

last 4 years than it has grown in the previous 15.

This year's growth was 1.8, I believe. The last quarter was .9 when we were more accustomed to 3.5, or 4.5 growth.

Why is that? There is a great argument about why that is, of course. The Senator from New Mexico yesterday talked about a program in which the Government would decide which are class A corporations. We would have more regulation and seek to have the Government more involved. That is a point of view, and not one that I agree with.

On the contrary, it seems to me that what we need to do to spark the economy is to have tax relief so that there is more money in the private sector to invest in job creation and to do something about regulatory reform.

I come from a background of small business, and I have some idea of how costly it is to meet the requirements of the regulations. Nobody is saying do away with all regulations, but we are saying that there are ways to do it that are less expensive, that are more efficient, and that will encourage small business.

I do not know how many people have heard of small businesses who say, "I am not going to fight it anymore. It is not worth it. I have put in all of this effort and really take home very little."

So, Mr. President, that is what it is about, and we have an opportunity to do that. We have an opportunity—starting last year. And, frankly, we have had opposition from the White House. We have had opposition from the minority Democrats. They do not want regulatory reform. That is available. We can do that. Balance the budget—we are still in the process of that. What is so magic about balancing the budget, for Heaven's sake? We have not done it for 30 years. Everyone else has done it. You have to do it in your family. You have to do it in your business. It is a constitutional requirement in Wyoming. The legislature is meeting now. When they came, they knew. "Here is the revenue we have, and here is the expenditure that we are allowed to make."

They do not do as we have done in the Congress for 30 years and say, "Here is the revenue. Here is the expenditure. Put it on the kids' credit cards."

That is what we need to do in order to do something about the economy, Mr. President. I hope that we will do that.

SENATOR HENRY SCHWARTZ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge today one of my State's—Wyoming's—unsung heroes, Senator Henry Schwartz, who served our great State from 1936 to 1942.

Senator Schwartz did much for Wyoming. But today I would like to focus on his efforts during the 76th session of Congress when he had amended the Na-

tional Defense Act to establish a school specifically for the training of black pilots.

While military opportunities for minorities increased after the Civil War—like the establishment of the famed Buffalo Soldiers who fought and died for our country on the western frontier—there were very few, if any, opportunities available in the Air Force, at that time, the Air Corps.

To challenge that trend, in 1939 representatives of the African-American community asked Congress to consider allowing blacks to be military pilots. The matter had been given little consideration until Senator Schwartz submitted an amendment to the National Defense Act which established a training school specifically for African Americans. The amendment passed with a vote of 77 to 8, and history was made.

With the help of the Senator from Wyoming, legends like Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., America's first black Air Force general and commander of the 99th Pursuit Squadron—also known as The Tuskegee Airmen—was given a chance to serve this country.

Past and future aviators, from astronauts to fighter pilots, will continue to rise in the defense of America because of Henry Schwartz's work.

So today I rise to acknowledge the work of Senator Henry Schwartz and sincerely thank him. His genuine belief in affording all Americans the opportunity to achieve is his legacy to this Nation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND RELATED MATTERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to consider a resolution (S. Res. 227) to authorize the use of additional funds for salaries and expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and related matters, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I believe that we have a constitutional ob-

ligation to get the facts as it relates to the Whitewater Committee and its work, which is incomplete. It is not nearly complete. It is not complete for a variety of reasons. The fact of the matter is that just this past Saturday—actually late on a Friday—this committee received a letter from a very prominent lawyer. That lawyer represents Bruce Lindsey. Bruce Lindsey is President Clinton's close friend, confidant, and assistant.

For months and months and months, Mr. Lindsey and his attorney were aware of the fact that we were seeking all notes and all relevant material that he may have had in connection with Whitewater. We know that he was part of this Whitewater strategic team. We know that. Mr. Lindsey testified that he did not take notes. We were concerned and we had reason to believe that he did take notes.

Mr. Lindsey's attorney sends us a letter, very interestingly, dated March 1. That is after the deadline for our committee's work or the appropriation for our committee. He sends us the notes that we had asked him about, which he had first denied ever having taken. There are two pages, all about Whitewater and various questions—like who made telephone calls in connection with it to Bill Kennedy, Randy Coleman, Hale, and other people involved in it. And then he tells us in his concluding sentence that he has additional documents, and he claims a privilege—not a privilege between himself, being Mr. Lindsey's lawyer—but he raises a privilege between himself and these documents being sent, that they are attorney-client discussions and communications with the President's counsel.

Now, first, we have the White House saying they would not raise the issue of privilege. Second, we have no way of knowing if this information falls within that domain. Third, in order to keep his client from obviously thwarting the will of the committee and its subpoena, he cloaks this. Understand, if anybody can simply say that these are documents or information that I shared with the President's counsel, that would automatically thwart us from getting information. That is what this is about. This is a way of keeping information from us and not, obviously, being in a position where he is in contempt of a duly authorized, issued subpoena. That is what is going on. It is incredible.

Now, our attorneys have written to him. Our attorneys have written and we have asked to see the so-called privilege log that would exist, and we have been denied that. We have been given no response to this. Here we have people who want to cut off this investigation. They want to cut it off. Well, I have to tell you that when we get information that comes in after the work of the committee, that we hoped had been concluded, and get information from key White House officials, I have to suggest that that is why it becomes

very difficult and dangerous to set a time certain for the conclusion of an investigation.

