

came through research grants from the National Institutes of Health.

Today, the University is widely known for its groundbreaking medical work in areas ranging from cancer research and treatment to fetal alcohol syndrome to burn treatment. None of these achievements would have been possible without Jack Lein.

His service to the citizens of Washington State is immeasurable, covering a spectrum of contributions that defies description.

Dr. Lein has served the university in a dizzying number of key positions. In addition to his faculty appointment, he was an assistant and then associate dean of the School of Medicine. He founded the School's Continuing Medical Education program and directed it for nearly 20 years.

He also was instrumental in developing regional medical education systems that have become national models. Under his aegis, the University's Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, and Community Medicine have flourished, and today, University of Washington Health Sciences students enjoy an educational experience unique in the country.

In addition to these achievements, Jack also served as both State legislative liaison for Health Sciences and coordinator of Federal relations for the entire University.

My own relationship with Jack Lein spans many years and many endeavors. Among his multiple roles, Jack was a sort of concierge of the medical establishment.

He knows nearly every politician in Washington State, and whenever a legislator or other officeholder needed a medical referral, Jack was the oracle. And since he put this role to productive use, as he did all others, he really knew how to get you when you were down.

Jack will be long-remembered throughout the University community as a consummate tactician with an absolutely unrelenting sense of humor.

No matter how dire the situation, and many have been, Jack finds the humor in it. He is a delightful companion and a wonderful friend. I wish him a long and rewarding retirement, and hope that he will slow down enough to savor it.

The University of Washington is losing one its lions, but I know of no one who has contributed more to it than Jack Lein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HANSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IF REELECTED, WILL THE PRESIDENT GRANT PARDONS TO THREE CONVICTED CRIMINALS: HIS FORMER BUSINESS PARTNERS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, this May, a Little Rock jury returned guilty verdicts on a total of 24 felony counts against President and Mrs. Clinton's business partners, James and Susan McDougal, and against his successor as Governor, Jim Guy Tucker.

Earlier this week, many of us watched with great surprise as the President, on the news hour with Jim Lehrer, in a televised national broadcast, refused to rule out the possibility of pardons for these three Whitewater convicted criminals if he is reelected.

□ 1945

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I introduced a resolution that would declare that it is the sense of this House that President Clinton should specifically, categorically, and immediately disavow any intention to grant Presidential pardons for his former Whitewater business partners, or to former Governor Tucker.

By passing this resolution before we leave this House, we send the right signal to the country that in this country no one is above the law and that convicted criminals do not walk free by virtue of having friends in high places.

Mr. Speaker, the President's statement raising this issue on national TV was not the first time the President has held open the possibility of presidential pardons for Susan and James McDougal and for former Governor Tucker.

About a month ago, in a televised interview on CNN, the President offered to use his considerable fund-raising abilities to raise money for these Whitewater defendants and for other individuals who had incurred legal expenses in connection with the Whitewater probe.

He said that once he leaves office, whether that be in 1997 or 2001, he will dedicate himself to raising money on behalf of those whose activities are being investigated by the Whitewater independent counsel.

Not surprisingly, the President's comments have been interpreted by many as a veiled promise to those implicated, convicted or otherwise, that if they will stand with the President, if they will stand tough this fall, that they will receive a pardon.

The American people need to know, what is the President doing with promises of raising funds to pay their attorney's fees, and with indications that a pardon may be forthcoming. We are talking about an investigation that was started by the Whitewater independent counsel, who was appointed pursuant to the President's own Attorney General, Janet Reno.

Ms. Reno charged the independent counsel to investigate violations of criminal law relating in any way to James McDougal, President William Jefferson Clinton, or Mrs. Hillary Rodham Clinton's relationship with Madison Guaranty Savings, or Whitewater Development, or Capital Management.

The investigation has resulted in convictions. The investigation has shown that over \$300,000 in taxpayers' money was stolen from the American people. This investigation has been at taxpayers' expense. For the President now to become directly involved and to hint that he may pardon those who directly benefit is nothing short of outrageous.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the American people are entitled to an answer before this election occurs. All we are asking for is an answer. Bill Clinton should not, nor should anyone, dance around and waffle on this important question. We need an answer directly from Bill Clinton; not from Mike McCurry, but from Bill Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I will read a statement of President Clinton, made when he was the Democratic candidate for Congress in Arkansas's Third District back in 1974, when President Ford pardoned Richard Nixon.

