

Mr. Stassen also has made many contributions outside of public life, including his service as the president of the University of Pennsylvania from 1948 to 1953.

However, he will be best remembered for his life-long interest in the United Nations. Since his involvement in the founding of the United Nations, Harold Stassen has maintained a dedicated and passionate commitment to bettering this international organization.

In fact, he has published numerous proposals for reforming the United Nations Charter and has made it his personal mission to educate the American public about the U.N.

Just 2 years ago, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. On April 13th of this year, Harold Stassen will celebrate his 90th birthday. A wide array of national and State officials will come together on this day in St. Paul, MN, to recognize Mr. Stassen.

As we continue our bipartisan efforts to renew and strengthen the relationship between the United States and the United Nations, I think it is fitting to honor one American with a distinguished record of public service who has long supported that effort.

As the chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee, the U.S. Congressional Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and also a fellow Minnesotan, I want to wish Harold Stassen a very happy 90th birthday and congratulate him for his accomplishments and many positive contributions to the history of the State of Minnesota, the United States, and the United Nations.

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

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AGRICULTURE IN WASHINGTON STATE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, agriculture is a cornerstone of Washington State's economy. Washington State farmers produce over \$5.8 billion worth of agriculture products, employ more than 100,000 people, and export nearly a quarter of all their goods to international markets. Without a doubt, Agriculture is Washington's No. 1 industry.

As I travel around the State I have listened closely to the comments, suggestions, and concerns of our State's agriculture community. Farmers and ranchers in Washington have without exception told me they want a smaller and less intrusive Government; a Government that lets farmers, ranchers, and local communities make decisions for themselves; and most importantly, a Government that will step up to the plate and fight for issues that affect their lives. As Washington's senior Senator, I plan to work for just that.

The web of Federal practices, laws and regulations governing agriculture

in the United States should offer our farmers consistency, flexibility and market access for their goods. Farmers view the Federal Government, like the weather and seasons, as an outside force to be dealt with. I want to ensure that the Federal Government is a partner with agriculture, instead of an east-coast overseer.

This year, the wheat, barley, canola, pea and lentil, potato, hops, sweet cherry, and apple associations, as well as countless other growers' organizations, have visited me in Washington, DC. From our discussions, I have compiled a list of broad agriculture priorities on which I will focus in the 105th Congress.

I have always had, and will retain, open channels of communication with my State's agriculture communities. Firsthand knowledge of the situations and problems that farmers and growers face is, for me, an invaluable tool as I work on issues that impact their way of life. So, I intend to meet with farmers, ranchers, irrigators, processors, shippers, and other agricultural interests during the April recess to discuss these matters.

For 3 days I will tour eastern Washington to discuss private property rights, tax reform, salmon recovery issues, agriculture research, transportation issues, the Endangered Species Act, trade policies, regulatory relief, the future of the Hanford reach and the reform of immigration policies important to the agricultural communities throughout Washington State.

During my visits to Yakima, Spokane, and the tri-cities, I will discuss my top 10 priorities for agriculture, refine them, and solicit feedback from the various agriculture interests that are affected by a wide range of intrusive Federal policies. My visit to eastern Washington will give me the opportunity to continue discussions already begun with Washington State's farmers, explain my intentions, and reaffirm my commitment to the agriculture community.

To reiterate, the agriculture community's interests are Washington State's interests—Washington's economic health and job base are greatly affected by the success or failure in this sector of our economy. I will therefore pursue my 10 priorities, which I believe will help build a stronger future for Washington State.

Two years ago agriculture communities in eastern Washington gave me the opportunity to work for them, represent their interests, and fight against policies that threaten their livelihood. As their Senator, I will be working aggressively to promote their interests in the 105th Congress.

Mr. President, I take this occasion to thank my friend and colleague from Hawaii who has been here longer than I have and has waited patiently for recognition, allowing my short remarks to precede his longer ones. He is a kind and thoughtful gentlemen.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his appreciation and wish him well during this break.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 490 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

ASIAN-AMERICANS AND THE POLITICAL FUNDRAISING INVESTIGATION

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as we prepare for hearings on campaign fundraising irregularities, I would like to express concern about the negative impact that this issue is having on the image of the Asian-American community.

Mr. President, Asian-Americans are an important part of our body politic. They have made significant contributions to politics, business, industry, science, sports, education, and the arts. Men and women like Senator DAN INOUE, Kristy Yamaguchi, Tommy Kono, I.M. Pei, David Henry Hwang, An Wang, and Ellison Onizuka have enhanced and invigorated the life of the Nation.

Indeed, Asian-Americans have played a fundamental part in making this country what it is today. Asian immigrants helped build the great transcontinental railroads of the 19th century. They labored on the sugar plantations of Hawaii, on the vegetable and fruit farms of California, and in the gold mines of the West. They were at the forefront of the agricultural labor movement, especially in the sugarcane and grape fields, and were instrumental in developing the fishing and salmon canning industries of the Pacific Northwest. They were importers, merchants, grocers, clerks, tailors, and gardeners. They manned the assembly lines during America's Industrial Revolution. They operated laundries, restaurants, and vegetable markets. They also served our Nation in war: the famed all-nisei 100th/442d combat team of World War II remains the most decorated unit in U.S. military history.

