

A CALL FOR FURTHER
INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time. I will share my time with my friend and colleague from California, Mr. ROHRBACHER.

This is, if not the last night of this session of the 104th Congress, it certainly is close to it. I should be rising to display a happy sentiment about what has happened because I am proud of what we have done in this Congress. I am proud of the work we have achieved. I am proud that our party has moved forward with a very aggressive agenda.

But, unfortunately, I rise to talk about something that to me is very sad, Mr. Speaker, because it gets at the heart of what this country is all about, and it relates back to one of the reasons why I got involved in public life in the first place.

In 1972, Mr. Speaker, I was teaching in public schools back in Pennsylvania, and to be very frank, I was somewhat dismayed when the investigation showed here in Washington that the President of my party, Richard Nixon, tried to cover up a third-rate burglary.

Now, that was not a major felony, but it was something that no one in fact should be allowed to get away with in this country, and in fact the system worked. That gentleman who served in the White House eventually had to step down because this body did a very thorough job in supporting an independent prosecutor who went in and found out that, yes, the President had in fact tried to cover up a third-rate burglary. And that is exactly what it was, and that is all it was.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States right now is about my age, a little bit older than I am. We are from the same generation. I understand that his wife, the First Lady, was involved in that investigation, was on the team who went after Richard Nixon, as a staff person, an idealist of the sixties generation, as perhaps I would characterize myself.

And here, Mr. Speaker, our paths now cross. I am a Republican Member of Congress and President Clinton and his wife are in the White House. And while I have been dismayed at many of the actions of this administration and this President, a President of my generation, nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing has outraged me as much as what I have seen over the past several days.

The Attorney General of this country suggested that we needed a special prosecutor to investigate the Whitewater case. Whether you believe the facts in that situation or not, in a bipartisan way we all agree, like we did with those who were in office when Richard Nixon was President, that this

should best be handled by a special prosecutor. The majority of the Members in both bodies agreed that that should be handled, especially if it potentially involved the President and First Lady, by a special prosecutor.

The special prosecutor has proceeded, Mr. Speaker, and he has gotten some convictions along the way, in fact, some convictions of some formerly very high ranking people in this administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, 1 month before the election, the heat is starting to be turned up on the White House.

□ 2030

And what really offends me, Mr. Speaker, is that while we have an investigation being conducted by an independent prosecutor, as we saw during Richard Nixon's era, we have a President for the first time in the history of this country come out and make public statements leading to the possibility of pardon for those people who, first of all, have been tried and convicted by a jury of their peers.

Now, for those who say, well, it is the right of the President to pardon those who have done wrong, I would say I do not disagree with that. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have here is something that has never happened before in the history of this country, a sitting President making public statements about a case where the investigator is trying to bring in witnesses who have refused to testify, who have gone on national television, who have been jailed because they have not cooperated with the Grand Jury and the special prosecutor, and a President who has said publicly that he has not yet thought about whether or not a pardon would be considered.

Now, if you were one of those individuals who has been convicted by a jury of your peers for wrongdoing, and in each of the cases of the convictions they are for multiple counts, they are not for one count, you would, I would think, be very enlightened and heartened by the comments of the President of the United States that he thinks justice should prevail.

But then he goes on to say he has not even thought about whether or not a pardon should be considered. But even worse than that, Mr. Speaker, he comes out publicly and says that it is commonly understood that the special prosecutor is, in fact, pursuing politics in his investigation of this situation.

Mr. Speaker, now I am not a lawyer. I am one of the few Members of this Congress that got here as a public school teacher, as someone who got involved in my community as a mayor and then county commissioner and now as a Member of Congress. But let me tell you one thing I have learned about our legal system, Mr. Speaker, and that is when you attempt to affect someone who is involved as a witness or a potential witness in a criminal investigation, for every citizen in America that is called tampering with a wit-

ness. Mr. Speaker, as a layperson and not an attorney, that is a felony far more grave than covering up a third-rate burglary.

Mr. Speaker, if you or I or my fellow citizens back in Delaware County or across Pennsylvania were being charged with something and had some way of affecting a potential witness to that case against us, and said that publicly and tried to influence what that individual may or may not say, they could be charged with tampering with a witness.

Mr. Speaker, that is illegal. That is not allowed in this country. And for the President of the United States to lay out the possibility of a pardon for someone who was making herself to be a national folk hero, after she was convicted by a jury of her peers for having done wrong, along with her husband who was convicted of many more counts, and who currently is in prison because she is saying she does not want to cooperate, is tampering with a witness.

Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous, and that is why I got involved in public life in the first place back in my county, back in the 1970's, when I first ran for mayor of my town. I was upset with the way the system was working. I was upset that a President could think that he could be above the law and that he could cover up any third-rate burglary and get away with it.

But President Nixon did not do that during the course of the investigation. His crime was covering up. It was Gerald Ford, the next President who, in fact, gave a pardon which caused him to be defeated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some would say this is sour grapes, you are just a Republican and all you want to do is beat up on the President because it is so close to the election. Mr. Speaker, that is not my reason for being here. In fact, let me read you some quotes that appeared in the national media this past week in response to what this President has done.

First of all, let me quote Richard Cohen. Richard Cohen is a columnist for the Washington Post, and anyone who reads the Washington Post knows that Richard Cohen is not exactly what you would call a conservative columnist. In fact, he is thought to be rather to the left in terms of his positions on issues.

