

CAMPAIGN FINANCE AMENDMENT
TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask for up to 10 minutes to speak on the joint resolution under the control of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to my co-sponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I understand the majority leader is on his way to the floor. Apparently there is a unanimous-consent request. As soon as he gets here, I will be glad to yield to him at that time.

Mr. President, I support this constitutional amendment for campaign finance reform and for overturning Buckley versus Valeo because I am convinced that only if we have such a constitutional amendment will we be able to have meaningful campaign finance reform. And that is urgently needed.

Those who oppose the amendment do so on a claim that there would be an invasion of inviolate first amendment protections. I suggest those arguments are not well founded as a matter of constitutional law or constitutional history.

The first amendment of the U.S. Constitution has been limited where there are important reasons for doing so. Perhaps the most famous decision is by Oliver Wendell Holmes on what is called the "clear and present danger" which would warrant limiting freedom of speech. The famous example was given of crying "fire" in a crowded theater.

And, Mr. President, I suggest that there is a clear and present danger today to America's political system if we do not have effective campaign finance reform.

The "fighting words" exception to freedom of speech is well recognized in a distinguished opinion by Justice Murphy. If someone says to another a racial slur or religious slur, that person may punch the speaker in the nose and not be charged with assault and battery, so that freedom of speech is limited by fighting words.

You have the examples of obscenity and moral standards, especially with children. There are limits as to what may be spoken or what may be put into printed context on obscenity.

It is my view, and really a prevailing view in America today, that there is an urgent necessity for campaign finance reform. It simply cannot be done if you have the Supreme Court decisions standing in the way, because they say that an individual may spend as much of his or her money as he or she may choose as a matter of freedom of speech but others cannot do so. Others are limited to \$1,000.

I have cited a rather forceful example from my point of view of my own personal experience running in the primary in 1976 for the U.S. Senate when the 1974 law was in effect limiting expenditures for a candidate in the primary with the population size of Pennsylvania to \$35,000. And my opponent in that race—who later was one of my very best friends and closest colleagues in the U.S. Senate, Senator John Heinz—we were opposing each other in that Senate primary.

The Supreme Court of the United States held that an individual could spend millions, and Senator Heinz did that, spent more than \$3 million in that primary and general election. But at the same time, the Supreme Court upheld the limitation of \$1,000 on what my brother could spend. Where was Morton Specter's freedom of speech if he was limited by the campaign finance law to \$1,000?

What sense does it make to say that a candidate has more freedom of speech than some other contributor? But that is what the Buckley versus Valeo decision did.

Then you have this rule or exception on campaign expenditures which are independent. That has become a practical impossibility to define what is an independent expenditure.

You have the 1996 Presidential election. You have an enormous amount of soft money raised on both sides by Republicans as well as Democrats, but the Democrats did it with more finesse, more direction, and more success, when President Clinton used millions of dollars in soft money for advertising in 1995, which so set the stage to make it impossible or at least virtually impossible to regain that ground. In this situation you had President Clinton personally editing the commercials which went over. Yet, they were supposed to be somehow immune from the Federal election laws, notwithstanding the fact that when a candidate runs for President there is a pledge that there will be no funds used on expenditures in addition to what the Federal Government is providing.

We have myriad rules on soft money. We have rules that are really impossible to apply on what is issue advocacy, where you can spend money, as opposed to advocacy for a candidate. Those commercials not only go right to the line, they really cross the line, with no enforcement possible, with a commercial saying everything but "vote for candidate John Doe."

The realism is that in the absence of an opportunity for Congress to legislate in this field, without this constitutional inhibition, campaign finance reform may not be achieved.

Then you had the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1996 on the Colorado legal party where there are four opinions written and not one of the opinions commands the consent or concurrence of five Justices. So when you finish reading that opinion, it is absolutely

impossible to say what the law is on the important campaign issues taken up in that case. The Supreme Court Justices are frequent in their criticism of what we pass in the Congress where they cannot find a clear-cut statement on our legislation and then they look to legislative intent. Some of the Justices say they cannot find legislative intent or they do not recognize legislative intent.

Our statutes are a model of clarity, and the worst of the statutes ever passed by the Congress of the United States is a model of clarity compared to what you had in the Supreme Court decision in the Colorado case, where you cannot possibly figure out what the law is, because among four opinions no five Justices have agreed on any set rationale to give guidance as to what the law should be.

