

(One trillion, eighty-four billion, two hundred sixty-one million)

Twenty-five years ago, July 21, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$434,462,000,000 (Four hundred thirty-four billion, four hundred sixty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,929,220,543,589.87 (Four trillion, nine hundred twenty-nine billion, two hundred twenty million, five hundred forty-three thousand, five hundred eighty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOANNE RAINSFORD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, throughout the Nation, whenever a community leader passes, his or her death is noticed and mourned by many. In small towns, however, the impact of such a loss is always magnified, for in such places, the deceased is more than a well known, but distant figure, he or she is a neighbor, a member of the local church, and more often than not, a friend. Such was the case on June 29 when Edgefield, SC suffered a tremendous loss with the passing of my friend, Joanne Tisdale Rainsford.

Mrs. Rainsford first came to Edgefield to work as a teacher, and it was not long before she became a well known and liked figure around town. Her civic mindedness led her to become involved in a multitude of organizations and causes, and though not originally from Edgefield, she worked hard on behalf of her new hometown. Among other groups, the Edgefield United Way, the Olde Edgefield Trade Association, and the Edgefield Community Development Association all benefited from the efforts of this tireless, devoted, and enthusiastic woman.

One of the cornerstones of a small town is the community newspaper, and Joanne Rainsford played an important role in helping produce the local paper, the Citizen News. In the mid-1980's, she spent about a year and a half as the managing editor of that publication, and she later became the president of Edgefield County Communications, the parent company of the Citizen News.

Though Mrs. Rainsford enjoyed many pursuits, she was particularly interested in history, and she worked hard to save and showcase the unique and rich history of Edgefield County. In recognition of her service as their president, and her leadership in any number of preservation projects, the Edgefield County Historical Society just this past June voted to rename its museum the Joanne T. Rainsford Heritage Center. This was an honor of which I know she was especially proud and the action of the society is all the more meaningful as they approved this recognition shortly before Mrs. Rainsford's death.

Whether it was through her work as a teacher, in her role as a newspaper executive, or as a civic booster, Joanne Rainsford worked hard to promote

Edgefield, to build the local economy, and to make her hometown an even more prosperous and desirable place to live. She was an articulate proponent of the heritage corridor, a unique project that blends history and tourism together over a 14-county region in our State stretching from the coast to the mountains. I was so impressed by her desire to bolster tourism, the No. 1 industry in the Palmetto State, that I appointed her as a delegate from South Carolina to the White House Conference on Tourism.

Mr. President, many people in Edgefield and throughout South Carolina mourned the passing of Mrs. Joanne T. Rainsford, as she was a woman who was liked and admired by all those who knew her. She was also a woman who approached life with great enthusiasm and who sought to leave her mark on the world through projects that benefited others. I can say without reservation that the work of the late Mrs. Rainsford had a positive effect on Edgefield County and that her work strengthened that community in many different ways. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of an article from the Citizen News be included in the RECORD following my remarks, it very nicely captures Mrs. Rainsford's accomplishments and her spirit. Her husband, Ben Rainsford; her stepchildren, Neely and Todd; her two sisters, Nancy and Mary; and all her friends and relatives, have my deepest condolences on this terribly sad event. We shall all miss Joanne Rainsford.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JULIA RAVENEL DOUGHERTY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am saddened to report the passing of a longtime friend, a great supporter, and one of the stalwart members of the South Carolina Republican Party, Mrs. Julia Ravenel Dougherty.

In the not so distant past, South Carolina was what was known as a one party State, where a victory in a primary election was all one needed to secure office, and where a significant segment of the population had no outlet for its views, opinions, and politics. All of that began to change in the 1960's when a cadre of forward looking politicians and interested citizens began to fight to create a true Republican Party in South Carolina.

