The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 38, nays 61, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 31 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Akaka	Dorgan	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Murray
Boxer	Graham	Reed
Breaux	Harkin	Reid
Bryan	Hollings	Robb
Byrd	Inouye	Roth
Cleland	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Conrad	Kerry	Wellstone
Daschle	Landrieu	Wyden
Dodd	Lautenberg	

NAYS—61

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Allard	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Ashcroft	Grams	Moynihan
Bennett	Grassley	Murkowski
Bond	Gregg	Nickles
Brownback	Hagel	Roberts
Bumpers	Hatch	Rockefeller
Campbell	Helms	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchinson	Sessions
Coats	Hutchison	Shelby
Collins	Inhofe	Smith, Bob
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith, Gordon H.
Craig	Kennedy	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerrey	Stevens
DeWine	Kohl	Thomas
Domenici	Kyl	Thompson
Durbin	Leahy	Thurmond
Enzi	Lott	Torricelli
Faircloth	Lugar	Warner
Feingold	Mack	
Frist	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Burns

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 38, the nays are 61. Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is rejected.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just a couple of observations about the vote just completed.

The constitutional amendment to strip political speech out of the first amendment and give the Government the power to control said speech was just defeated 61 to 38. We have had previous votes on the Hollings amendment in other years.

I would just like to mention for the benefit of my colleagues this is the biggest vote against the Hollings amendment yet achieved in the Senate. The opponents of this amendment included all but 4 Republicans and 11 Democrats. So I think it was a very encouraging indication of growing support for protecting the first amendment.

I want to thank my colleagues for this overwhelming vote against the amendment. Also I thank Tamara Somerville and Lani Gerst for their continuing good work on this issue. They are both members of my staff.

I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGATIONS OF ILLEGAL FUNDRAISING

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 22, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) to express the sense of the Congress concerning the application by the Attorney General for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate allegations of illegal fundraising in the 1996 Presidential election campaign.

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is my understanding, under the previous unanimous consent agreement, that discussion and debate will be taking place on either the resolution that Senators just voted on or the pending independent counsel resolution. Is that a correct assumption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Indiana has 40 minutes under the agreement.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I do not believe I will consume the full 40 minutes. In fact, I am sure I will not. And if I finish before that, I would be happy to yield that time back to expedite the process.

Mr. President, I generally believe that the Senate floor should be a place to talk about issues, not about scandals. So my first inclination is to voice my support for an independent counsel and hope the process will take its course. The need for this investigation should be beyond question, proven on the front page of the newspaper every morning.

Under normal circumstances, there would be little more to say. But this circumstance is not normal because it now concerns some of the most disturbing questions that can be asked in a democracy.

Was the executive power of the White House abused to improperly influence the outcome of an American Presidential election?

Were foreign governments invited by the Democratic Party and the Clinton administration to corrupt American elections?

Was the privilege of American citizenship distorted and undermined to serve the President's reelection?

And now we are forced to ask, were American intelligence services manipulated by this administration as part of its fundraising machine?

The revelations that began last October, and have continued until this morning, do not primarily concern the low standards of our current campaign finance system. Those standards, it has been argued, should be changed. We will be debating that in this body.

What the almost daily revelations we have seen do concern are the legal and ethical breaches of the current standards by the Clinton administration. And that charge is different in kind in the seriousness from the policy debate on campaign finance reform.

It is not the technical violation of campaign finance law that primarily concern me. Those are for lawyers and prosecutors to debate and decide. The issue is far greater than the sum of those ethical and legal problems. All of the strands of this scandal—high-pressure soft-money fundraising, illegal foreign contributions, the abuse of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and of the CIA—reveal an administration obsessed with reelection, indifferent to ethical rules and organized to skirt the law.

All of these efforts were directed toward one event, and one date: The Presidential election on November 5, 1996.

There are countless complex elements to this scandal, but only one central issue. Was the executive branch of Government corrupted and compromised by a rogue political election operation centered in the Democratic National Committee, the Office of the President, the Office of the Vice President, and the Office of the First Lady?

By definition—no matter what the justification—this would not just be a violation of legal and ethical standards regarding campaign financing, but arguably a crime against democracy itself.

The most recent revelation is one of the most damaging. We now know that the Central Intelligence Agency was used by the Democratic National Committee to encourage access to the President by Roger Tamraz, an international fugitive and major donor to the Democrat Party.

We know that Donald Fowler, chairman of the DNC, made a call to the CIA asking that that agency provide classified information to the White House about Mr. Tamraz and his business interests in a pipeline project funded partially by Chinese businessmen.

When the National Security Council refused to recommend a meeting between Mr. Tamraz and President Clinton, the White House eventually scheduled at least four that we know of. One meeting in April 1996 took place while Mr. Tamraz was being sought for questioning by Interpol, the international

police agency, for bank fraud in Lebanon. Mr. Tamraz made $177,000 in donations to Democrat causes and maintained business ties with both Saddam Hussein's Iraq and Muammar Qadhafi's Libya.

The White House has responded by saying in effect, as they have said to every issue that has been raised regarding their ethics and regarding their fundraising operation, ''Well, everyone is doing it.''

Mr. President, unless there are things going on here in the Senate that I do not know about, the White House defense that ''everyone is doing it'' does not apply here.

It has been said that the confirmation process is at fault in the withdrawal of the Anthony Lake nomination, the individual who headed the National Security Council during these events.

The fault, in fact, Mr. President, lies elsewhere. The Lake nomination was eventually undermined because he was forced to operate in the heart of a political fundraising machine whose abuses are being revealed to us in expanded detail each day.

The White House blames partisan Republicans, but the final straw in the failure of this nomination came because our intelligence services were politicized for partisan political advantage.

We are not entirely sure what Mr. Lake's role was in this. That is the reason why we requested interviews with NSC staff, interviews that were denied, and why we were going to seek today subpoenas to order those interviews to take place.

But we do know what the White House role was. And it was clearly inappropriate. If Anthony Lake is the victim of a political process gone haywire, that political process is to be found in the White House itself.

The most recent revelation is part of a pattern, a pattern of abusing executive power for political ends.

Concerning political solicitation at the White House, we now know that the Office of the President, the Office of the Vice President, and the Office of the First Lady were all involved in these efforts.

We know that the President's request for immediate action on fundraising in early 1995—the written message that read ''ready to start overnights right away''—we know that this began a program of White House coffees and Lincoln Bedroom overnights that eventually raised nearly $40 million.

We know that an unsigned memo was written to Martha Phipps, deputy chief of staff to the chairman of the Democratic Party, which suggested 10 White House rewards for major donors: two seats on Air Force One, two seats on Air Force Two; six seats at all private dinners; six to eight spots at all White House ceremonies and events; official delegation trips abroad; better coordination on appointments to boards and commissions; White House mess privileges; White House resident visits and overnight stays; guaranteed Kennedy Center tickets; six radio address spots; photo opportunities with White House principals.

We know, Mr. President, that at least 7 of these 10 perks were actually used in fundraising efforts. We know that the administration, in its fundraising efforts, applied few, if any, ethical standards to those who were given access to the White House.

Included in the White House coffees with President Clinton were a major drug dealer, a twice-convicted felon for theft and tax offenses, a Chinese arms dealer, and an international fugitive on conspiracy and embezzlement charges.

We know that the Vice President, Mr. GORE, solicited campaign contributions by telephone from his White House office on more than 50 occasions. One business figure who received a call recounts—and I quote—''There were elements of a shakedown in the call. It was very awkward. For a Vice President, particularly this Vice President who has real power and is the heir apparent, to ask for money gave me no choice.''

We know that the First Lady's chief of staff, Margaret Williams, accepted a $50,000 political contribution at the White House.

We know that Harold Ickes, assistant to the President, wrote a memo to a major Democrat contributor advising him on ways to make a $5 million contribution to the Democratic National Committee tax deductible. The three-page document detailed how such a contribution could be filtered through 501(c)3 organizations that were helpful to Democrat reelection efforts. In the memo, Mr. Ickes wrote, ''If possible, it would be greatly appreciated if the following amounts could be wired to designated banks.''

We know there was a clear direction from the President and First Lady to use a White House computer database for political purposes. That database, by the way, was purchased with $1.7 million of taxpayer dollars. One memo marked ''Confidential'' from White House political aide Marsha Scott argues that the database be made available ''to the [Democrat National Committee] and other entities we choose to work with for political purposes.'' On this memo are the handwritten words, ''This sounds promising. Please advise.'' Signed HRC.

Another memo from Ms. Scott, to Erskine Bowles, the President's current chief of staff, outlines a plan to use the database to reward supporters with ''trinkets'' and access. The memo concludes, ''This is the President's idea and it is a good one.''

Another memo from Ms. Scott to Thomas McLarty, the President's former chief of staff, states of this plan, ''Both the President and the First Lady have asked me to make this my top priority.''

We know, Mr. President, that former White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum, early in the Clinton administration, had contributed a memo titled ''Criminal Statutes.'' In that memo he wrote, ''A number of criminal statutes prohibit the use of Federal programs, [Federal] property or employment for political purposes. Violation of these criminal statutes is punishable by imprisonment and/or payment of a substantial fine.'' The memo went on to outline the type of activities clearly prohibited by the law: ''Soliciting or receiving campaign contributions on Federal property or in Federal buildings. This means that fundraising events may not be held [—may not be held—] at the White House; that no fundraising phone calls or mail may emanate from the White House or any other Federal buildings; and that no campaign contributions may be accepted at the White House or any other Federal buildings.''

So, Mr. President, based on the Nussbaum memo, the former White House counsel memo, then White House counsel, we know this administration was fully informed of these ethical and legal standards, the standards of the current system, but we also know those standards were broadly and repeatedly violated at every level of the Clinton White House.

And then there is the issue of White House political involvement in foreign political contributions.

We know that many of the principal figures in the current scandal—including John Huang, Charlie Trie and Johnny Chung—have been longtime Clinton supporters, some brought to Washington from Arkansas. They have had open access to this administration—Huang visiting the White House 78 times in 15 months and Chung visiting at least 49 times.

We know that Johnny Chung took six Chinese businessmen to the White House to hear President Clinton's radio address on March 11, 1996, in exchange for a $50,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee—the contribution that was given to Margaret Williams on March 17.

We know that Charlie Trie attempted to make a $460,000 contribution to the President's legal defense fund, claiming the money was collected from a variety of sources. Yet the serial numbers on the money orders were sequential and much of the handwriting was identical. Initially, only $70,000 of the money was returned. It took several months for the law firm overseeing the fund to return the remainder of the contribution.

We know, Mr. President, that John Huang was an official at the Clinton Commerce Department with a top-secret security clearance. While an official at Commerce, he recommended policies unfavorable to Taiwan and supported by China. We know that John Huang visited the Chinese Embassy at least two times during his tenure. In one instance, Mr. Huang requested top-secret documents on May 10, 1995, the day he was scheduled to meet the Chinese Ambassador.