Despite their historical contributions, Asian immigrants and Asian-Americans have suffered social prejudice and economic, political, and institutional discrimination. They were excluded from churches, barber shops, and restaurants. They were forced to sit in the balconies of movie theaters and the back seats of buses. They were required to attend segregated schools. They were even denied burial in white cemeteries—in one instance, a decorated Asian-American soldier killed in action was refused burial in his hometown cemetery. Rather than receive equal treatment, Asians on the whole were paid lower wages than their white counterparts, relegated to menial jobs, or forced to turn to businesses and industries in which competition with whites was minimized.

For more than 160 years, Asians were also refused citizenship by a law that

denied their right to naturalize, a law that remained in effect until 1952. Without citizenship, Asians could not vote, and thus could not seek remedies through the Tammany Halls or other political organizations as did other immigrant groups. The legacy of this injustice is seen today in the relative lack of political influence and representation of Asian-Americans at every level and in every branch of government.

Additionally, Asians were denied immigration rights. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 singled out Chinese on a racial basis, and the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1908 and the National Origins Act of 1924 prohibited Japanese immigration—while permitting the annual entry of thousands of immigrants from Ireland, Italy, and Poland. The 1924 law also allowed European immigrants to bring their wives from their homelands, but barred the entry of women from China, Japan, Korea, and India. Even Asians who were United States citizens were prohibited from bringing Asian wives into the country. Conversely, the 1922 Cable Act provided that any American woman who married an Asian would lose her citizenship. It was not until the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act eliminated immigration by national origins that the vestiges of these legal restrictions were lifted.

Asians were also targeted by laws prohibiting them from owning property. The alien land laws passed by California and other Western and Southern States earlier this century, fostered by nativists and envious competitors, placed heavy obstacles in the path of struggling Asian immigrants and their children that were not faced by others.

Perhaps most egregiously, Asians were denied civil rights guaranteed under the Constitution. The relocation of Asian-Americans from the west coast and Hawaii and their detention in internment camps between 1941 and 1946 is one of the worst civil rights violations in our history. One hundred twenty thousand men, women, and children of Japanese descent, two-thirds of them citizens, were incarcerated behind barbed wire fences, without due process or evidence of wrongdoing, under the grim view of machine gun towers. German-Americans or Italian-Americans did not suffer a similar fate. In the process, Americans of Asian ancestry were torn from their friends, their loved ones, their property, and their faith in the American dream. It was only in 1988, through legislation sponsored by Senator INOUE, Senator STEVENS, and others who serve in this body today, that the U.S. Government officially apologized for this injustice.

The reasons for historical prejudice and discrimination against Asians are complex, often involving economic or political motives. For example, at one time European immigrant labor groups felt threatened by cheap Asian labor

and staged strikes and acts of violence against Asians. Employers cultivated such ethnic antagonism as a stratagem to depress wages for all workers, Asian and European. Nativists used Asians as a foil for their racist philosophies. Politicians cynically exploited anti-Asian sentiment to maintain power. And the press used the "Yellow Peril", the specter of unlimited "oriental" immigration, to sell papers. But at heart, the reasons for anti-Asian practices remain far simpler: Asians looked different, they had accents, they worshipped different gods. They came from cultures and spoke languages that were beyond the narrow experience of traditional, white America.

Thus, Asians and Asian-Americans were targets. Unlike other contemporaneous immigrants—Irish, Italians, Poles, Jews—Asians stood out; they could not blend into the majority white population. Asians were naturally suspect for their skin color and appearance: they looked different so many Americans believed they must be different; that is to say, somehow less than true-blooded American. In many instances, the reaction of Asians was to turn inward, to establish their own communities or ghettos, like Chinatown or Japantown, or turn to small businesses or farms where they did not have to compete for employment against Caucasians—further isolating and insulating their communities from the rest of American society.

In time, however, Asians became more integrated in American life. The progeny of immigrants were born citizens, spoke only English, watched television and went to the movies, danced to the latest music, and felt they earned their place in society through workplace contributions and military service. As they assimilated, Asian-Americans enjoyed success in many areas of endeavor; in fact, they have been so successful that Asian-Americans have been cited as the "model minority." Today, Asian-Americans tend to have high educational achievement, some are prominent in business and the professions, and they have been cited by social scientists for having community spirit, a sense of fiscal responsibility, and a strong work ethic.

But the model minority image is mythical in many respects. On average, Asian-Americans earn less than Caucasians. There is a significant income disparity between Asians and whites with equal education. Asian-Americans also tend to be located in secondary labor markets, where wages are low and prospects minimal, and occupy lower or technical positions, where income potential is not as great as in the executive ranks. Proportionately fewer Asian-Americans are managers than is the case with other population groups; they constitute less than half of 1 percent of the officers and directors of the Nation's thousand largest companies. In corporate America, Asian-Americans have their own "glass ceiling."