One of the pioneers in that effort was Mrs. Dougherty, who is roundly recognized as having been a woman of great humor, strong organizational skills, and inexhaustible energy, as well as someone who was a tremendous motivator. From the Charleston County Republican Party to the gubernatorial races, and from my own Senate campaigns to the bids of GOP candidates for the White House, Julia Dougherty was always eager to roll up her sleeves and to lend her considerable talents to an election effort. Her loyalty to the party, and activism on its behalf, earned her not only the thanks

and admiration of countless people, but also an appointment as a delegate to the 1964 and 1968 Republican Conventions. Her loyalty and efforts were further recognized when in 1968, she was a member of the electoral college, and cast her vote for Richard M. Nixon.

In addition to her partisan political work, Mrs. Dougherty had a strong commitment to public service, and over the years, she made many contributions to building South Carolina into an even better, safer, and more prosperous State for all its citizens. She was the first female to ever serve on the South Carolina Highway Commission, and in that role, she was a forceful advocate for the modernization of the highway patrol, as well as the increased professionalization of that force. She later served as the State chairwoman of President Carter's friendship force, and during the Reagan administration, she served on an advisory committee to the Department of Transportation. Truly an impressive record, and one of which I know Julia was justifiably proud.

Despite her great love for politics and her commitment to public service, Mrs. Dougherty never sought elected office herself. This is truly a shame for I believe she would have made even more contributions to the Palmetto State as an elected official, and she certainly would have set a high standard for ability, integrity, and dedication for others to follow.

The death of Julia Ravenel Dougherty leaves a tremendous void in South Carolina politics and life in the lowcountry. Her family, which includes her cousin and my good friend, State Senator Arthur Ravenel; husband Francis; son Park; daughters Renee and Frances; and four grandchildren, all have my deepest sympathies. Their wife, mother, grandmother, and cousin will be missed by all those who knew this most remarkable woman.

LOUISIANA SENATE ELECTION CONTEST

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, nearly 3 months ago, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration voted to begin a preliminary investigation to determine the factual basis, if any, for a contest of the 1996 Senate election in Louisiana. I want to take a few minutes today to review where the committee stands in this matter, how we got there, and why I believe it is past the time to bring an end to this investigation and to dismiss the petition of Louis "Woody" Jenkins contesting the November 1996 Senate election in Louisiana.

The Rules Committee is currently faced with a decision: whether or not to allow an election contest to proceed, under the Senate's authority and duty under the Constitution, without any evidence of fraud or irregularities affecting the outcome.

This is not the first such decision the committee has faced in this matter.

Senators will recall that the initial bipartisan report of the committee's outside counsel found no evidence to support the claims in the petition, and suggested only the most limited review to determine whether or not Mr. Jenkins' more sensational claims of paid multiple voting had any merit. My colleagues will also recall that the committee, on a party-line vote, rejected that recommendation and moved forward with a substantially broader investigation at dramatically increased costs. Subject to a protocol negotiated by outside counsel for the majority and the minority, committee Democrats agreed to participate in a joint investigation.

Two teams of attorneys, accompanied by active duty and retired FBI agents, were dispatched to New Orleans, while here in Washington a pair of highly skilled Government Accounting Office [GAO] detailees reviewed tens of thousands of documents subpoenaed from state and local election officials in Louisiana. In addition, Committee staff spent countless hours conferring with counsel, establishing procedures for the investigation, assisting GAO with its review, and managing the day-to-day operations in New Orleans.

In the course of the joint investigation, over 130 subpoenas were issued; key witnesses were interviewed, in some instances more than once; voters were contacted in an effort to validate their election day sign-in at the polls; numerous election officials were interviewed; and hundreds of documents were produced by both Mr. Jenkins' and Senator LANDRIEU's campaign organizations.

What has the committee learned as a result of all this effort, which has cost the taxpayers well in excess of the \$250,000 originally budgeted, Mr. President?

We have learned that there is no evidence—I repeat, no evidence, Mr. President—of any fraud or irregularity on election day in Louisiana that would have affected the outcome of this election.