We know that in an Oval Office meeting on September 13, 1995 —including President Clinton, Bruce Lindsey, John Huang, and James Riady, the Indonesian head of the Lippo Group—a decision was made to transfer Mr. Huang to the Democratic National Committee where he became vice chairman of finance.

We know that John Huang approached officials of the Asian American Business Roundtable with a plan to channel more than $250,000 through roundtable members to the Democratic National Committee in return for a $45,000 kickback.

We know Huang helped arrange a California fundraiser at a Buddhist temple, attended by Vice President GORE, in which illegal contributions were transmitted to the DNC through third parties. One participant was paid $5,000 in cash in small bills and told to write a check. Vice President GORE claimed for 2 months he was unaware this event was a fundraiser. But a memo later surfaced that revealed that Vice President GORE's staff had briefed him on the fundraising purpose of the event.

We know that John Huang raised more than $3 million for Democrats in illegal contributions from Asian sources.

We know that the FBI, based on surveillance of the Chinese Embassy, expressed serious concerns that the Chinese Government was attempting to influence American elections through illegal contributions. That information was communicated to two officials at the Clinton White House in June of 1996. For reasons that for the moment are unclear, Mr. President, that information was not acted upon.

Another area of White House political involvement concerns the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

We know in September 1995 a Democrat activist from Illinois wrote to the First Lady to alert her of an ''opportunity'' presented by a new Immigration and Naturalization Service policy to increase the pace of naturalization. Daniel Solis wrote, ''The people stuck in Chicago's naturalization bottleneck represent thousands of potential voters.'' He added that ''similar backlogs exist in politically important States'' like California and Texas.

We know the Vice President's office initiated a program called Reinventing Citizenship USA. We know the Vice President's office became involved in this project. A senior advisor to Vice President GORE sent an e-mail to a gentleman by the name of Dough Farbrother, another Gore aide, in March of 1996. Mr. Farbrother, being another Vice Presidential aide, received the memo in 1996, and that memo stated, ''The President is sick of this and wants action.''

We know that in a later message to the Vice President, Mr. Farbrother said that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is not doing enough to ''produce a million new citizens before election day.''

He concluded that, ''Unless we blast INS headquarters loose from their grip on the front line managers, we are going to have way too many people still waiting for citizenship in November.''

We know that Mr. Farbrother later drafted a memo to President Clinton on behalf of Vice President GORE, which stated that ''if we are too aggressive in removing the roadblocks to success, we might be publicly criticized for running a pro-Democrat voter mill and even having Congress stop us.''

We know that as a result of these efforts 180,000 people were processed without criminal background checks. Clearly, the standards of citizenship were bent and broken for political purposes.

Mr. President, in the middle of all this political activity at the White House, designed to influence the Presidential election, Vice President GORE made the following statement: ''The ethical standards established in this White House have been the highest in the history of the White House. You have a tougher code of ethics, tougher requirements, strictly abided by.'' When that statement was made last year, it was barely credible. Today, that statement is offensive and outrageous. Evidence piles upon evidence of legal and ethical wrongdoing in the Clinton administration.

Mr. President, each day, it seems, either the New York Times, or the Washington Post, or the Wall Street Journal, or other major, credible investigative organizations, detail new improper or illegal activity, or both, coming out of this administration, related to the campaign financing operation run in the White House during the last election. As a consequence of this, I believe we are forced to three conclusions by this unfolding scandal. First, the White House, in preparation for the election, was turned into a political machine—more like Tammany Hall than the most ethical White House in history. The staff of the President, the staff of the Vice President, the First Lady, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and even the CIA were all involved. We are not sure exactly what the direct involvement was of the President. We know the Vice President, who was referred to as ''solicitor in chief,'' was a key player in all of this, in one way or another, Mr. President, with fundraising or increasing the number of Democrat voters. There was even use of the CIA in the operation to fund this election, which was conducted in an unprecedented and extraordinary and very disturbing way. Clearly, all the advantages of the executive branch were employed in the President's reelection effort.

Mr. President, there is something deeply disturbing and inherently troubling about all of this. In a democracy, we prevent public officials from using their public office to improperly influence the outcome of elections because such practices are, perhaps, the most serious form of corruption in a democracy.

The second conclusion from all of this is that the return of illegal money by the Democrat National Committee comes after the benefits that it bought, after the election is past and after the damage is done. In reality, the money raised by Johnny Huang and others cannot be returned because it has already been used. The DNC will simply raise new money, which is then refunded. We must not fool ourselves that returning illegal money is sufficient punishment, or any kind of punishment at all. It turns illegal funds into a campaign loan to be repaid after the votes are counted. And now it is unclear just when that loan will ever be repaid, because despite public announcements that the DNC is returning illegal contributions, not a penny—at least a reported penny—has yet been returned.

Finally, this unfolding story of the White House improperly influencing the result of the national election is not politics as usual, as is so often alleged by the White House in response to each new allegation. This is something unique and something uniquely disturbing. This administration wants us to believe that its actions, if questionable, were normal practice, but we must never, Mr. President, become immune to illegality. This record of broken trust and broken rules does not primarily indicate the need for campaign finance reform; it indicates the need for further FBI investigation. It indicates the need for immediate firings in the White House. It may indicate the need for criminal prosecutions. It certainly indicates the need for independent counsel.

Every time the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, or other publication reports a new aspect of this scandal, the same response comes back from the White House: ''Republicans are being partisan. This is just politics. We all do it, so let's clean up the mess together.''

No one at the White House, in any context, seems willing to take responsibility for ethical and legal violations. If the White House will not assume that responsibility, then it must be imposed. Senator THOMPSON's committee will doubtlessly do good work, but its results will almost certainly be attacked and discounted by the Clinton administration as simply ''partisan politics.'' I supported the effort to allow that committee to move forward in its investigation. But it is clear that the pattern of response from the White House now that whatever is said either by this Senator on this floor, or any Republican on this floor, or any Republican in a public statement, or conducted by any committee controlled by a Republican chairman—it's clear now that every question asked, every allegation made, and every statement offered is simply labeled as ''partisan politics.''

For that reason, it seems that in the end, we have no choice but to proceed

with independent counsel. While far from perfect—and I have had my reservations about independent prosecutors—such a process, however, was designed to move questions of criminality outside the political process. And those questions of criminality in this case are serious questions—as serious as it gets—and may reach to the very highest levels of our Government.

This administration has maintained its power, but has squandered its integrity. It has actively undermined the integrity of an American Presidential election. This is a breathtaking act of political arrogance. Yet, the President insists it was justified because, in his words, ''The direction of the country was at stake.''

I wonder what the public response would have been, Mr. President, if during the Watergate investigation of then President Nixon the response from the President, the response from the Vice President, and the response from the administration had been that all the means that we took, all the things that we engaged in were justified because our political agenda and the direction of our country was at stake.

To overlook virtually every questionable, improper, illegal practice, and to overlook this 14 pages of what we know—who knows what we don't know?—and simply say that it was justified on the basis that the agenda of this administration was so important that any law could be violated, that any ethics rule could be overlooked, that any practice could be undertaken, simply to advance their political agenda for the future of America, puts this country in a dangerous, dangerous situation.

The ends do not justify the means. While the President and his party feel strongly about what the agenda should be for this country, it is clear that there are opposing agendas that are debated every day on the Senate floor and in the Congress, and debated among the American people. It is political arrogance to suggest that one party's political agenda for the future of this country justifies the kinds of campaign practices that took place in the reelection effort of this President.

The White House for years has chosen its own direction. That direction appears to be the corruption of the very democratic process itself.

Mr. President, I believe this situation has become so serious and so potentially threatening, and damaging to the political process and to the office of the Presidency that an independent counsel is needed, and needed immediately. I, therefore, will join with many here in this body in a sense-of-the-Senate resolution calling upon the Attorney General to immediately name an independent counsel, someone who is above reproach, whose credibility is acceptable to the American people, whose integrity is unquestioned, to investigate the extraordinary serious allegations printed in major newspapers with great credibility. Just reading the quotes alone from memos obtained regarding some of these practices raises enough question I believe for the appointment of an independent counsel.

I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort. Clearly the administration and the White House has decided to follow the course of labeling every charge as simply a partisan attack, equating campaign financing in the last congressional election with what took place at the White House—and they are leagues apart in terms of degree—attempting to confuse the issue with phrases like ''Mistakes were made''; ''We promise we won't do it again, even though we are proud of what we have done.'' The phrases and comments that seem to indicate that we are all in the same pot together on this one; ''You guys did it. We did it. Let's put behind us what was done and move forward to clean up the system.''

I think it is time people began to take responsibility for their own actions. Since the White House refuses to do this, I think it is appropriate that we move forward with independent counsel. I will be supporting the resolution to be voted on tomorrow.

Mr. President, if I have any time left, I yield that time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise today to support the resolution of Senator LOTT calling for the Attorney General to appoint an independent counsel to investigate many of the allegations of illegal activity concerning the 1996 election cycle.

This statement—I will read most of it—is very serious. It bothers me as a Senator to do this. I am not a big proponent of the independent counsel statute, but I think clearly it was written to avoid a conflict of interest between the Attorney General and covered persons, those persons being the President, the Vice President, and heads of national committees. I think we have seen evidence in the last 2 or 3 months that there probably is a conflict of interest between the Attorney General and the President and the Vice President and other high officials within the Clinton administration.

In the New York Times there is an editorial that says:

> Disclosures about a Chinese plan to influence the election have taken the fund raising scandal to a new level of seriousness and clarity. Now it is clear that any citizen with a reasonable interest in the efficiency of the Federal investigative agencies and the integrity of the electoral process will want a full account of what went on.

I agree with that.

Recent news reports revealed conflicting accounts by President Clinton, the White House, and the FBI, concerning whether the President was made aware of intelligence information that the Chinese Government might be trying to influence the upcoming elections. The FBI believe they may attempt to funnel illegal donations into Presidential and congressional campaigns. The question whether the President was aware of this information and if not, why it was kept from the President, is just one of the numerous conflicts of interest pending before the Attorney General.

It is an important issue to determine whether President Clinton was aware of the Chinese Government's intended illegal actions before he approved White House coffees, lunches, and dinners with individuals known to have close ties to the Chinese Government. Charlie Trie, Pauline Kanchanalak, and Johnny Chung were allowed frequent access into the White House to attend various functions and one-on-one meetings with the President.

Mr. Chung came into the White House reportedly 49 times—and I have heard 51 times—and he donated over $366,000 that had to be returned. One of Mr. Chung's visits came only 1 day after he delivered a $50,000 check to Mrs. Clinton's Chief of Staff Maggie Williams in the White House. Mr. Chung brought six Chinese businessmen into the Oval Office to watch the President's radio address, one of which is the vice president of a Chinese company that trades weapons. They had their photos taken afterward. The White House was warned about handing over these pictures by the President's own NSC staff. They labeled Mr. Chung a ''hustler'' and warned that he might use the pictures to ''enhance his business.'' In spite of this, Mr. Chung also brought Chinese beer executives into the White House who evidently obtained their pictures with the President since it was reported that one of these pictures was featured on a billboard advertisement for the beer company.