Mr. Cohen, in an article this past week, likened Mr. Clinton's anti-Starr campaign to the Watergate era when Richard Nixon fired his nemesis, Archibald Cox.

This is the quote from Richard Cohen. "Personal attacks on the independent counsel or appeals to partisan chauvinism hardly reassure me," Mr. Cohen wrote in a column this week. To go on and quote him further, "It seems to me I have heard this song before, in 1972 to be exact."

Now, this is not the gentleman from Pennsylvania, CURT WELDON, Republican. This is not the gentleman from

Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, Speaker. This is not the gentleman from New York, BILL PAXON, chairman of the congressional committee, or even Bob Dole, Republican candidate. This is Richard Cohen, columnist in the Washington Post, likening the President's actions, Mr. Speaker, to those of 1972 when Richard Nixon was, in fact, in office.

But let us go beyond Richard Cohen Mr. Speaker. How about the New York Times? The New York Times is not exactly the Washington Times. It is not known for its conservative principles, its conservative thinking, or its conservative editorials. What did the New York Times editorial page say this week in response to what this leader of our country did in terms of his public statements in regard to the Whitewater situation and Special Prosecutor Starr?

The Times blasted the President for his verbal shots at Mr. Starr this past Monday during a PBS interview when the President was being interviewed and for his discussion of the pardon process while ex-Whitewater partner Susan McDougal refuse to testify before a Federal Grand Jury. And this is what the New York Times said, Mr. Speaker.

"Both comments create the impression that it is the White House that wants to use partisan thrusts to disrupt the legal process, not Mr. Starr and others, who remain legitimately curious about the full story of Whitewater."

Again, Mr. Speaker, this was not Republicans in this body, this was not Bob Dole or Jack Kemp. This was the New York Times in an editorial this week, Mr. Speaker.

Let us go further, Mr. Speaker, and let us talk about Daniel Schorr. Daniel Schorr, who covered Watergate for CBS News and now does commentary on National Public Radio, said, "The President's answers to PBS anchor Jim Lehrer were designed to put Mr. Starr on the defensive and keep McDougal hopeful. His game is to keep Starr on the defense. I think he is having some success in doing that," said Mr. Schorr. "What serves Clinton's purpose very well," and I am quoting him, "is to just leave open the possibility of a pardon," he said. "It leaves the defendants some incentive not to give away the Clintons."

Which I think the President perhaps knows could happen. That is not the quote, by the way, I am adding my own editorial comment. I will get back to the quote.

"When you look at the words, you can't have a problem with it. It's not what he said, it's what he didn't say."

Mr. Speaker, this President is very clever sometimes at not necessarily saying or conveying directly what he means, but using whatever he says to convey some other meaning, and that is exactly what Daniel Schorr is saying the President is doing in this particular situation.

We could go on to the Wall Street Journal, and some would say, well, the

Wall Street Journal is more conservative, and I would agree with that publicly, but I will still quote Paul Gigot, a Wall Street Journal columnist, who said, and I quote, "It sure wasn't appropriate." Continuing the quote, "It seemed to me that he was holding out hope to Susan McDougal about the prospect of a pardon, which is an interference with the Starr investigation."

Mr. Speaker, what we have seen happen in this country this past week may not sway the election. It may not help or hurt this President in his efforts to be reelected to a second term. But I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, as a child of the 1960's, close to this President's age, as someone who got involved in public life because I was fed up when I saw a sitting President try to cover up a third-rate burglary and who was offended that he was from my party, so I got involved, that I am outraged. I am incensed that this individual would think that he has the ability to so blatantly in the public process leave the option open for a pardon.

Mr. Speaker, when this happened this week, even though I am not on the appropriate committees, I felt that I had to do something, and so I did. I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to announce what I have done. I drafted a letter, Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago. I would like to read the letter which will go to this President tomorrow.

"Dear Mr. President. We are shocked and alarmed by several of your recent statements about the ongoing investigation of independent counsel, Kenneth Starr, and the possibility that several of the figures involved in the Whitewater affair might receive Presidential pardons.

"Accordingly, we write to ask for your assistance with two very specific issues. First, we ask for your assurance that Jim and Susan McDougal, Jim Guy Tucker and other individuals associated with the Whitewater affair will not receive presidential pardons of any sort. This is particularly important in the case of Susan McDougal, who remains in jail on contempt charges. Even the hint of a possible pardon smacks of interference on your part in the important work of the independent counsel. Leaving the door open for a pardon at some point represents, as Richard Cohen in a recent Washington Post column correctly observes, 'a whisper of an offer,' of a pardon.

"Second, we request that you make public the evidence which supports your contention that Susan McDougal is being held in jail on contempt because she refuses to lie about the First Lady and you. This is an extremely serious charge about the integrity of Kenneth Starr. If there is even a grain of truth to support this charge, you should produce that 'evidence' immediately or withdraw your claim.

"These are issues of the gravest importance that speak directly to the integrity of the independent counsel and the investigation he is undertaking. We look forward to your response on these two critical issues. Sincerely."

Mr. Speaker, when I drafted the letter on Wednesday I thought I would bring it over and get some of my friends who I thought would be concerned about this to sign this letter with me, but I was prepared to sign it myself.