We have learned that key witnesses to alleged vote buying and multiple voting were paid and schooled in fabricating their stories—none of which were confirmed by other records—and may have even been threatened once they revealed the truth about the attempt to mislead this committee. Those allegations of witness tampering which occurred after the election have been referred to the proper law enforcement officials for review.

We have learned that virtually none of the thousands of so-called "phantom votes" identified by Mr. Jenkins exist, nor are they corroborated by the mounds of election documents subpoenaed.

We have learned that numerous other so-called irregularities in the election are not violations of the Louisiana Election Code, but are simply technical violations or are so insignificant that Louisiana State law would not recog-

nize them as a valid basis for overturning an election.

Some have suggested that the committee suspend the investigation until such time as the law enforcement authorities conclude their separate investigations into allegations of witness tampering. I believe such sentiment—which I would like to believe is the product of caution and not partisanship—is misguided.

Investigations of criminal tampering with committee witnesses are not designed to turn up evidence that is relevant to, let alone sufficient for, a finding by the Senate that but for fraud or irregularity, the 1996 Louisiana Senate election would have been decided differently. Specifically, evidence that witnesses were paid after the election to lie about illegal activities that did not occur, did not affect the outcome of the election itself, and would not be a basis for overturning the election.

I would like to respond to the allegation, made by Mr. Jenkins, at least one of my Republican colleagues on the committee, and Mr. Jenkins' attorney that the Democrats on the committee are hostile to this investigation and have decided to kill it for partisan reasons. In response, let me remind my colleagues and everyone else present about the time line in this case:

After his defeat on November 5, 1996, Mr. Jenkins claimed that his loss was due to massive voting by dead or incompetent voters. He also alleged that certain African-American precincts in New Orleans had turned out at greater than 90 percent—in one case at more than 100 percent—and in support of Senator LANDRIEU. Both allegations proved false after petitioner sought a court order for death and incompetency records—which yielded nothing—and after an Orleans Parish official revealed that no precinct had turned out at more than 82 percent and that 8 of the top 10 precincts had been majority-white and supported Jenkins in the election.

On November 14, 1996, Jenkins then brought a State law election challenge, making no mention of dead or incompetent voters or abnormally high turnouts. Instead, he alleged that so-called precinct audits prepared by volunteers from election records—which themselves were produced under court order—yielded thousands of phantom votes and mismatched signatures on election documents, plus evidence of improper assistance by poll workers. Jenkins dismissed his own suit, citing an inability to gather sufficient evidence—despite the judge's offer to extend the statutory deadline for filing an amended complaint.

On December 5, 1996, Jenkins filed a contest petition with the Senate—which he then amended on December 17—in which he restated his allegations of phantom voting and mismatched signatures, adding a serious of sensational allegations of vote buying, multiple voting, fraudulent voter registration and other election fraud, as well as a

laundry list of other complaints including vote hauling, malfunctioning voting machines, failure of poll workers to identify voters, and campaign finance violations. After Senator LANDRIEU responded on January 17, 1997, Mr. Jenkins filed a response on February 7, 1997, reiterating his earlier allegations and presenting more supporting material to the committee. Eventually, Mr. Jenkins' submissions to this committee totaled over 9,000 pages. Key portions of this material were blacked out by Jenkins to obscure the names of individuals claiming to have participated in or having witnessed fraud on election day.

In response to these extensive submissions, the Rules Committee retained two outside counsels to wade through the material and make a recommendation to the committee regarding the sufficiency of the petition. On April 8, 1997, counsel presented the committee with a report recommending dismissal of the bulk of Jenkins' allegations, with counsel to conduct a limited investigation into the most sensational allegations of vote buying, multiple voting, and fraudulent voter registration. On April 15, 1997, Mr. Jenkins testified against the bipartisan report, claiming that it would result in the committee overlooking or ignoring serious evidence of fraud and irregularity in the November 1996 election.