Pauline Kanchanalak visited the White House at least 26 times and donated approximately $250,000 to the DNC. On the day Ms. Kanchanalak brought some of her business clients to a White House coffee with the President, she donated $85,000 to the DNC and it was recorded that the donation was for ''coffee with the President of the United States.'' Ms. Kanchanalak has not been available to answer questions about any of this. She apparently left the country after congressional subpoenas were issued and there were news reports that documents were destroyed.

Charlie Trie visited the White House up to 37 times and delivered $640,000 in checks and money orders to the President's legal defense fund. The money had to be returned since it was from unverifiable sources. About 1 month after Mr. Trie delivered the bulk of these checks, President Clinton expanded the number of members of the

U.S.-Pacific Trade and Investment Policy Commission and Mr. Trie was appointed to that Commission. The White House denied any connection between the donations and the delivery of the money, but questions remain unanswered. Mr. Trie also arranged for Chinese arms merchant Wang Jun to attend a White House coffee with President Clinton. Wang Jun is a former officer of the Chinese People's Liberation Army and was chairman of a Chinese company suspected of trying to import illegal automatic weapons into the United States.

Did the President know about the Chinese Government's plan before his reelection campaign and his legal defense fund accepted hundreds of thousand of dollars in illegal donations?

Was the President aware of this information when he allowed a Chinese arms dealer and manufacturer into the White House?

Was Mr. Trie's appointment to the Trade Commission related to his generous donations to help pay the President's legal expenses and to aid his reelection efforts?

All of these examples show just how many conflicts of interest exist for the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to investigate these allegations. And that is just what they are at this point—allegations. However, the independent counsel statute clearly provides under section 591(c)(1) and (d) of title 28, United States Code, that the Attorney General may invoke the independent counsel process when the Attorney General has received specific information from a credible source sufficient to constitute grounds to investigate whether a violation of any Federal criminal law, other than a Class B or C misdemeanor or infraction, may have been committed by any other person if such investigation or prosecution by the Department of Justice may result in a personal, financial, or political conflict of interest.

The independent counsel statute is intended to allow the Attorney General to request the appointment of an independent counsel when this type of conflict of interest occurs involving those at the highest levels of our Government and top officers of the President's political party. I believe that Attorney General Reno has ample information and should therefore, invoke this provision of the statute to immediately request appointment of an independent counsel.

Attorney General Reno testified before the Government Affairs Committee in favor of the reauthorization of the act. She testified that:

> The reason that I support the concept of an independent counsel with statutory independence is that there is an inherent conflict whenever senior Executive Branch officials are to be investigated by the Department and its appointed head, the Attorney General. The Attorney General serves at the pleasure of the President. . . .

Section 591 (a) and (d) of the independent counsel law also contains a mandatory provision which requires the Attorney General to invoke the independent counsel process whenever the Attorney General has received specific information from a credible source sufficient to constitute grounds to investigate whether any Federal criminal law, other than a Class B or C misdemeanor or infraction, may have been violated by a covered person.

There has been specific credible information publicly reported that officers and agents of the Democratic National Committee were acting under the direction of and pursuant to instructions given by the President, Vice President, and other top level officials in the White House and the Clinton-Gore reelection campaign. The President, Vice President, the Clinton-Gore Reelection Campaign chairman and treasurer are named in the statute as covered persons.

If it is correct that certain officers and agents of the Democratic National Committee were acting under the direction of the reelection campaign and were in effect exercising authority for the campaign at the national level, then it is open to interpretation whether the chairman and top officers of the DNC would also be covered persons under the law.

The law also provides a list of other covered persons which includes the Attorney General, certain top Justice Department officials, Cabinet Secretaries, and other top level administration officials. Any person working in the Executive Office of the President with a salary of $133,500 or above is also a covered person under the law.

What this means is that if the Attorney General receives specific information from a credible source that any Federal criminal law, other than a Class B or C misdemeanor or infraction, may have been violated, Attorney General Reno must conduct a preliminary investigation and seek the appointment of an independent counsel if further investigation is warranted.

There are numerous Federal laws that may apply to the allegations we have heard about and seen reported in the news:

Title 18 of the United States Code, section 599 makes it unlawful for a candidate for Federal office to promise an appointment to any public or private position or employment in return for support of his candidacy.

Section 600 makes it unlawful to promise employment, a contract, or other benefit in exchange for any political activity or support for a candidate or political party.

Section 607 makes it unlawful for any person to solicit or receive any contribution intended to influence an election for Federal office in any [government] room or building.

This is the tone that has been related to the President's fundraising coffers and also to the Vice President's phone calls.

Section 641 makes it unlawful to convert Government property which includes telephones, copy machines, or Government computer records for ones own use.

Section 201 makes it unlawful to give or offer a bribe to a public official in order to influence an official act.

Section 205 makes it unlawful for a Government employee to act as an agent for anyone before a Federal agency on matters that the United States is a party or has a direct interest.

Section 793 makes it unlawful to communicate national defense information to anyone not entitled to receive it.

Section 794 makes it unlawful to communicate national defense information to a foreign government or representative of a foreign government.

Section 219 prohibits a Federal Government official or employee from acting as foreign agent by delivering money actually derived from foreign countries.

Sections 611–621 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act prohibit any person from acting in any capacity on behalf of a foreign government or foreign political party without registering with the Attorney General.

Section 1905 makes it unlawful for a Federal employee to make an unauthorized disclosure of proprietary business information.

Section 1956 is the money laundering statute.

Section 1505 makes it unlawful to obstruct an agency or committee proceeding.

All of these laws are subject to:

Title 18, section 371, conspiracy statute which makes it unlawful to conspire to commit any offense against the United States; and sections 1341 and 1342, mail and wire fraud statutes which make it unlawful to use the mails, radio, or telephones in connection with any scheme to defraud or obtain money by false pretenses.

Section 1001 false statements statute which makes it unlawful to make a false statement or use a document containing materially false statements in a matter before the executive branch and with some limitations, the judicial and legislative branches.

The Federal election laws make it unlawful to: Solicit or accept political contributions from foreign nationals in section 441e; it makes it unlawful to knowingly accept a contribution made in the name of another person; section 441f; or makes it unlawful to solicit any contribution from persons with contracts with any government agency; section 441c.

These are only a portion of the Federal laws that apply to the allegations currently under review.

Recent news accounts of solicitations of campaign contributions by the Vice President, and possibly the President or senior White House staff, occurring in White House offices not used for residential purposes, or onboard Air Force One, may have violated Federal criminal laws prohibiting soliciting or receiving political contributions in any

Government room or office or conversion of Government property to one's own use.

There has been specific credible information publicly reported that the Cheyenne-Arapaho Indians of Oklahoma contributed $107,000 to the Clinton-Gore reelection campaign in order to meet with President Clinton to discuss the return of Federal lands. It also was reported that Clinton-Gore reelection campaign chief fundraiser Terrance McAuliffe may have offered a Government benefit of access in exchange for additional political support which may violate Federal law prohibiting the promise of a Government benefit in exchange for political activity or support.

There has been specific credible information publicly reported that President Clinton, Vice President GORE, Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes, and other covered White House and Clinton-Gore campaign officers coordinated the solicitation and expenditure of independent Democratic Party funds which may be in violation of the Federal election laws. It was further reported that Democratic party advertising and expenditures were directed toward the reelection effort which may have had the effect to render these funds subject to campaign finance limitations to which they otherwise were not subject.

There has been specific credible information publicly reported that President Clinton met with Long Beach officials to advance a proposed contract between the city of Long Beach and the Chinese state-owned merchant fleet, the China Ocean Shipping Co., COSCO, to lease an abandoned United States Navy Station at Long Beach. It was also reported that individuals—Charlie Trie, Wang Jun, and Johnny Chung—with business interests linked to the Chinese shipping company made campaign donations to the Democratic National Committee and visited the President at a White House coffee during the negotiations for this lease which may have violated Federal laws if any promise of a Government benefit was given in exchange for political activity or support or if a promise of money from a foreign government was given.

Yesterday, the Wall Street Journal reported that oil financier Roger Tamraz, who had an outstanding international arrest warrant for allegedly embezzling $200 million from a Lebanese bank, attended a White House coffee, a White House dinner and reception, and viewed a movie with President Clinton. All of these visits were allowed in spite of warnings from the President's own National Security Counsel Asian specialist's recommendation that Mr. Tamraz should have no future meetings or future access to the White House. Mr. Tamraz met with the NSC specialist in an attempt to obtain support from the administration for a multibillion dollar oil pipeline from the Caspian Sea to Turkey that he was negotiating to build. He then tried to set meetings with Vice President GORE and President Clinton.

The specialist's advice appears to have been followed until Mr. Tamraz made donations of $50,000 and then $100,000 to the Democratic National Committee. When the National Security Counsel determined that it was not in the best interest of the United States to support Mr. Tamraz's business proposal or for his return to the White House, he went to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Tamraz is quoted as saying that he thought that ''through the DNC [he] could make a policy heard.'' DNC Chairman Don Fowler is reported to have personally called the White House's NSC specialist and asked her to drop her opposition to Mr. Tamraz meeting with President Clinton. Mr. Fowler apparently also managed to have the CIA send over a paper on Mr. Tamraz which Mr. Fowler said would show that Mr. Tamraz had helped the United States in the past. The requested meetings with the President did occur. It was reported that Mr. Tamraz had four meetings with President Clinton in spite of these warnings. What did Mr. Tamraz do to warrant such special access? We know that he donated at least $177,000 to the DNC and it was reported that he raised more money from other large donors.

Why was a man with an international arrest warrant, accused of embezzling $200 million from a foreign bank, allowed into the White House to meet with the President?

Why was this same man allowed to meet with President Clinton over the objections of his own National Security Council Asia specialist's warnings?

Why was the chairman of the Democratic National Party involving himself in foreign policy issues?

Why did he call the National Security Council to attempt to change a decision?

How did the chairman of the Democratic National Committee obtain a copy of a paper on a donor from the CIA and have it sent to the National Security Council?

On whose authority was this done?

Was the President aware of his party chairman's actions and did he approve?

If not, why did he continue to meet with this man?

What was requested in these meetings and was any benefit provided to Mr. Tamraz as a result?

There has been specific credible information publicly reported that a cocaine dealer convicted of transporting nearly 6,000 pounds of cocaine into this country, Jorge Cabrera, met with President Clinton in the White House. Eric Wynn, convicted of 13 counts of stock fraud which allegedly was to benefit the Bonano crime family, met with President Clinton. And a man alleged to have been associated with Russian organized crime, Gregori Loutchansky, also met with President Clinton. Mr. Yogesh Gandhi contributed $325,000 to the DNC and met with President Clinton to give him a World Peace Award although reports allege that he owed $10,000 in back taxes and filed divorce papers in court that he was a pauper and could not afford to pay the court's fees. Numerous other specific allegations surrounding John Huang and Webster Hubbell have been widely reported and raised questions about their activities in relation to Chinese interests.