Mr. Speaker, in 2 hours on the floor of this House, and I had not talked and still have not talked to anyone in the leadership, including the Speaker or the other leaders who are not involved and aware of what I am doing, I was able to collect 185 signatures, from 185 representatives all across this country, from every State in this Union. And that was in 2 hours yesterday and a half-hour on the floor today. And during that time period, 185 elected officials, representing almost one-half of the population of this Nation agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this has got to be stopped.

No one is above the law in America, even someone who can look in the camera and with a straight face say that he will wait until the process is over and that, in fact, it is political, without providing any bit of evidence to support that claim.

Mr. Speaker, some would say, well, you are just a Republican and all you got were those conservative Republicans to support you in signing that letter. Mr. Speaker, I will admit the overwhelming majority of these signatures are Republican.

I can tell you one month before an election it would be extremely difficult to get any member of the President's party to sign a letter of this type that basically confronts him directly and asks him to respond.

□ 2045

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a bipartisan letter. In fact, three Democrats joined with us in saying to this President, put up or shut up. If you have no evidence of political involvement on the part of the special prosecutor, then shut your mouth. And stop going around the country attempting to provide support for someone who has been convicted by her peers and who sits in jail on contempt charges because you are fearful that she might say something that will implicate you and your wife.

Mr. Speaker, 185 Members of this body signed this letter. The letter is still open and my colleagues and our colleagues, I would hope, who want to sign this letter can do so by calling my office this evening, I will be there; as well as calling tomorrow, I will be in there again. And I will let them sign the letter there or on the House floor, because I think we have to make a statement, Mr. Speaker.

Back to my days in 1972, when I got involved because the leader of my party tried to cover up a third-rate burglary, and now we have a situation where our sitting President flaunts his ability to do what every citizen in this country cannot do and that is intimidate or somehow affect what a witness will say in a grand jury proceeding and

make allegations about political implications of Special Prosecutor Starr with no evidence presented to back what he is saying publicly.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans who signed this letter are no conservatives. They are moderates, and many of them would be considered to the left in our party, Members who supported this President on issues as I have. I have voted with this President on family and medical leave and voted with him on anti-strike breaker and voted with him on environmental issues and voted with him on more funding for the poor, \$100 million plus up in the community action agency program and supported him when he has been right. But I will not stand in this body and allow anyone to think that because of their office they can manipulate the system in such a way that he will hope that through the next 5 weeks that this woman will just stay quiet and not be involved because there is that possibility out there of a presidential pardon.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that we need to have this President come before the American people and do what he has not done very well, and that is be honest with the people about his intentions.

All he has to say publicly is, I will not issue a pardon for Jim or Susan McDougal, for Jim Guy Tucker or anyone else. I will let the process work. If he says that, he has solved our problem and we will let the process work as it did with Richard Nixon.

Mr. President, again, as a child of the 1960's, as someone who is very close in age to this President, I am absolutely outraged at what is occurring. I think that this body has got to take action and this letter will help accomplish that.

With that I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair reminds all Members, they must address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my friend from Pennsylvania, perhaps he could explain, perhaps he could explain for the record exactly what the Whitewater investigation is all about. Some people who have heard Whitewater do not fully understand that what we are really talking about here is the looting of a savings and loan institution in Arkansas. Basically a clique, a small political clique in Arkansas who ran that State are basically being accused of looting the savings and loan that was guaranteed by the taxpayers. Once that savings and loan, Madison Savings and Loan went belly up, then we got stuck, the American taxpayers got stuck for tens of millions of dollars that then were needed to pay off the debts of the bankrupt savings and loan.

All of the activities that are going on concerning Whitewater, basically the roadblocks that are being put up and the stonewalling that is happening and the various attempts to attack the spe-

cial prosecutor and to prevent people from getting evidence, that basically is happening as part of an attempt to thwart the investigation of the looting of a savings and loan, is that not correct?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is very familiar with the case. I am not on the appropriate Committee on House Oversight but I have followed it during my process. As I understand it, that is exactly what happened. It was a looting of a savings and loan.

That is why the special prosecutor was set up and comparing it to what happened in the 1970's, it was a bipartisan effort to see whether or not the President, who was of my party and of the gentleman's party, in fact did something that violated the basic trust of the American people, and we found that he did. What bothers me the most is that the President's wife at that time was leading the effort to uncover the President and what he had done.

And now we have a situation where the President has gone far beyond, far, far beyond the coverup of a third-rate burglary. Tampering with a Federal witness is a felony. To lay out the possibility of a pardon, while there is a person who is incarcerated because she will not respond to a request by a legitimate judge and special prosecutor in this country, is a felonious act. I am not a lawyer but that is what it is. I have asked people. It is an outrage that this country should not allow to happen. In my mind this action makes Richard Nixon look like a Sunday school teacher in comparison in terms of what has occurred this week.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, in 1992, when then-Governor Clinton was kicking off his presidential campaign, I have a distant memory of that event. And recently someone called my attention to the subject matter that he used to kick off his presidential campaign. I am not sure if my friend from Pennsylvania is aware of what the central theme of the President's first campaign speech was, but it was honesty in government. And he used as an example of the terrible dishonesty that was going on in the Federal Government, he used the savings and loan scandal as the basis for his charge of the corruption that was going on in Washington, DC.