On April 17, the Rules Committee—on a party-line vote—rejected the counsels' report and instead initiated a wide-ranging investigation. Although the committee Democrats disagreed strenuously with the decision to open up the scope of the investigation, we agreed to continue to participate in a bipartisan investigation.

Beginning the next week, our outside counsel met with the majority's choice of outside counsel, and together they drafted a protocol not only to guide our investigation but to serve as a basis for the detail of FBI agents and GAO personnel to the committee on a nonpartisan basis. The agents were especially important, because Mr. Jenkins refused to turn over his documents to the committee or our outside counsel—including the crucial names of his fraud witnesses—until he was assured that they would be delivered to FBI agents detailed to the committee.

On May 12, the majority and minority chief counsels traveled to New Orleans to select space in the Federal building to serve as temporary committee office space. Chairman WARNER subsequently requested a 60-day lease of the space which expires on July 31.

On May 13, committee staff were joined in Louisiana by members of both the majority and minority outside counsel teams. The group conducted interviews with the Governor, the leadership of the Louisiana Legislature, the secretary of state, the commissioner of elections, and the State district attorney for East Baton Rouge. It was during these interviews that the

then-lead attorney, Richard Cullen, advised that the 45-day investigative period began that day.

During the week of May 19, with the concurrence of committee Democrats, Chairman WARNER issued over 130 subpoenas to Louisiana election officials. The vast majority of the subpoenas were answered in a timely manner.

On May 30, 1997, again with concurrence of committee Democrats, Chairman WARNER issued subpoenas to political committees affiliated with both Senator LANDRIEU and Mr. Jenkins. Senator LANDRIEU delivered her documents on June 3, the deadline for delivery in New Orleans, but Mr. Jenkins—despite having months to prepare documents in support of a case brought at his behest—sought and received an extension until Monday, June 9.

Meanwhile, GAO evaluators detailed to the committee had begun work on June 2, 1997, reviewing petitioner's allegations of the existence of more than 7,400 so-called phantom votes in the November 1996 Louisiana senate election. Included in the materials Mr. Jenkins submitted on June 9 was a substantial revision of the phantom vote totals downward to just over 5,700 votes—less than the margin of difference in the November election. Nevertheless, Mr. Jenkins continued to express the belief that upon further scrutiny, the election records would yield enough phantom votes to more than make up the difference. As has been widely reported, we now know from the GAO evaluators detailed to the committee that this is not true. In fact, GAO detailees have concluded that further investigation of the allegations they have reviewed to date would be unwarranted.

Back in New Orleans, investigators were interviewing individuals named in the unredacted materials finally provided to the committee by Mr. Jenkins on June 9. Within a week, a disturbing pattern emerged. Not only were the allegations of fraud untrue, the witnesses revealed that they had been paid by agents of the petitioner to tell their stories.

Subsequently, on June 20, committee investigators discovered that at least one of these witnesses had been threatened, by agents of Mr. Jenkins, and told to reaffirm their original stories of fraud. For his part, Mr. Jenkins denies paying any witness and claims no knowledge of any payments by his agents for testimony.

Once I learned that the only evidence of election fraud in this matter was clearly false and purchased by agents of Mr. Jenkins, I decided that I could not, in good conscience, continue Democratic participation in the joint investigation. On June 23 I advised Chairman WARNER of my concerns. On June 25, the committee Democrats announced our withdrawal from the investigation.

On that same day, June 25, I asked the U.S. Department of Justice to investigate whether the witnesses were

threatened in violation of Federal law, 18 U.S.C. § 1505, which prohibits obstruction of a Senate investigation.

It is my understanding that Chairman WARNER subsequently made a similar referral to the Republican district attorney for East Baton Rouge Parish, Mr. Doug Moreau, who has scheduled interviews with both the witnesses and the agents of Mr. Jenkins who allegedly paid them to lie. According to press reports, Mr. Moreau and his staff are also currently reviewing allegations that poll workers may not have followed the Louisiana Election Code to the letter. Mr. Jenkins has said that he supports these parallel investigations, but believes that the Rules Committee should continue its probe as well.