All of these questions need to be answered. They clearly present a conflict of interest for the Attorney General and the Department of Justice. And they do involve credible information concerning covered persons that may have violated Federal law.

Mr. President, I urge the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to investigate these charges. I think the law calls for it. I think it is very clear. I do not think it is close. So I urge the Attorney General to appoint an independent counsel immediately.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent following my presentation that Senator LEVIN from Michigan be recognized on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator LEVIN has time reserved.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss a piece of legislation that I and a couple of my colleagues intend to introduce, but I did want to comment first on the remarks that have been offered previously on the floor of the Senate, including the just-completed remarks by the majority whip.

It is certainly the case that a number of allegations about fundraising abuses are serious and ought to be investigated. The current campaign financing system in this country is in desperate need of revision and reform. The range of abuses that need investigation goes all the way around the spectrum. These include abuses by the major campaign committees, both the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee, congressional campaigns, and the White House. There are a wide range of allegations surfacing almost daily now for several months about abuses in campaign financing. All of them deserve to

be fully investigated. The American people deserve no less than that.

Last week, there was an attempt to do a congressional investigation resolution on the floor of the Senate. That resolution was attempting to put blinders on the investigation sufficient so that it would only investigate a little corner of the problem, and it was the majority party saying only investigate the opposition. It turned out that sufficient members of the Senate would not agree with that. So, finally it had to be broadened to say investigation of campaign finance abuses ought to be across the board, no matter which party is involved with those abuses. As a result the charter given last week to the Senate Committee that will investigate these abuses, is a broader charter rather than a narrower charter.

The same should hold true with the discussion about the resolution now before the Senate. This resolution, once again, attempts to narrow it. The resolution that will be offered by the Senator from Michigan, a substitute offered by Senator LEVIN, is what I will choose to support, largely because that resolution contemplates that abuses shall be investigated with respect to either party or any party in which there is an allegation of fundraising abuse.

The Senate Judiciary Committee already has petitioned the Attorney General on the question of an independent counsel. The law provides for that. The law does not provide for the Senate to intervene on a political basis to petition for an independent counsel. What is happening here is unprecedented. It has not happened previously.

Part of this debate is whether this is politics or substance. We already have a congressional investigation that will now be organized and will be very well funded. We already have a letter from the Senate Judiciary Committee to the Attorney General. The question of whether this legislation now brought to the floor is a political missive, I suppose, is up to those who are looking at it and would make judgments about its narrow scope. I prefer that we consider the resolution and vote for the resolution offered by the Senator from Michigan.

I make one additional point. What is not on the floor of the Senate is campaign finance reform. It ought to be. Campaign finance reform ought to be brought to the Senate. We ought to debate it. We ought to reform the campaign finance system.

What is not on the floor of the Senate, and it must be, is the Chemical Weapons Treaty. That is very important business that is before the body. We must bring it to the floor and have a vote on it and have a debate on the Chemical Weapons Treaty. The attempt to end the spread of poison gases for warfare in this world is a noble attempt initiated first by President Reagan and then by President Bush, sent to us by President Clinton. Many countries have already signed the initiative. It is being held up in this body. Very soon we will have to take aggressive action to try to wedge that to the floor of the Senate and insist on a vote on the important Chemical Weapons Treaty.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 465 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent ordered, the Senator from Michigan is to be recognized. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, there is only one reason the Senate is being asked by the majority leader's resolution to intervene in the independent counsel process which is being considered by the Attorney General. The reason is partisan politics, pure and simple. It is regrettable for many reasons, particularly following last week's determination by the full Senate to support a broad and fair and evenhanded investigation by the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee into campaign finance practices in the 1996 election—Presidential and congressional, House and Senate, Republican and Democratic. In doing that last week, we recognized as a body that abuses in campaign fundraising are not in the exclusive domain of either political party, or either end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We confirm the view, as stated in the Governmental Affairs Committee report, in support of funding a broad scope investigation that:

> The committee intends to investigate allegations of improper activities by all, Republicans, Democrats, or other political partisans. It will investigate specific activities, not the political party against which the allegations are made.

But now, in a partisan attempt to reestablish the focus of the press and the public on just the Democratic National Committee and just the Clinton-Gore campaign, the majority leadership brings this resolution to the floor. The very wording of the resolution reveals its partisan objective. Nothing in the resolution mentions activities in connection with the Republican National Committee, or the fundraising activities of Members of Congress. The resolution mentions possible Democratic problems exclusively and calls upon the Attorney General to seek the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate only allegations against Democrats. It is an unbalanced, partisan piece of work, and I expect it will receive the unbalanced partisan vote that it deserves.

But in addition to the reversal that it reflects of the Senate's unified position on a broad, bipartisan investigation into campaign finance reform, it does damage to the very law that it is seeking to invoke. For the past 18 years I have served as either chairman or ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee of the Governmental Affairs Committee with jurisdiction over the independent counsel law. I have been actively involved in three authorizations of this important statute. And having experienced and studied the history of this law, it is apparent to me that this resolution runs directly counter to the fundamental purpose of the independent counsel law.

The independent counsel law was enacted in the aftermath of Watergate. The Watergate Committee recommended, and Congress agreed, that we needed an established process by which criminal investigations of our top Government officials could be conducted in an independent manner free from any taint of favoritism or politics. This was necessary, we decided, in order to maintain the public's confidence in one of the basic principles of our democracy—that this is a country that follows the rule of law. We established a process whereby the Attorney General would follow certain established procedures in reviewing allegations of criminal wrongdoing by top Government officials and decide at certain stages whether to ask a special court to appoint a person from the private sector to take over the investigation and conduct it independently from the chain of command at the Department of Justice. We wanted the public to have confidence that investigations into alleged criminal conduct by top Government officials were no less aggressive—and I might add no more aggressive—than any such investigation of the average citizen. We particularly wanted to take any suggestion of partisanship out of the investigative and prosecutorial decisionmaking process.

So here is what we did. We established the requirement that if the Attorney General receives specific information from a credible source that a crime, other than a class B or C misdemeanor, has been committed by certain enumerated top Government officials, the Attorney General has to conduct a threshold inquiry lasting no more than 30 days, to determine if the allegation is frivolous or legitimate. The top officials who trigger this so-called mandatory provision of the act are the President and Vice President, the Cabinet Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries of the executive branch departments, plus very top White House officials who are paid a salary at least as high as Cabinet Secretaries or Deputy Secretaries, and in addition the chairman and treasurer or other top officials of the President's campaign committee.

If, after that threshold inquiry, the Attorney General determines that there is specific information from a credible source that a crime may have been committed, the Attorney General must then conduct a preliminary investigation lasting no more than 90 days in which she gathers evidence to determine whether further investigation is warranted. If, after the conclusion of the 90-day period, the Attorney General determines that further investigation is warranted with respect to a covered official, then she must seek the

appointment of an independent counsel. The Attorney General is required by law to seek such appointment from a special court made up of three article III judges appointed for 2-year terms by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

The independent counsel law also has a provision that gives the Attorney General the discretion—and I repeat the discretion—to seek an independent counsel where there is a criminal allegation against a noncovered official and the Attorney General determines that the Department of Justice has a political, personal, or financial conflict of interest with respect to the investigation. There must still be specific information from a credible source that a crime may have been committed and a preliminary investigation to determine whether further investigation is warranted. Use of this provision is contemplated where the Attorney General or top Justice Department employees may have been personally involved in the matters under investigation or where the Attorney General has an unusually close personal relationship with the subject of the investigation.

A third provision of the independent counsel law provides that the Attorney General may seek the appointment of an independent counsel relative to allegations against Members of Congress. The independent counsel law provides that if the Attorney General receives specific information from a credible source that a crime may have been committed by a Member of Congress, she can determine whether the continued investigation of that allegation should be conducted by the Department of Justice or whether it is in the public interest that the investigation be conducted by an independent counsel. Like the conflict of interest provision, this is a discretionary authority, but it is one the Attorney General has available to her in matters involving Members of Congress.

In crafting the independent counsel law, Congress contemplated a role for Congress with respect to the appointment of an independent counsel in a specific case. We included a provision that is tailored to the purposes of the law. The independent counsel law explicitly provides that the appropriate avenue for congressional comment on the appointment of an independent counsel is through action of the Judiciary Committee. The law provides that either a majority of the majority party or a majority of the minority party may request the Attorney General to appoint an independent counsel acting in the Judiciary Committee. Upon receipt of such a letter, the law provides that the Attorney General must respond in writing to the authors of the letter explaining ''whether the Attorney General has begun or will begin a preliminary investigation'' under the independent counsel law setting forth ''the reasons for the Attorney General's decision regarding such preliminary investigation as it relates to each of the matters with respect to which the congressional request is made. If there is such a preliminary investigation, the report shall include the date on which the preliminary investigation began or will begin.''

The Attorney General is not obligated to trigger the statute when she receives such a letter. She is not required to initiate a threshold inquiry or conduct a preliminary investigation. She is only required to respond within 30 days, as I have indicated before. That is the process that we provided in the independent counsel law for Congress to express an opinion in triggering the statute.

Now, why did we adopt that procedure specifically in the statute? We wanted to provide an opportunity for congressional expression in a moderate way. We did not say the Senate or the House could trigger the required report by resolution, thereby raising the stakes and increasing the level of possible partisan bickering. We provided for members of the Judiciary Committee to make the request to the Attorney General, and we required of her only that she respond in writing to the letter in a 30-day period in the manner indicated. So we channeled congressional concerns about the appointment of an independent counsel into a low-key, limited process to keep partisan politics at bay.

We also established this limited process because central to this law is the constitutional requirement that the Attorney General control the triggering of the statute. Congress as a whole is constitutionally prohibited from forcing the Attorney General to seek an independent counsel. In fact, when the constitutional challenge to the independent counsel law was considered by the Supreme Court in the case of Morrison versus Olson, the Supreme Court based its finding of constitutionality for the law upon the fundamental principle followed in the statute that the Attorney General has full authority to exercise her discretion free of congressional control.

The Supreme Court said the following in Morrison versus Olson:

> We observe first that this case does not involve an attempt by Congress to increase its powers at the expense of the executive branch . . . Indeed, with the exception of the power of impeachment—which applies to all officers of the United States—Congress retained for itself no powers of control or supervision over an independent counsel. The act does empower certain members of Congress to request the Attorney General to apply for the appointment of an independent counsel, but the Attorney General has no duty to comply with the request, although he must respond within a certain time limit . . . Other than that, Congress' role under the Act is limited to receiving reports or other information and oversight of the independent counsel's activities, functions that we have recognized generally as being incidental to the legislative function of Congress.