Back in 1974, when President Ford pardoned Richard Nixon, the Democratic candidate for Congress in Arkansas' 3rd District bitterly criticized the pardon, stating that it had "undermined respect for law and order, prejudiced pending trials, and dealt another blow to that vast body of law-abiding Americans, whose faith in equal justice under the law has been shaken." In the intervening 22 years since he issued that stern pronouncement condemning the Nixon pardon, Bill Clinton's view of presidential pardons has apparently "evolved." The President's refusal to rule out pardons for his personal friends and business associates found guilty on 24 felony counts by a jury of 12 Arkansas citizens is another example of the hypocrisy and "situational ethics" that we have come to expect from this administration. It is absolutely incumbent upon this President to assure the American people—before the November 5 election—that he will not abuse the presidential pardon authority to let the guilty go free.

Democratic Theme: All President Clinton has said is that pardon applications submitted by the McDougals or former Governor Tucker will be treated like any others would be, pursuant to procedures established by the Department of Justice for processing such applications. To categorically rule out pardons for the McDougals and Jim Guy Tucker at this time would be an injustice to them, denying them a right that other Americans have to petition the President for executive clemency.

One need look no further than the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post for a rebuttal to the specious suggestion that the President should feel free to treat pardon requests by his convicted Whitewater business partners as he would any other request for clemency. The Post writes as follows:

These Whitewater cases are not like any other, because those seeking pardons may have information bearing on Mr. Clinton himself or his wife. Before the election, Mr. Clinton should make clear that, if reelected, he

will not subvert the judicial process through attacks on the special prosecutor or by abusing the president's pardon power. That much should be obvious.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the special order time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and speak in his stead for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE UPCOMING CONTINUING RESOLUTION MAY CONTAIN SPECIAL INTEREST PROVISIONS, INCLUDING ONE TO AVOID "BUY AMERICAN" LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I recall Speaker GINGRICH's initiative this evening called Correction Days. The idea was to do away with congressional business as usual and make government more responsive to our people.

Mr. Speaker, I fear today and tomorrow may be the opposite of Corrections Day. They could be renamed Special Interest Days. Maybe we will need another Corrections Day to undo the damage we think is being done as the House completes its regular business, passes its respective appropriations bills, and finally recesses.

I am speaking in particular of the continuing resolution about to emerge from behind closed doors and being worked on by the leaders of one side of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the special interests know full well that Members of Congress are eager to wrap up and get back home and prepare for the upcoming election. So they have lined up, it appears, so they can speak their special provisions into law at the last minute in the continuing resolution, because they know we have to pass that in order to keep the Government running.

We used to have Howard Metzenbaum as the watchdog over on the other side, but we have heard rumors, in fact, that patent law protections might be undermined by some provisions being inserted by one of the Members in the other body.

This afternoon, and I am going to insert this in the RECORD for our colleagues, the Associated Press reported that certain companies are trying to skirt "Made in the U.S.A." laws by sneaking special provisions into the continuing resolution. Let me read the first sentence, the lead sentence, in fact, to a story written by AP congressional writer Jim Drinkard.

He writes:

Lobbyists for one of America's largest toolmakers are seeking a last-minute con-

gressional deal that would allow them to continue marketing wrenches and other tools forged in foreign countries as made in the U.S.A.

Let me repeat. This is from the Associated Press. It says that this particular toolmaker is seeking to put language in this bill that would allow them to continue marketing wrenches and other tools made in other countries under the "Made in the U.S.A." label.

That is not what is supposed to be in this bill. Not only is it nongermane to the continuing resolution, it is also false advertising. It is not only an abuse of the legislative process, sneaking through special interest provisions in the closing hours of the session, it is unfair to American workers, because skirting "Made in America" laws kills American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we have many skilled workers in our country whose future depends on strong and competitive machine tool industries. We do not want to be undercutting them just to cut a special deal for a special interest. But according to the AP, Stanley Works, headquartered in New Britain, CT, sells tools that were cast or forged in foreign plants.

