

foreign aid to Jordan. Jordan was giving aid and comfort to Saddam Hussein at a time of international crisis and war—a war which was authorized on this floor in debate that I very well remember back on January 10, 11, and 12, 1991—where notice had been given by the U.N. resolution that a war would be started on January 15.

So, speaking for myself on the Appropriations Subcommittee—and we make the first cut on aid, and that usually stands up with what the Appropriations Subcommittee does—I have grave reservations about aid to Jordan, and certainly about increasing aid to Jordan. And now to find the sequence of events in Jordan as to what has happened, and it follows in sequence, King Hussein's statement, I think that we have to be very reflective as to what aid and what American dollars we are going to give to Jordan.

One of the press reports contains a notation that a woman identified as the mother of the individual who fired the shots said that her son is mentally ill. Now, I don't know whether that is true or not, but I do know that if there is an indication of that, it requires an investigation and a determination by Jordanian officials, and perhaps by an international group, as to why you have somebody identified as being mentally ill in a situation to acquire the firepower which led to this tragedy. Those are all questions, Mr. President, that I think need to be answered.

When we look at the appropriations process, a commitment has been made by the United States to give some \$500 million to Palestinian authorities. Senator SHELBY and I offered a resolution which requires as a precondition to that funding that the Palestinians do two specific things: No. 1, change their charter which calls for the destruction of Israel and exercise efforts to stop terrorists. And I think, Mr. President, there is good reason to believe that the Palestinians have not fulfilled those requirements. What the Palestinians did was have a convention and say that everything in their charter inconsistent with the declarations of September 13, 1993—when Chairman Arafat was honored at the White House—would be null and void. But that is a long way from picking up the charter and specifically rejecting provisions of the charter which call for the destruction of Israel. This is something which Senator SHELBY and I discussed with Chairman Arafat in January 1996. This is something that Senator Brown and I discussed with Chairman Arafat in Gaza in August 1995. And this is something which a group of Senators, including this Senator, discussed with Chairman Arafat downstairs in the Capitol last week.

When these matters are called to Chairman Arafat's attention, he brushes them aside. He pooh-poohs them. He says, "Well, we have already done all that needs to be done." And the reality is that they have not done what the Specter-Shelby amendment calls for.

When it comes to the issue of fighting terrorism, I think again there has been insufficient action. There are terrorists who have been identified by Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian authorities who have not been turned over to Israel. I personally took a list of those which I had obtained and verified. I discussed them with Chairman Arafat. He had one excuse after another why that was not done. There are weapons in Palestinian-controlled territory which are supposed to have been identified and turned over. And that has not been done.

The President has certified that there has been sufficient compliance with the Specter-Shelby amendment. The President can make a certification. There is nothing that the U.S. Senate can do about that short of the appropriations process. But these are issues which I intend to bring to the subcommittee when we take a look at the moneys we appropriate this year.

The President has great authority, but he cannot appropriate money. He can veto appropriations bills, but he cannot appropriate money. That has to come from the Congress. That has to come from the House and from the Senate. When it comes to the funding for Jordan, or when it comes to the funding for the Palestinians, and we see them holding this meeting this weekend, the President may think that is fine. If he thinks that is fine, he can send a U.S. representative. But if the appropriators disagree with him, if the Congress disagrees with him, we don't have to appropriate money. That has to be taken into account by the President when he sets U.S. foreign policy.

So I make those comments. It is really very, very sad what has gone on, for the bloodshed of these seven girls and for the bloodshed which previously has occurred. I believe that we need some sober leadership to defuse the situation and to understand that there are very, very difficult problems facing the parties there. When Prime Minister Netanyahu takes steps that he has to withdraw a certain percentage from the West Bank, and he does so after a closely contested vote in the Israeli Parliament and the Israeli Cabinet, that is about as far as he can go. When those actions are rejected by Chairman Arafat, and Chairman Arafat gets aid and comfort from the President who criticizes what Israel did and from King Hussein who criticizes what Israel did, then I suggest that those matters really have to be worked out by the parties, and not by long-distance advice from the United States, or even short-distance advice from Jordan. But we had better tone down the rhetoric.