In addition, many Americans mistakenly view the successful assimilation

of more established, affluent groups such as Chinese-Americans and Japanese-Americans as the community norm. They do not realize that the community is extremely diverse in terms of ethnicity and recency of immigration. The more recent arrivals from Southeast Asia—for example, Vietnamese, Thais, Cambodians, Laotians—have significantly lower levels of income, education, and occupational advancement.

Perhaps because of their success, perceived and otherwise, Asian-Americans continue to suffer for their minority status. They are periodically targets of hate crimes. The 1982 baseball bat killing of Vincent Chin in Detroit, a scapegoat for the Detroit auto industry's inability to compete with Japan, illustrated America's ignorance about Asian-Americans—Chin was of Chinese, not Japanese, heritage—and the inequality of justice for Asian-Americans—the killers paid a fine of \$3,780 and never served jail time. In 1987, teenagers chanting, "Hindu, Hindu," beat a young Indian-American to death. These are not isolated incidents. Last year, a report by the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium found that hate crimes against Asian Pacific-Americans grew from 335 incidents in 1993 to 458 incidents in 1995, a 37 percent increase in just two years.

These violent incidents have been paralleled and surely fed by a growing national xenophobia. The fear of things foreign has manifested itself in cutbacks in international programs; the growth of the English only movement; and the passage of California's proposition 187 and Federal legislation to curtail social services to undocumented aliens and legal residents. Fear of Asians and other minorities is also seen in proposals to rollback minority language provisions of the Voting Rights Act and in broadbased attacks on affirmative action in education, employment, and contracting.

I recall that only a few years ago, during the height of the debate over the budget deficit, much was made of the fact that a significant portion of our debt was held by Japan, but overlooked was the fact that both the British and Dutch had far greater investments in United States debt and property than the Japanese. Likewise, Japanese purchases of signature properties like Pebble Beach and Rockefeller Center received sensationalized coverage, but few stories traced the decline and eventual sale of these high-profile investments to other owners.

Today, with the hype and hoopla surrounding Asians and Asian-Americans involved in the fundraising controversy, we see hints of the kinds of anti-Asian treatment that have been practiced in the past.

The first and most obvious of these is the inappropriate and misguided attention paid by the media, commentators, and public figures to the ethnic heritage of those involved in the fundraising

controversy. For example, an early Washington Post front page headline trumpeted an "Asian Funds Network." However, upon a careful examination of the article, the reader found the article was principally concerned with Asian-Americans, not Asians. Clearly, in some quarters, "Asian" and "Asian-American" are synonymous, unlike the case with Europeans and European-Americans. In fact, the term "European" Americans is rarely heard in public discourse, because the ethnic origin of European Americans is not presumed to have a bearing on their patriotism.

Despite the fact that Asian-Americans have paid taxes, lived and worked here for several generations, and died in military service, a different standard applies: Asian-Americans are still deemed to have an extraordinary, perhaps sinister, connection to their countries of origin.

Mr. President, I think that I speak for the entire Asian-American community in expressing the hope that we can get to the bottom of this whole controversy, wherever the cards may fall. Those responsible for violations of laws or improper conduct should be identified and appropriately dealt with by the relevant authorities. However, I know that Asian-Americans also agree that the gratuitous attention to the heritage and citizenship of John Huang and other fundraisers is unjust and destructive. According to the press and others, John Huang isn't simply a DNC fundraiser or even an Asian-American fundraiser; rather, he is referred to as a "Taiwan-born naturalized citizen with ties to an Indonesian conglomerate" or, worse, "an ethnic Chinese with overseas connections."

Last fall, during an appearance at the University of Pennsylvania, Presidential candidate Ross Perot erroneously referred to John Huang as an "Indonesian businessman." Later, alluding to the fundraising controversy, Mr. Perot rhetorically asked his audience, "Wouldn't you like to have someone out there named O'Reilly? Out there hard at work. You know, so far we haven't found an American name." The implication of these and other characterizations is that being Asian and naturalized, rather than of European stock and native born, somehow renders one less American.

Mr. President, this hyphenation or qualification of citizenship status is one of the subtle ways in which Asian-Americans are cast as different and therefore suspicious. To some, Asians and Asian-Americans are the Fu Manchus of Hollywood legend—evil, cunning, and inscrutable Easterners who march in lockstep to some hidden agenda. According to this view, being of Filipino or Thai or Pakistani heritage is all the same—if your skin is yellow or brown, you are alleged to share certain invidious characteristics of your race; your individualism fades into a kind of monolithic group identity.

Thus, all Asians and Asian-Americans are, by extension, responsible for John Huang's or Charlie Trie's or Johnny Chung's alleged misdeeds. Furthermore, goes this circular reasoning, since it is accepted that Asians lack individualism, John Huang, Charlie Trie, and Johnny Chung must be part of an Asian conspiracy.

A columnist for the New York Times played on this stereotype when, in a series of editorials last year, he wrote of the "penetration of the White House by Asian interests" and characterized John Huang as "the well-subsidized Lippo operative placed high inside Clinton Commerce." The columnist also referred to an "Asian connection" which provided contributions through "front men with green cards." Even the respected Wall Street Journal described some of John Huang's donations as coming from "people with tenuous connections to this country," although it is unclear whether it was referring to Asian residents or Asian-Americans.