Indeed, in the book "Men of Zeal," the former Democratic leader, Senator George Mitchell, said exactly that. He said this about when you set time lines:

The committee's deadline provided a convenient stratagem for those who were determined not to cooperate. Bureaucrats in some agencies appeared to be attempting to thwart the investigative process by delivering documents at an extraordinary slow pace. The deadline provided critical leverage for attorneys of witnesses in dealing with the committee on whether their clients would appear without immunity, and when in the process they might be called.

This is exactly what is taking place—holding back documents and documentation until the critical moment. Wait until the committee goes out of existence and then say, "Oh, by the way, I was culling my files * * *." Look, that is preposterous. This is the second major player to do this, the other being Mr. Ickes and his lawyer. Guess what his lawyer found? Mr. Ickes is deputy chief of the White House. His lawyer found the same kind of information. Guess what? In the same way. He culled his files and found them. Why would you not undertake this when we issued subpoenas months and months and months ago?

There have been more editorials than this Senator cares to go through. Almost by a 5-to-1 ratio, the editorials say the Whitewater work should continue. Even though they did not say it should continue without a deadline, they indicate that, obviously, the work and the investigation has to be conducted in a way not to unduly politicize this investigation. We understand that there are political ramifications. We understand that on both sides.

I think it is instructive to look at two articles. One is the New York Times. I do not deprecate any source of editorials. They have a right to think what they do. I think it is instructive when they say, "The Senate's duty cannot be truncated because of the campaign calendar." That is the New York Times, not Senator D'AMATO. That is not a partisan vehicle for Republican or conservative policies. Very clearly, the question then is: What are my friends afraid of? What is the White House afraid of? What are they hiding? What are they hiding?

Now, it has been said that, "You will never end this." Look, I will put forth now that we are willing to say we will conclude this in 4 months. We think the trial will take 6 to 8 weeks, maybe a little longer. That would give us 6 to 8 weeks, depending on when the trial in Little Rock ends. Why do I say trial? There are key witnesses, who have been unavailable, that this committee would like to examine. We would like to examine them and find out what they know or what they do not know. By the way, some of them may be unwilling to come in.

I do not know how much more generous we can be. Certainly, to set a time

deadline of April 5 is silly and would guarantee that we could not bring in these witnesses. It would guarantee, I think, the kind of thing that we got in that letter that was sent to us, in which the lawyer, in a very artful way, claims attorney-client privileged communications with the private counsel for the President.

What we will do is have all of these witnesses that we seek to get documents from simply talking to the President's lawyer, and then you have automatic attorney-client privilege raised. That is wrong. We may have to fight that out, and we may have to take it to the floor of the Senate and ask for enforcement of the subpoena, and we will do it. We will do it.

I do not know if those documents or that information will give us new information, information that we are not aware of. But I have to ask, "why would you hold this back?"

Why would you not let us see the so-called privileged log so we could determine whether or not this was noted as something that was privileged earlier on, or is this just a convenient way to keep the committee from getting information and the American people from getting facts they are entitled to.

I had a radio commentator who said, "I am sick of this Whitewater." I have to tell you, ours is not to be an extraordinary, wonderful show. That is not the job of this committee. Ours is not to be entertaining. Ours is to get the facts. That is what we are attempting to do. But we have been thwarted every inch of the way.

Again, here is the New York Times. What do they say? "The Senate's duty cannot be canceled or truncated because of the campaign calendar." Then it goes on to say something very illuminating: "Any certain date for terminating the hearings would encourage even more delay in producing subpoenaed documents that the committee has endorsed since it started last July. The committee has been forced to await such events as the criminal trial next week of James McDougal, a Clinton business partner in the failed Whitewater land venture."

Now, these are facts. Facts. We have not had the factual information we have required and we are entitled to. We have been dealt with, I believe, disingenuously by many of the witnesses through their counsels in holding back information. I cannot believe a lawyer, in terms of searching for information, would not have revealed the facts and information repeatedly. If one were to look at the transcripts of the testimony, we will see witnesses who cannot remember, who forget over and over and over again.

Officer O'Neill, the uniformed officer who was on duty at the White House the night of Vincent Foster's death, testified he was about to secure Foster's office. He saw Maggie Williams. Who is Maggie Williams? She is the assistant chief of staff to the First Lady, Hillary Clinton. He saw her carrying

records out of Foster's office and place them in her office.

Now, his testimony is very detailed. Williams and other White House insiders present at the same time, deny the records were removed. Williams testified that she did not remove documents from his office.

The fact of the matter is we found documents, billing records that we know were in the possession of Mr. Foster. We know that; we have his own personal handwriting affixed to the billing documents. Guess where they show up? Upstairs in the residence of the White House.

Now, how do you think they got there? How do you think they got there? By the way, Officer O'Neill has no reason to make up a story. He is not going to make a story up.

We have another young man by the name of Castleton. Officer O'Neill says, "I saw Evelyn Lieberman walk out of the counsel suite; she stood in front of the doorway, and I looked at her." Again, locking the office was mentioned.

A few seconds later, I saw her come out with Mr. Nussbaum, come out behind her, and I saw Maggie Williams come out and turn to the direction I was standing and carrying what I would describe as folders, and she had them down in front of her as she walked down in the direction of where I was standing. She started to enter her office. She had to brace the folders on her arm, on a cabinet, and then she entered the office and came out within a few more seconds and locked the door.

How did he know that this was Maggie Williams? He says, "When Maggie Williams did walk out of the office and walked in my direction, Miss Lieberman said, 'That is Maggie Williams. She is the First Lady's chief of staff.'"

He goes on.