I believe that it is ironic at best, it is ironic today for us to be confronted with stonewalling and roadblocks being thrown into the path of a special prosecutor who is attempting to come to grips and to follow the leads that are necessary to bring to justice those people who were involved with the looting of a savings and loan institution that cost the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars.

Some people have said that the President, that this President, President Bill Clinton, has more chutzpah in the history of this country. There are a lot of reasons for saying that. He did have enough chutzpah, for example, to try to change the language when he tried

to say that taxes were contributions and Federal spending all of a sudden became investments. It took a lot of chutzpah to be able to try to face the American people and try to say that, convince them that taxation is really contribution and Federal spending is really investment and in some way fool them into the reality that that was different.

It takes a lot of chutzpah for a President who began his presidential campaign on the theme of honesty in government and attacking this savings and loan scandal to now be engaged in the type of tactics that you have just outlined, to try to basically thwart an investigation into the savings and loan scandal that was taking place right in Arkansas. Of course, he would suggest that it was happening right underneath his nose but he did not know anything about it and that his wife, although deeply involved in the law firm that had some of these accounts and dealt with people who were dealing with the savings and loan, that she of course knew nothing about it as well. This does take some chutzpah.

It also takes some chutzpah, as they say, for the same President to simply shrug off miraculous happenings that have been going on during this investigation. For example, most people have probably forgotten by now the miraculous appearance of Hillary Clinton's billing records for the Rose Law Firm that just were, had disappeared for about a year and then like a miracle appeared in the living quarters of the first family in the White House.

These things were either a miracle or someone consciously did these things. It just seems that the press is willing to ignore that, but if a Republican like Richard Nixon would have been involved in something as blatant as this, it would not be a matter for a chuckle, it would be a matter for questions and follow-up questions and a dogged investigation from that moment on.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I would say to my friend and colleague that I think this is the straw that breaks the camel's back, because now we have the American people seeing through what has been going on here and we have an instance where you have a major columnist for the Washington Post, the New York Times editorial board, Daniel Schorr, the Wall Street Journal, editorial papers across the country, my own local paper in my county has been so incensed with the President that when he visited Philadelphia this past Wednesday, they broke their tradition and editorially endorsed his opponent the day he came to Philadelphia.

This is incensing people who have worked with this President, and I wanted to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], who just came over here, because like me and perhaps unlike some of our other Members of our caucus, he and I worked with this President on issues. He and I have supported him on environmental priorities. He and I have supported him on

issues affecting those things that we maybe differ with our caucus a little bit. And now it has got us to the point where we are incensed and outraged because perhaps in our, I will let the gentleman speak for himself but in my case, 1972 was a turning point because it displayed the arrogance that one person could have in thinking that they were above the people and above the laws that all of us have to live under. What he has done in this case is he has gone beyond the limit.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] who, by the way, came over to sign the letter. We now have 186 signatures and, Mr. Speaker, I would urge our colleagues sitting in their offices who have not signed from either party to come over to the floor. The letter is here and, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage their constituents back home, Mr. Speaker, if they would like to make sure they communicate that, that would be appropriate because many of them are in their offices this very evening and phone calls to them might prod them to come over.

Mr. DORNAN. If I could just have 10 seconds, did you notice the front page of the most truthful paper calls it a curt letter with a small "c." First, I looked and I said, hey, CURT's name should be capitalized here. They meant it was a rather brief, succinct letter. What should we be doing, dripping with honey and with treacle running down our back and tell him, do not pardon these people?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. My point is, this is something I did not want to have to do on the last day of the session, which should not be in this mode, but, Mr. Speaker, this is it. It is the last chance for us to speak out.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I happened to be working here on another bill that we are putting through the Senate, and we have already put through here. I heard your remarks and I think they are frankly the most brilliant remarks I have heard since becoming a Member of Congress in January 1993. You are absolutely right. You are absolutely digging into the right aspects of this.

What we have is the intimidation of the chief executive of the United States, of the judicial branch of the United States Government. What you have described, which is true, is absolutely unheard of. I think every American citizen should share your and our outrage that are talking about this subject tonight. It is absolutely shameless conduct. As you say, if you have some evidence on the special counsel, produce it or quit the nonsense and the PR and the charm going around this country.

I gave the gentleman a question I wrote out a few days ago on this very subject, which is what should be put to all candidates in the national debates. If the press sits in that debate and does not put the question, and I have put it about as succinctly as I can there, then

I think you are doing the people a disservice before they vote in November, because what you described, your hunches, your instincts are absolutely correct.

I have spent a year and a half with Chairman CLINGER of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I am chairman of one of the relevant subcommittees on this matter. On Filegate, Travelgate, call it anything you want in the Watergate tradition, what we have seen there is the most cruel treatment to civil servants, if you will, in quotes, who have served numerous presidents of both parties, were doing their job. And suddenly the Arkansas gang said, hey, we would like those jobs. Everybody knows any President can come in and fire anybody he wants. But this presidency knew that those people were respected by the media, so charges were trumped up and the FBI, I am sorry to say, was brought into the matter and even told what to write hither and yon.

When you look at that record that Chairman CLINGER, who regretfully is retiring from this institution, brought out, his instincts were right in the spring of 1993; he knew something was wrong. And there is a law on the books that says, if so many, seven or eight of us on Government Operations, as it was at that time, sign, requesting the executive branch to produce the papers, we can do it.