A more recent manifestation of this stereotype can be found on this week's cover of the National Review, which depicts President Clinton and Mrs. Clinton with slanted eyes, buckteeth, and wearing a coolie hat and Mao cap, respectively, over the headline, "The Manchurian Candidates." This is a true low for reporting standards, more reminiscent of William Randolph Hearst's Yellow Press than of modern journalism. Some irresponsible publications, in the interests of sensationalism, are obviously more than willing to conflate racist stereotypes with modern standards of objective journalism. The President, Mrs. Clinton, and the Asian-American community are owed an apology for this gross affront to decency and taste.

Mr. President, a second major fallout of the fundraising affair is the impression fostered by the media and commentators that legal Asian-American participation in the political process is illegitimate. Charges of undue influence on the part of the Asian-American community have been raised with regard to immigration policy, specifically, the "fourth preference" category that allows siblings of citizens to immigrate.

The press makes much of the fact that Asian-Americans who are concerned about this matter also contributed money to the campaign. Certainly Asian-Americans, the majority of whom are immigrants, wish to be reunited with their families. However, it is improper to imply that contributions to political campaigns by Asian-Americans should be held to a higher standard or any more suspect than contributions by other Americans. This is tantamount to suggesting that the practice of giving to political campaigns should be limited only to non-Asians.

A third troublesome impact of the fundraising allegations is the overhasty and excessive reaction to the

issue of legal contributions by permanent residents. In the wake of the "Asian donor" story, proposals have been made to eliminate their eligibility to make political contributions. Alarmed by the public fallout of the controversy, the Clinton administration and the Democratic National Committee have preemptively decided not to accept contributions from permanent residents or U.S. subsidiaries of foreign corporations. And a number of Members of Congress have returned contributions made by permanent residents who are Asian, not because the contributions were illegal but because they feared the public's reaction to their accepting "Asian" money.

Mr. President, I acknowledge that there are legitimate concerns regarding the wisdom of allowing permanent residents to make contributions to political campaigns, apart from the possibility that proscribing such contributions may violate the free speech rights accorded all residents, citizens and aliens alike, by the Constitution. As my colleagues know, the Supreme Court has held that campaign contributions are an activity protected by the first amendment, and that the first amendment rights of legal residents are fully protected.

In this instance, however, I am more concerned by the possibility that the only reason why campaign contributions by permanent residents has become an issue now is because, for the first time, Asians and Asian-Americans happen to be involved in a major way. Evidence of this perhaps can be seen in the DNC's private audit of supposedly suspect contributions.

Reportedly, DNC auditors asked Asian-American donors whether they were citizens, how they earn their money, if they would provide their tax returns, and other intrusive questions, while threatening to tell the press if the donors did not cooperate. Some of the Asian-Americans contacted were longtime political contributors with impeccable reputations, who were naturally outraged. The DNC audit clearly smacked of selective harassment of those who happened to have Asian surnames; it underscores the Asian-American community's fear that they are being asked to pay for the alleged transgressions of a handful of individuals who happen to be of Asian heritage.

Mr. President, a fourth major concern of the fundraising affair is that it has undermined Asian-American leadership opportunities in Government. According to some analyses, the fundraising affair impelled the Clinton administration to drop from consideration the names of University of California-Berkeley Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien and former U.S. Congressman Norm Mineta for the positions of Secretary of Energy and Secretary of Transportation, respectively. Thus far, no Asian-American has ever held Cabinet rank, and only a handful are represented in the senior ranks of Government.

Furthermore, I would not be surprised to learn that every Asian-American candidate for political appointment is currently being scrutinized for contacts he or she may have had, no matter how innocent, with the Asian and Asian-American principals in the fundraising investigation. As a consequence, I greatly fear that promising Asian-American candidates for responsible Federal office will fall by the wayside, victims of guilt by association.

A fifth and perhaps most serious impact of the fundraising story, however, is its long-term effect on Asian-American participation in the political process. Last year, a record 75,000 Asian-Americans registered to vote, a sign of the Asian-American community's newfound confidence and political maturity. I am deeply concerned that biased scrutiny of Asians and Asian-Americans by the press, politicians, and investigators will kill this initial flowering of a historically quiescent and apolitical community, a flowering that led to the historic election of an Asian-American to governorship of a mainland State.

Will this scandal confirm Asian-Americans' fears that the system is rigged against them, discouraging them from participating in the development of public policy in a meaningful way? If so, this would be tragic for a community that is by far the fastest growing in the Nation, which is expected to comprise 7 percent of the population by 2020, and which has so many skills and experiences to offer our country. This tragedy would be compounded for those immigrants recently escaped from the yoke of authoritarianism, who might find the consequences of political activism reminiscent of the penalties experienced in their countries of origin.

In conclusion, Mr. President, as we investigate the fundraising affair, let us remember the bigotry, prejudice, and discrimination faced by Asian immigrants and Asian-Americans as they struggled for acceptance in the New World. Let us recall how they overcame steep social, economic, and institutional barriers to become valuable, contributing members of society.

