

I did a little research about demonstration projects. That is the subject of the McCain amendment. The first paragraph of the McCain amendment says:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a demonstration project shall be subject to any limitation on obligations established by law that applies to the Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

In essence, if a State wants a demonstration project and a Member of either body gets that on to the bill, then it counts toward their quota. I think it is very sensible because, historically, here is what has happened.

The surface transportation bill in 1987 was, Mr. President, the first time demonstration projects were authorized on that bill, approximately \$1 billion to \$2 billion. During ISTEA 1991, I was a member not only of the committee but a conferee. I was in about the second or third row, and I watched what took place. The demonstration projects flowed in the course of the bill being developed in the House and then in the conference. The result: The grand total was \$6 billion of demonstration projects.

When the Environment and Public Works Committee started work on this legislation, it was in my subcommittee which I chair, and with the distinguished ranking member, Mr. BAUCUS, the committee decided that we would not put in demonstration projects. That philosophical decision has carried through to this moment. In this bill, as amended, to the best of my knowledge, there are no demonstration projects, and we have achieved our goal so that we will go to conference with zero, with an allocation of the money to the several States, hopefully in the range of 91 percent return on that dollar paid by citizens of that State or visitors at the gas pump. That was a goal I charted in the subcommittee work. It had solid support in the subcommittee, we had solid support in the full committee, and I am proud to say we have achieved that equity in this bill.

If we begin to put in, in conference, the magnitude of demonstration projects approximating what was done in 1991, watch out; that 91 percent is going to disappear. Therefore, I think it is important that we will carry this bill through today without demonstration projects.

There is another reason. I went back and looked at the 1991 bill. About half of those projects under that legislation have never been completed to this date, 6 years later, and the reason is that a Member of the U.S. Congress, if he or she is successful in getting a demonstration project, gets \$2 million or \$3 million authorized, goes out with a press release, gains all the notoriety for bringing home something, and then what happens? The State, which has overall authority over what is really going to be built in that State, decides, one, it is not a priority item for the State and, two, they are not going to

put up the matching funds to develop the project. As a consequence, we now have, of the 1991 bill, half the funds languishing when they could have been spent elsewhere, perhaps within that State, or for other really high-priority projects. The result has been a large percentage of these funds have not been spent because they are not priority projects in that State.

Further, setting aside funds for these projects grossly distorts our objective to achieve equity and fairness in the distribution formulas. Historically, project funds are not calculated in each State's return in their contributions to the highway trust fund.

The amendment by Senator MCCAIN is an important statement for the Senate to take to the conference. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, since the vote is now set at 10:45, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

EXPANSION OF THE KEN STARR INVESTIGATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment on the calls for Mr. Ken Starr to end his investigation and to urge the public and the media to give Mr. Starr an opportunity to finish his work, to put the issue on the back burner, to accord the President the presumption of innocence, to accord the same presumption to Mr. Starr—put the matter on the back burner so that we can focus on the pressing problems of Iraq, the budget, the highway bill and the other important matters to come before the Government.

There has been much questioning of why Ken Starr has taken so long on the investigation of the Whitewater matter and how he has jurisdiction over the incident involving Ms. Monica Lewinsky. There has not been an explanation, to the best of my knowledge, as to the activities of Mr. Starr which have been expanded so substantially and the kind of delays which have necessarily been involved in the work of independent counsel, something that I understand, having been district attorney of Philadelphia and having run a number of grand jury investigations.

People wonder why Mr. Starr has moved from Whitewater to Ms. Lewinsky. The fact of the matter is that he has done so at the specific request of Attorney General Reno. We know how circumspect Attorney General Reno has been with the appointment of independent counsel. But he was asked to do so because matters came to light which suggested a connection with the way that Mr. Webster Hubble was offered employment outside of the District of Columbia, arranged by a certain individual with a

certain firm outside of Washington, DC, and then the same offer was made to Ms. Lewinsky. When these matters were called to the attention of Attorney General Reno, she asked Mr. Starr to expand his jurisdiction.