Question. A lot of questions have been asked about the fact you indicated some uncertainty whether there was a box on top of the folders. Are you in any doubt that Maggie Williams was carrying folders as she walked out of the White House counsel's office and walked past you into her own office?

Answer. I am not in any doubt about it at all, sir.

Question. Were you not sure, right?

Answer. I was, yes, sir.

Question. You are not playing games with us and not going to tell us you are certain about something if you are not?

Answer. No, sir.

Let me continue here. There is a young man by the name of Castleton, a White House intern who worked on the Clinton 1992 campaign; this is not a person who is out to get President Clinton. He testified that at Maggie Williams's request, he carried a box of documents that had been removed from Vincent Foster's office. This box was moved from Maggie Williams's office to the First Lady's personal residence. During the trip to the First Lady's office, Castleton testifies that Williams told him that the First Lady wanted to review these records.

Now, Maggie Williams, she does not remember. She did not remember. She

says that she would never tell him that. Why would she tell this fellow this? That is what she testifies to.

Why would Castleton make up a story like that? How do you think realistically the billing files turned up in the personal residence—the billing files of the Rose Law Firm; the billing files that really point to critical times and dates; the billing files that demonstrate that indeed the Rose Law Firm and Mrs. Clinton in particular had numerous calls with Seth Ward, Seth Ward being the eventual purchaser, one of the purchasers of the Castle Grande property. I think there were 14 to 15 conversations, meetings and/or calls, during a relatively short period of time, during a matter of 4 or 5 months. This is not inconsequential. This is Seth Ward, Webb Hubble's father-in-law.

One would ask, why would Webb Hubble not have been doing that work? One would have to come to the conclusion, given the nature of those transactions—and those transactions wound up costing the American taxpayers, ultimately, \$3.8 million, taxpayers' money—that those transactions were not bona fide. As a matter of fact, Federal officials have characterized them as "sham transactions" that really were the kind of thing that led to the looting of the bank.

"Let me ask you, when Mr. Chertoff raised the question to Mr. Castleton, did you understand that the box you were taking was a box of files that originated in Mr. Foster's office?"

"I did understand that, sir." This is Mr. Castleton, a young man that worked on the Clinton campaign; he still works at the White House.

Mr. CHERTOFF. You heard that from Maggie Williams?

Mr. CASTLETON. Yes.

Mr. CHERTOFF. Let me ask you, Mr. Castleton, on the way to the residence after you picked up the box, you were walking up with Maggie Williams on the way to your residence. What were you told by Maggie Williams about the box being taken up to the residence?

Mr. CASTLETON. I was told that the contents of the box needed to be reviewed.

Mr. CHERTOFF. Reviewed by whom?

This is a young man that worked on the Clinton campaign in 1992, a young man who was working in the White House, a young man who still works in the White House.

Mr. CASTLETON. By the First Lady.

Mr. CHERTOFF. And is this something that Margaret Williams told you as you were walking up?

Mr. CASTLETON. As we were walking from the place where I originally picked up the boxes to the residence.

Now, counsel goes on further. This young man is unequivocal. I have to ask a question: Why would he lie? Why would Officer O'Neill lie? Why would he lie? He had no reason to make this up. Why would somebody who, as a partisan, has every right to be for one or the other—he went out and worked for the President—why would he would deliberately just make this up out of his head?

And then, do not forget there were intervening times. They could have said, "I imagined; I heard." He did not do that. It was unequivocal.

Counsel says, "Now, what did Margaret Williams say to you?"

"Miss Huber, she called."

Miss Huber is a longtime Clinton aide who eventually found the billing records. Where? In the personal residence of the First Lady and the President.

Miss HUBER. She called and said that Mrs. Clinton had asked her to call me to take her to the residence to put this box in our third floor office. We call it an office.

Mr. CHERTOFF. Had Margaret Williams, on an earlier occasion, talked to you about storing records in the residence?

Miss HUBER. No.

Mr. CHERTOFF. This was first time you had ever done that?

Ms. HUBER. Yes, sir.

And you specifically recall that the First Lady had made that request?

Yes.

Now, look, is Ms. Huber lying? Is Officer O'Neill lying? Ms. Huber has spent 20 years with the Clintons. Do you think she lied? She did not lie. She told the truth.

Listen to this. It is very instructive. It is very instructive. This woman, Ms. Huber, is the person who stores personal documents and puts them away for the Clintons.

Mr. Chertoff says, "Had Margaret Williams on any earlier occasion ever talked to you about ever storing records in the residence?"

And Ms. Huber says, "No."

Again, I think this is rather interesting. This is the first time. So Mr. Chertoff says:

This the first time she ever had done this?

Yes, sir.

And she told you specifically the First Lady had made this request?

Yes.

Now, let me tell you something. Here we are talking about three people, three people. Officer O'Neill, who says that he actually saw Maggie Williams removing documents from Vince Foster's office. She denies it.

Here is the second young man, Mr. Castleton. He worked for President Clinton in the campaign. He still works for the White House; he obviously has an affinity for the President and First Lady. He has no reason to make up an adverse story. What does he say? He says Maggie Williams told him, "We are bringing these documents up to the First Lady." And, "The First Lady wants to review them." Wants to review them.

He did not equivocate.

"Are you sure," we said.

"Yes."

"Are you sure?"

"Yes."

And then we take Ms. Huber, a woman who ran the Rose Law Firm. She was the office manager there. She was in charge of the Governor's Mansion. She is a special assistant at the White House, a close confidant of the Clintons. She is the woman who stores

their various papers, such as, I think she testified, income tax records and other papers, deeds of their homes, et cetera. We are talking about a trusted confidant, a friend of the Clintons.