With this in mind, Mr. President, let us keep our attention on matters of substance—the laws that were possibly broken, the processes and procedures that were bent, the individuals who circumvented or corrupted the system, and most of all what we can do to prevent abuses in the future. These are the real issues at hand.

By the same token, Mr. President, let us avoid focusing on such irrelevancies as the ethnicity of the participants in this affair. Let us cease characterizing individuals by meretricious stereotypes; conversely, let us avoid judging an entire community by the actions of a few individuals. To do otherwise, Mr. President, would be a grave disservice to the seven million Americans of Asian ancestry who are valued and

rightful participants in our great democratic experiment.

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the text of articles by Robert Wright and Frank Wu addressing Asian-Americans and the fundraising controversy be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Legal Times, Feb. 10, 1997]

THE ASIAN-AMERICAN CONNECTION—THE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS FIASCO AND RACIAL STEREOTYPING

(By Frank H. Wu)

As Congress prepares for hearings on the campaign fund-raising fiasco arising from the work of Democratic Party official John Huang, the racial aspects of the controversy have become obvious to many Asian-Americans, if not to the general public. But to combat the problem of racial stereotyping in this matter, its presence first must be acknowledged.

Consider the following evidence:

Before the November election, independent presidential candidate Ross Perot commented about the controversy: "You know, so far we haven't found an American name." And: "Wouldn't you like to have someone out there named O'Reilly? Out there hard at work." Likewise, during the campaign, Republican candidate Robert Dole and House Speaker Newt Gingrich warned of foreigners buying the White House. After Bill Clinton's re-election, auditors from the Democratic National Committee began contacting Asian-American donors, asking whether they are citizens, how they earn their money, and if they will provide their tax returns, all the while threatening to tell the press if the donors do not cooperate.

Meanwhile, New York Times columnist William Safire, who seems to have written about nothing else since introducing this scandal to the mainstream media, dubs the controversy the "Asian connection"—the title itself revealing a perceived racial element to the matter. The Wall Street Journal, in its initial series of articles, described Asian-Americans as "people with tenuous connections to this country." Huang himself is almost always referred to as an "ethnic Chinese" with overseas connections, despite his U.S. citizenship and low-key assimilationist approach.

Imagine how odious the same stories would be with a different racial or religious group standing in for Asian-Americans. If Jewish politicians were described as having a "Jewish connection" or portrayed as traitors who represented Israeli interests, many more people might be troubled by the anti-Semitic implications. When Pat Buchanan and Gore Vidal began to verge on such claims in the 1980's, none other than William F. Buckley was prompted to publish a book of essays discussing the "new" anti-Semitism.

Furthermore, nobody has suggested that the ethical lapses of Speaker Gingrich can be traced to his ancestry. Nor do people believe that the disgrace of consultant Dick Morris reflects on his entire racial group. Yet the leading newspapers and television networks continue to focus almost exclusively on Asian-Americans who are alleged to have given money improperly, attributing their behavior to their racial backgrounds, while giving only passing notice to campaign contribution transgressions by whites. (In this past election, after all, it was a Dole adviser who received the heaviest fine ever assessed for a proven case of money-laundering.)

Recently, journalists Robert Wright and Michael Kelly argued over whether l'affaire

Huang was an incident of "yellow peril" revisited. Writing in the online magazine Slate, Wright suggested that racism had been used to transform a minor scandal into a case of alleged major wrongdoing. Kelly responded in The New Republic that this view was merely a ploy by the Democrats to avoid answering questions about misconduct.

Despite this focus, Asian-Americans are strangely missing from the scene, the silent subjects of the debate. Asian-Americans cannot afford simply to stand by and allow the attacks on Huang to proceed, without at least asking people to pause before assuming he represents all of us. By the very nature of the allegations, however, Asian-American (as well as Democratic) commentators are assumed to be self-interested or covering up. Moreover, if we do speak out, we look like we are defending not only the behavior of a monolithic community but also the actions of foreign companies. We're in a classic Catch-22 situation.

There have been a few exceptions to this silence. As the scandal was developing last October, the nonpartisan Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute (CAPACI) held coordinated press conferences in Washington, Chicago, and Los Angeles to denounce the treatment of the Huang matter. Yet the only coordinated Asian-American response to the crisis was given minimal media coverage.

Similarly, the day before CAPACI held its event, the Rev. Jesse Jackson called a press conference in New York. The Rainbow Coalition leader was as supportive of Asian-American political empowerment as he was critical of Indonesian government labor policies. His statements attracted even less attention than did CAPACI's.

Despite the intense media interest in Asian-American involvement in campaign contributions, our positive electoral accomplishments are ignored. Until the president praised him in his State of the Union message last week, how many Americans were aware that Gary Locke, the son of Chinese immigrants, was the first person of Asian descent to win a governorship on the continental United States when he was elected to head the state of Washington last November? Nor was it widely reported that in the last election, Asian-American civil rights and community groups organized an unprecedented nationwide naturalization drive to ensure that eligible individuals became citizens and exercised their rights. Or that a record number of Asian-Americans voted. These stories and others received a fraction of the coverage that the Huang spectacle has attracted.