The resolution before us would tend to undermine that basic principle of this law. It also does undermine the nonpartisan spirit which has been so important to this law's operation. This law has been reauthorized in this Chamber at the instigation, I believe, at least on the last three occasions, of then Senator Bill Cohen, Republican from Maine, and myself. We always did it on a bipartisan basis. We always told each other it was critical to this law's functioning that it be implemented carefully as written and not be undermined by bipartisan efforts to use it to its advantage in this most political body.

That is why as an alternative to the majority leader's resolution I have introduced, with Senator LEAHY, a resolution which simply urges the Attorney General to follow the law as it is written, to do her job with respect to all three of her powers to invoke the statute: The mandatory coverage of covered officials in the executive branch, the conflict of interest provision, and the Members of Congress provision. And it asks her to consider all allegations involving Federal elections, Democratic and Republican, Congress and the President, and to do so free of any political considerations.

The majority leader's resolution is problematic both for what it leaves out and what it includes. It leaves out any reference to allegations against Members of Congress and the Republican Party, and it includes conclusory language with respect to the allegations against the White House and the Democratic Party. The resolution leaps to judgment and purports to make the very judgments about possible criminality which the statute and the Constitution reserve for the Attorney General.

The majority leader's resolution very clearly leaves out the same group which some in this body tried to leave out of the Governmental Affairs Committee's investigation, allegations against Members of Congress.

Let us just look at some of the activity that the majority leader's resolution would rather the Attorney General ignore that is not referenced in this resolution at all.

A few months ago, when the 105th Congress first got underway, the media was filled with articles about Speaker NEWT GINGRICH and his misuse of alleged tax-exempt organizations to further partisan political ends.

On January 17, 1997, a specially-appointed investigative subcommittee of the House Ethics Committee released a unanimous bipartisan report which presented the following conclusions:

> The subcommittee found that in regard to two projects, Mr. Gingrich engaged in activity involving 501(c)(3) organizations that was substantially motivated by partisan political goals. The subcommittee also found that Mr. Gingrich provided the committee with material information about one of those projects that was inaccurate, incomplete and unreliable.

The two projects referred to, a television course called ''American Opportunities Workshop,'' and a college course called ''Renewing American Civilization,'' were largely paid for with

tax-exempt donations to two tax-exempt groups, the American Lincoln Opportunity Foundation and the Progress and Freedom Foundation.

The House bipartisan report notes that tax-exempt groups are not allowed to engage in partisan political activities. It states that even Mr. GINGRICH's tax counsel, ''said that he would not have recommended the use of 501(c)(3) organizations to sponsor the course because the combination of politics and 501(c)(3) organizations is an 'explosive mix,' almost certain to draw the attention of the IRS.''

The unanimous bipartisan report of the House ethics investigative subcommittee went on to make the following notable findings:

Based on the evidence, it was clear that Mr. Gingrich intended that the [American Opportunities Workshop] and renewing American civilization projects have substantial partisan political purposes.

This is a bipartisan finding, that Mr. GINGRICH ''intended'' that those two projects have ''substantial partisan political purposes.'' And the subcommittee went on:

In addition, he was aware that political activities in the context of 501(c)(3) organizations were problematic. Prior to embarking on these projects, [the committee wrote] Mr. Gingrich had been involved with another organization that had direct experience with the private benefit prohibition in a political context, the American Campaign Academy. In a 1989 tax court opinion [the subcommittee continued] issued less than a year before Mr. Gingrich set the [American Opportunities Workshop] projects into motion, the academy was denied its exemption under 501(c)(3) because, although educational, it conferred an impermissible private benefit on Republican candidates and entities. Close associates of Mr. Gingrich were principals in the American Campaign Academy. Mr. Gingrich taught at the academy, and Mr. Gingrich had been briefed at the time on the tax controversy surrounding the academy.

And the investigative subcommittee over in the House continued:

Taking into account Mr. Gingrich's background, experience, and sophistication with respect to tax-exempt organizations, and his status as a Member of Congress obligated to maintain high ethical standards, the Subcommittee concluded that Mr. Gingrich should have known to seek appropriate legal advice. . . . Had he sought and followed such advice . . . 501(c)(3) organizations would not have been used to sponsor Mr. Gingrich's [American Opportunities Workshop] and Renewing American Civilization projects.

Now, that unanimous, bipartisan report was issued 2 months ago. It raises, directly, explicitly, serious questions about the deliberate and illegal misuse of tax-exempt organizations by a prominent Member of Congress, and false statements to Congress. The House Ethics Committee report found that Speaker Gingrich intentionally used two tax-exempt organizations for partisan political purposes, even after having been specifically denied tax-exempt status for another organization in 1989 because of the partisan nature of that organization's work. How revealing it is that the resolution before us, of the majority leader, does not mention one word of that entire matter—not a word.

And even leaving aside the issue of Mr. GINGRICH, given the campaign season just behind us, it is also revealing that the resolution before us makes no mention in any way of the tax-exempt organizations that played so prominent a role in the 1996 election. Congress made a decision many years ago that we wanted to give a break to charities and civic organizations devoted to working for public purposes, but we didn't want to use taxpayer dollars to subsidize partisan political activities by these organizations. Blatant violations of the legal limits on partisan political activity appear to have taken place during the 1996 election cycle by a number of tax-exempt organizations. Let us just look at two examples.

In the last months of the 1996 election cycle, the Republican National Committee transferred $4.6 million to Americans for Tax Reform, an organization that is exempt from paying taxes. Grover Norquist, the president of tax-exempt Americans for Tax Reform, was quoted in one Washington Post article as stating that in the last weeks before the 1996 election, his organization sent out 20 million pieces of mail and paid for millions of phone calls in 150 congressional districts. Much of this last-minute activity was made possible by the Republican National Committee's $4.6 million contribution. That is according to the article.

An Associated Press article that came out in October of 1996 quoted Mr. Norquist as saying that his group was sending out a last-minute, $3 million mailing to reinforce Republican antitax messages and that ''two-thirds of the money came from the GOP.''

Mr. Norquist indicated in the Washington Post article that his group didn't pay for televised political ads, but there is evidence to the contrary. An ad broadcast in the New Jersey Senate campaign states that it was paid for by the tax-exempt Americans for Tax Reform. The ad directly attacks the Democratic candidate for missing votes. Here is a sample:

Taxpayers pay liberal Bob Torricelli $133,000 a year, but he doesn't show up for work. That's wrong.

That ad was broadcast in the final weeks of the campaign. It presumably cost a great deal of money to air and may have been paid for with those RNC funds.

Americans for Tax Reform also sponsored what was designated facetiously as a special award for Members of Congress, in the last weeks of the 1996 campaign. The award was called the ''Enemy of the Taxpayer'' award, and it was given to 34 Members of Congress, none of whom were Republicans. The press release issued by Americans for Tax Reform contained a quotes from Mr. Norquist, directly attacking the Democratic Party.

That is not all. A group called Women for Tax Reform, operating out of the same office as Americans for Tax Reform, was created in late August 1996, to launch a national television advertising campaign. It announced its first two ads, both of which consisted of a woman directly attacking President Clinton. One included the following statement:

When Clinton was running, he promised a middle-class tax cut. Then he raised my taxes. He was just lying to get elected. This year, he'll lie some more.

The activity that I have just described, TV ads, direct mail, phone calls, and Enemy of the Taxpayer awards, are as partisan as anything I have seen in my years in politics. These activities were directed at Federal candidates, they were timed to happen in the last weeks before the Federal elections, and they were apparently paid for by millions of dollars in contributions given to the tax-exempt Americans for Tax Reform, including millions from the RNC.

The president of Americans for Tax Reform, Grover Norquist, is routinely described by the Washington Times as a GOP strategist. In 1995, he published a book called ''Rock the House'' celebrating the Republican takeover of the House of Representatives, for which Speaker NEWT GINGRICH provided the introduction. The quotes inside the cover of his own book reveal much about the man running this tax-exempt organization.

Rush Limbaugh states, ''Grover Norquist is perhaps the most influential and important person you've never heard of in the GOP today.''

Haley Barbour, RNC chairman, writes, '''Rock the House' is a true insider's account of the Republican revolution of 1994.''

Paul Gigot, a Wall Street Journal columnist and television commentator portrays Mr. Norquist as ''one of the main power brokers in the new Republican majority.''

Mr. Norquist is described by these persons—each of whom he chose to feature in quotations designed to promote his book—as a Republican insider and power broker. That isn't exactly the profile one would expect for what is supposed to be a nonpartisan, tax exempt group.

So, what are the possible violations? What are the possible violations of criminal law? The list might include: Knowing and willful violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act and false statements to the IRS in violation of 26 United States Code 7206 or 18 United States Code 1001.

Let me describe another tax-exempt group. This one has not been around for very long. It is called Citizens for Reform. It incorporated in Virginia in May 1996, was granted tax-exempt status in June 1996. Its articles of incorporation state that the group's purpose is:

. . . to serve the public interest and to promote the social welfare by fostering and developing greater public participation, on a nonpartisan basis, in the national debate

concerning the size, scope, growth and responsibility of government and of the impact of government on the community, the private sector, and citizens in all walks of life.

This group stated that it expected to conduct conferences, seminars, public events, research, and studies. In its application for tax-exempt status, which is, by law, a publicly available document, the group states that it does not have any membership dues, contributions or gifts in 1996, and projects raising only $1,000 in revenue in 1997 and another $1,000 in 1998.

This group, Citizens for Reform, stated that it had no plans to spend ''any money attempting to influence'' any elections. Within months of its creation, this tax-exempt group, however, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on television and radio ads targeting Federal candidates, and brimming with the intensely partisan type of campaign rhetoric. Ads paid for by this group appear in California, Montana, New York, Kansas, Texas, Arkansas, and Pennsylvania. The group now, apparently, admits spending $2 million in the 5 months before election day.

One TV ad specifically targeted a Democratic candidate for Congress in Montana, Bill Yellowtail. Here is an excerpt from this ad:

He preaches family values, but he takes a swing at his wife. Yellowtail's explanation: he only slapped her once but her nose was not broken.

That is supposed to be nonpartisan activity?

Another TV ad directly targeting a Democratic Congressman, CAL DOOLEY in California. Here is a sample:

Cal Dooley said no to increased money for drug enforcement. Instead, Dooley gave your money to radical lawyers who represented drug dealers.

How is that for another nonpartisan ad?

One of their radio ads was broadcast just before the 1996 election in New York. The ad attacked Democratic Congressman MAURICE HINCHEY and lauded his Republican challenger. It was described in a Wall Street Journal column as follows:

Rep. Maurice Hinchey, the ad said, voted against ''sensible welfare reform,'' [and] voted for ''the largest tax increase in history'' and took money from a union with ties to the mob. By contrast, it said, Rep. Hinchey's Republican challenger . . . supports ''real welfare reform,'' would cut taxes and promises to ''stop special-interest influence on Capitol Hill.''