And get this. You must understand how unusual this set of transactions were. Mrs. Clinton, again, gives an order, an order that Maggie Williams relays to this young man. She says, "We have to take these documents upstairs because Mrs. Clinton wants to review them."

When we asked Maggie Williams about that she denies it. "Why would I tell him?" Of course she told him. He did not make that up.

But are we going to say that Officer O'Neill was wrong? That this young man made up this story? And that Ms. Huber, Carolyn Huber, who has been with the Clintons for years and years and years and years, that she would dream this up? Listen to what Mr. Chertoff, our counsel, asked. He said:

"Had Maggie Williams on any earlier occasion talked to you about ever storing records in the residence?"

Ms. Huber said, "No, no."

"Mr. Chertoff. This was the first time she asked you that you had done that?"

"Yes, sir."

"And she told you specifically that the First Lady had made these requests?"

She says, "Yes."

Are we really saying here that Ms. Huber made this story up? That she lied? Listen to the question:

Had she told you specifically that the First Lady had made this request?

Yes.

Had you ever been asked to do this before by Maggie Williams?

No.

These are the kinds of things that we find. They may be embarrassing. I have not brought these out before but, I tell you, it demonstrates the need to continue and to get the facts. And then we have the mysterious—I call it the miraculous appearance of these documents.

Let me ask you, how do you think the documents got there, given the testimony of Officer O'Neill? Given the testimony of Tom Castleton, a young assistant who works in the White House, who said he was instructed to take the documents there and that Mrs. Clinton wanted to review these files? That is what he was told by Maggie Williams. Given the fact that Carolyn Huber had never been asked by the chief of staff for the First Lady to take files upstairs? She had been asked by the First Lady, had been asked by the President. Indeed she was their confidant. Never been asked before, but, more specifically, had been told that these instructions came by way of the First Lady.

And then where do the files, the billing records, show up? Do you really wonder how they got there? Do we really believe the butler brought them there? How could the butler get his hands on them? Did he go into Vince

Foster's office, unseen by anybody and everybody? Do we really want to be serious about this? Or do we want to trivialize it and say, "Well, it is political."

We can do that. That is fine. I am used to that. That is fine. What the heck, they have a file over there on me at the White House that their staff has been directed to compile, that they sent over to the DNC. I did not know that was the kind of thing that our Government was involved in. I did not think that the White House should be doing that kind of thing. I have heard about enemies' lists in the past. Is that the kind of business we are in? We want to stop the investigation? This is what we are going to do and we do not care who we slander and how we do it? And do we really use Government employees to become engaged in this kind of thing?

It is bad enough if you are going to do that out of a political party. Let them do it. I do not say it is good. I do not say it is bad. It takes place. But, I mean, are we going to have Federal employees at the White House engage in that kind of thing? Are we going to have them be instructed by their counsel, by one of their counsels, who tells them: Let us get a file. Give us all the dirt you have on the Senator and send it over to the Democratic National Committee so we can get one of their guys to go out and continue to make regular attacks.

It is not going to keep me from calling them as I see them. Let me tell you something, if there are facts that are exculpatory and there is nothing wrong, then, fine. This is just one little, tiny area.

If we want to talk about this for days and days on the floor of the Senate we can do that and we will continue to do that. And let me serve notice, you may block this by way of a rollcall, a party rollcall. People have a right to vote any way they want. We will continue this work. And if we have to do it through the Banking Committee, we will do it.

Let me tell you, I have not asked to go beyond the scope of that resolution and I have resisted calls to get into other areas. I have resisted them. But my inclination will not be to do that if we are forced to go through a very circuitous process, in which ours is to get the facts.

When the New York Times—you can quote 32 others and you can quote letters to the editors, et cetera, that say this is a political witch hunt, this or that—when they say that we should continue the work and gather the facts, do not truncate this, I do not think there can be a clearer call.

Let me go on. Here is Mr. Chertoff, in discussing some events with Miss Williams. He says, "The fellow that helped you take the box, the papers, up to the residence?" She is talking about this young Castleton, Mr. Chertoff is. Miss Williams says, "Yes."

Mr. Chertoff, the counsel said, "Did you tell him that the reason that docu-

ments had to go to the residence was so that the President or the First Lady could review their contents?"

"No," she says. "I do not recall saying that to Tom Castleton."

Mr. Chertoff then goes on, "When you say you don't recall, are you telling us affirmatively that you didn't say it or are you just saying that you don't have a recollection one way or the other?"

"Miss Williams. Well, I would like to say—" now listen to this—"affirmatively I did not say it, because I cannot imagine why I would have that discussion with an intern about the files, going to the President and the First Lady. I know that I told them we were going to the residence because I figured he needed to know where he was going. But I cannot imagine that I said more than that. So I do not recall having the discussion with him."

Mr. Chertoff later on goes on:

Well, let me read you—that this intern testified in his deposition, starting at line 7, page 139, and he said, "And, what did she tell you? Answer: She told me that they were taking the boxes into the residence." That part you agree with?

Ms. Williams says, "Yes."

Mr. Chertoff then says:

And, did she say where in the residence? Answer. No. Question. Did she say why you were taking them there?

Here is Mr. Castleton:

She says "yes."

Question. "What was her statement? She says that the President, or the First Lady, had to review the contents of the boxes to determine what was in them. You disagree with that?"

Ms. Williams. "Yes. I do."