Federal courts have required that tools made in foreign countries had to bear markings showing where they came from, so someone from Toledo, or any other community who wants to buy some tools, will know whether those tools were made in our country by American workers or whether they were made in a foreign country.

That was not good enough for Stanley Works, it appears. They want to sell their tools to the consumer without revealing the true origin of those tools. That is misleading to the American consumer, it is unfair to American workers, and special interests appear to be lined up to do an end run around our "Made in America" laws right in the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, "Made in America" laws help keep American workers employed. They help keep the orders coming in and jobs alive. They should not be eviscerated in a last-minute congressional deal to placate a special interest.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article by Mr. Drinkard.

The article referred to is as follows:

ENDGAME OF A CONGRESS: TIGHTENING THE SCREWS ON FEDERAL REGULATORS

(By Jim Drinkard)

WASHINGTON (AP) Lobbyists for one of America's largest toolmakers are seeking a last-minute congressional deal that would allow them to continue marketing wrenches and other tools forged in foreign countries as "Made in the U.S.A."

It's an example of how in the frenzied endgame of a congressional session, special-interest provisions that have lain dormant for months suddenly take on new life as their backers seek to attach them to any bill that moves.

In this case, there is "only one train leaving the station," in congressional parlance the omnibus money bill needed to keep the government running once the new fiscal year

begins Tuesday. That bill has become a magnet for pet amendments ranging from gun control to banking regulatory changes.

The Stanley Works, based in New Britain, Conn., sells tools that in many cases were cast or forged in overseas plants. Customs rules for years have allowed them to be imported and finished in the U.S., then sold without markings showing the country where the parts originated.

But a Federal court ruling four years ago upset that arrangement. It required that some foreign-origin tools had to bear markings showing where they came from, because the final product was substantially the same as the imported items. That triggered the current lobbying scramble.

Lobbyists for Stanley began angling to attach their provision to the money measure, and lobbyists for their competitors laid trip wires around Capitol Hill to head them off.

"This reflects an intra-industry war," said Rep. Nancy Johnson, R-Conn, who has gone to bat for Stanley, a large home-state employer.

A lawyer for the company, Stave Weddle, said Customs is "particularly unwise to be making a change when the whole area of country-of-origin labeling is being addressed by the World Trade Association," which may reach a different conclusion.

The saga began several years ago, when National Hand Tool Corp., a Stanley division, sought to import socket wrenches made in Taiwan without stamping them with the name of the country. The company argued that the tools were heat-tempered and further machined in the United States, so they were primarily U.S. made.

But the Customs Service ruled otherwise, saying that the tools had not been "substantially transformed" in the United States. That meant they were required to be marked as made in Taiwan. The tool company appealed, but lost in federal court.

Against that backdrop, Customs announced last year that it planned to update its rules to codify the court's ruling and make clearer which imported tools had to be marked with the country where they originated.

For Stanley, the announcement was like a hammer blow; it had built a network of suppliers in several foreign countries, relying in part on a series of Customs rulings that permitted it to label the final tools as made in the United States. Any change would threaten its marketing, which emphasizes quality homegrown products.

In the first six months of the year, Stanley paid a Washington law and lobbying firm about \$120,000 to advocate its position on Capitol Hill, and paid another lobbyist \$12,100, according to lobbying disclosure reports.

In May, Sen. Phil Gramm, R-Texas, introduced a bill that would have let toolmakers market their goods as made in the United States, even if the metal parts were made abroad. It amounted to a blanket exemption from the foreign-marking requirement.

Johnson inserted a similar provision into a catchall trade "technical corrections" bill that passed the House. That language would simply have barred Customs from issuing any new regulations for at least a year while the entire spectrum of regulations on labeling of imports is studied.

"If you change it for one product, it has enormous implications for other products," Johnson said. "Customs is overreaching."

But Danaher Corp., a competing toolmaker with plants across the United States, countered by hiring the law firm Hogan & Hartson for \$100,000, and the lobbying firm WinCapitol for \$220,000, both to help torpedo the provision.

To strengthen its hand Hogan & Hartson formed the American Hand Tool Coalition,