□ 2100

And we did it, and we were stiffed every single week for weeks. Now our friends on the other side say, "Well, gee, why are you bringing this up in an election year?" Well, if they produced the documents that the law says they should have produced, we would have had that thing wound up in 1993 and 1994.

Now some of us are objective on that committee. And I will tell you, I did not know CHRIS SHAYS until I came here, but I never was so proud to serve with an individual in my life as CHRIS SHAYS. In the previous Congress, when you had the HUD scandal that occurred under the Reagan administration, he, as a Republican, went after the witnesses to get the truth, just like any of us should, regardless of who is in the White House.

What we want is the truth. That is what Chairman CLINGER wanted. That is what I wanted. That is what most of us on the committee wanted. And slowly we are getting it. But it is dribbled out to us after subpoena, after subpoena is issued, after we have to threaten them with contempt of Congress, after passing a resolution here which could mean jail time, and finally it is dribbled out.

And as my colleague from California knows, just the most amazing amount of miracles appear. Papers; it is like Peter Pan is running around dropping records on tables, and suddenly people come in and find them. You know, it is unbelievable, and where is the media to

do the hard work that Woodward and Bernstein did which brought them the appropriate prizes because they were right on the track? They nailed it down. And where is the help to nail it down?

But I commend you for raising this subject, because it is on everybody's mind, and each presidential candidate should be asked that question.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HORN. And I would like to put the question in the—

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Put that question in the RECORD, Mr. speaker.

The question referred to is as follows:

Mr. President: Will you promise the America people that if you are re-elected, or even if you should lose in November, that you will, under no circumstances, use the Presidential pardon power to pardon either Jim McDougal, or Susan McDougal, or Jim Guy Tucker, or any member, present or former, of the White House staff, or any member of your own family, or any other person that the Independent Counsel may investigate or prosecute?

Potential follow-ups: Will you promise to resign if you should use the pardon power?

Why will you not give a straight answer to this very simple question?

And I would just say to him that CHRIS SHAYS, in fact, signed the letter, as did many other moderate Republicans who stood up when there was a HUD scandal in the Reagan administration, asked the tough questions, went to the wall to go through the investigation in a bipartisan way, just as bipartisan Members did, Republicans and Democrats back in 1972.

And I would just ask the gentleman who has been involved in the oversight committee in this area, that individual who had, as you say, trumped up charges brought against him that basically ruined his career and his family and caused him to spend hundreds and thousands of dollars, Billy Dale; that led to a trial, also like Susan McDougal.

Would the gentleman tell me what the outcome of that trial was and how quickly the verdict came down?

Mr. HORN. It came within, I believe, 2 hours. It was a very quick verdict, and the sad thing is, after they wrecked not only Billy Dale's reputation, but other members of the Travel Office staff, they wrecked their reputations, and they cost hundreds of thousands of dollars collectively on the part of the individuals who were in that Travel Office, and, as I said earlier, they served Democratic and Republican administrations with good faith and efficiency, yet they were dragged out of the White House, told to get out of there by 5 o'clock, a station wagon comes up, they are lying on the floor as they are taken out.

I mean it was something that would happen in the Soviet Union, for Heaven's sake, and this has happened in 13 acres downtown. The White House of the United States; it is supposed to epitomize democracy. And talk about

the misuse of institutions of the Government. As was true of the Nixon administration, they misused the FBI. And when we get into Filegate, that is a whole other story we ought to—

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And what the gentleman did not mention was, that verdict that came down within 2 hours was a complete and total acquittal, unlike Susan McDougal, who went on television after a jury of her peers convicted her, I believe, of four counts and her husband of 18 or 19 counts. Unlike Susan McDougal, Billy Dale was acquitted by a jury of his peers of all charges within 2 hours. But his reputation was ruined.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of action is not America. We did not tolerate this when Richard Nixon was the president. We came together as a country and said this is not the kind of leadership that should be leading America. And in this case, this President had better answer for his actions and withdraw his political statements, answer whether or not he will pardon, or he should step aside, or this country should take action to remove him from office based on his actions in this situation.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I think the President's action concerning the Travelgate affair does indeed show the character of the individual we are now talking about who happens to be President of the United States.

I worked in the White House for 7 years and knew Billy Dale very well, and the public should understand whom we are talking about here. We are not talking about a political appointee, who was appointed by the Republicans, who happened to be a hold-over. No.

Billy Dale is a civil servant. He is a veteran who ran an office in the White House that had served President Carter as well as President Ford and as well as Ronald Reagan, a man who is just a civil servant like other civil servants, whose patriotism is demonstrated in the hard work and long hours that he takes in a job that is different than other civil service jobs, because he had to travel with the President, he had to make sure things are done.

Sometimes they work until midnight, but as a civil servant, he does not get overtime pay. This is someone whose patriotism was expressed in the fact that he was doing his very best job for those who held the office.

And that is the way it was with all those folks down in the travel office; we knew that. They were regular human beings, they were people that, you know, spend their times with their family and churches, and they are totally nonpolitical. You could always go to them with a problem, and they were there to help.

Well, these people were fired precipitously when President Clinton became President. Now why were they fired? Well, we know now that they were fired because the President had some cronies that he wanted to put in the office. One was an attractive female, and one had

to do with a crony who basically was engaged in a travel company that wanted to get contracts, that had something to do with who was handling the travel office.

Well, before we can do that, of course, we have to get rid of these just average Americans. But who cares about them? Who cares about these civil servants?