Mr. Chertoff. "And you also do not agree with Mr. Nussbaum's testimony that in his discussion with you he indicated that the documents would go to the residence and the Clintons would be there and they would make a decision where they go? You disagree with that?"

Ms. Williams. "No. That is not what I recall."

Mr. Chertoff. "You disagree with both of those?"

Ms. Williams. "That is not what I recall."

Mr. President, here we have a Secret Service officer, Officer O'Neill, who testifies that on the night of Vince Foster's death, that he sees Maggie Williams moving these documents—and he testifies with particular clarity. Maggie Williams denies that and takes polygraph tests. They sustain her contention that she did not do that. In fairness to her we have to say that.

I think we also have to understand and note that we do not know how many polygraph tests she may have taken. There is also a very real question with respect to the reliability of them given the manner and the circumstances in which they are administered. But there is no reason, no earthly reason, for Officer O'Neill, who has been on the security detail of the Secret Service for some 17 years, to have conjured up his testimony or to have made that up or to create or to fabricate.

No. 2, this is just one little part. But I focus in on it because I think it an-

swers the question as to how the documents got into the residence—the documents being the billing records that just came to light in January, months and months and months after—2 years after the special counsel had subpoenaed them.

So people knew. I mean, the White House lawyers knew. Everyone knew that these documents were requested and were sought for 2 years. They were covered by a subpoena. They were covered by our request and subsequent subpoena in October.

(Mr. COVERDELL assumed the chair.)

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, let us take a look at this. So we have the officer. He sees files being removed. We then have the testimony of Mr. Castleton, the young White House intern who is now working at the White House and worked for the President in his election campaign in 1992 and probably will be working on this one. So he has no reason, no hostility, no animus to try to create a story. He says that Maggie Williams told him they were taking these documents up to the White House because "Mrs. Clinton wants to review them."

Then we add to that Mrs. Huber, Carolyn Huber—who worked for the Clintons for 20 years, was really in charge of their personal day-to-day matters, the archiving of important documents, their deeds, their tax records, et cetera. She is the person who says that when she initially found these billing records back in August of last year—and I believe her—she thought they were being left there because things were generally left on the table, the Clintons would leave things on the table to be filed by her, and that is what she did.

She took these and put them into a box and carried them downstairs to her office where she would review eventually that and other materials to decide where they should be placed. It was not until January 4 that she discovered what these were.

How did these documents get there? Who had them? Who had control over them? Who deliberately withheld them from the special counsel, from the RTC, and from others? How do you think they got there? Do you think Officer O'Neill dreamed up the fact that Maggie Williams took documents out of Vince Foster's office? Do we think this young man, Tom Castleton, dreamed up the fact that it was said that indeed Mrs. Clinton wanted to review these files, and they were carried up, she asked to have carried up these boxes of documents. And what about Mrs. Huber, a Clinton confidant for 20 years, who ran the Governor's mansion in Little Rock, was office manager in the Rose Law Firm and is an assistant now in the White House, who is in charge of archiving all of the most personal of their documents? Do you think she made up the story when she said, for the first time—never before, you have to understand—she passed an assignment to carry documents up by the

chief of staff, Maggie Williams, to the First Lady? This is the first time the First Lady asked her. She was specific in saying that this took place and Mrs. Clinton wanted to look at these papers.

Is there any wonder why? This is not something that you could easily lose—a slip of paper, a scrap of paper inadvertently in the bottom of a desk drawer or in a file that one would not come up with, you know, the general file. These are the records.

Why do you think the records were discovered in August? That was the very time when the RTC was raising questions with respect to the various transactions.

What is illuminating about this is that there are a number of times, occasions, when the Rose Law Firm—in particular, one of its partners—had conversations with Seth Ward about a transaction that was characterized by Federal banking regulators as a “sham.” This is a transaction that would eventually lead to the loss of \$3.8 million of taxpayers’ money and, obviously, one with which Webb Hubbell did not want to have his name associated because the deal maker in that case was his father-in-law, Seth Ward. His father-in-law. That is why he had another partner on that deal. I do not know what they were going to do. But eventually Seth Ward had to pay back \$335,000 when the bank collapsed and the RTC said, “You are going to give us back this money.” He had a big lawsuit between McDougal and the bank. He won that lawsuit because lots of the facts that probably should have been presented at trial—the fact that it was an inside, cozy deal—really did not come out. There was \$335,000 in commissions that Ward got for not doing a darned thing. Why give that money for not a thing? There was a 10-percent commission for land that was sold by this fellow McDougal, partner to the Clintons, from one bank to the other.

Now, look, the pattern continues. Documents are produced because they fall into the hands of the people who cannot nor will allow themselves to be placed in a position of obstructing justice. When Mrs. Huber eventually realized what these documents were and that they were subpoenaed materials, when she saw them on January 4, she did what she was supposed to do; she called this attorney, called White House counsel. They came over and made copies. The committee got them.

So how do you think the documents got there? Do you think they were in that box that young man carried up there? If they were in that box, then how is it, as maintained by the White House, that everything was sent over, that nobody looked at this. I think that is the most unreasonable, incredible story I have heard.

Let me tell you why. You had a lawyer, a trusted confidant and lawyer, who met an untimely, tragic death and he had some of your most sensitive papers in terms of your tax treatment and liability in terms of a variety of is-

sues that could be certainly embarrassing and certainly important to you. And he died, and you ask someone either at his office, a coworker, a secretary, “Please get me those documents because I want to have them transferred over to my new lawyer.” If you wanted them to be transferred directly, would you not ask them to transfer them directly?