The nature of the impropriety alleged against Huang also belies a racial bias, or at least a lack of understanding of what constitutes valid national vs. improper special interests. Initially, the nexus between the contributions and public policy decisions was said to be some vague influence on American foreign policy by multinational companies or Asian governments. Later, the alleged "payoff" for campaign contributions was alleged to be related to immigration matters—an issue that clearly is of particular interest to the Asian-American community, but also one of national concern.

Indeed, last year, immigration was the issue dividing the country. The Clinton administration's strategy, like that of moderates in Congress, was to distinguish between legal and illegal immigration: Save the legal immigrants by sacrificing the illegal immigrants.

As it happens, Asian-Americans—a majority of whom are immigrants—generally supported family-based immigration. Like other Americans, many Asian-Americans were especially concerned with protecting the so-called

fourth preference, which allows citizens to sponsor their brothers and sisters as immigrants.

Huang recognized the obvious. He organized a dinner bringing together Asian-Americans and the Democratic Party at a lucrative fund-raiser, a dinner at the Hay-Adams Hotel in Washington at \$25,000 per couple. President Clinton himself attended the fete.

Huang wrote a briefing memo prior to the dinner stating that immigration would be a key issue for Asian-American voters. President Clinton denies that he ever read the memo. In any event, his administration had already made the strategically sensible decision to oppose abolition of the fourth preference.

Critics have suggested that this series of events demonstrates that the president "flip-flopped" on the fourth preference, sacrificing the interests of the American public in controlling the borders for an infusion of foreign money to his campaign. Such a view, of course, ignores the fact that the people who seek to bring over their relatives are themselves citizens. And the view is based on an erroneous understanding of what the administration's position had been.

In fact, in the past, the Clinton administration had sought only to suspend use of the fourth preference temporarily, until the waiting list was cleared out. It never pushed for outright elimination of the provision. Thus, a misunderstanding of the distinction between interrupting use of the fourth preference and abolishing it may have produced the appearance of impropriety.

Indeed, the scandal is not that Asian-Americans were able to voice our views on immigration, but that we had to look like we were potential donors of large sums of money before we would be heard. Assuming that Asian-American contributors helped save the national tradition of immigration, there is nothing shocking about people trying to bring together their families or actively participating in politics in an effort to do so.

Immigration connects our nation to the rest of the world. Much as the rules of immigration affect citizens along with their immigrant relatives, they also turn on domestic politics blended with foreign affairs. If Asian-Americans and others who care about allowing immigrants to come to this country are motivated by some sort of racial self-interest, then the same might be said of whites and others who wish to close the borders.

There is a better way than to allow political disagreements to degenerate into such suspicions. Otherwise, genuine issues of campaign finance reform will be obscured by racial accusations and counter-accusations.

SLANTED—RACIAL PREJUDICE IS PART OF WHAT FUELS THE CLINTON CAMPAIGN SCANDAL
(By Robert Wright)

The New York Times runs a lot of headlines about scandals, but rarely does it run a headline that is a scandal. On Saturday, Dec. 28, it came pretty close. The headline over its lead Page One story read: "Democrats Hoped To Raise \$7 Million From Asians in U.S." On the inside page where the story continued, the headline was: "Democrats' Goal: Millions From Asians." Both headlines were wrong. The story was actually about a 1996 Democratic National Committee document outlining a plan to raise (as the lead paragraph put it) "\$7 million from Asian-Americans."

Memo to the New York Times: "Asian-Americans" are American citizens of Asian ancestry. "Asians," in contrast, are Asians—citizens of some Asian nation. And "Asians in U.S." are citizens of some Asian nation

who are visiting or residing in the United States. This is not nit-picking. It gets at the heart of the subtle, probably subconscious racial prejudice that has turned a legitimately medium-sized scandal into a journalistic blockbuster.

Would a Times headline call Polish-Americans "East Europeans in U.S."? (Or, in the jump headline, just "East Europeans"?) And the headline was only half the problem with Saturday's story. The story itself was wrong-headed, implying that there's something inherently scandalous about Asian-Americans giving money to a political campaign. In fact, the inaccurate headline was necessary to prevent the story from seeming absurd. Can you imagine the Times running—over its lead story—the headline "Democrats Hoped To Raise Millions From U.S. Jews"?

Political parties target ethnic groups for fund-raising all the time (as Jacob Weisberg recently showed in these pages). They target Hispanics, they target Jews, they pass the hat at Polish-American dinners. To be sure, the Asian-American fund-raising plan was, in retrospect, no ordinary plan. It went quite awry. Some of the projected \$7 million—at least \$1.2 million, according to the Times—wound up coming in the form of improper or illegal donations (which, of course, we already knew about). Foreign citizens or companies funneled money through domestic front men or front companies. And sometimes foreigners thus got to rub elbows with President Clinton. For all we know, they influenced policy.

But the truly scandalous stuff was old news by Dec. 27. What that day's story added was news of the existence of this document outlining a plan to raise money from Americans of Asian descent. And that alone was considered worthy of the high-scandal treatment.