The Wall Street Journal article went on to say, ''It is impossible to find out who put up the money for the ad; Citizens for Reform doesn't have to say.'' The president of Citizens for Reform, Peter Flaherty, said that his group has spent money in 15 different congressional districts in 10 States.

What happened to the statement of that group that it had no plans to attempt to influence any elections? That is a statement made to the IRS to get an exemption: ''No plans to influence any elections''—that is the representation.

How did it happen that just months after receiving its tax exemption, this group had $2 million and the resources to sponsor patently political ads across the country? What happened to the conferences and the seminars that this group was going to hold? What happened to the statements it made to the IRS that it planned to raise no money in 1996?

Those questions give rise to others. Was there a knowing and willful violation of Federal campaign laws or false statements to the IRS?

But the majority resolution before us does not mention any investigation of Citizens for Reform or Americans for Tax Reform or any other tax-exempt group that was active in the 1996 elections in violation, allegedly, of the laws prohibiting those groups from engaging in partisan activities and whose tax-exempt millions paid for TV ads, voter education materials, get-out-the-vote activities that are just completely at odds, apparently, with what a tax-exempt organization is allowed by law to do.

For my part, I trust the Attorney General to conduct a thorough criminal investigation of all the allegations against Democrats and Republicans, members of the executive branch and the legislative branch. I think she will follow the evidence wherever it leads, as she should. I also trust her to follow the independent counsel law, to use it if she determines that there is specific information from a credible source that a crime may have been committed by a covered official, or to use it for anyone other than a covered official against whom there is such specific information the Department has a personal, financial, or political conflict of interest, or Members of Congress if she determines it is in the public interest to do so.

The majority leader's resolution omits what it should include, which is the Attorney General's review of activities of Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. I will give the Senator 3 minutes from the time reserved for this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair and my good friend from Vermont.

The majority leader's resolution omits what it should include, which is the Attorney General's review of activities of Members of Congress, and it includes what it should omit, by prejudging the very investigation by the Attorney General that it seeks. It thereby does a disservice to the Nation, which is awaiting an objective and fair review, and it undermines the independent counsel law which is dependent upon a nonpolitical application free from partisan pressure.

An alternative resolution that I and Senator LEAHY will be offering will urge the Attorney General to make a thorough and fair review of the allegations, free from political pressure, to reach whatever conclusion is appropriate as to the persons covered by the statute, as to persons not covered by the statute where there might be a conflict of interest, and as to Members of Congress where the public interest indicates that an independent counsel might be the proper course for her to pursue.

This alternative resolution we will be offering embodies the spirit of the independent counsel law. It permits the process invoked by the Judiciary Committee a few days ago to proceed without interference by this body. That letter was sent by Republican members of the Judiciary Committee to the Attorney General asking her to appoint an independent counsel. The law requires her to answer that request within 30 days. We should not prejudge that process that the law provides for, and we should not prejudge the Attorney General's answer. We should stand by the process which was established in the independent counsel law and not give in to this partisan effort.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin on the floor. I wonder if it might be in order for me to speak for about 4 minutes and then it be in order for him to immediately reclaim his time. I would take this time from the time reserved to the Senator from Vermont as manager on this side.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I spoke for hours on this issue on Friday and again yesterday. I will not repeat what I said other than to compliment the distinguished Senator from Michigan and others for what they have said. I put into the RECORD the editorial from the Washington Post that reaches the same basic conclusion as the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

I spoke of the fact that the resolution before us, the resolution introduced by the distinguished majority leader and others, is aimed just at the President, the Vice President and very, very carefully—very, very carefully—excludes the Republicans in Congress as it does the Democrats in Congress.

If we want to show real interest in justice, we should say, well, let us look at any activity of Members of Congress, too. Let us not act as though we are so above the law that we can only point our finger at the President. But that is not the point I am here to bring up, Mr. President.

I have had the privilege of serving with five Presidents: President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton. I have served here with a number of very distinguished majority leaders on my side of the aisle: Senator Mansfield, Senator BYRD, and Senator Mitchell,

all as majority leader; and on the other side of the aisle, Senator Baker and Senator Dole. Of course, now I serve with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

I mention these majority leaders, Senators Mansfield, BYRD, Mitchell, Baker and Dole, because there is one thing that I recall from each one of them in setting the agenda of the U.S. Senate. It was that if the President of the United States was going to be abroad in a summit meeting, negotiating with other heads of state, the U.S. Senate would refrain from bringing forward matters directly aimed—especially partisan matters—directly aimed at the President of the United States.

This resolution is directly aimed at the President of the United States. And what is going to happen? We will arrange to make sure we vote on it almost within hours of the time he will sit down with the President of Russia, the leader of the only other nuclear superpower.

Mr. President, has this body and this town become so partisan that we are going to ignore the tradition of all Republican leaders and all Democratic leaders in this body, and that is, to show some unity behind the President while he is abroad representing not Democrats, not Republicans, but all Americans?

Never in my 22 years in the Senate have I seen such an egregious breach of tradition. That does not mean that a President, Republican or Democrat, is given a free ride. What that means is that the President of the United States will at least be able to demonstrate, when he is abroad representing this country, that he is shown some support back home during the time he is abroad. When he is back here, we will go back and forth and fight as we always have. Fine. That is the process. But the tradition has always been to be supportive of the President when he is at a summit with other leaders. Of all summits he might be attending, what could be more important than the one with the President of Russia?

It was tasteless enough to introduce this resolution and start the debate on it while the President was undergoing surgery at Bethesda. Now, that, at the very least, shows a tastelessness that also, I believe, is unprecedented in this body. That could be chalked up to tasteless partisanship that is not appropriate. It is as bad as making jokes at the President's expense when he is lying there in pain recovering. But we just assume that sometimes we have tastelessness in politics.

However, when we have votes designed to hit directly at the President while he is abroad in a summit, that, Mr. President, goes beyond tastelessness. That shows no regard for history. That shows no regard for the traditions of this body. That shows no regard for the importance of a President being abroad.

Now, I had differences with President Reagan on the way the Contra war was run. I recall we held off from any questions of that when he was going abroad for summits. I may have had differences with President Bush and some of his issues, but we held off on any discussion of that when he was going abroad for a summit.

Mr. President, with all due respect to my good friends on the other side of the aisle—and I have many—I ask them to at least take a few minutes if they are going to set the schedule, and I ask them to take a look at the history of the United States, the history of the Senate, the history of the Presidency, and know there are certain things we do in this country to demonstrate we are worthy of being only 1 of 100 men and women representing a quarter of a billion Americans.

I am deeply saddened by this. I hope this is only a momentary lapse in the kind of traditions that have kept the Senate, occasionally at least, the conscience of the Nation. I hope this is only a temporary lack of those things that show the Senate to be the best.

I thank my friend from Wisconsin.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise today to speak on the two resolutions which the Senate is debating, the so-called Republican version and the Democratic version. I take this opportunity to explain why I intend to vote against both versions as they are now being offered.

At the outset, we should be clear that there is no reason for the Senate to actually consider either version. The statute authorizing the appointment of an independent counsel gives the authority to make the appointment to the Attorney General of the United States, and it also provides a mechanism for the House and Senate Judiciary Committees to invoke a procedure for the Attorney General to respond to a request for appointment of an independent counsel. Mr. President, that, in fact, is what has been used in recent days. Both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees last week voted to invoke that process. The Attorney General has 30 days to respond.

In effect, what we are doing today, since all of that has already happened, what we are doing today is really just shear theatrical maneuvering. On the one side, we have the Republican resolution, which carefully restricts the request and any implication of wrongdoing just to the Clinton White House. That resolution puts Congress off limits for an independent counsel investigation for its alleged wrongdoing. It puts the Republican National Committee off limits for an independent counsel investigation. The Republican resolution turns a blind eye to any allegations of impropriety beyond the White House itself.

On the other side, we have a Democratic resolution that stops short of even taking notice of the fact that there have been so many allegations of wrongdoing on the part of the Democratic Party that the public is crying out for an independent, impartial investigation.

Mr. President, both sides appear to be ignoring the degree to which the fundraising practices of the 1996 elections have gone beyond any limits and created the appearance of a system totally out of control. The improprieties are not limited to the fundraising activities in the White House. Both parties engaged in an almost mindless race to the bottom. The staggering amounts of money raised in the 1996 elections, more than $2.7 billion, compelled the kind of fundraising excesses which continue to shock the country each day. Day after day the front-page story is yet another tale of improprieties and new scandals. The stories encompass both parties, the congressional races as well as the Presidential races.

Mr. President, according to a poll released last week by the Wall Street Journal and NBC News, 91 percent of the American people believe that, if an independent counsel was appointed, the investigation should include all Federal elections, not just the Presidential race, but congressional races, as well.

Last fall, Common Cause filed a request with the Attorney General for appointment of an independent counsel to investigate the violations of law by both parties in the 1996 campaign.

At the time, I said that such action might be appropriate. More recently, I reached the conclusion that it was necessary because it had become clear that the seemingly endless scope of allegations arising from campaign fundraising activities touching all levels of our Government had grown so vast that the only manner in which the public's confidence can be ensured is, Mr. President, by the appointment of an independent counsel. In my view, given the breadth of the allegations, any investigation conducted by the Department of Justice is inevitably and unavoidably subject to the taint of political conflict in this context. To this end, I called upon the Attorney General to appoint an independent counsel.

However, an important distinction between the position I have taken and that offered by the majority in the form of this resolution is that I believe that any call for an independent counsel must necessarily include an investigation of all potential wrongdoers, be it on the part of the executive branch, the political parties, or the Congress. The Republican resolution takes the position that neither Congress nor the Republican National Committee should be subject to such an investigation. I believe the American people will see through this approach. How can anyone suggest to the citizens of this Nation that potential illegalities should be subject to an independent counsel, provided the target is the President but not the Congress? When the target is one party, but not the other, they will surely see such a ploy for exactly what

it is, yet another partisan maneuver designed to delude the public into believing that the problem is limited to a small group of people and not a systemic problem that demands a comprehensive overhaul of our system of campaign finance laws.

Mr. President, as a threshold, it is essential to understand the basis for the independent counsel as well as who is covered by the law. The underlying premise behind the independent counsel law, a premise which we should sustain and that is threatened by partisan gamesmanship, is that we have an inherent obligation to ensure the confidence of the American people and the public in investigations of the Government. This law, born of the Watergate scandal, was derived to restore and protect the public's confidence in these types of investigations, and in the process preserve and promote the public's confidence in the integrity of the U.S. Government.

Mr. President, the independent counsel law provides that the Attorney General must seek an independent counsel upon finding specific information, derived from a credible source, that a violation of Federal law has potentially occurred in regard to certain covered persons, such as the President, the Vice President, Cabinet members, certain high-level officials in the White House, among others. In addition to these mandatory provisions, the independent counsel law provides the Attorney General with certain discretionary power for other persons—those not covered by the mandatory provisions—and, Mr. President, to emphasize, Members of Congress. Members of Congress are included within these discretionary powers of the Attorney General with regard to the independent counsel. In regard to other persons, an independent counsel may be sought if, in the face of specific evidence of illegality, derived from a credible source, a personal, political, or financial conflict of interest exists or may arise as a result of a Department of Justice investigation. In regard to Members of Congress, the discretionary standard is a public interest standard. In other words, if the Attorney General has evidence of a violation of Federal law involving a Member of Congress, she may seek an independent counsel if she finds it to be in the public interest.