But would it not be more reasonable, and perfectly appropriate, to say I wish to look at these documents before I send them over to my lawyer? There may be things that are relevant or irrelevant, pertinent or not. There may be documents in there that have nothing to do with us.

And, indeed, very interestingly, there was a document that apparently made its way up to the White House. It made its way up to the White House and somehow mysteriously got kicked back because it was not germane. Now, the Clinton lawyers did not send that back. We have not found out how it got back. That is the mysterious document that travels in reverse. We do not know how that document got back.

But the point of the matter is, it would not be unreasonable for anyone, anyone, least of all the First Family, to want to review these. And so it becomes very, very difficult for us to understand, some of us, how it is that the billing records show up. And, indeed, if no one reviewed the documents, you would have suspected or imagined that they would have been there. These were documents that Vince Foster was working on. He has notations all over them, his own personal hand. So how do you think the documents got there? You do not think that they were transported there?

And what about the documents that Tom Castleton transported? Wouldn't most people want to see what documents concerning your own life were being sent to a new lawyer? I think it is absolutely extraordinary to believe that you would have no interest in checking this out, that you would leave it to someone else, that you would leave it to a new lawyer. It is very difficult to believe.

So what would the conclusion be if one were to say it would be difficult to believe? It means that somebody did look at these. But, you see, once you take a stand and put out a story as the White House did—because I think they were embarrassed when it was discovered that these documents were secreted away in this closet for a period of time—they had to come out and say, yeah, they were, instead of saying, sure, the Clintons looked at them. It would be natural. But, see, they already denied that: No, never looked at them, never.

I think that would be one of the most unnatural things, illogical things, not to look at your own papers, not to look at your own papers, not to say, well, what is there? At least I know what we sent over to our new lawyer, after their lawyer, their friend, had died in such a way.

But, see, once you make a story up, you have to stick to it. And so the mystery of the disappearing, then the appearing, billing records, I think becomes rather logical. They were in possession of the White House, the First Family, right since the day that young Mr. Castleton brought those files, all of those files up there to be reviewed.

Now, for the life of me, I cannot understand why they did not say, of course, we looked at them. What would I say? Would I say it was wrong or evil for the First Family to look at their own personal papers? Of course not. It would be illogical to suggest that they should not or would not or could not. And I know when I have heard colleagues say, oh, well, they would be accused of all kinds of conspiratorial things if they looked at them. Come on. That is nonsense. People have a right to look at their own documents, the President, Vice President, anybody.

So here we are at this point in time. The record is replete with these kinds of inconsistencies, and I think they are more than inconsistencies. I believe that Maggie Williams did not give us testimony that provided all the facts to us. I believe that she did not accurately relate the facts, particularly with respect to the instructions she received about moving these documents and who they were there for, and I think that helps answer the question of the mysteriously reappearing documents.

Let me cite again the New York Times:

The Senate’s duty cannot be truncated nor canceled because of the campaign calendar. Any certain date for terminating of the hearings would encourage even more delay in producing subpoenaed documents than the committee has endured. The committee has been forced to await such events as the criminal trial of the McDougals.

I am ready and willing to do the work of the committee as expeditiously as possible. Notwithstanding, we should not set arbitrary time limits. Why? Because that provides an opportunity, as has been stated before, for purposeful delay that I believe has occurred before this committee. And I do not know of anyone who can say that we have received all of the documents. How can you say that? I got a letter from a lawyer on behalf of one of President Clinton’s closest aides that says he is not turning over documents to us, and he is raising a privilege that the President said they would not. We are going to cooperate. So I know for certain that there are documents that we are entitled to that are being withheld deliberately—deliberately.

I say that I would be willing, and I ask my colleagues on the other side, to consider putting a time limit of 10 weeks after the Little Rock trial concludes, no longer than 4 months from this point, because, as my colleagues have pointed out, the trial could go on indefinitely. There has to be an end at some point because there are other important considerations, and situations

that we want to attempt to avoid. And it was my intention to attempt to avoid right from the inception. I thought we could have had our work completed. We ran into the problems of not getting witnesses and documents heretofore. But I recognize that there are some on the Democratic side who feel very strongly that this should not continue. So with that in mind, I am willing to put forth that we have a 4-month extension or any combination of 8 to 10 weeks after the trial, whichever is less, whichever is less, as a finite time.

I recognize also that if indeed there are matters of great consequences that come forth, then obviously it will behoove all of us to say that we have to continue. But if indeed there are still unanswered questions, and it is just a matter of us not being able to continue, then we have to act accordingly.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side would consider this. By next week, we will get into the testimony of Susan Thomases, unbelievable testimony, testimony that is not credible, of this brilliant lawyer, a close friend of Mrs. Clinton, who cannot remember key dates even though they are logged in her files. And we will get into the extraordinary things we had to do in order to get documents from her. If this is the kind of thing that they want, then we will have to do it.

I say, last but not least, that I will spell this out with specificity. And if indeed we fail in cloture the first time, we will take it to cloture again and again. I guess the White House will look at the polls to determine the impact of attempting to keep us from going forward and, I think, holding back facts.

So we will make a determination. If we cannot come to a resolution we will have to use whatever resources we have at our disposal to do the best we can—and it may not be as easy and may be more cumbersome—so that we can to get the facts. We will do that. I will use the jurisdiction of the Banking Committee. And I will spell that out in further detail. So we will not be without resources. It will be more difficult. It will place a greater strain. We may have to meet a lot more.