Leave aside this particular story, and consider the "campaign-gate" scandal as a whole. What if the same thing had happened with Europeans and Americans of European descent? It would be just as improper and/or illegal. But would we really be so worked up about it? Would William Safire write a column about it every 15 minutes and use the loaded word "aliens" to describe European noncitizens? If Indonesian magnate James Riady looked like John Major, would Newsweek have put a huge, ominous, grainy black-and-white photo of him on its cover? ("Clinton's European connection" wouldn't pack quite the same punch as "Clinton's Asian connection"—the phrase that Newsweek put on its cover and Safire has used 16 times in 13 weeks.) Would the Times be billing minor investigative twists as lead stories?

Indeed, would its reporters even write stories like that Saturday's? The lead paragraph, which is supposed to crystallize the story's news value, is this: "A White House official and a leading fund-raiser for the Democratic National Committee helped devise a strategy to raise an unprecedented \$7 million from Asian-Americans partly by offering special access to the White House, the committee's records show." You mean Democrats actually offered White House visits to Americans who cough up big campaign dough? I'm shocked. Wait until the Republicans discover this tactic! The Friday after Christmas is a slow news day, but it's not that slow. And as for the "unprecedented" scale of the fund-raising goal: Virtually every dimension of Clinton's 1996 fund-raising was on an unprecedented scale, as we've long known.

There are some interesting nuggets in the Times story. But among them isn't the fact, repeated in the third paragraph, that fund-raisers told Asian-American donors that "po-

litical contributions were the path to power." And among them isn't the fact, repeated (again) in the fourth paragraph, that "the quid pro quo promised" to Asian-American donors was "in many cases a face-to-face meeting with the President." And, anyway, none of these nuggets is interesting enough to make this the day's main story. The only way to do that is to first file Asian-Americans in the "alien" section of your brain. That's why the story's headline is so telling.

The funny thing about this scandal is that its root cause and its mitigating circumstance are one and the same. Its root cause is economic globalization—the fact that more and more foreign companies have an interest in U.S. policy. But globalization is also the reason that the scandal's premise—the illegality of contributions from "foreign" interests—is increasingly meaningless. Both the Times and the Washington Post (in its blockbuster-lite front-page story, the next day) cited already-reported evidence that a \$185,000 donation (since returned) may have originated ultimately with the C.P. Group. The C.P. Group is "a huge Thai conglomerate with interests in China and elsewhere in Asia" (the Times) and is "among the largest foreign investors in China" (the Post). But of course, Nike, Boeing, General Motors, Microsoft, IBM, and so on are also huge companies with interests in China and elsewhere in Asia. They, no less than Asian companies, at times have an interest in low U.S. tariffs, treating oppressive Asian dictators with kid gloves, and so on. Yet it is perfectly legal for them to lubricate such lobbying with big campaign donations.

Why no journalistic outrage about that? Well, for starters, try looking at a grainy newsweekly-sized photo of Lou Gerstner and see if it makes you remember Pearl Harbor. (By the way, neither the Times nor the Post noted that the ominous C.P. Group is involved in joint ventures with Ford and Nynex.)

You might think that, in an age of globalization and with the United States' fate increasingly tied to the fate of other nations, the United States' best newspaper would be careful not to run articles that needlessly feed xenophobia. Guess again. Six weeks ago a Times op-ed piece by political scientist Lucian Pye explored the formidable mindset that governs China today. Current Chinese leaders have "distinctive characteristics" that give them "significant advantages" over the United States in foreign policy. They "see politics as exclusively combative contests, involving haggling, maneuvering, bargaining and manipulating. The winner is the master of the cleverest ploys and stratagems [sic]." Moreover, Chinese leaders are "quick to find fault in others" and try "always to appear bold and fearless." Finally ("in a holdover from classical Chinese political theory"), China's leaders "insist on claiming the moral high ground, because top leaders are supposed to be morally superior men." In short, China's "distinctive" edge lies in combative, Machiavellian, mud-slinging, blustery, self-righteous politics. Gosh, why didn't we think of that?

These peculiar traits, Pye noted, aggravate another disturbing feature of modern China. It seems that the Chinese people vacillate "between craving foreign goods and giving vent to anti-foreign passions." in other respects, too, they evince a "prickly xenophobic nationalism." Imagine that.

LINKS

Feel free to read the Times story that got me so exercised (the Times Web site requires that you register before serving you the page; registration is free). Or, instead, you can subject yourself to my further exegesis

on appropriate ethnic terminology. You can also view the grainy Newsweek cover featuring Asian-American James Riady—the Oct. 28 issue, which is headlined “Candidates for Sale: Clinton’s Asia Connection.” From Slate’s “The Compost,” read Jacob Weisberg’s column about the history of fund-raising fraud in the United States and Eric Liu’s piece damning the press for painting Asian-Americans as having dual loyalties. PoliticsNow begins the new year with a feature, titled “1996 Yearbook: Scandals,” that covers the fund-raising issue. Visit the DNC Web site for a more positive portrayal of the embattled organizations.

EPA’S COSTLY REGULATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Environmental Protection Agency has proposed new rules to modify the ambient air standards for ozone and particulate matter. I recently wrote to the EPA and urged the agency to reaffirm the current standards, conduct additional monitoring of particulate matter and related air quality issues, and allow our States to complete action on the ambitious clean air standards that are already in place before implementing additional regulations. I was joined in this letter by Senators ROCKEFELLER, FORD, GLENN, and ROBB.