In conclusion, Mr. President, since the majority leader has arrived, it is my view, after studying the Constitution for more than 40 years, that the decision of Buckley versus Valeo simply is not good constitutional law to equate speech with campaign spending. It impedes, obstructs, and prevents Congress from legislating in this important field. That is why I urge this amendment be adopted.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, about the outcome of today's vote. I say as a matter for the future we ought to build a record, one day, so that we will overturn Buckley v. Valeo, and then have some sensible legislation in this very critical area.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—SENATE
JOINT RESOLUTION 22 AND SENATE JOINT
RESOLUTION 18

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the pendency of Senate Joint Resolution 22, no amendments or motions be in order other than a motion to table, and at the conclusion of the vote on passage of Senate Joint Resolution 18 at 2:45, approximately, today, there then be 90 minutes for remaining debate, to be equally divided between the two leaders or their designee, with an additional 10 minutes allocated to Senator SPECTER.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of debate time for Senate Joint Resolution 22 on Tuesday, the joint resolution be temporarily laid aside, and Senator LEAHY or his designee be recognized to offer a joint resolution relative to the independent counsel, and no amendments or motions will be in order, other than a motion to table, and that there then be 90 minutes of debate to be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and an additional 30 minutes under the control of Senator FEINGOLD, 20 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD, 30 minutes under the control of Senator LEVIN, 20 minutes under the control of Senator NICKLES, and 40 minutes under the control of Senator COATS.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion or yielding back of time today, the second joint resolution be laid aside.

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

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, this agreement would call for two rollcall votes on the independent counsel issue. However, the votes have not been ordered by consent yet. I hope to discuss further with the Democratic leader today exactly when that will occur so that we can schedule those two votes.

I should note that we have one Senator who had a death in the family. We want to make sure that he is able to be back here for that vote.

In light of this agreement, there will be no further votes after the 2:45 vote today. Members should be prepared to vote tomorrow around 10 o'clock on the independent counsel issue.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I listened with considerable interest to the observations of my friend from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, about the, as he put it, ill-advised Buckley decision.

Let me say, Mr. President, I think the Buckley decision was an outstanding decision. Obviously, the Supreme Court feels it was because they have had a number of opportunities in the last 20 years to revisit it, refine it, cut it back, restrict it, and in each instance they have expanded it further in the direction of more and more freedom to speak in the political process in this country.

The essence of the Buckley decision was in several passages that bear repeating as we move here toward the vote on this constitutional amendment to, in effect, overturn the Buckley case. The Court said with regard to spending limits, "The first amendment denies Government the power to determine that spending to promote one's political views is wasteful, excessive, or unwise. In a free society ordained by our Constitution, it is not the Government," said the Court, "not the Government, but the people individually as citizens and candidates, and collectively as associations and political committees who must retain control over the quantity and range of debate on public issues in a political campaign."

Now, Mr. President, that really sums it up here. Who will control the political discourse? The Court had that issue directly before it in the Buckley case,

and the Court said the Government is not going to control political speech in this country consistent with the first amendment.

Now, Senator HOLLINGS understands that, and he is offering this constitutional amendment to allow the Government to control political discourse for the first time in the history of our country. It leads you to ask the question: Who will feel more comfortable if we, the Congress, are in charge of regulating and controlling political speech in this country? Well, I do not think our citizens will feel more comfortable with that. That is clearly the end result of this debate, because this amendment says, in effect, the Buckley case will be overridden so that the amount of expenditures that may be made by, that is, by the campaigns, in support of the campaigns or in opposition to the campaigns shall be regulated by the Government.

All of us in here will have the last word on just how much speech is allowed, not only the quantity of it but the range of it.

Now, the Buckley case went on to say that a restriction on the amount of money a person or group can spend on political communication during a campaign necessarily, Mr. President, reduces the quantity of expression. So what we have after this amendment is the Government with the power to control how much we get to speak.

The Court said: "* * * reduces the quantity of expression by restricting the number of issues discussed, the depth of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached." That pretty well says it all. Under the Hollings amendment, the Government will be able to decide how much we get to speak, how big an audience we get to reach. In short, the Government would control political discourse in this country. The Court went on to say that "this is because"—referring to their opposition to spending restrictions—"virtually every means of communicating ideas in today's mass society requires expenditure of money." It is a fact, whether we like it or not, to the extent that the Government defines what your financial outlays can be, if you are a candidate or if you are a group in support of or in opposition to a candidate, the Government is saying, in effect, you only get so much speech, a rationing of speech. And we here in the Congress get to determine how much everybody talks.

