney General concluded that it was necessary. It was not this Congress. I thought it was. I believe it was. There were leading Democrats who spoke to the necessity—Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator BRADLEY, and others—as it relates to dealing with this. But as it relates to the expenditures of money, let us look at the record.

This committee, I think, has been very judicious. The Democratic leadership working with Republicans last year authorized \$400,000. We only spent \$300,000. This year we have set \$950,000. I hope we spend less than that. We have been very judicious in using taxpayers' money. So to date we have spent \$300,000. Although that is not an inconsequential sum, we have been extremely judicious.

With regard to the expenditures and what has taken place with the special counsel, let me just indicate, first, that David Hale pleaded guilty. He was a municipal judge and has made some extremely serious allegations. The special counsel is reviewing his allegations with respect to why he made certain loans that were illegal or inappropriate, who asked him to do so, and so forth.

Webster Hubbell, the third ranking official in the Attorney General's office, pleaded guilty to charges that

emanated, again, from this investigation.

Neil Ainley, president of the Perry County Bank, where large sums of money, \$180,000, were taken out to fund campaign activities, pleaded guilty.

Chris Wade, a real estate agent who was the sales agent for Whitewater Development, pleaded guilty in a bankruptcy matter. Robert Palmer, last December, a Little Rock real estate appraiser, pleaded guilty to conspiracy charges relating to backdating and falsifying appraisals for Madison Guaranty.

I make these remarks because I do not believe that it is fair to leave the impression that this has just been a big waste of time and that there was no wrongdoing. Five individuals, at this early and preliminary stage of these investigations, have already pleaded guilty, some in very high, responsible positions. That is the work of the special counsel. He has to defend the appropriateness of the expenditures which he makes.

However, I think for the record it is fair to reflect that several individuals have pleaded guilty to various charges. As it relates to our work, I am going to reiterate that I believe this committee has properly set forth the venue, the scope and the way in which it intends to move forward in a bipartisan manner to find out the truth and get the facts. Was there an attempt to impede legitimate investigations undertaken at RTC? Why were certain people taken off the case? Why were certain RTC investigators disciplined? Why was information about confidential criminal referrals made public? Was there a failure to go forward? These are legitimate questions. There may be appropriate reasons. But, then again, we might discover inappropriate action.

So these areas are within the scope. We are not going to attempt to dig up something that does not appear to be really connection to the matters that we have set forth. And it is our hope, depending upon the schedule of the special counsel as he goes through the materials, that we can wind this up sooner rather than later, and conduct the business of the people in a manner which reflects credibly on our constitutional obligations as Senators.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the remainder of my time. My colleague may have something to do. I am prepared to vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I will take just a couple of minutes, I say to my distinguished colleague from New York.

First of all, I want to underscore the positive and constructive way in which the chairman of the Banking Committee and members of his staff interacted with us in trying to address the question of working out a resolution that we would bring to the floor of the Senate. Obviously, it is not an easy thing to do, and Members of the Senate have

differing views about this matter. But I do think we were able to, in the end, work out a rational approach to this inquiry and investigation, which I indicated in a sense had been committed to last year.

Obviously, you always have to work out carefully the scope questions, which has been done in this resolution, because the scope could be infinite, in a sense, if you leave it to people's imagination. So there were candidates for scope that I think went beyond the horizon, and they are not included. But we have tried to, in effect, put a focus here.

In fact, some of the questions the distinguished Senator from New York just raised, that he felt emerged out of the previous hearings—and he made reference to last year's minority statement in the report—have in fact been spelled out here as matters that could be looked into under this resolution.

There were other candidates, of course, that were not included. We have tried to be rational here. We have tried to be reasonable. The matters specified herein have been the outcome of that process.

Second, I want to say the resolution has been put together in a way that presumes that the two sides will work together cooperatively in carrying out the inquiry, that the staffs will interact in that fashion, that material will be generally available and so on. We are trying to get an inquiry here in which everyone is joined in trying to find out what the facts are. A lot of questions are raised, and will be looked into. If you did not raise questions, you would not have an inquiry, so I recognize that. But our job, I think, is to probe the factual matter behind those issues.

I was interested that my colleague earlier used the word "allegations," and that is what it is until you actually get the facts that sustain it. And that is the process we are going to engage in. Some things, you know, when you finally examine them, turn out to be fairly innocent. At least I think. We had this point about Captain Hume, who did not appear when he was supposed to be a witness.