But I have put forth the basis by which we could resolve this matter without one side saying, "What are you hiding?" and the other side saying, "It's nothing but politics." We will raise the question, what is the White House afraid of? What are they hiding? My colleagues on the other side will say this is nothing more than politics in an attempt to embarrass the President. No one gains by that. No one gains by that. So I put this offer forth, and I hope we can work this out and resolve our differences.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, politics or policy, that is the question. Mr.

President, if there was ever anything that is clear as the noonday Sun on a cloudless day, anything that is obvious, it is that Whitewater is politics, pure and simple, and has nothing to do with policy. And the Senate should not continue this charade any longer.

Mr. President, we have had 121 witnesses. We have had 40 days. We have had over 200 depositions. We have had 45,000 pages of documents that have been produced. We have had blah, blah, blah, full of sound and fury, and absolutely signifying nothing.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Whitewater Committee, the last time he spoke—and I wanted to ask him some questions, and he did not yield for that purpose—spoke about the comparison of Whitewater with Iran-Contra. I wanted to draw with him the comparisons between the two. I think the comparison of these two hearings really draws in sharp focus, in sharp contrast, the difference between policy and politics.

In the case of Iran-Contra, Mr. President, we had a matter of grave national concern, national issues involving a terrorist state, Iran, and involving the action of the administration, as an administration while in office, that involved the President of the United States, involved the National Security Adviser while he was National Security Adviser, involved employees of the White House and of the Government, involved in some of the most critical issues then before this Nation. They were issues as to which the Congress needed the information in order to make policy, in which the administration needed the information in order to make policy.

With all of those important issues, Mr. President, Iran-Contra took half the time that the Whitewater hearing is taking. Mr. President, I confess I voted for this Whitewater investigation. Frankly, I search my mind as to why in the world I ever voted for it in the first place.

What are we doing with Whitewater? Does that involve the President of the United States as President? Oh, no. Does it involve a recent event? Oh, no. This is more than 10 years ago. Does it involve a matter as to which the Congress needs information to make policy? Oh, no.

I mean, look, whether Whitewater was a good development or whether the McDougals embezzled money from the RTC or whatever are not matters as to which we need to make policy. If they are, they have been fully brought out with 121 witnesses and 45,000 pages of information.

By the way, we have a special prosecutor that has spent over \$25 million and has a huge team down in Arkansas as we speak, looking into any lawbreaking. So it is not lawbreaking. It is not policy. It is not recent. Just what is it, Mr. President? What are all these things about, all these witnesses?

I must confess to you, Mr. President, I hear all this stuff and it goes in one

ear and out the other. I am a lawyer by training, as are many of my colleagues. You just cannot keep up with it because it is all, we know, irrelevant to anything except politics, this political season.

We are told now that we need to go on for another 4 months or 10 weeks or whatever it is. For what? We have already had the First Lady come down and testify. We have already had these very broad subpoenas that have subpoenaed everything in the Western World. They wanted all the e-mail that has come out of the White House. They tell me it will cost \$200,000 just to comply with their request for e-mail.

Undoubtedly they will, among that \$200,000 worth of e-mail, they will be able to bring up somebody from the White House and say, did you say such and such in an e-mail? They will say, no, I do not remember that. They will be able to produce it, and it will be another one of these great revelations. These great revelations about, "Can you remember something you did 10 years ago?" And maybe they cannot. I hope people will not pull me up before a witness stand in some way and ask me about things that happened 10 years ago, and "Did you make these notes or not?"

The question is, are the notes significant? What do the billing records signify? Not much. And whatever they signify, it has already been brought out. The distinguished Senator from New York is free to argue all of these things. You know, did Susan Thomases—did Ms. Williams—did this person do this or that? It is all out there to the extent it has any relevance to anything.

I submit it is not relevant to anything except the Presidential race. It is an attempt to get President Bill Clinton and the First Lady of this country to be put in an embarrassing position. That is all this is about. Everybody knows that, Mr. President. Everybody knows that. Give me a break.

Are we trying to make policy here? Just what law is it that we will be able to amend or change or propose by virtue of Whitewater? Is the President charged with any wrongdoing, any violation of law? No, he is not. Is the First Lady charged with any violation of law? No, she is not. How about an ethical violation? No, they are not. But if they are, and if the evidence is there, we have a very partisan special prosecutor who has over \$25 million already spent in a bottomless pit of money in order to be able to pursue that.

That is a legitimate purpose. It may be illegitimately or partisanly pursued by the special prosecutor, but it is certainly legitimate and within the ambit of the law, and it is not going to be stopped by what we do here in the Congress. So if there is lawbreaking which has not been either charged or revealed so far, that special prosecutor can do it.

What the special prosecutor cannot do is to have these hearings with all

these accusatory looks and tones and dredging up pieces of paper, throwing them out with a flourish as if they signify anything. And, Mr. President, we know they have no significance beyond the political race that is presently occurring.

We know that if Bill Clinton were not President of the United States, there would be no thought of going into this kind of thing, wasting these kinds of resources, wasting this much time of the Congress on this issue. It is politics, pure and simple, unvarnished, obvious and clear, and I hope we do not give another nickel to this boon-doggle—not another nickel.

I think my colleagues are proposing giving some more money to pursue it further. I hope they do not give a nickel. Whatever there is here—and there is nothing of legitimate concern for us, because it does not involve the President as President—it does not involve policy that we need to know about, it does not involve charges of wrongdoing against the President and the First Lady. It involves innuendoes that can be useful only as political fodder in a political campaign, and that is all. I hope we do not continue it at all.