What is significant is not only the President was off base and that the White House was off base in this matter, but that once that act happened, once it happened, it was a wrong thing to do.

Instead of admitting that they made a mistake, the White House set out to destroy these people, to destroy them, not just to fire them, but to charge them with improprieties and illegalities and to actually bring legal and criminal charges against them to utterly destroy them. In order to what? In order to make sure there was no political damage for the President for making a wrong decision.

This is the nature of the person who is occupying the Presidency of the United States today. This is wrong. This indicates an arrogance; it indicates an absolute disregard for other human beings. How can you look at another human being and treat them in that way? I would not treat my enemies in that way. I would not charge my enemies with crimes that they did not commit in order to gain some type of upmanship in a political match. I would not do that.

This is even worse than that. This is charging a civil servant with crimes in order to give yourself a political advantage, someone who is not even your political enemy.

Let us just note that this wrongdoing was recognized almost immediately by the jury, and within 2 hours, as we said, Billy Dale and these loyal civil servants, these loyal Americans who had worked their lives out in this particular spot in the White House, they were totally exonerated, and then what was the President's action?

When we tried to ensure that these people would not have to sell their homes, that these people would not have to have all of their life savings drained away because they had to have such legal bills, what then did the President do? Do you remember?

The President at first agreed, OK—well, through his spokesman—well, yeah, we will sign the bill if the Congress passes a bill to take care of their legal fees, and then he took it back. And then he took it back because he says he wants the legal fees of these people who were charged with criminal activity themselves to be paid by the Government or we cannot take care of these people who were just absolutely victims of his own misdeeds.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and the actions there are appalling to those Members who have been involved in looking at this situation, and it has just been devastating for that family.

Unfortunately, as much as the media had a fond affection for Billy Dale, and some of them I even understand contributed to his legal defense fund, they did not take this case. It was early on in the Clinton administration. It was just kind of brushed aside.

And it has been confusing for the American people to understand, and some who do not tune in regularly say, Well, there is another they are just charging; you know, it is another accusation; these accusations fly back and forth all the time, and it is just politics as usual. But, Mr. Speaker, this is different.

As I said before, this struck me this week because I have not felt this way since I was outraged, as a public school teacher in 1972, when I, as a Republican, heard that Richard Nixon had, in fact, covered up a third-rate burglary and, in fact, accidentally or deliberately had part of his tapes erased that he kept in his office.

What do we have now, Mr. Speaker? We have a President who feels such arrogance that he can stand up in a public forum on national TV and he can say with a straight face, "I don't know whether I'm going to deal with that issue of pardons or not, it will take its course," and then goes on to say, "But there is no doubt that what is being done to Susan McDougal is politically motivated because they want to get Bill and Hillary Clinton."

Mr. Speaker, I will say it again. No person in this country, be he or she Republican or Democrat, potentate or king, President or street worker, is entitled to violate the law and violate it especially with the arrogance that we have seen displayed this week.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, the bending point and the breaking point has arisen, and I sense a frustration and a feeling of incense across the country that is being displayed by the media that perhaps was not displayed during the Bill Dale situation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair must remind all Members that it is not in order to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I understand that comment, and I am not engaging in personalities, I am engaging in factual information in regard to comments made by the leader of this country in a national public forum where he basically allowed the impression to be left that a pardon could be offered to someone who right now is in jail for contempt, of not cooperating with the Federal grand jury and the U.S. prosecutor.

I yield to my friend and colleague, Mr. HORN.

Mr. HORN. I think you are absolutely right on that, and I regret to say, on the earlier point you made, that Billy Dale's legal fees and the others that were so terribly treated by White House officials have been stopped in this Congress by some of our friends on

the other side of the aisle and the other body, and those fees should certainly be paid.

I think one of the most eloquent members of our Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is the representative from Maryland, CONNIE MORELLA, and she has zeroed in over many hearings on just the point you have, the inhumane treatment of these workers, some of whom voted for the President, some of whom went back to the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and, as was said by my colleague from California, they were professionals, they were serving the media, and the media had a lot of demands, especially when you travel with the President, all that involved, and they did a splendid job, and they knew they were respected by the media, and they covered their tracks.

This was the modern coverup. They were covering their tracks on why they really wanted to get rid of the office. And as all three of us have said, and it is in the evidence under oath since all our witnesses are under oath, it was simply relatives of the President that want to take over the travel office.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman would yield, the fact is that when things are just permitted to happen and the proper attention is not paid to them by the press, other things that are worse happen. People get arrogant because they can get away with things.

For example, right off the bat we heard that the First Lady had been involved with some kind of commodity scheme that permitted her \$100,000 profit. Now, if that had been any Republican President's wife, this would have been examined, and today, every time there would be a press conference during the election, you would be having people ask questions about it.

But that is just a distant memory now. It is a distant memory, and the fact that she got away with that, then we have—who hears about the Travelgate scandal now? Is the President being asked about this?

The fact is, if we were not bringing it up, the press would not be following through. And, my dear friend from Pennsylvania, you are talking about something and comparing it to the Watergate scandal wherein a third-rate burglary, which was wrong, which was a wrong thing for President Nixon and his staff to have gotten involved with during a political year, the incredible time and effort that was taken by members of the media to follow up, to dog it, to get every detail, to follow through every bank account was just something that they would not let go.