We had President Mubarak this week in Washington. He met downstairs in the Foreign Relations room. President Mubarak gave some good advice to those of us who were listening. It is worth repeating. President Mubarak said that the rhetoric ought to be toned down about Jerusalem. You have declarations by the Palestinians that

Jerusalem is the inviolate capital of the Palestinians and that the Palestinians are going to assert and succeed in that. And you have rhetoric at a high level by the Israelis saying that Jerusalem will be undivided and will not be a matter for Palestinian influence.

What President Mubarak was saying is, let's stop the rhetoric. Let's stop the declarations which incite people in the area. Let's tone down that rhetoric. And I think that is very good advice, indeed.

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGATIONS OF ILLEGAL FUNDRAISING

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I see my colleague, Senator DORGAN, on the floor waiting to speak. So I shall not take too long in commenting on the resolution calling for independent counsel, Senate Joint Resolution 22. But I came here to speak on this subject, and I think the time is past for independent counsel.

Independent counsel should be appointed where there is credible evidence that there had been criminal violations. You don't have to prove the case. Credible evidence is really a statement of prima facie which takes the case from the grand jury and on a fair evaluation as to what has occurred and what has been made public. It is my legal judgment, having some experience in the field, having been district attorney for Philadelphia for 8 years, and having served on the Judiciary Committee for many years, that we have long since passed that point.

It is not a partisan issue. It is not just Republican Senators who are saying that. The same call has come on the other side of the aisle from Democrats. You have ranking officials who have been involved in fundraising in religious institutions which raise violations of Federal law in a fairly clear-cut manner. You have, again, ranking officials who have engaged in campaign practices. Dick Morris was cited by the President himself as having identified the commercials. We know the President is bound not to accept additional money when there is Federal financing, which there was. And millions of dollars were raised, again, on both sides. Those moneys were used to further the President's campaign in 1995.

There is an issue about advocacy as opposed to the candidates themselves. But that line, I think, has been crossed. Certainly, there is credible evidence which warrants an investigation.

The day before yesterday the Judiciary Committee dealt with a resolution on this subject. Yesterday, a letter was circulated, which I signed, which was sent to the Attorney General requiring an answer within 30 days. She does not have to agree with the letter which was sent, but she does have to respond.

Mr. President, we know what has been in the public media. We know that an investigation has been conducted by the Public Integrity Section and by the FBI. The question is raised as to what that investigation has disclosed, which is known to the Attorney General. I believe we ought to have an answer from the Attorney General based upon what has been presented to her from the public record, and an inquiry as to what she knows from the confidential record that she is privy to.

When the grand jury investigates, those matters are secret. When the FBI investigates, those matters are not made available to the Judiciary Committee. But we have presented a substantial body of material, and I believe we are entitled to an answer not only as to that, but a certification, in effect, from the Attorney General as to what she may know beyond what is in the public record, because that investigation has been going on for a long time, and she is privy to what has occurred with the investigation of the FBI and with the investigation of the grand jury. I think we are entitled to a response on that basis. But there is sufficient material on the record.

It is my hope that we will not have a filibuster on this resolution but we will be able to take it to a vote. As Senator DODD said at some length about the filibuster against the McCain-Feingold bill, I broke party ranks, as did a number of Republicans, in voting for cloture on that matter. I am not satisfied with the McCain-Feingold bill, which I have not cosponsored. But I do believe the matter ought to come to the floor and that we ought to offer amendments. We ought to see if a majority of the U.S. Senate is willing to pass campaign finance reform.

Similarly, on this resolution calling for independent counsel, I think we ought to have a determination up or down as to whether a majority of Senators agree with the letter which we sent over to the Attorney General calling for independent counsel.

I thank the Chair for sitting on this Friday afternoon when most of our colleagues have left town, and I will soon be returning to Pennsylvania.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes as if in morning business.

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

CRIME IN AMERICA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there are a good many issues that come to the floor of the Senate that cause debate between Republicans and Democrats. Some are partisan, some cause great rancor, but there is one issue that ought not ever be a partisan debate. That is the issue of crime and how we in our country address it.