But that was not the first call for the expansion of Ken Starr's jurisdiction. He was appointed as independent counsel on August 5, 1994, to take over the investigation which had been conducted by independent counsel Robert Fiske which involved the Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan matter which resulted in the conviction of three individuals, including the former Governor of Arkansas, Governor Tucker, and all aspects, including the alleged multimillion dollar fraudulent bankruptcy engaged in, again, by former Governor Tucker and two other individuals.

Mr. Starr's jurisdiction was then expanded on May 22 of 1996 to investigate possible violations of Federal criminal law concerning the firing of White House Travel Office employees, a major investigation.

Then another expansion of Mr. Starr's jurisdiction occurred on June 21, 1996, when he was asked to take over the investigation relating to matters of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reports for background investigations being turned over to the White House between December 1993 and February 1994, another highly controversial and complex matter.

A third occasion was brought about where, again, Mr. Starr was asked to expand his jurisdiction on October 25, 1996, to determine whether White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum had violated Federal law before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

A fourth expansion of Mr. Starr's jurisdiction occurred on January 29 when he was asked to take a look at the issue as to whether Ms. Monica Lewinsky had suborned perjury, obstructed justice, intimidated witnesses or otherwise violated Federal law.

If you take a look at just one item on the agenda of what Mr. Starr has had, and that is the investigation of former Governor Jim Guy Tucker, that matter occurred on his jurisdiction on September 2, 1994, when the Department of Justice confirmed Mr. Starr's jurisdiction.

On June 7, 1995, the Little Rock grand jury returned a three-count indictment against Governor Tucker.

On September 5, 1995, the district court dismissed the indictment.

Then it was not until December 12, 1995, that Mr. Starr argued the matter before the eighth circuit asking that the indictment be reinstated and that the judge be removed.

On March 5, 1996, the Eighth Circuit reinstated the indictment and dismissed the judge.

Between March and October of 1996, Governor Tucker and two other defendants took appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, which were not denied until October 7, 1996.

On October 22, the case was assigned to another judge. The trial date was set on October 21 and an application for continuance was filed by Governor Tucker on October 31, and it was granted until March 17.

Because of the limitation of time, I ask unanimous consent that the full chronology be printed in the RECORD.

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

TUCKER I CHRONOLOGY

August 31, 1994—Judge Starr writes letter of referral to Attorney General Reno seeking confirmation of jurisdiction over the Tucker I investigation.

September 2, 1994—Acting Assistant Attorney General John C. Keeney writes Judge Starr confirming jurisdiction.

June 7, 1995—Little Rock grand jury returns a 3-count indictment against Governor Tucker.

September 5, 1995—District Judge Henry Woods dismisses the 30-count indictment on grounds of lack of jurisdiction.

December 12, 1995—Judge Starr argues before Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals seeking reversal of the dismissal and recusal of Judge Woods for bias.

March 15, 1996—Eighth Circuit panel unanimously reverses Judge Woods' dismissal, orders reinstatement of indictment, and removes Judge Woods from the case.

March–October 1996—Governor Tucker and the two co-defendants file petitions for rehearing (unsuccessfully) and then petitions for *certiorari* in the United States Supreme Court.

October 7, 1996—Supreme Court denies *certiorari*, and remands the case to the District Court in Little Rock for trial.

October 22, 1996—Case reassigned to Chief U.S. District Judge Stephen M. Reasoner.

October 24, 1996—Trial is set for December 2, 1996.

October 31, 1996—Governor Tucker files a Motion for Continuance of December 2, 1996 Trial on health grounds.

November 14, 1996—District Court enters order postponing Governor Tucker's trial and setting new trial date of March 17, 1997.

December 25, 1996—Governor Tucker gets liver transplant.

January 31, 1997—Governor Tucker files a second Motion for Continuance of trial.

February 11, 1997—District Court enters Order continuing trial date to September 22, 1997.

June 4, 1997—Governor Tucker files third Motion for Continuance of trial date.