Mr. President, over the past few weeks, I have been approached by colleagues and others who argue that Members of Congress are simply not subject to the statute. Mr. President, that is simply incorrect. In fact, if one reviews the legislative history of this law, one finds that Congress had previously been covered, albeit not explicitly, under the other persons provision. In the 1994 reauthorization, Congress clarified this and added a separate section solely for Members of Congress.

The conference report accompanying the 1994 amendments to the independent counsel law states as follows:

> The 1987 law provided the Attorney General with the discretionary authority to use the independent counsel process for any person whose investigation or prosecution by the Department of Justice ''may result in a personal, financial, or political conflict of interest.'' This discretionary authority permitted the Attorney General, if a conflict of interest were present, to use the independent counsel process to investigate Members of Congress. However, Members of Congress were not specifically identified as falling within that general category of coverage.

Mr. President, realizing the hypocrisy of a law that allows an independent counsel in regard to the executive, but not explicitly with regard to Congress, the Congress chose to act. The conference report continues:

> The Senate bill gives the Attorney General specific discretionary authority to use the independent counsel to investigate Members of Congress. It broadens the standard for invoking the process with respect to Members from requiring a conflict of interest to requiring the Attorney General to find it would be in the public interest. This broader standard would permit the Attorney General to use the independent counsel process for Members of Congress in cases of perceived as well as actual conflicts of interest.

Not only did the Congress then act to explicitly include Members of Congress, it took the additional step of making the standard for invoking the statute easier to apply than it had been previously. As the conference report stated, the statute may be invoked in the case of a perceived or actual conflict of interest. Now, this is a significant statement of congressional intent as to whether or not Congress falls within the ambit of the independent counsel statute.

Yet, Mr. President, the resolution brought to the floor of the Senate by a Republican leader chooses a different course and turns a blind eye to any potential illegal conduct on behalf of Members of Congress, be it real or perceived. It simply says to the Attorney General, appoint an independent counsel in regard to the Clinton administration, but not in regard to any illegality involving Congress or the Republican National Committee. Mr. President, I believe this approach is seriously flawed and should be rejected.

As I indicated previously, 9 out of 10 Americans want all illegality in regard to the 1996 elections investigated. Yet, this resolution chooses to ignore that which the American people seem to readily understand—that being that all illegality should be investigated.

Mr. President, when one looks at the myriad of allegations that have arisen in the wake of the 1996 Federal elections, it is not difficult to see why the American people feel that both political parties, and Congress, should be included in an independent counsel investigation.

There has been a lot of attention focused upon alleged wrongdoing by the Clinton White House. But equal attention needs to be focused upon similar allegations about the behavior of both national parties and the Members of the Congress during the fundraising explosion in the 1996 election.

At the outset, it should be understood that what is being sought here is an independent counsel to investigate allegations of wrongdoing in the 1996 election. The distinguished chairman of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, stated during the debate on this issue on Friday as follows:

> The answer to whether criminal wrongdoing has occurred will of necessity turn on the resolution of disputed factual, legal, and state of mind determinations.

Repeating that, he said:

> The answer to whether criminal wrongdoing has occurred will of necessity turn on the resolution of disputed factual, legal, and state of mind determinations.

We have to stress what the Senator from Utah stated: At this stage, whether there was criminal wrongdoing turns on the resolution of factual, legal, and state-of-mind determinations. Obviously, those factual determinations can only be ascertained by an impartial investigation, and that statement applies equally to allegations regarding Republican conduct in fundraising activities as it does to Democratic conduct.

Without engaging in an extensive description of the allegations of improper conduct in the 1996 election, which goes well beyond the activities of the White House, let me highlight a few areas.

First, with respect to the soft money machines that were operated by both parties in the 1996 elections, the initial request filed by Common Cause last fall for appointment of an independent counsel alleged that both the Clinton and Dole Presidential campaigns, along with their respective political parties, knowingly and willfully violated Federal campaign finance laws. Common Cause specifically charged that both campaigns were engaged in illegal schemes to violate the Presidential primary spending limits and the ban on soft money being used directly to support a Federal candidate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah also alluded to this question in his remarks on Friday when he stated:

> There remains significant factual questions of the extent to which the allegedly improper fundraising activity was, in fact, directed toward benefiting Federal campaigns.

If, indeed, it is determined that there were knowing and willful schemes to use soft money in both Presidential campaigns, both parties, as Common Cause asserts, would have violated existing law prohibiting such activity. Of course, Mr. President, the answer cannot be ascertained until an independent investigation is conducted.

Mr. President, let me describe another piece of soft money activity that has been tied directly to the Republican National Committee; that is, the transfer of some $4.6 million from the RNC to a tax-exempt organization headed by Grover Norquist, a close ally of the Republican Speaker of the House. This organization, according to a Washington Post story on December 10, 1996, then used the RNC money to flood voters in 150 congressional districts with millions of pieces of mail and phone calls.

Now, this story adds a rather peculiar twist to the concept of independent expenditures. There have been plenty of complaints about various groups, including labor organizations, running independent campaigns against particular candidates. But this story describes what appears to be what or what may have been a money laundering scheme, which allowed the RNC to raise soft money and then transfer it to this tax-exempt group, which then used the money for an independent expenditure campaign.

Was there coordination of these expenditures with the candidates themselves, or through the Republican National Committee? Was this transfer of money designed to allow the RNC to do indirectly what the law prohibits them to do directly—that is, spend soft money in a congressional campaign? Should we not be seeking the answer to that question? Was this a violation of tax laws as well as campaign finance laws? As the Senator from Utah stated in calling for an investigation of Democratic fundraising activities, there are significant factual questions involved here as to the extent to which this fundraising activity was directed toward benefiting Federal congressional campaigns. Mr. President, those questions cannot be resolved without an investigation.

With respect to the issue of foreign contributions being illegally funneled into Federal elections, I think we are all aware of the allegations that have been made that the People's Republic of China may have targeted Members of Congress, as well as the White House. How successful they were remains unknown. Certainly, we ought to have this question addressed in any independent counsel investigation with regard to Members of Congress, as well as the White House.

Finally, let's be candid about the fact that the allegations that campaign contributions were exchanged for special access to policymakers are not directed solely against the current administration. The newspapers have been filled with story after story of Members of Congress, and the political campaign committees of both parties, establishing various schemes to woo and impress large contributors.

For example, in 1995, the Republican National Committee is reported to have promised $15,000 donors four meetings a year with House and Senate Republican leaders, as well as participation in international trade missions. Of course, in fairness, similar charges have been made against the Democratic National Committee. Did these schemes cross the line in some cases? Was there illegal exchanges of access for campaign contributions? The answers can only be ascertained after factual investigations.

It is little wonder, Mr. President, that in light of these types of allegations, the American public would ask for a broad investigation. It is not difficult to understand why 91 percent of the American people think that all illegality, including that of Congress should be considered by an independent counsel.

Mr. President, I mentioned earlier that the statute provides a specific mechanism for congressional involvement in the appointment of an independent counsel. That mechanism is triggered by a request from the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. I also noted that both committees had already acted pursuant to that statutory authority to submit a request to the Attorney General.

Unfortunately, that process also broke down along partisan lines. As a Democratic Senator who had previously called for appointment of an independent counsel, I had hoped to be able to work on a bipartisan basis within the Judiciary Committee to formulate a request that would transcend party lines. Unfortunately, that effort failed.

In the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Republican members sent one letter; the Democratic members sent another. The respective letters resembled the resolutions before us today. As far as I am concerned, neither letter went far enough.

I choose not to sign either letter because the Democratic letter stopped short of calling for an independent counsel, while the Republican letter, much like this resolution, chose to focus solely on the administration and ignored the potential illegal conduct on behalf of the Congress. Instead, I sent my own letter asking for the appointment of an independent counsel in regard to all illegal activity in the 1996 Federal election, including Congress.

Mr. President, in calling as I have for an independent counsel, I have been taken to task by all sides—from those who do not want a special counsel and from those who, somehow, believe that by calling for an independent counsel to investigate all parties, I am somehow seeking to protect the administration. Notwithstanding these inconsistent conclusions, I remain firm in my belief that the scope of the allegations is such that the only way we can hope to salvage the confidence of the American people in any investigation of campaign fundraising illegalities is to appoint an independent counsel. In so doing, I do not mean to disparage or question the ability of our Attorney General, Janet Reno, to conduct a fair and evenhanded investigation. I simply feel that the scope of this problem is such that irrespective of her evenhandedness, her ultimate conclusion will be suspect and challenged on political grounds. In a sense, the political nature this debate has taken in the Senate makes my point.

In regard to many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I simply disagree with those who argue that an independent counsel should not be appointed. While I appreciate the sincerity of their perspectives, I have reached a different conclusion. The decision to call for an independent counsel is not one that any of us should take lightly. The statue exists for very specific reasons directed at promoting public confidence in the investigation of the Government. The statute does not exist to provide elected officials opportunities to score political points against officials of the other party as I fear has been attempted with this resolution.

In my view, we risk something far greater than short-term partisan advantage by engaging in a process as partisan as this. We risk the further erosion of the public's confidence in the Government and in particular the U.S. Senate to set aside partisanship and work for the good of the American people. At the same time, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle ought to be willing to expose their own parties to the same intense scrutiny that they urge for the opposite party. An evenhanded investigation into all aspects of fundraising improprieties in the 1996 election is the fair response.

This raises the final point I wish to make. That being the pressing need to set about doing the work of the people of this Nation in a bipartisan, constructive manner. As I travel to each county in Wisconsin, as I do each year, I talk with the men and women of my State and at each and every stop, be it in Milwaukee or Bayfield County, the people I listen to all want us to work together and help solve the problems that confront them each and every day.

