

remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1462.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2723 AND H.R. 1972

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2723 and H.R. 1972.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY ON THE DEATH OF JERRY JUNKINS, PRESIDENT OF TEXAS INSTRUMENTS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join Dallas, the State of Texas, and the Nation in expressing my profound sympathy for the loss of a world leader, Mr. Jerry Junkins, president of Texas Instruments, who died, untimely, of a heart attack while traveling in Europe.

Mr. Junkins is well known throughout Texas, the Nation, and the world. He was a leader in trade policies, a leader in support of education, a leader in support of public-private partnerships and the creation of jobs, and a real leader in giving minority businesspeople opportunities. A very untimely death.

Mr. Speaker, with great sadness, I rise to pay special tribute to a good friend, and a remarkable individual who has distinguished himself by his exceptional contributions to the Dallas business community. Mr. Jerry R. Junkins, the Chairman, president and CEO of Texas Instruments, passed away from a heart attack while on a business trip in Germany. He was 58.

Jerry Junkins will be remembered for his many contributions in the international, national and state arenas, particularly as a leader in pushing for global trade expansion for the U.S. But for those of us in Dallas, he will be remembered as a champion for our community. He was a champion of early childhood education, especially for TI's support of the Margaret H. Cone Model Head Start Center. For many years, he chaired the Dallas Citizen's Council Education Committee. He was a guardian angel for Paul Quinn College, and he was the inspiration behind the TI Minority Business Development Program which grew to over \$120 million in a very short time.

Jerry Junkins joined Texas Instruments in 1959, and worked his way to its top position of president and CEO in 1985. He became chairman in 1988. Jerry Junkins served in a broad range of civic and industrial positions in Dallas, including: Member of the Board of Trustees of Southern Methodist University; and Member of the Board of Directors of Cat-

pillar Inc., The Procter & Gamble Company, and 3M. He was also a member of the Business Council, cochairman of The Business Roundtable, and chairman of its International Trade and Investment Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, all of Dallas and the State of Texas grieve for Jerry Junkins' wife, Sally, his daughters Kirsten and Karen, his parents, and his brothers and sisters. Mr. Junkins was an extraordinary leader, an exemplary businessman, and a highly respected national and community leaders. He inspired those he worked with, won the devotion of his friends, and earned the gratitude of his Nation. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Jerry Junkins.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

WHAT NEXT FOR THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL?

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this week, the President's business partners in the Whitewater venture were found guilty of a total of 22 counts of bank fraud. James and Susan McDougal were President and Mrs. Clinton's business partners in the Whitewater Development Corp.—which is still the main focus of Kenneth Starr's investigation.

In addition, Jim Guy Tucker, Bill Clinton's successor as Governor of Arkansas, was found guilty of conspiracy and mail fraud.

Recently, a number of my colleagues have been raising questions about Mr. Starr's ethics and his work as Independent Counsel. They have stated that he is biased because of his Republican background or his legal work for different clients.

Mr. Speaker, this is nonsense being put out by the Democrats for political purposes. Mr. Starr's results speak for themselves:

First, of 19 charges that Mr. Starr filed against Mr. McDougal, he was convicted on 18.

Second, of four charges Mr. Starr filed against Mrs. McDougal, she was convicted on all four.

Third, of seven charges filed against Governor Tucker, he was convicted on two.

Fourth, of 30 charges Mr. Starr filed in these cases, he won convictions on 24. That is an 80 percent conviction rate. A jury of 12 Arkansas citizens has examined the evidence and clearly does not feel that Mr. Starr is filing frivolous or unsupported charges.

Fifth, in addition to this week's convictions, Mr. Starr has received guilty pleas from nine other people involved in Whitewater—political associates of President Clinton, associates of Madison Guarantee Savings and Loan, and people who worked on the Whitewater deal.

Sixth, one of those people who pled guilty was the Associate Attorney General of the United States—Webster Hubbell—a close friend of the President.

Clearly, serious crimes have been committed, and the independent counsel is doing a good job of bringing people to account for them. That is why Democrats are suddenly attacking the Independent Counsel.

At this point, there are two obvious questions that everyone is asking:

First, what impact do these convictions have on the President and Mrs. Clinton?

Second, where does the Independent Counsel go from here?

Let me shed a little light on these questions.

What impact do these convictions have on the President and Mrs. Clinton?

President Clinton was not on trial in this particular case. But he was never far away from it either.

David Hale testified that then-Governor Clinton pressured him to make the illegal loan of \$300,000 to Susan McDougal.

Documents presented during the trial showed that part of that money went to pay debts of the Whitewater Development Corp. Bill and Hillary Clinton were partners in Whitewater, so they directly benefited from this loan.

The defense believed President Clinton's testimony during the trial would be a knockout punch for the defendants. It wasn't. The President's testimony apparently did little to cast doubts on the prosecution's case. Mr. and Mrs. McDougal were convicted on 22 of 23 counts.

The Castle Grande real estate deal was at the heart of this case. As an attorney at the Rose Law Firm, Hillary drew up legal papers for some of the key transactions. Throughout the trial, documentary evidence showed that this deal was a series of sham transactions that helped bring about the downfall of Madison Guarantee Savings and Loan.

This raises a very serious question: How much did Hillary Clinton know about the true nature of the Castle Grande deal?

For 4 years, Mrs. Clinton has been telling the public that she did very little legal work on the Castle Grande project. She made this statement in a sworn statement to Federal banking investigators.

However, the Rose Law Firm billing records that mysteriously turned up at the White House in January disputed that statement. Even though they had been under subpoena for 2 years, the records weren't given to the Independent Counsel until they were "discovered" in January.