July 22, 1997—District Court enters order granting Governor Tucker's further continuance, continuing trial date yet again.

August 15, 1997—Court denies Haley severance motion to grant Marks' continuance. Trial for all three defendants is set for March 9, 1998.

August 26, 1997—William Marks pleads guilty, signs cooperating agreement, begins cooperation with the United States.

November 6, 1997—Anticipating a *fourth* Motion for Continuance by Governor Tucker, OIC files a Motion to Retain or Advance Trial Date.

December 6, 1997—District Court enters Order setting firm trial date of February 23, 1998, and suggesting no further continuances will be granted.

February 20, 1998—Governor Tucker and co-defendant Haley plead guilty, sign cooperative agreements.

Mr. SPECTER. The long and short of this, Mr. President, is that from September 2, 1994, until February 20, 1998,

the case involving former Gov. Jim Guy Tucker was pending with a whole series of complex legal maneuvers, until on February 20 of this year, former Governor Tucker entered a guilty plea and signed cooperative agreements.

Without taking a look at the specifics, it is hard to see why Mr. Starr has taken so long. But this is just one item on the agenda, and the chronology shows why so much of the delay has occurred.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the chronology as to Ms. Susan McDougal be printed in the RECORD showing exhaustive applications from August 17, 1995, until March 9, 1998, involving the immunity grant and the refusal of that witness to testify.

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

SUSAN MCDUGAL CHRONOLOGY

August 17, 1995—A federal grand jury in Little Rock returns a 21-count indictment charging Susan McDougal, James McDougal and Governor Jim Guy Tucker with fraud-related charges.

March 4, 1996—The trial of Susan McDougal, James McDougal and Governor Tucker begins before U.S. District Judge George Howard, Jr.

May 28, 1996—The trial jury finds Susan McDougal guilty of three counts: (1) Mail Fraud; Aiding & Abetting Misapplication of SBIC Funds; (2) Aiding & Abetting False Entry in SBIC Records; (3) Aiding & Abetting False Statement on an SBIC Loan Application.

August 20, 1996—Judge Howard sentences Ms. McDougal to: 24 months BOP; \$5,000 fine, \$300,000 restitution, community service, and \$200 special assessment.

September 3, 1996—United States District Judge Susan Webber Wright, who handles Grand Jury matters in the district, enters an order granting Ms. McDougal immunity and ordering her to testify before the Grand Jury.

September 4, 1996—Ms. Dougal appears before a Federal Grand Jury in Little Rock, Arkansas, and refuses to testify.

September 6, 1996—Judge Wright orders Ms. McDougal held in contempt for her refusal to testify before a Grand Jury. Judge Wright orders Ms. McDougal to be detained until she agrees to testify or until eighteen months has passed.

September 9, 1996—By arrangement with Judge Wright, Ms. McDougal surrenders to the U.S. Marshal to begin her civil incarceration.

September 19, 1996—Judge Wright denies Ms. McDougal's Motion to Vacate Civil Contempt.

September 23, 1996—President Clinton interviewed on PBS-TV's "News Hour" by Jim Lehrer about possible pardon for Susan McDougal. (See page 8 of "News Hour" transcript)

October 3, 1996—Susan McDougal waives her right to oral argument in the matter of Judge Wright's contempt Order.

October 9, 1996—The United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (Bowman, Loken, and Hansen) affirms Judge Wright's contempt Order.

November 14, 1996—Judge Wright denies Ms. McDougal's second Motion to Vacate Civil Contempt.

February 14, 1997—OIC writes Counsel to the President Charles Ruff, requesting that

the President publicly urge Susan McDougal to testify before the grand jury in Little Rock. (See Chronology of Correspondence with White House on Susan McDougal's Refusal to Testify Before the Grand Jury)

June 30, 1997—Judge Wright denies Ms. McDougal's third Motion to Vacate Civil Contempt.

July 18, 1997—Judge Wright denies Ms. McDougal's motion for reconsideration of the Court's June 30, 1997 Order.

