

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

murder, though it hath no tongue, will by most miraculous organ out, all of this financial corruption will by most miraculous organ out by, using her very words, truth in speaking.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, what I did in my special order was ask a number of questions that were still unanswered. One of the questions that I think is very, very important is why did the Arkansas Development Financial Authority send \$50 million of Arkansas money to the Cayman Islands to deposit in a bank in the Cayman Islands, which is a major drug transit point acknowledged by almost every DEA agent in the world? Why would they send \$50 million of Arkansas money down there? That is a question that needs to be answered.

I have the electronic bank transfer statements in my office. I am going to put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is no doubt the money was wired to the Cayman Islands. The question needs to be asked, why was it wired? Why would the Governor of Arkansas allow that? Why would the Arkansas Development Financial Authority, a State-run agency, send their money out of the country to a drug haven? I hope that the independent counsel will explore that. We are going to ask other questions as well.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, no one other than the gentleman has investigated the Vince Foster thing or analyzed it. And the line of Vince Foster's that comes back to us from the grave about the whole Whitewater mess and the IRS problems was, these are Vince Foster's words, "This is a can of worms we do not want to open." The can of worms was opened in front of that jury and they got 24 felony convictions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the Portia from the other side of the aisle.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I will accept that. I am the gentlewoman from Texas. I appreciate the gentleman from California in his sincerity, and also my friend who is down at the well, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

But might I just suggest to both of my colleagues, first of all, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] speaks highly of those who have offered themselves for a military career. Governor Jim Guy Tucker is a former Marine war correspondent, a graduate from Harvard, or undergraduate, and University of Arkansas Law School, I believe. I do not think he engaged in the business of public service to find himself where he is today.

My point being made on the floor is that we have various entities that are engaged in investigating these circumstances, including the special prosecutor and, in fact, the Senate Whitewater committee. I believe they have spent to date some \$12.4 million

and have yet to find or determine anything related to any consequences relevant to the White House.

My only point, made to both gentlemen, is that I think we would do well to allow those who have been designated to investigate it, and if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is involved in the investigation, so be it; but the point is we do not add to the resolution by false accusations or loose accusations where we do not have the proof to answer the questions.

The gentleman from Indiana has every right to ask a question. I hope the gentleman's question is answered. But I do not find it meritorious to engage in this kind of debate.

Mr. DORNAN. I agree. Just to clear the record, for those who were not forced to take 4 years of Shakespeare in school, that Portia, because I well know the gentlewoman's distinguished name, means a lady lawyer of exceeding skill, as in Portia from the Merchant of Venice, who gave us the great soliloquy:

The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice bless'd:
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.

I just wanted that on the record.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, Shakespeare also said:

The first thing we do is kill all the lawyers.

Mr. DORNAN. That was in Henry VI. The barber said that. I do not want any part of that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman's compliment. I want it to be acknowledged I am just a humble servant from the 18th Congressional District of Texas. But I appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. But I do think it is appropriate that we not take yesterday's headlines and be able to determine truth or fact here in the House when we do not have all the facts.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, they are taking bets in our cloakroom that AL GORE will run one heck of a race in October of this very year for President of the United States.

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

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

MEDICARE

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, why is it that Washington is unable to ad-

dress and solve a political problem until it becomes a crisis? Why is it that Washington's answer to any problem is to take more in taxes and waste more in spending?

Well, they are doing it again, but this time it's serious. This time it's about Medicare. The President and the bureaucrats in Washington say there is no problem. I do not agree. The President wants everyone to ignore the financial problems surrounding Medicare, but I will not be silent. We have a moral imperative to fight back. And America needs to fight back as well.

What would you think of your Federal Government if it knew Medicare was in trouble, yet did nothing to save it? What would you think of the politicians in Washington if they had the figures in their hands and knew the truth, yet chose to do nothing? What would you think of your Member of Congress if he or she allowed Medicare to go bankrupt when they could have saved it? You would be pretty angry. Right? You would never forgive them. You would vote against them next November.

Well, guess what? That is exactly what the President has done. He knows the numbers. He knows what his own Medicare trustees have found. The trustees have admitted that Medicare is hemorrhaging money at a frightening rate. They have admitted that the program will soon be bankrupt. That is right. Bankrupt. That is not a joke. That is not some political claim. That is a fact.

President Clinton knows it. But he has tried to hide this fact because the elections are coming up. We have a President who will say and do anything to get reelected—and that includes playing politics with Medicare.

Sure, Republicans could have played along. We could have remained silent and done what politicians have done for decades—tell our voters that everything is fine until the crisis hits. But we did not come here to engage in politics-as-usual, and I did not come here to sell out my constituents just for the sake of the next election. Medicare is a matter of principle, and I would rather be sent home for telling the truth than remain here by telling lies.

Medicare has to be strengthened financially—there is no choice—and we have to stop the mismanagement once and for all. This may not be what some want to hear, but they have to hear it anyway. It may be common in Washington to hide the truth, but I cannot. And I will not. It is your money and your children's money. You have a right to know the truth.

I have seen the numbers issued by the Medicare trustees, and if we do not act soon, it will soon be too late. If we do not strengthen Medicare financially, we will continue to spend millions more than we take in, and it will go bankrupt. But it is not just a question of spending more money—and we Republicans want to spend 7 percent more per year, every year, on Medicare. It is