These proposed rules have been extremely controversial, and have been sharply criticized by State Governors, municipal leaders, and business organizations. I have recently been made aware that these rules have also been criticized by other Federal agencies.

During the interagency review of these rules overseen by the Office of Management and Budget, several Federal agencies submitted comments which questioned many aspects of the proposed rules, including their scientific basis and cost effectiveness. These comments are part of the public record. Judging by the tone of the comments from the interagency review process, it appears that many Federal agencies are concerned about these proposed rules.

In but one example, the EPA has stated that the total national cost of implementing the ozone rule would be \$2.5 billion. However, the Council of Economic Advisers has stated that the cost of full attainment of just the ozone rule could be \$60 billion, or \$57.5 billion more than estimated by the EPA. This is a substantial discrepancy. The Department of Transportation, in its initial interagency review submission, concluded that “it is incomprehensible that the administration would commit to a new set of standards and new efforts to meet such standards without much greater understanding of the problem and its solutions.” The U.S. Small Business Administration stated that EPA’s proposed regulation “is certainly one of the most expensive regulations, if not the most expensive regulation faced by small businesses in 10 or more years.” The SBA said that “considering the large economic impacts suggested by EPA’s own analysis that will unquestionably fall on tens of

thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of small businesses, this (proposal) would be a startling proposition to the small business community.”

I understand that some of these Federal agencies had also planned on submitting comments to the EPA as part of the public comment period. However, the Oil Daily, a trade publication, has reported that these agencies were prevented from doing so. The Oil Daily reported that “according to a leaked memo, the agencies were muzzled [by OMB] * * *.” The article further quotes the memo as instructing agencies that “based upon reports from a meeting this morning * * * Federal agencies will not [I repeat not] be transmitting comments on the EPA proposals.”

Although the agencies provided critical comments during the interagency review process, there is no evidence that the proposed rules were significantly modified to reflect their concerns. OMB cannot, therefore, defend its “muzzling” of Federal agencies—as characterized by the Oil Daily—by arguing that the proposed rules reflect the collective wisdom and judgment of Federal agencies, when the exact opposite is the case. I would also note that the interagency review comments from last fall are part of the public record, and so there is no reason why the agencies could not also submit comments during the public comment period. EPA and OMB are apparently holding conversations with some of the Federal agencies, but the critical comments of other agencies will not be shared with Congress and other interested parties. On its face, this becomes a private comment period, rather than a public comment period.

I am disturbed by this apparent lack of candor and public accountability on the part of the administration in discussing these rules. These proposed rules will impose significant costs, not only on our Nation, but also on Federal agencies themselves. Many agencies and departments operate facilities that will be directly affected by these rules. As the ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I believe that these impacts and costs must be considered and reviewed as part of the appropriations process.

I am, therefore, today writing to various Federal agencies requesting that these agencies individually comment on the cost of the proposed EPA rules, both with regard to the operations of the individual departments, and upon that aspect of the Nation’s infrastructure that is regulated by the departments in question. I am also writing to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, requesting his comments on the cost of these proposed rules to the Federal Government in its entirety.

As our Nation strives to balance the budget, while at the same time providing Federal programs and services desired by the public, it is important that the significant costs of new regulations, such as these, be made available

and taken into account as part of the budget process.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not want to take much time. Am I correct in assuming that the Senate is ready to recess shortly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senate is still waiting for the House with respect to the adjournment resolution.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. GORTON pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 16 and S. Con. Res. 17 are located in today’s RECORD under “Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.”)

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, with the concurrence of my good friend from North Dakota, I will just proceed for a moment.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on March 16, Daniel Patrick MOYNIHAN, the senior Senator from New York State, turned 70. Senator MOYNIHAN has been referred to, quite properly, as the intellectual of the Senate and called by many, a renaissance man. I mean no disrespect when I say that during a couple of the gatherings of the Irish on March 17, he was also referred to as the “World’s Largest Leprechaun.”

To me, Senator MOYNIHAN is a good friend and a mentor, a wise voice that I heard before I was in the Senate, and since. He is a man who has spoken with great prescience on issues involving families and the economy, global power and welfare reform, on so many things.

Senator MOYNIHAN has served in administrations of both Democrat and Republican Presidents. He has always been ahead of his time, sometimes with a controversial voice that then turns out to be the only accurate voice.

Like all other Senators, I wish him very well as he heads into the latest decade of his life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column by David Broder entitled “The Moynihan Imprint” be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1997]

THE MOYNIHAN IMPRINT

(By David S. Broder)

Today is the 70th birthday of a unique figure in the public life of this nation for the past four decades, the senior senator from New York, Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Tomorrow, a day-long symposium and a celebratory dinner at the Woodrow Wilson Center will make it clear just how large Moynihan’s legacy is.

Previewing the papers to be delivered, as Georgetown professor Robert A. Katzmann, a onetime student of Moynihan’s and organizer of the tribute, allowed me to do, was a reminder of just how rich and varied the New York Democrat’s contributions have been.