Sadly, the short history of the 105th Congress, much like the 104th Congress, seems to ignore that call to action. Rather than setting about the hard work of actually balancing the Federal budget we debated for a number of weeks a constitutional amendment which would have forestalled the hard choices until well into the next century. In the meantime, the budget process itself, the process by which we can actually balance the budget, continues to languish. In fact, the 105th Congress has debated more constitutional amendments than it has confirmed Federal judges—three constitutional amendments, no judges. We have also debated a resolution dealing with the scope of the Governmental Affairs inquiry into campaign irregularities and finally, after much public pressure, the scope of that inquiry was adjusted to cover not just illegality but improper conduct, but only after the Senate was needlessly tied up for a number of days. Although this resolution before us for the third day now should only be concerned with illegality, we are nonetheless at an impasse because the proponents of this nonbinding and unnecessary resolution refuse to include themselves in the scope of the inquiry. No wonder people are turned off by government.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I will not support this one-sided resolution calling for an independent counsel to investigate only one aspect of the 1996 elections. I have made clear my belief that one should be appointed and I did

so long before the political exercises which have consumed the Judiciary Committee and this body were set in motion a few weeks ago. Further, I will not support the Democratic alternative because it fails to call for an independent counsel. While the Democratic alternative is correct that any investigation must necessarily cover Congress it falls short of calling for an independent counsel. But more importantly Mr. President, than how any one of us votes on these resolutions, it is my sincere hope that we can set aside the divisive partisan issues which have characterized the outset of the 105th Congress and move toward bipartisan solutions. We should balance the budget, we should address juvenile crime, we should strengthen educational programs, and we should reform the campaign laws which have created the unrelenting money chase that gives rise to so many of the problems which frame this debate.

The campaign finance system in this Nation is broken and in desperate need of repair and the American people understand that, even if some members of the Senate seem to believe the current, scandal-ridden system works fine, they certainly don't feel that way. Furthermore, the American people also understand that the responsibility for the current scandals regarding the campaign fundraising activities of the 1996 Federal elections lie at the feet of both parties, the administration and the Congress.

Yet what is ultimately more important than assessing blame and passing nonbinding resolutions is whether or not this body moves forward and adopts comprehensive, bipartisan campaign finance reform.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the majority is bringing to a vote a resolution that urges the Attorney General to begin the process of appointing an independent counsel to investigate allegations of illegal fundraising in the 1996 Presidential election campaign. I will oppose this resolution, if it remains unchanged, because it urges an overly narrow, one-sided investigation. Instead, I will support the alternative to be proposed by Senator LEAHY.

Let us remember that the independent counsel law places the authority to seek an independent counsel in the hands of the Attorney General, and her hands are tied unless certain thresholds are met. I have great faith in the independence and integrity of Janet Reno. She has already invoked the independent counsel process several times during this administration. If and when she believes that the law should be triggered, she will, I am confident, take appropriate action. Yet the majority seeks with this unfortunate resolution to tell her what to do.

I hope that the majority will instead accept the alternative resolution being proposed by Senator LEAHY. The Leahy amendment would change the majority's resolution in several ways, all for the better.

The Leahy amendment suggests that the Attorney General use her best professional judgment to determine whether to invoke the independent counsel process. It asks that she make her decision without regard to political pressures. It urges her to do so in accordance with the standards of the law and the established procedures of the Department of Justice. And it makes no distinction between presidential and congressional campaigns; it urges that potential illegalities by covered persons be investigated, regardless of which branch of government is involved.

In short, the Leahy alternative attempts to observe both the letter and the spirit of the law in this matter. It avoids prejudging the issue. Most importantly, it attempts to prevent the further politicization of the independent counsel process, a process that Congress established in order to take politics out of the investigation or prosecution of high government officials.

Fundamentally, that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose the majority's resolution and support the Leahy alternative. Let us not attempt to politically influence our Justice Department and Federal judiciary in this matter. Let us not make a bad situation worse. Let us repeat the bipartisanship that we showed last week. Let us respect the independent counsel law and the independence of the judiciary. And let us also proceed with a diligent and thorough congressional investigation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes of the time allotted to the minority.

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I do not know whether in the coming weeks the Attorney General will determine whether or not the threshold has been reached to name independent counsel. But I do know, in her tenure of service, Attorney General Reno has had an uncompromising sense of personal integrity. She was called upon in a number of instances to reach a determination about investigating high officials in this administration, including President Clinton. She has never hesitated to act in the interests of justice. So, while I do not personally believe at the moment that the circumstances exist for independent counsel as defined by the law, it is important, again, to reassure ourselves about the quality of justice in this country under the leadership of the Attorney General and, just as important, in the great traditions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the able leadership of the Bureau's Director, Louis Freeh.

Though I recognize that today some disagree and in their own judgment believe that it would be better in the national interest to proceed to an independent counsel, whether you accept their evaluation on this day or perhaps mine in believing it should be left to another day, there is the question about whether or not the act is able to be properly implemented at this moment as intended in the independent counsel statute. It is my judgment that, while we may differ in this institution on whether or not the act should be applied, we should be able to agree on the underlying problem, and that is there is a problem in the court with the ability to appoint a special counsel.

The statute requires that the Chief Justice appoint judges to serve in the special division for a term of 2 years. Three judges are to serve on the council that will, in turn, name a special counsel in this or any other instance. It was the intention of the Congress to facilitate a rotation of these judges to ensure their independence so that no one dominates the appointing process, for purposes of the confidence of this Congress and the interests of justice. For whatever reasons, what were to be temporary assignments on the court in this special division appear to be becoming lifetime appointments. Judge Sentelle, who chairs the court, is in his third consecutive term. Judge Butzner is in his fourth. Judge Fay has now begun his second term.

Mr. President, this is not what was intended in the independent counsel statute, and as we debate today the relative merits of whether to appoint an independent counsel, every Member of the Senate needs to consider, if the Attorney General is requested to make this appointment, who will be making the appointment and what confidence do we have the congressional intent of independence and the integrity of the judgments will meet the necessary standards of justice?

Most particularly is the question of Judge Sentelle. Judge Sentelle's position in leading this three-judge panel raises serious questions and, indeed, I believe inhibits the ability of the Attorney General to proceed with confidence when and if she reaches a determination the statutory requirements to name an independent counsel are reached.

During the 1993 debate over reauthorization of the independent counsel statute, Senator Cohen perhaps said it best. He said:

> The appearance of justice is just as important as justice itself, in terms of maintaining public confidence in our judicial system.

Mr. President, no one could possibly believe that the appearance of justice is served by having Judge Sentelle in these circumstances name an independent counsel. Judge Sentelle is a known

political associate of two Republican Senators who have views on this issue. He has served as a member of Senator HELMS' National Congressional Republican Club and was chairman of the North Carolina State Republican Party convention. He stands accused of engineering the removal of Whitewater counsel, Robert Fiske, and replacing him with an independent counsel who clearly has exercised his position with questionable judgment and clear partisanship. I speak, of course, of Kenneth Starr.

The decision to appoint Mr. Starr came only days after Judge Sentelle had a private luncheon with two Members of this institution who had strong views on the subject, in what was an extrajudicial and clearly inappropriate meeting.

Mr. President, despite poor judgment, inappropriate actions, Judge Sentelle was recently reappointed to his third term on the court. As senior judge in this position, with the other two judges serving in this similar capacity, both on senior status, he clearly has an extraordinary influence over the operation of the appointing process.

Five former presidents of the American Bar Association considered these facts, these extrajudicial communications, and determined they give rise to appearance of impropriety.

As long as Judge Sentelle sits on the special division, there will always be questions regarding the objectivity of the independent counsel appointments. I believe, therefore, whether you share my judgment that the trust should be placed in the Attorney General to determine whether or not the requisite requirements have been reached in the statute before appointing or requesting the appointment of an independent counsel or you agree with other Members of the Senate that those criteria have already been reached, we certainly, in the interest of fairness, can reach a judgment today that Judge Sentelle should recuse himself from his current responsibilities. Failing that recusal, it is certainly incumbent upon Chief Justice Rehnquist, given his general responsibility for the administration of the courts, to remove Judge Sentelle or request that he temporarily remove himself from the appointment process.

I recognize the strong divisions in the Senate. I understand the passions that this issue brings to different Members of the Congress. But certainly despite our partisan differences or our interpretations of the facts, our common interest in justice should lead us to one determination. There is a need in our country and in this Senate to come away from this debate with a feeling that an impartial and a fair administrator of justice is required to implement the independent counsel statute, whether that determination in naming an independent counsel is to be reached now or whether the facts dictate that they are to be named later.

Mr. President, it is a simple question of fairness and justice. I hope other Members of the Senate will join with me in calling upon Judge Sentelle, in the best traditions of the American judiciary, to recuse himself now, but I also hope, before any other Members of this Senate need to rise and express themselves on these facts, the Chief Justice of the United States will exercise his responsibilities to ensure that the courts are true to their traditions of justice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RELATIVE TO THE DECISION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL PROCESS

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, on behalf of Senators LEAHY and LEVIN, I call up Joint Resolution 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 23) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Attorney General should exercise her best professional judgment, without regard to political pressures, on whether to invoke the independent counsel process to investigate alleged criminal misconduct relating to any election campaign.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time for debate on the joint resolution be yielded back.

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

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN pertaining to the introduction of S. 456 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

IN SUPPORT OF THE CONFIRMATION OF ALEXIS HERMAN

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, today the Labor Committee is considering the nomination of Alexis Herman to be Secretary of Labor. Alexis Herman has been a friend and a colleague for many years. I believe she would make an outstanding Secretary of Labor. She has always shown the leadership, good judgment, and high principles that the job requires. Her commitment to improving the condition of America's working people is second to none.

Alexis Herman has long dedicated her efforts to putting all Americans to work. She began her career by bringing together workers needing employment and employers needing workers. She did this by providing relevant, necessary training for potential employees so that they possessed the skills needed by employers.

Through her work, companies across America had access to employees who had the specific skills necessary for each company's particular jobs, and the people she trained were able to obtain work because they were trained for positions that actually existed.

As you know, she went on to head the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor under President Carter. Her work there included helping displaced homemakers enter the work force, increasing opportunities for women to apprentice in skilled trades, and promoting women-owned businesses, something that has received strong bipartisan support in the Congress.

I would like especially to highlight her efforts at the Women's Bureau to provide job training opportunities for welfare recipients. Now, more than ever, we need to promote practical policies for putting people to work. Last year's welfare bill will mean that a flood of untrained, unskilled people will be searching desperately for work, or their families will go hungry. Without skills and training, however, their prospects for finding a job are bleak. We need Alexis Herman's practical experience working with employers and employees in the coming years if we are to put over a million people to work.

Alexis Herman's commitment to diversity will also enhance our work force. We, in this Nation, have the best work force in this world. Any time we retreat from providing equal opportunities to all of our citizens, however, we risk weakening our greatest asset, our workers. If we fail to utilize the talents of all of our people, we sell ourselves short as a nation. With her vast experience in increasing diversity in the workplace, Alexis Herman will ensure that no talent goes untapped.

In addition, as public liaison for President Clinton, Ms. Herman worked with Americans across the country—Americans with diverse backgrounds and concerns. She has served as a liaison with these many diverse groups and the President so successfully, because she is interested in, sympathetic to, and able to work with, the full spectrum of the American people.

I would also like to note Ms. Herman's commitment to continue the work of Secretary Reich in enhancing pension security. I have spent the last several years focusing on retirement security for all Americans, and for women in particular. Secretary Reich was a strong ally and we are beginning to make progress. Retirement security is one of the most important issues for our time, with baby boomers turning 50 every 9 seconds. If we allow a generation to retire into poverty, the Nation