February 23, 1998—The United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (McMillian, Gibson, and Beam) affirms Ms. McDougal's May 28, 1996 conviction.

March 9, 1998—Ms. McDougal's confinement for civil contempt expires, and she begins serving the 24-month fraud sentence previously imposed by Judge Howard on August 20, 1996.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there have been frequent misunderstandings, as matters have been reported, one as recently as Senator LOTT's—our distinguished majority leader—comments over the weekend talk shows with his statement about Mr. Starr ending his investigation being taken entirely out of context, something that Senator LOTT has explained.

Several weeks ago, I made a comment that I thought Attorney General Reno erred in appointing Mr. Starr to the Lewinsky matter because the American public would not understand why he was on the President's personal affairs after having started on White-water. No criticism at all of Mr. Starr, but it was my view that Mr. Starr would become a lightning rod for the investigation, taking focus away from the real subjects of the investigations. My comments were interpreted to be critical of Mr. Starr, which they, in fact, were not.

I think it is true that Mr. Starr has not run a perfect investigation, and I commented publicly that it is not easy in the course of one of these complex matters, again relating to my own experience in operating grand juries as district attorney, when he brought before the grand jury certain witnesses on obstruction-of-justice charges, which seemed to me to be a misreading of the statute.

But one thing that must be remembered is that the Attorney General of the United States, Janet Reno, has full authority to remove Mr. Starr or to limit his activities if she chooses to do so. In fact, her superior, the President of the United States, has the authority to order the removal of Mr. Starr, not saying he would do so in the light of our experience with the "Saturday Night Massacre." But the Attorney General of the United States does supervise what is going on here and so does the three-judge court.

Taken in its entirety, there is ample justification for the length of time which has been taken, and that if anybody other than Mr. Starr had been asked to take over the investigation relating to Ms. Monica Lewinsky on January 29, 1998, it would be hard to understand how anybody less than 2 months after that fact would be calling for him to terminate his investigation.

So it is my hope that we will all take a deep breath, let Mr. Starr continue his investigation, put it on the back burner, take the pressure off the President, give him the presumption of innocence until the investigation is completed, and give Mr. Starr the similar presumption of propriety as to what he is doing so we can move forward to the very important business at hand in this country, including the ISTE A legislation.

I note the hour of 10:45 has come. And ISTE A is the pending business which will occupy the country, much to the benefit of the country, contrasted with the matters relating to Mr. Starr and the President on that pending investigation.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

THE BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, during a much earlier stage in my life, I was a police officer. It was a different time. Police officers were treated much differently then than now. One of the things I did not have to worry about was wearing any type of bulletproof vest or body armor. That is not the case today. Things are much different than when I was a police officer.

Now all law enforcement officers in the United States, sadly, must be concerned about being shot or in some way harmed as a result of their being a police officer. Because of that, Mr. President, I am very happy to commend this body for the passage of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act, which was passed last night by unanimous consent in this body. I commend Senators LEAHY, CAMPBELL and HATCH for working on this legislation with this Senator and others. We ask that this matter be acted on very quickly by the House and sent to the President as soon as possible.

This bipartisan legislation creates a \$25 million fund and a 50 percent matching grant program within the Department of Justice to help State and local law enforcement agencies purchase body armor and bulletproof vests. The State of Nevada will receive at least \$200,000 each year for this.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, more than 30 percent of the approximately 1,200 police officers who have been killed by firearms since 1980—30 percent, I repeat—would have had their lives saved if they had been wearing bulletproof vests or body armor of some kind.

The FBI estimates that the risk of fatality to officers while not wearing these body protectors is almost 14 times higher than those wearing such body protection. We hear all the time about police officers who do not have the same protection that criminals have. And that is the truth. It is a sad state of affairs when criminals many times are better protected on our streets than our law enforcement officials are.

