

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of April 4, 1997, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"), invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to UNITA. United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement my declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against UNITA. The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or air-

craft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports*: Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports*: Luanda and Lobito, Benuela Province; and *Namibe*, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points*: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

There has been one amendment to the Regulations since my report of April 3, 1997. The UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 590, were amended on August 25, 1997. General reporting, recordkeeping, licensing, and other procedural regulations were moved from the Regulations to a separate part (31 CFR Part 501) dealing solely with such procedural matters. (62 *Fed. Reg.* 45098, August 25, 1997). A copy of the amendment is attached.

2. The OFAC has worked closely with the U.S. financial community to assure a heightened awareness of the sanctions against UNITA—through the dissemination of publications, seminars, and notices to electronic bulletin boards. This educational effort has resulted in frequent calls from banks to assure that they are not routing funds in violation of these prohibitions. United States exporters have also been notified of the sanctions through a variety of media, including via the Internet, Fax-on-Demand, special fliers, and computer bulletin board information initiated by OFAC and posted through the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Government Printing Office. There have been no license applications under the program since my last report.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from March 26, 1997, through September 25, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to UNITA are approximately \$50,000, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Office of Southern African Affairs).

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 24, 1997.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of 2 USC 154, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 102-246, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board:

Mr. Wayne Berman of the District of Columbia to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

LET JUSTICE PREVAIL

(Mr. BARR of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the difference between the Department of Justice of 1957 and 1997 could not be more starkly realized than looking at these tremendously important and positive images of a struggle for civil rights 40 years ago in which the United States Department of Justice was leading the way to uphold our laws, and the Department of Justice of 1997 which has become known as the stonewalling capital of the capital.

Madam Speaker, there are some of those that say because the Attorney General recently took the tiny step for the Department of Justice and that giant, giant tiny step for the Department of Justice, that we ought to say, wonderful, the Attorney General has decided to decide to decide whether to appoint a special prosecutor.

Madam Speaker, I join the New York Times, which, on September 14, called on the Attorney General to step aside and let justice prevail today as it did in 1957.

Madam Speaker, the New York Times editorial is as follows:

[From the New York Times, September 14, 1997]

THE PROSECUTOR GAME

The torrent of disclosures of political fundraising abuses by the Democrats last year has no doubt had a numbing effect on many Americans. But if ordinary citizens find it hard to keep track of the shady characters, bank transfers and memos suggesting that Vice President Gore and others knew what they say they did not know, the justice Department, has no excuse. Recent weeks have brought fresh evidence that the department's investigators are either lethargic or over their heads. Even worse, Attorney General Janet Reno's failure to seek an independent counsel to oversee the probe no longer looks like a principled assertion of faith in Justice's career staff. It looks like a political blocking operation to protect President Clinton and Mr. Gore from the vigorous investigation that would be aimed at any other officeholder who had received so much suspicious money.

Earlier this month, Ms. Reno was warned by Republicans in the House that "the mood in Congress to remove you from office grows daily." That is a drastic step we are not quite ready to endorse. But the Congressional frustration is understandable in light

of recent developments. It is hard to fathom, for example, why Justice Department investigators were so clearly taken by surprise when it turned out that the Democratic Party had engaged in a systematic scheme of juggling its books, transferring money from one account to another in possible violation of the law. Had the investigators been doing their job, they would have also discovered months ago that the basis for Ms. Reno's repeatedly saying that there were no credible allegations of wrongdoing against Vice President Al Gore was flat wrong.

After disclosures in the press that the Democrats mixed campaign accounts that are supposed to be rigidly separate, Ms. Reno abruptly announced that her department would actively consider asking for a special counsel to take over the case. But there really is no need for delay in recognizing the obvious. Moreover, it would be a political subterfuge to limit the special counsel to Mr. Gore. His boss has earned one, too.

The first order of business ought to be fixing responsibility for the Democrats' fundraising abuses, not simply the shuffling of accounts but whether there were any quid pro quos for all those donors and whether anyone in a major responsibility knew of the laundering of money and illegal transfers of funds from foreign sources. Among the highest priorities, in addition, is determining whether Mr. Gore violated Federal laws by soliciting money from big donors from his office at the White House.

There may be a temptation among Democrats and others to suggest that bookkeeping violations are inconsequential. But that would be a fundamental misreading of the issue. The reasons go back to the reforms that followed the biggest political scandal in modern American history.

Watergate led to two historic changes in American politics. First was the establishment of a process in which the Attorney General may seek the appointment of a special prosecutor, which later became known as an independent counsel, to investigate cases against top Administration officials. In 1993 when the statute was renewed, Ms. Reno herself affirmed the importance of being able to turn to an outside counsel to avoid "an inherent conflict of interest" when the Attorney General, an appointee of the President, must oversee an investigation that could damage the Administration politically. She is burdened by that conflict today.

Watergate also produced limits on campaign contributions that were flagrantly violated last year. Since 1974, it has been illegal for an individual to contribute more than \$1,000 to a Federal candidate per election or more than \$20,000 per year to a political party for candidates election expenses. Individuals may not give more than \$25,000 in such contributions a year for all candidates and parties put together. These strictly limited contributions that are used for direct candidate support are called "hard money." Federal election law separates hard gifts from the unlimited "soft money" that can be given to the party for their operating and promotion efforts. Last week we learned that the Democratic National Committee routinely deposited soft money in its hard money or candidate accounts without informing the donors. Although some of the money was later shifted to other accounts, it is clear that the D.N.C. was casual about one of the law's most basic distinctions.

Ms. Reno's primary duty is to uphold the laws on the books. But her Democratic loyalty seems to flow toward those bearing endless legalistic explanations as to why the laws either do not mean what they say or can be ignored with impunity. She should step aside and let someone with a less partisan view of law enforcement take over the

crucial task of investigating the White House money flow.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, 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 Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EWING 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 Montana [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HILL 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 California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN 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 Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART 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 Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROGAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. COLLINS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, after 1 p.m. and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. LAZIO of New York (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, after 2:30 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, after 6 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on September 29.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOLLOHAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. TORRES.

Ms. Christian-Green.

Mr. FILNER.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. MARTINEZ.

Ms. Velázquez.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. CASTLE.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. PAPPAS.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

Mr. RILEY.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. PORTER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 542. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel FAR HORIZONS; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 662. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel VORTICE; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 880. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel DUSKEN IV; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that