Well, what happened—obviously there was a slip-up, but I think that is what it was, a slip-up. Captain Hume was deposed. He had over 300 pages of deposition testimony. Apparently at his deposition he said he was about to take a—go on a vacation. After that the hearing date was set. Everyone sort of assumed that Captain Hume could be brought back in for the hearing. A subpoena, I do not think, was issued for him.

Mr. D'AMATO. I do not think it was issued.

Mr. SARBANES. I do not think it was issued for him so he did not, as it were, ignore a subpoena. And he went on a hunting and fishing trip and could not be located, is what happened.

In the end, I think it was judged that given we had 300 pages worth of deposi-

tion it was not worth having another hearing simply to bring Captain Hume in. I mean it is a small matter, but I only mention it to show that sometimes when you really examine the facts you discover that something that looked amiss at first has a very simple, plausible, and reasonable explanation for it.

We expect, as I understand it, now to move forward with this. I know that the chairman and his staff will be talking with our staff to begin to plan the first set of hearings which I think will probably be in the next month or so, and then we can proceed from there as we schedule other matters which have been stipulated here in the resolution as being within the scope of the inquiry which this special committee will now undertake.

But I do again want to underscore the, I think, responsible way in which the chairman and members of the staff have worked with us in order to try to frame a resolution which we could bring to the floor of the Senate today which I think carries forward the legitimate requirements imposed upon us in terms of carrying out an investigation without straying beyond what most people regard as reasonable bounds.

Mr. President, with that, I made my statement. I see the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and I would like to yield time to him.

Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. President, when I was a student in law school I remember studying criminal law. There never had been a lawyer in my family. So I knew nothing about any kind of law. But I remember the professor about the second day said, "Remember, the presumption of innocence is the hallmark of our system of criminal jurisprudence." It is not presumption of guilt.

I asked the question, "Should I defend somebody if they came into my office and told me they were guilty?"

He said that will be a personal call, but you bear one thing in mind. That person may not know whether he or she is guilty under the law. They may think they are and are not.

I am going to vote for this resolution. I have no objection whatever to a fair, open hearing giving everybody a chance to answer the questions of this committee. But I have heard some names thrown around here this morning.

Mr. President, in cases like this, all you have to do is throw out a name. Oftentimes you have destroyed a person or at least destroyed their reputation.

And there has been entirely too much of that surrounding this case.

So let me admonish my friends in the U.S. Senate, and especially on this special committee, lawyers and nonlawyers, to ask yourself when you are making some of these speeches and you are throwing out names, why did not this happen, why did not that happen? Well, hindsight is a wonderful thing. But ask yourself when you are throwing names around and wondering whether or not you are destroying that person, a perfectly innocent person for life, you ask yourself this question: "How would you like to be in that somebody's shoes and hear your name bandied around on the floor of the Senate which carries with it the connotation of some wrongdoing or some guilt?"

I hope the Members of this body will rise above that sort of thing, and when they say something and use some of these names in regard to this hearing, make awfully sure they are not destroying some innocent person needlessly and wrongfully.

I look forward to the hearings. I look forward to the people having an opportunity to say what they want to say and answer the questions of the Members of this committee. But for God's sakes do not prejudge everybody that is going to be called as a witness before they get there and have an opportunity to answer the questions.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me 2 minutes. I had not planned to speak again. But the distinguished chairman of the committee made reference to three or four individuals who have either pled guilty or have been indicted, et cetera. I would like to talk about some of those.

Neil Ainley worked with a bank in Perryville about 50 miles from Little Rock. He pled guilty to four counts, but not one of those counts related to Whitewater; not even close to Whitewater. One was his so-called failure to file with the Internal Revenue Service a withdrawal of cash for the 1990 Clinton campaign; nothing whatsoever to do with Whitewater.

The second individual the distinguished chairman mentioned is Chris Wade. If I am not mistaken, Chris Wade was a real estate broker I believe in Mountain Home near the Whitewater development area. Chris Wade, subsequent to these many years of dealing with the lots at Whitewater, filed bankruptcy; not related to Whitewater in any way. But in the bankruptcy filing he failed to disclose either an asset or a debt. I do not know all the facts but this matter is unrelated, totally unrelated to Whitewater; no relationship whatsoever to the President and Mrs. Clinton. But yet

the prosecution has now had him plead guilty.

The third person referred to was Webb Hubbell. We know that case. Webb Hubbell has pled guilty. It is a sad day. He is a good friend. But it was nothing that related to Whitewater Development Corp., absolutely nothing that related to Madison Guaranty, nothing whatsoever. Web Hubbell pled guilty to overbilling his clients; nothing to do with the RTC, nothing to do with Whitewater; totally irrelevant.