□ 2115

That sent a message to a lot of people. That was a good message: We in government cannot be arrogant and we cannot abuse power.

But what has happened with the current administration is that they came here believing that they could get

away with things that no other administration could get away with. I am afraid that the news media, the news media is verifying this terrible fact.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of my friends and colleagues for appearing here tonight with me. I had originally come here to do a 5-minute special order, but felt the opportunity to take additional time and did so.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. WELDON, my special order is following you, and I will ask my California colleagues to stay, because I want to see the same firestorm in the press about Clinton threatening to shut down the Government over giving Social Security to illegal immigrants, and demanding that we use up tens of thousands of schoolteachers like my brother Dick to educate the children of illegal immigrants, even though we have grandfathered in anybody who is already in school through grade 12. We are going to discuss that.

Here is something I want to tell you. I have a reputation around here, Mr. WELDON—

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. No, I do not believe that.

Mr. DORNAN. For not being a shy, retiring type. But I just saw you do something that makes me feel not limp-wristed, but not as tough as I thought I was, because you challenged the Parliamentarian, and you were right.

Our great Speaker up here, the gentleman from Georgia, MAC COLLINS, the Speaker pro tem of the day, only transmits to us what the Parliamentarian tells him. The Parliamentary advice was to tell you that you were getting personal with Clinton.

We are talking about pirating funds from a bank, looting a bank. Webster Hubbell is in jail for the mirror image of doing what he and Hillary Clinton did together. So of course Clinton is thinking pardon, because Hillary Clinton is not protected by rule XVIII.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER P.T.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DORNAN. Yes. I am going to fight back with the Parliamentarian. Let us have it out on the last day of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind Members that, although remarks in debate may include criticism of the President's official actions or policies, it is a breach of order to question the personal conduct of the President, whether by actual accusation or by mere insinuation.

Mr. DORNAN. I deliberately did not mention him, Mr. Speaker. Tell the Parliamentarian to open up her ears and listen. I said Hillary is not protected by rule XVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DORNAN. All right. I have had it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DORNAN. Thank you. I said Hillary. She is not protected by rule XVIII. Only Mr. AL GORE and Mr. Bill Clinton.

Hillary, I can talk about Roger Clinton being a cocaine addict for the next solid hour. I can even quote what he said about his brother if I do not use the name. People will have to figure out who his brother is. He might have 10 brothers. He might have one half-brother. But I can do anything I want to Roger Clinton, and I choose not to bang on Hillary Clinton much, but tonight is an exception, because she is the twin of Webster Hubbell.

Together they did all the coverups in what the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] called the pirating, the looting, I am not talking about the President here, the looting and the pirating of funds for their own personal political gain in Arkansas.

I could talk for 1 hour without mentioning—

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman will talk for 1 hour. I would just ask the gentleman to let me conclude.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman again for not allowing the Chair, through our pal, Mr. COLLINS, to chastise you incorrectly when you are discussing public crimes, not making personal attacks.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Just in concluding, Mr. Speaker, once again it was with reluctance that I came over here tonight, but I had to do it.

I got involved in the 1970's in public life probably for the same reason the President did, to serve my constituents. I was outraged at what Richard Nixon did. He was in my party. I was dismayed at my party because of what he had done, in thinking he could be above the law and he could cover up a third-rate burglary.

What I saw this past week, Mr. Speaker, and I am not talking about anything that has gone before, what I saw this week in terms of publicly talking about an ongoing investigation, leaving the possibility out there of a Presidential pardon, and then making accusations with no proper backup, has to be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 186 Members of this institution, and perhaps some more who will join us, I, tomorrow, will have this communication delivered to the President of United States. I hope that he takes positive response to the first question, which is, in fact, to say yes, positively, he will not issue a Presidential pardon to any of those who have been convicted in the Whitewater scandal; and, second, I ask him to either provide documentation of political motives or efforts on the part of Mr. Starr or to withdraw the public statements that he has made.

I do so in the hopes of keeping this country the freest, the most democratic country in the world, and a country where everyone, including my friends back in Delaware County, who have to go to work every day and abide by the speed limits and the regular laws all of us have to abide by, understand that the man sitting in the White House is no better than they are, and must abide by those same rules and laws.

INTEGRITY NEEDED IN THE WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, a bit of bipartisan levity. In case the 1,300,000 audience from the territory of Guam, in which it is already tomorrow, on the other side of the dateline, all the way through our beautiful 50th State, Hawaii, down to the territory of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Island, not to forget Western Samoa, back in the Pacific, all of them watching may have missed it earlier today, because of the various time zones, my friend, the gentleman from Ohio JIM TRAFICANT, made this observation on our runaway, bloated Federal Government.

This is JIM TRAFICANT. He is the best one-minute man in the House, not I, so I hope I do it some justice. Here goes TRAFICANT, fighting Democrat of Ohio: "Don't be fooled by the Clinton Administration's budget-cutting rhetoric, because nothing has changed," says Representative JAMES A. TRAFICANT, Ohio Democrat.

"In an effort to cut the budget, the GAO called the OMB and the CBO, the RTC and the NSC and the ITC and the GSA and the IRS, and they had no success." I am with him so far. I have tracked every one of those agencies. I have been here 20 years, so the alphabet soup is okay to the point.