I don't think it is much of a reach to suggest that we are going to want to shut down those who criticize us. We don't like these independent expenditures in particular. We certainly don't like what our opponents are saying about us. So what we would do in the aftermath of the Hollings amendment is shut those people up. We would probably—in terms of independent groups—shut them entirely up. In terms of our opponents, we would set the spending limit so low they would not have a chance and never will be able to get the

message across, because virtually every incumbent starts off ahead, and if the other fellow can't get resources, he is going to stay ahead.

The Court went on to say, in Buckley, "Even distribution of the humblest handbill costs money." Further, the Court stated, "The electorate's increasing dependence on television and radio for news and information makes these expensive modes of communication indispensable elements of effective political speech." Indispensable elements of effective political speech.

Now, the Buckley case was right on the mark. They understood what it takes to speak in today's modern American society. It is not a question of whether we like it or not. This is a fact. It is as certain as the Sun is going to come up tomorrow. It is as certain as the Sun is going to come up tomorrow. Without the resources to market the message in this society, your speech is quieted—under the Hollings amendment quieted by the Government, which will control your discourse.

The Court in the Buckley case further said, "There is nothing invidious, improper, or unhealthy in a campaign spending money to communicate." There is nothing unhealthy about that. Nothing is inherently unhealthy about that. With regard to the growth in campaign spending, which was anticipated in 1976 and certainly has occurred, the Court said, "The mere growth in the cost of Federal election campaigns in and of itself provides no basis for Government restrictions on the quantity of campaign spending."

In other words, the Court was saying a lot of speaking is not bad, and an effort to try to restrict the amount of speaking to some Government-prescribed formula is a clear violation of the first amendment, which is why we are now voting on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to give the Government the power to control political discourse in this country.

The Court also addressed the issue of the level playing field. We often hear that. Proponents of bills, for example, like McCain-Feingold, say they want to "level the playing field." This is what Buckley had to say about leveling the playing field. The Court said, "The concept that Government may restrict the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the first amendment." In other words, the notion that the Government is wise enough to level the playing field is abhorrent to the first amendment.

After all, if you think about it, it would be impossible to level the playing field. How is the playing field leveled if you only leveled the amount of money? I would say that in my State of Kentucky, in order to have a remotely level playing field, you would have to get 600,000 people to change their registration and two major newspapers to leave the State. Then you might have, in some ways, a level playing field.

Then, of course, what happens when your opponent is famous, maybe a well-known athlete or a war hero, or somebody who has a special place in the hearts of the American people? How is the playing field leveled then? The Government has prescribed how much you can speak in the campaign. Your opponent starts off 5 yards from scoring a touchdown, and you're way back on your own 20, and the Government says this is how much you get to communicate with the constituents. In what way is that a level playing field? In fact, the Court rejected out of hand the level playing field argument.

So the Buckley decision was a sound decision. The Supreme Court believes it is a sound decision. They have reinforced it time and time again over the last 20 years. This amendment basically has no constituency. Common Cause, the principal group supporting various kinds of campaign finance reform, opposes the Hollings amendment. The American Civil Liberties Union opposes the constitutional amendment. Even our dear colleague, Senator MCCAIN, who differs with me on this issue, opposes this amendment. This is an amendment without a constituency. The Washington Post, who is certainly interested in its version of campaign finance reform, opposes this amendment.

In short, Mr. President, regardless of how you may feel about which kind of campaign finance reform might be appropriate, amending the first amendment for the first time in 200 years to give the Government the power to control the political discourse in this country by individuals, groups, candidates, and parties is a substantial overreaching and a dangerous step in the wrong direction. I think it could probably be argued persuasively that this is the kind of speech that the Framers of our Constitution had most in mind when they were writing the first amendment. They were just beginning the process of having elections and dealing with the issue of campaigning. Certainly at the heart of what they had in mind when they talked about free speech was free political speech.

After this amendment, pornography and flag burning would have more protection under the first amendment than political discourse. Political discourse would be singled out among all the other kinds of expression that we are free to engage in in this country under the first amendment; political discourse would be singled out and handed over to Government control. Mr. President, this is clearly a step we should not take. I hope the amendment will be substantially defeated.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it is rather amusing to hear my distinguished colleague say that this particular initiative is "without a constituency." The constituency started 10 years ago with the Commission on

the Constitutional System. I have quoted a group of several hundred present and former legislators, executive branch officials, political party officials, professors, and civic leaders who are interested in analyzing and correcting the weaknesses that have developed under our political system since the Buckley case.