It was quickly discovered that the billing records had Mrs. Clinton's fingerprints on them. More importantly, these records for the first time provided documentation that Mrs. Clinton had drafted legal documents for Castle Grande.

The questions that this raises are numerous:

First. Did Mrs. Clinton mislead Federal investigators about her involvement in Castle Grande?

Second. Did she or anyone at the White House obstruct justice by hiding these records for 2 years.

Third. Did Mrs. Clinton understand the nature of the sham transactions for which she was drawing up option agreements?

Where does the Independent Counsel go from here?

There are many other facets of the Whitewater scandal that merit continued investigation:

First, the Whitewater deal itself; second, potentially illegal contributions to Bill Clinton's campaigns; and third, the death of Vincent Foster.

One important area that I hope the Independent Counsel is exploring is the Arkansas Development Finance Authority—or ADFA.

ADFA was created by Governor Clinton in 1985 to provide economic development loans in Arkansas.

In December of 1988, ADFA deposited \$50 million in a Japanese bank in the Cayman Islands. I have a copy of the contract that I will enter into the record. I have also delivered a copy of this document to the Independent Counsel's office.

Why would an economic development agency in Arkansas deposit \$50 million in a bank in the Cayman Islands? The Cayman Islands are a well-known center of money laundering for drug dealers. The State Department's international narcotics control report described the Caymans as "a haven for money laundering."

In addition, public documents show that ADFA was steering bond underwriting business to a firm owned by Dan Lasater. Mr. Lasater's story by now is well-known. He was a financial supporter of Bill Clinton's campaigns. He flew Bill and Hillary Clinton around on his private plane. He hired Bill Clinton's brother and paid off an \$8,000 drug debt he owed. Mr. Lasater also pled guilty to Federal charges of cocaine distribution.

Why was ADFA steering business to someone like Dan Lasater, who was

well-known in Arkansas for drug use and wild parties at which drugs were freely distributed?

Why was ADFA putting millions of dollars in foreign banks in a money-laundering haven like the Cayman Islands?

Was then-Governor Clinton aware of what was going on at the agency that he created?

All of these questions need to be resolved. The Independent Counsel should not quit—and I am confident that he will not quit—until these questions are completely answered to the public's satisfaction.

□ 2000

The questions that this raises are numerous: Did Mrs. Clinton mislead the Federal investigators about her involvement in Casa Grande? Did she or anyone else in the White House obstruct justice by hiding these records for 2 years? Did Mrs. Clinton understand the nature of the sham transactions for which she was drawing up option agreements?

Second, where does the independent counsel go from here? There are many other facets of the Whitewater scandal that merit continued investigation: the Whitewater deal itself, potentially illegal contributions to Bill Clinton's campaigns, the death of Vince Foster. One important area that I hope the independent counsel is exploring is the Arkansas Development Financial Authority.

The ADFA was created by Governor Clinton in 1985 to provide economic development loans in Arkansas. In December of 1988 the Arkansas Development Financial Authority deposited, and get this, \$50 million in a Japanese bank in the Cayman Islands. I have a copy of the contract that I will enter into the RECORD. Tomorrow night, since I am out of time now, Mr. Speaker, I will go into more detail on this \$50 million that was Arkansas money that was transferred to the Cayman Islands, a major transit point for drug trafficking in this hemisphere.

WE MUST NOT TAKE YESTERDAY'S HEADLINES AND MAKE THEM TODAY'S CONCLUSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was compelled, in listening to my good friend on the other side of the aisle, to simply rise and ask for truth in speaking, only because I think that we do a disservice to make yesterday's headlines today's congressional debate.

A jury rendered a verdict yesterday. Some of those individuals are friends of those who are in government here in Washington, DC. The comment that I heard at this point is that the he wished his friends well. The comments that I heard of their lawyers is that the

process is not over, and, in fact, they have the right to appeal. The real question becomes, now, for us in this Congress, to allow the process to move forward.

There is a Whitewater investigator committee in the Senate that has a June 14 deadline. To date, they have found nothing and determined nothing. There was a report secured by the RTC just about 2 years ago from a law firm in California, an independent assessment that found no wrongdoing on the part of the President and First Lady. But we are here only to encourage the fairness and openness to this process.

I hope we do not take to the House floor to cause statements to be made that would suggest that we have concluded and we have all the answers. It is appropriate, as I have said, for this process to be followed through. We might listen mindfully to the foreman of the jury, who spoke very eloquently yesterday evening and indicated that it was not a question of the integrity or credibility of the President of the United States. They made independent judgments on the data and documentation submitted.

But I do believe that we have the responsibility to the American public to be forthright. There is no reason to hide the ball, but we also have the responsibility to be responsible; to allow those authorities that have the jurisdiction, the courts of law, the investigative committee in the Senate, to do their job. We add nothing to bring to the floor accusations on the President and First Lady when there are processes going forward to ensure that the job is done.

I believe that American people would like us to proceed accordingly, and I hope we give respect to all of those involved in this process, including those who have been now judged, who have the right as Americans to appeal their case to the highest court of the land.

TRUTH IN SPEAKING

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, there are so many subjects racing through my mind right now for a 5-minute special order. I was going to talk about an Army hero who was killed in Bosnia trying to, to use his own words from a few hours before his death, clear these stinking minefields for the children of Bosnia, but the last gentlewoman began her remarks by saying it is time for truth in speaking.

Let me tell the gentlewoman, as somebody who started investigating Little Rock in 1992, before the Clintons were in the White house, I think Little Rock, just Little Rock, in an otherwise great State, and only in the field of politics with some businesspeople, was a stinking hole of corruption; with not this current Governor, but the prior Governor, a stinking hole of corruption. And that like Hamlet's line about