If we continue spreading this dragnet out further, if we go after every person that has ever had contact with Bill Clinton or Hillary Clinton or James McDougal or whatever, if they have ever made a phone call to them, if they have ever borrowed money or given them a campaign contribution, Lord only knows how long this investigation is going to go. It will go beyond the year 2000.

I just hope that our colleagues on the Banking Committee will realize that we must focus this investigation as it relates to Whitewater and to its original mission.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator, ranking member, and the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back time.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, we yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Abraham	DeWine	Inouye
Akaka	Dodd	Jeffords
Ashcroft	Dole	Johnston
Baucus	Domenici	Kassebaum
Bennett	Dorgan	Kempthorne
Biden	Exon	Kerrey
Bond	Faircloth	Kerry
Boxer	Feingold	Kohl
Bradley	Feinstein	Kyl
Breaux	Ford	Lautenberg
Brown	Frist	Leahy
Bryan	Gorton	Levin
Bumpers	Graham	Lieberman
Burns	Gramm	Lott
Byrd	Grams	Lugar
Campbell	Grassley	Mack
Chafee	Gregg	McCain
Coats	Harkin	McConnell
Cochran	Hatch	Mikulski
Cohen	Hatfield	Moseley-Braun
Conrad	Hefflin	Moynihan
Coverdell	Helms	Murkowski
Craig	Hollings	Murray
D'Amato	Hutchison	Nickles
Daschle	Inhofe	Nunn

Packwood	Roth	Specter
Pell	Santorum	Stevens
Pressler	Sarbanes	Thomas
Pryor	Shelby	Thompson
Reid	Simpson	Thurmond
Robb	Smith	Warner
Rockefeller	Snowe	Wellstone

NAYS—3

Bingaman	Glenn	Simon
----------	-------	-------

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

So the resolution (S. Res. 120) was agreed to.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. THURMOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 812 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it has been our hope that we could work out some agreement on H.R. 483, the so-called Medicare Select bill. I know Senator ROCKEFELLER has some concerns about it. What we would like to do is bring the bill up, and if anybody has amendments, they can offer the amendments and see if we cannot complete action. It is a program that expires on June 30. I am not an expert on the program itself. I think Senators PACKWOOD and CHAFEE will be happy to manage the bill. I will not do that.

I would like to ask unanimous consent that we turn to the consideration of H.R. 483, the Medicare Select bill, but I am not going to make that request yet.

Is the Senator from West Virginia prepared to object to that?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I am afraid I will have to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to consideration H.R. 483 under the following time agreement: 1 hour on the bill to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, with one amendment to be offered by Senator ROCKEFELLER relative to Medicare, 1 hour for debate to be equally divided in the usual form, and that no motion to table be in order; further, that following disposition of the Rockefeller amendment, the bill be advanced to third reading and that final passage

occur without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXTENDED USE OF MEDICARE SELECTED POLICIES—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. DOLE. In light of the objection, I move to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 483.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to proceed.

Is there debate on the motion?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this is not one of the most broadly understood issues. But it is a very important one, Medicare Select. There are, I guess, two issues that concern me. One—and this is less important, but nevertheless important to me—is the area of process. I had written Senator DOLE, the majority leader, a number of months ago asking for a hearing on the subject of Medicare Select. I was told in a letter back from the majority leader that we would have hearings on Medicare, obviously, and that Medicare Select would be a part of those hearings. The Finance Committee has not had any hearings on Medicare Select and, therefore, that constitutes a problem.

Second, there is a study on Medicare Select which is going to be completed by the end of the summer, and it is not a frivolous study or a frivolous problem. It is a serious problem involving seniors and Medicare supplementary insurance. Currently, 15 States are participating in the 3½-year experimental Medicare Select Program. This bill would expand Medicare Select to all 50 States for 5 years.

One of the States that has Medicare Select is, in fact, the State of Florida. I cosponsored legislation sponsored by Senator GRAHAM that would temporarily expand Medicare Select for another year. So this is not just a question of those States that have Medicare Select wanting to continue to expand it, or to make it permanent, or whatever. We have genuine concerns.

There are other issues involved. One of the conclusions of the preliminary evaluation of this study which I have been referring to, which will be completed at the end of the summer—and that is why I hoped we could wait until that time, this being the first year of a 2-year session—was that about half of the savings in the form of cheaper MediGap premiums for beneficiaries came about as a result of discounting payments to hospitals.

Now, theoretically, if seniors are having their care actually managed, the Medicare Program would realize savings from the lower use of health care services.