I must say, the distinguished Senator from Maryland is a lot closer to this than I am. I trust his judgment. If he would say we have to continue for 2 days or 5 days or whatever, I may reluctantly vote for it. But, Mr. President, I am so sorry that I voted for this resolution in the first place. I do not know what we were thinking when we commissioned this Whitewater boon-doggle investigation. I do not know what we were thinking, and I hope we will terminate it as soon as we can. I wish we would set a precedent that we do not do this kind of thing.

Look, if the other party gains the White House this year—I will not be around here as a Member of the Senate, but I hope our side does not try to do that to their side when they get in office. It is a waste of time, it is a waste of resources, it is a diversion from the purposes of this country and of this Senate and of this Government. We ought to get about the business of running the Government as set forth in the Constitution and let the candidates run the campaigns. Enough is enough, and we have already had too much.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business.

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

LONGEVITY IN THE SENATE: RECOLLECTIONS OF T.F. GREEN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today the number 93 symbolizes a notable milestone in Senate history. It is the 93d day after Senator STROM THURMOND's

93d birthday, which was the same span of days and years reached by my venerable predecessor Senator Theodore Francis Green on the day of his retirement on January 3, 1961. Tomorrow, Senator THURMOND will be 93 years and 94 days old and he will assume Senator Green's mantle as the oldest sitting Senator in history.

I join in extending hearty congratulations to Senator THURMOND on his remarkable durability and I wish him well in years to come. But I do hope we will not lose sight of the extraordinary long and distinguished career of the previous record holder.

The career of Theodore Francis Green will always be an inspiration and a model for productive senior citizenship. He was a classic late bloomer whose political career did not really begin until he was 65 years old. And his most prolific years were in the two and a half decades that followed.

Born in Providence in 1867—a year before Ulysses Grant was elected President—Senator Green was descended from a distinguished line of forebears dating back to the founding of colonial Rhode Island. Five of them served in Congress. He began his own public life when he raised and outfitted his own company in the Spanish-American War.

He served a single term in the Rhode Island General Assembly in 1907, but then endured 25 years of political rejection and disappointment. He ran for Governor three times without success, in 1912, 1928, and 1930—counted out he said by the opposition—and he lost a race for Congress in 1920. And then in 1932, at an age when his contemporaries were contemplating retirement, he was elected Governor of Rhode Island, swept in on the New Deal tide.

Reelected to the governorship in 1934, he engineered on inauguration day the so-called Bloodless Revolution which in a single afternoon ended Republican dominance of the State government and earned him the pejorative of "Kingfish Green" in some circles. The coup was never successfully challenged and he went serenely ahead with his reform agenda.

In 1936, Theodore Francis Green was elected to the U.S. Senate, beginning 24 years of continuous service during which he became a colorful and beloved fixture of Washington life. He was a strong supporter of the New Deal and of social legislation in the post-war era. A dedicated internationalist and a tireless world traveler, he ascended to the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the age of 89 in 1957.

He was not particularly impressed by his own longevity. "My age is nothing to be proud of," he said. "It's just an interesting incident." But the secret of longevity, he said is moderation. "I don't get worried and don't get excited. It would take more or less of a bomb to upset me."

There was, however, another factor that kept him going and that was his

almost ceaseless thirst for physical activity. It can hardly be coincidental that Theodore Green and STROM THURMOND—both devotees of physical fitness—should be the record holders for Senate seniority.

Green's prowess was legendary and he was sometimes referred to as Tarzan, notwithstanding his modest 150-pound physique. He was a wrestler and a mountain climber and a handball player. He continued high diving until he was 82 when he was finally convinced by doctors and friends to give it up. And he continued to play tennis until he was 87, and they quit only because he could not find time in his busy schedule to play.

But to the end he continued to work out and swim several times a week in the Senate gymnasium or at the YMCA. And most of he walked, daily—except in the worst weather, from his bachelor quarters at the University Club to his office in the Russell Building. Every morning at about 8:35 he would start out on the 2-mile walk, a familiar stooped figure with his pince-nez eye glasses, usually proceeding down through Lafayette Park and up Pennsylvania Avenue. It usually took about 45 minutes.

The daily walk was prompted as much by an aversion to automobiles as it was by a love for exercise. The only car he ever owned was acquired for ceremonial purposes and it spent most of its days on blocks in his Providence garage. He never learned to drive. But he loved trolleys and legend has it that he once showed up, impeccably attired in top hat, white tie and tails, to take a society matron to a concert, traveling by street car.

Like the new holder of the longevity record, Senator Green had great appreciation for women. He often liked to joke that he looked forward to every leap year in hopes that some lovely lady would claim him. Even as he approached 90, he was regarded as one of the better dancers among Washington bachelors. And Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter once said that Theodore Green was "the most charming dinner partner your wife could have."

When Senator Green claimed the longevity title in 1956, Senators Lyndon Johnson and William Knowland, the majority and minority leaders, presented him with a gavel supposedly made from the oldest tree on the Capitol grounds and proclaimed he had outlived all the surrounding flora. Senator Green often spoke of serving till he would be 100, but in 1960, aware of failing eyesight and hearing, he decided to step down. He died 6 years later, in his 99th year, in the house where he had lived all his life in Providence.

As I said at the time of his death, I was then and have always been greatly in his debt. I benefited by his wise advice and counsel and gained by following his example. He truly was my role model. And I shall always appreciate his willingness to serve as chairman of