Now, "So since they had no success," Mr. TRAFICANT continues, "The GAO then called the DOD, the DOE, the DOT, and the DDT." I think he lost me on DDT. "Still, they could find no cuts. So then the GAO called the CIA, the DIA, and the OSI, and the PCBs and the PCPs." I fell off the charts on the last one. "And they could find no cuts."

"So then they called again the OSI and the ORI and the IUD, and could find no cuts. And finally, so frustrated, they called," and I am a married guy, I know the code on this next one, "they called the PMS, and there were no cuts to be made. So they decided there should be a whole new program called the accounting selection system, hereafter to be known as A-S-S, which only goes to show us, when it comes to bureaucrats and cuts, it is still the same in Washington, D.C. It is called BS in D.C."

That is the last time I will be lighthearted here, because I would like to

read a letter. Last night I was happily incorrect. I did not make the last special order of the very successful 104th Congress. Canadian yearly multimillionaire—meaning every year he becomes a multimillionaire over and over—Peter Jennings says this was not a productive Congress. Contraire, Peter, my Canadian friend, who pays a lot of U.S. income tax, I hope. It was very successful.

I though last night was it. So here I am back for an hour, to be joined by my friend, the gentleman from Huntington Beach and the greater area, including a lot of parts that I represented for 8 years in beautiful Orange County, he will be joining me. But I want to read a letter, I would say to the gentleman from California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and then ask the Chair's unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, this is from a doctor in the hometown where by mom and my aunt, Flo Haley, grew up, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, the great Scranton Wilkes-Barre, Wyoming Valley. That is where the State of Wyoming got its name, right there in eastern Pennsylvania.

This is Dr. Gerald Ferry—I will not give his address. Jerry Ferry, kind of an easy name to remember, said "Dear Congressman DORNAN, I respectfully request that you consider organizing a series of special orders regarding Clinton's attempted reelection similar to those conducted in 1992," when, of course, he was not protected by rule XVIII, which is to keep us from going for one another's throats here and in the other, as Tip O'Neill used to say, "the other body;" I like the great American's way of calling the Senate "the other body."

Dr. Ferry continues, "Please, do whatever you can to rid our great Nation of the Clinton menace." He means the Clinton administration; he is not being personal there, I am sure. Dr. Ferry would not do that. "Your friend, Jerry. No response necessary."

We had talked, and we were called Tiger Flight. This post-Korean War fighter pilot and three combat pilots, the gentleman from Texas, SAM JOHNSON, a few years older than I, fought in Korea and came back in Vietnam. That is what almost 30 years of service did for that great American; shot down in both wars, captured in Vietnam, horribly tortured. Only the torture of Red McDaniel, our friend, and a few others ever went beyond SAM JOHNSON of Texas, our colleague's torture.

He joined me on the floor one night after our colleague, the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, joined me. And then the only aerial ace since World War I began to ever serve in the U.S. House or Senate, our colleague, the gentleman from California, "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, he joined us. His district adjoins DUNCAN HUNTER'S.

That was 4 years ago this very day, and we went into October. I think we adjourned late into the night of Octo-

ber 4-5, and we became known as Tiger Flight, and I was getting a thousand calls every 24 hours from smart Americans who saw what was coming.

There were no books out on either Clinton, no talk about, it takes a Clinton village to raise my children. You know where my kids were raised. Mr. Speaker, you may not know; but you know, DANA, in Westwood Village and Brentwood. I do not think O.J. Simpson's Brentwood or Westwood Village at the foot of UCLA is the village that was going to help raise my five kids, who are all thoughtful but outspoken and passionate conservatives, particularly on life issues, in raising what will soon be 11 grandkids.

My daughter Terry, who ran my presidential campaign, she is great, Terry Dornan Cobban, she does not need any help from Springfield Village or Burke Center Village or anybody. She knows what to do with her kids, and she knows good teachers from bad teachers.

So going back 4 years ago, people remembered that, and they expected about 10 days here, and it did not happen.

I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], did you see the movie, "The Longest Day?" General Eisenhower, by then a four-star, said, "I am not putting men on the beach unless we control the air." And we so pounded the Luftwaffe, the Flying Army, so that by the time D-Day rolled around we had air superiority; not supremacy, yet. The Luftwaffe only sent up two airplanes, two Messerschmitts, the first helicopter seen over simulating a strafing run across the beach on a camera in oil, to steady the camera; an early steadying device.

The German fighter pilot, who is still alive, he just died recently, his name is something like Pappin, Pippin, he gave the exact dialogue he said that day. It is in Cornelius Ryan's book, "The Longest Day," after they strafed. And they killed some Americans; so when the audience laughed, I did not like it. They strafed the whole beach and killed some Americans. That was it, one pass. Ran for their lives.

As he pulled off the target, our young men hitting the beach at Omaha, way after the first waves, first two waves, he said, "Well, the Luftwaffe has had its day." Two fighters.

□ 2130

Mr. ROHRBACHER, it is you. It is me. This is it. There will be no special orders tomorrow. We are going to adjourn sine die. So we will respect this rule XVIII for the last time. Because when we meet in December and organize, it is going. If we have to find people trained as Republicans to be parliamentarians, that is not good enough. I want rule XVIII out the window, for anyone. Let us say Bob Dole wins and our pal Jack Kemp whom we love. I do not want to hamstring—that means tie their ankles together—I do not want to hamstring the minority, and I hope