We have the support of 44 law professors, which I have inserted into the RECORD, as well as 24 State attorneys general. When I introduced this joint resolution in some 10 years ago, it was only relevant and pertaining to the Federal Government. The States came and begged and said, "Amend the Buckley ruling and include protection for us also." The cities came and said, "Amend it, please, and include the protection for the cities also."

Yet, my distinguished colleague says that he has the endorsement of the Washington Post and the ACLU. He had better not let many on his side of the aisle hear that or they will start changing their votes. I know that crowd over there. I can tell you, Mr. President, we need to examine the very authority that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky uses—the Buckley case—which he said was good. He said it was good 1976 it is good in 1997. He says it's good and that "we don't want, need the Hollings resolution." Incidentally, it is the Hollings-Specter. I don't know whether they are ashamed to have a Republican cosponsor it. They don't mind saying "McCain-Feingold," but they don't want to say "Hollings-Specter." But I do appreciate the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania joining in. I understand also that my colleague from Delaware, Senator ROTH, has asked for time. I was waiting to make sure he had a moment. But in any event, I admire their courage for joining me because apparently they have made this into a party position. When I lose my good friend, the Senator from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, who cosponsored this three times and now comes and says he is worried about the freedom of speech, I know the pressure is on. But, after saying Buckley is good, they then say vote against the Hollings initiative. They argue that my amendment would be the first time in 200 years we have limited the freedom of speech, whereby there is no question that this is exactly what the Buckley decision does. The Buckley decision limits the freedom of speech of those who wish to contribute in political campaigns. The Buckley decision limits to this very moment the freedom of speech of political action committees. He talks about this being the first time in 200 years, yet he has to acknowledge that their authority shows the spurious nature of their defense.

Mr. President, what we have is what the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH, said would gut the freedom-of-speech provision for the first time. Yet, we have already had it gutted in the Buckley decision. Thereupon, as the Chief

Justice said in his dissenting opinion, it is half a haircut. You can't deal with the contributions without dealing with the expenditures of those contributions—both sides of the same coin, as he expressed it.

So we have been at this now for 20 years. We have had over 240 votes in Congress on campaign finance reform. What we have finally come to is not the question of how but the question of whether or not we are going to really limit. Heretofore, for 20 years we have had Common Cause say that this measure is public financing. We have had McCain-Feingold say, if you will voluntarily limit yourself, you can get free time, free TV time, free mailing time, and everything. All of those initiatives were dealing with how to limit. But now, my good friend from Kentucky says really we should not limit it at all.

That is the vote. If you want to limit, this is the way to give the authority to the national Congress to limit it. If you do not want to limit it, then vote against it. If you want reform, if you want to really get on top of this problem, we don't tell you how to do it. But you have to have the authority within the people's national Congress to actually limit it. That is the resolution. A constitutional amendment which is just as significant—in fact, more important than—five of the last six amendments to the national Constitution dealing with elections. Adopt it, if you please, and in 18.5 months—the average of those five—I would dare say that with the constituency we have of the cities, the States, the interest, and the people, this would be ratified in the 1998 November election.

They have worked it pretty good in a partisan fashion to try to bring in the freedom of speech, by saying money is speech. But it can't be. But what we are talking about is paid speech, not free speech. You go down to the Washington Post, which he says endorses this, and ask them for a quarter page or half page, and see how much free speech you get out of that newspaper.

What we are talking about is the right to control the election. The war in the field of battle, as the distinguished Senator INOUE knows, is won by those who control air over the battlefield. Those who control the airwaves win political elections. There isn't any question about it. Money talks here. If we can't get on top of this monster, as Elizabeth Drew has said, we will never be able to save the process. We will never be able to save the democracy itself. Chief Justice Jackson said that the Constitution is not a suicide compact. We can move after 20 years to address this important problem facing our nation. We should move.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 31 Leg.]

YEAS—38

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

NAYS—61

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

NOT VOTING—1

Burns

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

I would just like to mention for the benefit of my colleagues this is the big-

gest vote against the Hollings amendment yet achieved in the Senate. The opponents of this amendment included all but 4 Republicans and 11 Democrats. So I think it was a very encouraging indication of growing support for protecting the first amendment.

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

I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGATIONS OF ILLEGAL FUNDRAISING

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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