I come to the floor today to speak about legislation I will formally introduce on Monday on behalf of myself and a Republican colleague, Senator CRAIG, from Idaho. We have joined together to offer a piece of legislation that we introduced in the last Congress. I think this bill makes a great deal of sense, and I hope the Congress will consider it favorably in this session. As a way of describing the legislation, I want to address why I think legislation in this area is necessary to deal with the issue of crime.

There are a lot of things in this country we can point to that suggest our country is headed in the right direction. Our economy is growing. Some would like it to grow faster, but it is growing. We are not in a recession. You can point to some pretty good things in our education system. Not many people are getting on airplanes and leaving our country to go to college somewhere else. If you want to go to a world class university, largely you would want to be in the United States to do that. If you want to get good health care, you do not get on an airplane to go elsewhere. The best health care available in the world is available in most cases in this country. After doubling our use of energy in the last 20 years, America has cleaner air and cleaner water than we had 20 years ago.

So you can point to a number of things in this country that give cause for great optimism. But in the area of crime, I at least, and I think a lot of my colleagues and the American people, have a nagging feeling about the lack of safety and security in our country, that something we are doing is not working, that we seem to be on the wrong path. I know that some people point to crime statistics and say violent crime has declined. But when violent crime spikes way up and then drops marginally, violent crime is far too high in this country.

Here is a crime clock. One major criminal offense occurs every 2 seconds in our country, one violent crime every 18 seconds, one murder in America every 24 minutes, one forcible rape every 5 minutes in our country, one robbery every 54 seconds, one aggravated assault every 29 seconds. You cannot as a citizen of this country review what is happening on our streets and in our neighborhoods and believe we are on the right track with respect to crime.

This morning I read a piece in the Washington Post that described some of the concerns I have expressed before in this Chamber. It says, "Inmates' Early Freedom Rankles Many in Florida."

This article says: "Frank O'Neal got the news that his brother's murderer was being given an early release from prison when his son read it in the Tuesday edition of the local newspaper. All around the State of Florida, O'Neal's experience was repeated as corrections officials unexpectedly granted early release to 300 murderers, rapists, robbers, and other violent inmates."

Florida required prison officials to grant inmates 20 days off for good behavior, 20 days off for every 30 days that they served without regard to their crimes on the outside or their behavior on the inside. As a result, 200 additional inmates will be released next Monday, and 2,700 prisoners will eventually be set free early under this approach.

The fellow that Mr. O'Neal heard about yesterday was a man named Garcia. He stabbed William O'Neal, the brother of Frank O'Neal, 36 times. William O'Neal was a grocery store manager—stabbed 36 times before this fellow then stole a TV set and VCR and left him dead. Now, Garcia has been granted early release.

I have talked about early release previously. Some of the things I have talked about have convinced me that the system itself is a system which just does not work.

A couple of weeks ago there was a District of Columbia police officer who was murdered in Prince Georges County, MD. His name was Oliver Wendell Smith, Jr. He was shot three times in the back of the head outside of his apartment. His wallet, pistol, and badge were stolen.

All three men now charged with this murder have long criminal records. One of them was free on bond on drugs and weapons charges and another was on pretrial release for burglary and assaulting another police officer. I have their records in this paper given to me by the police department at my request. These are people who should not have been on the streets to murder a policeman. These are people who should have been in prison. We knew who they were, but our country said go ahead to the streets. In Florida, 2,700 criminals will go to the streets.

I talked last year about the Jonathan Hall case. A man named James "Buck" Murray was sentenced to life imprisonment without parole for the murder of Jonathan Hall. Jonathan Hall was a 13-year-old boy from this area who was stabbed about 58 times and then left for dead in an icy pond. But when they found his body, he had grass and dirt between his fingers because he obviously had not immediately died from all those stab wounds. He, laying in that icy pond, had tried to pull himself out of the pond but died before he could.

Now, let me tell you about the guy who murdered him. James "Buck" Murray, in 1970, was sent to 20 years in prison for slashing the throat of a cab driver, stealing a cab and leaving the driver for dead. While in a Virginia