I should add that when committee staff and the two teams of outside counsel met with Mr. Moreau on May 13, he advised them that his office had neither the resources nor the expertise to conduct a full-scale investigation of alleged election fraud that may have occurred in the 1996 Senate election. Mr. Moreau was also reluctant to state unequivocally that his office, located in Baton Rouge, had jurisdiction over alleged criminal activity in New Orleans Parish. And yet, that is exactly what Chairman WARNER has requested Mr. Moreau to investigate.

Based upon the review of evidence to date, it is unfair for petitioner or anyone else to claim that Democrats want to kill this probe prematurely. This case has consumed over 7 months, hundreds of thousands of dollars—not to mention hundreds of thousands more in the parties' legal fees, a portion of which they are customarily reimbursed by the Senate—and countless hours of staff time. After all this expenditure, the investigation has produced no evidence—none at all—that would support continued investigation, let alone action by the Senate to overturn the election.

Finally, in the interest of fairness I believe we should remember our colleague Senator LANDRIEU, who has faithfully continued serving the people of Louisiana while patiently enduring countless allegations and months of uncertainty in order for the Rules Committee to pursue each and every one of Mr. Jenkins' charges—none of which have produced a shred of credible evidence.

As has been widely reported, I am currently involved in negotiations with Chairman WARNER and other members of his caucus regarding the appropriate way to close this investigation in an orderly fashion. Whatever resolution we reach on this issue should, in my opinion, first, acknowledge that the investigation to date has produced no evidence of any fraud, error, or irregularity in the 1996 Louisiana Senate election, and second, set a fixed, firm date on which the Rules Committee will meet to vote on whether to termi-

nate the investigation and dismiss the petition of Mr. Jenkins.

I join my entire Caucus in expressing our full and complete support for our colleague, Senator MARY LANDRIEU, and call on Chairman WARNER and members of the majority to end this investigation and remove the unjustified cloud of doubt overshadowing Senator LANDRIEU and the elected officials and good people of Louisiana.

THE OMNIBUS PATENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am delighted that the report is finally available for S. 507, The Omnibus Patent Act of 1997. The Senate Judiciary Committee voted 17 to 1 in favor of a Hatch-Leahy substitute to this bill on May 22. I urge all Members to take the time to learn about this legislation, which is designed to assist American innovation.

The Omnibus Patent Act would reform the U.S. patent system in important ways. The bill would:

Reduce legal fees that are paid by inventors and companies;

Slash redtape in the Patent and Trademark Office;

Increase the value of patents to inventors and companies; and

Facilitate U.S. inventors and companies' research, development, and commercialization of inventions.

In Vermont, we have a wide variety of independent inventors and small companies. It is especially important to me that this bill help them as well as larger, more specialized firms. I have spoken with independent inventors and representatives of smaller companies to learn what reforms they recommended. I have tried to ensure that their recommendations were incorporated into the Hatch-Leahy substitute amendment that was reported by the Judiciary Committee.

I am especially gratified that the Hatch-Leahy substitute responds to the concerns of independent inventors and small businesses concerning the matter of 18-month publication. These concerns were articulated at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing by the president of the Vermont Inventors Association, Bill Parker. Mr. Parker suggested giving applicants who only file in the United States a choice whether or not to publish early. He also recommended that we enhance the protections granted to those who choose 18-month publication if we wish to encourage them to take that course.

The substitute does both of these things. In particular, it allows any applicant to avoid publication before the granting of the patent simply by making such a request upon filing the application and by certifying that the application has not—and will not—be published abroad. The substitute also provides for the issuance of patents on individual claims in published applications as they are approved, rather than waiting for the disposition of all claims contained in such an application, as