We cannot allow the criminal element to have the upper hand. One thing we can do is what we are doing in this legislation to protect law enforcement officers all over the country, including the State of Nevada, who put their lives on the line every day to protect us—our property and our person.

Boulder City Police Officer David Mullin, who acts as the chief of police of Boulder City said:

These vests are real life savers. They not only help protect officers from attacks involving guns and knives, they have [even] saved many officers from major injuries or death in traffic accidents. Unfortunately, [he goes on to say] there is a real difficulty in meeting purchasing and replacement [costs of these instruments].

These body-protection elements will go a long way in helping law enforcement in Nevada. Bulletproof vests can cost \$1,000. They cost that much money. Nevada Highway Patrol Col. Michael E. Hood recently recounted a story about Maj. Dan Hammack, of the Nevada Highway Patrol. He stopped someone. The person immediately got out of the car—this is a routine traffic stop—and shot Major Hammack in the stomach. Had he been wearing this armor, he would not have been injured at all.

Unfortunately, the accounts of Chief David Mullin and Highway Patrol Col. Michael Hood are stories that are heard all over the country on a daily basis. The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act will ensure that all our law enforcement officials will have the ability to be equipped and protected for their jobs. I think this legislation should move as quickly as possible in the House so we can save the lives of police officers on a daily basis in this country.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I say to the Senator, I would very much like to be a cosponsor with the Senator. I find, Mr. President, in my work in the Senate that when Senator REID speaks, I listen. He has made a very valuable contribution to the highway bill as a member of our committee. I have followed this same subject for some time. I know that law enforcement across the land would be heartened by this initiative. It is long overdue, Senator.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Virginia, the law enforcement officials in Virginia have the same difficulty as the law enforcement officials in Nevada and the rest of the country. As we come home late at night, I see, along the parkway going to my home in Virginia, police officers have pulled somebody over. It is dark at night and they are out there alone. That is a frightening thing. Think of how that man or woman who has to do that feels in the dead of night, pulling over somebody, and they don't know for sure who is in the car. They know something is wrong or they wouldn't pull the car over.

What this legislation does is give them an even break. They have some

protection if this person, in their cowardly manner, gets out and shoots them. These body protectors will stop a bullet from killing them. It will still hurt, but it will stop the bullet from killing them.

I express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Virginia for his kind comments and his usually fine advocacy on behalf of the people of Virginia and this country.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator, and I ask unanimous consent I be made a cosponsor of the bill.

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

TRIBUTE TO MR. GEORGE T. SINGLEY, III

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the professional dedication, vision, and public service of Mr. George T. Singley, III. He is retiring after 33 years of military and civilian service in the Department of Defense, most recently, as Acting Director of Defense Research and Engineering [DDR&E]. A native of Delaware, and a long time Virginia resident, Mr. Singley is a nationally and internationally renowned technology leader. As both Deputy and Acting Director of Defense Research and Engineering, he has guided our nation's Science and Technology (S&T) defense effort for several years.

His extraordinary vision and strong leadership have dramatically enhanced the defense S&T program. This contribution significantly improved our efforts to field a force whose technological superiority remains unchallenged, now, and well into the next century. He has focused the defense S&T program on developing capabilities necessary to achieve the goals of future joint warfighting, as expressed in the Chairman's Joint Vision 2010.

Before coming to DDR&E, Mr. Singley served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Technology. He was responsible for the Army's entire S&T program. This program, spanning 21 laboratories and centers with approximately 10,000 scientists/engineers had an annual budget of \$1.4 billion. Mr. Singley also was the chief scientist to both the Secretary of the Army and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research, Development and Acquisition. As a Program Execution Officer in the Army, he led five helicopter program offices. He pioneered the Light Helicopter Experimental (LHX) program, better known as Comanche, which became the Army's first stealth helicopter program. A truly remarkable career.

Mr. Singley is Chairman of the Executive Board of the American Helicopter Society. He served as their President from May 1996 through April 1997. He is a past Vice President of the Army Aviation Association of America, and a member of the Association of the United States Army. His numerous awards include: