

2460, a bill to curb deceptive and misleading games of chance mailings, to provide Federal agencies with additional investigative tools to police such mailings, to establish additional penalties for such mailings, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 95

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 95, A resolution designating August 16, 1997, as "National Airborne Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 257

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 257, A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that October 15, 1998, should be designated as "National Inhalant Abuse Awareness Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 276—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD REIMBURSE THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER FOR COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL'S INVESTIGATION OF HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH MS. MONICA LEWINSKY

Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 276

Whereas, on January 17, 1998, President Clinton testified in a sexual harassment lawsuit brought by Paula Jones and denied a sexual relationship with a former White House intern Monica Lewinsky;

Whereas, President Clinton's personal lawyer, David Kendall, stated on September 13, 1998 that the President "absolutely" sought to mislead Ms. Jones's lawyers in the January 17 deposition;

Whereas, during a January 26, 1998 White House news conference, President Clinton stated, "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Ms. Lewinsky";

Whereas, President Clinton invoked Executive Privilege in an effort to limit grand jury questioning of aides Bruce Lindsey, Sidney Blumenthal, Cheryl Mills, Nancy Herneich and Lanny Brewer;

Whereas, none of President Clinton's claims of Executive Privilege were ever supported by the courts;

Whereas, on May 22, a federal judge denied a previous motion by the President to prevent Secret Service agents from being compelled to testify before a grand jury;

Whereas, on July 7, 1998, a federal appeals court denied the President's appeal and ruled that Secret Service employees must tell the grand jury what they observed by guarding the President;

Whereas, on July 29, 1998, President Clinton agreed to testify from the White House in response to a subpoena issued by the Independent Counsel's office;

Whereas, on August 17, 1998, President Clinton testified before a grand jury and made an address to the nation admitting "an improper relationship" with Monica Lewinsky;

Whereas, the President has unnecessarily and improperly prolonged the investigation of Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr;

Whereas, the President knowingly provided inaccurate information in a sworn deposition

and in public statements about his relationship with Monica Lewinsky;

Whereas, the President invoked improper claims of Executive Privilege, attorney-client privilege and Secret Service privileges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that President Clinton has unnecessarily delayed the investigation of the Independent Counsel, and

(2) President Clinton should reimburse the American taxpayer for the costs associated with the Independent Counsel's investigation of his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, last Friday, Congress and the American people were finally able to read the 445-page report on the investigation of the independent counsel, Judge Kenneth Starr. It is now, of course, the constitutional duty of the House of Representatives to review that report and determine whether the articles of impeachment, censure, or whatever action, are indeed warranted against the President.

I rise today not to discuss that specific issue of impeachment or censure, but I rise today to discuss the issue of equity. For the last 7 months, due to the actions of the President—and I might add, the President alone—substantial costs have accumulated as a result of the President's intentional strategy. And that strategy is to delay and thwart the investigations of Judge Kenneth Starr.

Mr. President, I think it is the duty of this body to discuss and reflect on the cost that has been borne by the American public as a result of the calculated deception that has gone on for the last 7 months. Certainly, it has been evidenced by the report that it was a deception, a deception to cover up and delay. It is clear that after the President testified on January 17 in Paula Jones' sexual harassment lawsuit that the President began a calculated plan to mislead and basically deceive the independent counsel and the American public with his "legally accurate" testimony in the Jones case.

Indeed, when the President's attorney, David Kendall, was asked yesterday if the President was purposely attempting to mislead the attorneys for Paula Jones during his sworn deposition, he replied "absolutely."

Mr. President, it has been 7 months now, 7 months since President Clinton sought to prevent the independent counsel from determining the veracity of his statements. Despite the fact that the Clinton administration issued a statement in 1994 that the administration would not invoke executive privilege for any personal wrongdoings, the President withdrew and reasserted claims of executive privilege on five specific occasions. These claims were warrantless and served as nothing more than a delay tactic. In fact, not one of the claims of executive privilege was found by a court of law to be justified.

As a result of the President's plan for public deception—I hate to use that

word, but I can't put it in any other term—and certainly delay, the investigation of independent counsel Starr was unnecessarily prolonged for approximately 7 months, despite the fact that the President, in January of 1998, promised, promised, the Congress and the American public to cooperate fully with the investigation.

Lastly, the President refused six invitations to voluntarily testify before the independent counsel's grand jury. It was only when he was faced with the subpoena and the result of the DNA test and the reality that the tests would soon be completed that the President finally appeared before the grand jury.

Where are we? What does all this really mean? It means that for more than 7 months, President Clinton has pursued a strategy of deceiving the American people and the Congress and purposely delayed and impeded the independent counsel's investigation. The cost of the President's campaign of delay and deception totals nearly \$4.4 million.

I ask unanimous consent the letter from the Office of the Independent Counsel be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1998.

Mr. DAVID L. CLARK,
Director, Audit Oversight and Liaison, U.S.
General Accounting Office, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CLARK: This is in response to Senator Frank Murkowski's letter to you dated September 3, 1998, requesting certain costs incurred by this Office relating to the Monica Lewinsky investigation. In your meeting with personnel in our Office on September 4, 1998, we agreed to provide you with answers to the Senator's questions as accurately as possible. As we mentioned in that meeting, our financial accounting system does not categorize costs by case, or project. Therefore, we determined the cost by estimating the time spent on the Lewinsky investigation by all staff members. Further, the Lewinsky portion of certain general costs was allocated based on those estimates.

The enclosed spreadsheet displays a Summary of Expenses relating to the Lewinsky investigation. The expenses are categorized in the same manner as our Financial Statements shown in GAO's audit reports. Work on the Lewinsky investigation continues today and many members of our staff are still working on this matter. For purposes of this request, we chose to account for costs recorded through August 31, 1998. Subsequent costs have not yet been recorded. To include them here would decrease the accuracy of the costs we have computed. Should the Senator request costs after August 31, we will certainly update the enclosed Summary.

In response to question 1 of Senator Murkowski's letter: for the period January 15 through August 31, 1998, Lewinsky-related investigation costs for personnel compensation and benefits (including employees and detailees) are \$1,861,456. Contract Services (including consultants) costs are \$884,110. Most incumbent members of this Office have devoted more than 50% of their time to the Lewinsky matter. Many staff members over the past eight months, both old and new, have worked considerable overtime hours,

most of which were related to the Lewinsky investigation and many were for uncompensated attorney-hours.

Question 2 of the letter requests the cost of witnesses associated with the Lewinsky investigation. These costs amount to \$13,841, which is included in the Summary, under various categories.

Question 3 of the letter, Lewinsky-related travel costs, is shown in the Summary as \$949,895.

Should you or the Senator's office have any questions about the estimate, please call Paul Rosenzweig or me at 202-514-8688.

Sincerely,

JACKIE M. BENNETT, JR.,
Deputy Independent Counsel.

Attachment

SUMMARY OF EXPENSES RELATING TO MONICA LEWINSKY
[Jan. 15-Aug. 31, 1998]

Category of expense	Lewinsky related expenses
Personnel Compensation and Benefits	\$1,861,456
Travel Costs	949,895
Rent, Communications and Utilities	356,494
Contractual Services	884,110
Supplies and Services	82,653
Capital Equipment	186,021
Administrative Services	73,294
Total	4,393,923

Note: The expenses shown above do not include other costs allocated to this Office by the General Accounting Office (GAO). Certain administrative costs incurred by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AOUSC) are periodically charged to this Office. The amount of this charge for the period in question is not available (for the six-month period ending March 31, 1998, the amount was approximately \$121,700).

Additionally, payroll costs of FBI personnel assigned to this Office are paid by their agency, and therefore are not included in the above expenses.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That letter that has just been made part of the RECORD is highlighted here relative to the detailed expense associated with the Monica Lewinsky incident, expenses from January 15 to August 31, 1998, including categories of expenses relative to personal compensation, travel costs, contractual services, supplies, capital equipment, administrative services. The total is \$4.3 million, roughly \$4.4 million. That is the cost to the American taxpayer.

The question that I brought up earlier was one of equity. Equity demands the costs of the delays should be borne by the President and not the taxpayers of this country.

I ask that my colleagues support me in the resolution that I have submitted which would require the President to reimburse the American taxpayers for the expenses that resulted from the delays of the investigation, the delays that were initiated and caused directly by the President.

My colleagues should note that this resolution is not unprecedented. We, in Congress, have required Members under investigation by the Ethics Committee to reimburse the committee for the costs of the investigation. The same standard should apply in the case of the President of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 277—EX-
PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE
SENATE WITH RESPECT TO THE
IMPORTANCE OF DIPLOMATIC
RELATIONS WITH THE PACIFIC
ISLAND NATIONS

Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BYRD,

Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FORD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 277

Whereas the South Pacific region covers an immense area of the earth, approximately 3 times the size of the contiguous United States;

Whereas the United States seeks to maintain strong and enduring economic, political, and strategic ties with the Pacific island countries of the region, despite the reduced diplomatic presence of the United States in the region since World War II;

Whereas Pacific island nations wield control over vast tracts of the ocean, including seabed minerals, fishing rights, and other marine resources which will play a major role in the future of the global economy;

Whereas access to these valuable resources will be vital in maintaining the position of the United States as the leading world power in the new millennium;

Whereas Asian countries have already recognized the important role that these Pacific island nations will play in the future of the global economy, as evidenced by the Tokyo summit meeting in October 1997 with various Pacific island heads of state;

Whereas the Pacific has long been regarded as one of the "last frontiers", with an enormous wealth of uncultivated resources; and

Whereas direct United States participation in the human and natural resource development of the South Pacific region would promote beneficial ties with these Pacific island nations and increase the possibilities of access to the region's valuable resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is in the national interest of the United States to remain actively engaged in the South Pacific region as a means of supporting important United States commercial and strategic interests, and to encourage the consolidation of democratic values;

(2) a Pacific island summit, hosted by the President of the United States with the Pacific island heads of government, would be an excellent opportunity for the United States to foster and improve diplomatic relations with the Pacific island nations;

(3) through diplomacy and participation in the human and natural resource development of the Pacific region, the United States will increase the possibility of gaining access to valuable resources, thus strengthening the position of the United States as a world power economically and strategically in the new millennium; and

(4) the United States should fulfill its longstanding commitment to the democratization and economic prosperity of the Pacific island nations by promoting their earliest integration in the mainstream of bilateral, regional, and global commerce and trade.

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that today, along with Mr. AKAKA, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BYRD, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FORD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MURKOWSKI and Mr. SESSIONS to submit the Pacific Island Summit Resolution.

Since the end of World War II, the U.S. has lacked a strong diplomatic policy and presence in the Pacific Region. This has become more prevalent in recent years. Often characterized as a policy of "benign neglect," the current situation is insufficient to con-

tinue the role of the U.S. as the leading world power as we enter the new millennium.

The Pacific region covers an immense area of the Earth, approximately three times that of the contiguous United States. Increasing enforcement of treaties demarcating exclusive economic zones are revealing Pacific Island countries that wield control over vast tracts of the ocean, marine fisheries and undersea minerals; resources that will play a major role in the future of the global economy.

As natural resources around the world dwindle, access to the relatively untapped resources in this region of the world will become increasingly important. The U.S., as the leading world power, should seek to maintain strong ties to this region. By cultivating diplomatic relationships with these leaders today, we foster strong economic ties tomorrow.

In October 1997, then-Prime Minister Hashimoto held a summit meeting in Tokyo, Japan with various Pacific Island heads of state. Clearly, Japan is aware of the unlimited potential of this region, its valuable resources, and the importance of gaining access to them. It is economically and strategically important that we not stand idly by while other countries step into the vacuum created by the present U.S. policy.

This resolution, Mr. President, encompasses all of these ideas in expressing the sense of the United States Senate that a summit meeting between the President and leaders from the Pacific region would be an excellent opportunity for the U.S. to strengthen its position economically and strategically. These Pacific Islands in return will be provided the rare opportunity to share their interests, visions for the future, and concerns with the leader of the world's most powerful democracy. It is my sincere belief that this summit will rebuild a foundation neglected since the end of World War II and be the beginning of a mutually beneficial relationship between the U.S. and this great region.

Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives, which speaks to the importance of developing and maintaining close diplomatic and economic ties with the Pacific and that a Pacific Island Summit would aid the U.S. considerably in attaining this goal. It is my hope that this legislation will be considered and approved in both chambers expeditiously.●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPRO-
PRIATIONS ACT, 1999

BUMPERS (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3591

Mr. BUMPERS (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Ms. LANDRIEU) proposed