the inclusion by reference of the conference report language accompanying the vetoed Commerce, Justice, State bill, which proposed transfer of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to the Department of Interior.

Industry leaders, business managers, and local elected officials, have internalized the public's unquenchable desire for continued progress in environmental protection. That is a real revolution.

Now, we are halfway through the fiscal year for which this omnibus bill is providing funds. The uncertainty of funding has caused widespread havoc among local governments, businesses, and States. The stop and start approach harms good, solid planning and jeopardizes public and private sector jobs. It does not make any sense to do things this way.

Most Americans do not have the luxury of time necessary to fully monitor how things are being handled here. They don't know who to blame for the holdup of wastewater treatment grants or education loans. But, they are tired of the infighting and want it to end.

Americans want our laws fixed to relieve unnecessary burdens or gross inefficiency. But, they will not surrender what they know to be theirs—the right to clean air, clean water, and a safe environment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Lautenberg amendment to the Omnibus Appropriations Act. It gives the environment the high priority it deserves, by restoring some of the most serious cuts proposed in the pending bill.

We need to do all we can to see that the Nation's priceless environmental heritage is passed down from generation to generation. This amendment offers Republicans and Democrats alike a chance to give the environment the priority it deserves.

It restores needed funds for programs to improve the safety of our Nation's drinking water supplies, and helps protect our lakes, rivers, and coastal areas from harmful pollutants.

It maintains the Federal Government's commitment to provide needed assistance to communities struggling to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

It gives States and localities the support and flexibility they need to bring their water systems into the 21st century.

In particular, the amendment will restore $190 million for the Clean Water Act's State revolving fund, which offers a vital source of Federal assistance for wastewater projects across the Nation.

The cost of implementing clean water mandates has put an extraordinary burden on families and businesses in thousands of communities.

In Massachusetts, the cost of these mandates has resulted in water and sewer bills that exceed many of my constituents' property taxes. Low-income families have had their water shut off because they were unable to pay their soaring bills. Some families are now paying $1,600 a year for water and sewer service, and the rates will continue to rise through the end of the decade.

In the communities of Fall River and New Bedford, businesses that use water-intensive processes—particularly textile companies—are considering leaving the State, because the projected rate increases will put them at a competitive disadvantage. To add insult to injury, these communities are also plagued by double-digit unemployment, and have not yet recovered from the ongoing economic recession.

Congress has a responsibility to help ease the burden of their rising water and sewer rates by providing additional support for the State revolving fund.

The Lautenberg amendment also adds $75 million in clean water funds for the cleanup of Boston Harbor. This addition will bring Federal assistance back to the $100 million level of annual support recommended by President Clinton and President Bush as well, and provided each year by Congress over the past several years.

Over the course of the past decade, the cleanup of Boston Harbor has received strong bipartisan support. Democrats as well as Republicans have recognized the crushing financial burden on the 2.5 million ratepayers in the area to meet the $3.5 billion in federally mandated cleanup costs.

State funds have been essential as well in bringing relief to these ratepayers. In addition, the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, which oversees the cleanup of Boston Harbor, has successfully worked to reduce the costs of the project.

But continuing Federal assistance remains vitally important for this ongoing project, which still has several years to go before completion. The project has passed some important milestones already—it has reduced harmful metals dumped into the harbor from 3,000 pounds per day in 1984 to 500 pounds per day in 1993. It has reduced the number of harbor beach closings by 70 percent over the last 4 years. But much more remains to be done.

At the $100 million annual level, Federal assistance meets just 18 percent of the total Boston Harbor cleanup costs—far below the Federal share provided in the past for many other clean water projects throughout the United States.

Finally, the Lautenberg amendment will also restore $175 million to the State revolving fund under the Safe Drinking Water Act. This fund will, for the first time, provide Federal assistance to States and localities to improve their public water systems and ensure the safety of their drinking water supplies. Many communities urgently need this assistance to comply with Federal law and build new water treatment facilities, develop alternative water supplies, and consolidate small systems.

The creation of this revolving fund received the unanimous support of the Senate last November, by a vote of 99 to 0. The Lautenberg amendment will help make that commitment real and bring relief to cities and towns across America.

Communities across America will benefit from this amendment. This Congress should not go down in history as the anti-environment Congress. I urge the Senate to give this amendment the overwhelming bipartisan support it deserves.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND RELATED MATTERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 p.m. having arrived, there will now be 1 hour equally divided on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be equally divided between the sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, for the past 16 days our Democratic colleagues have used the Senate rules to block consideration of a resolution to provide additional funds, funds for the Whitewater special committee. That is simply wrong. The Senate has a duty to get the full facts about Whitewater.

The Democrats are filibustering, for 16 days now, to prevent the Senate from voting on whether or not to provide additional funds for the Whitewater Committee.

So that the record is clear, we must understand how much we are asking for. We are asking $600,000. In addition, I have agreed to allow us to have a vote to curtail the committee's investigation to 4 months. They have said they wanted to negotiate with us. We are willing to negotiate. We have heard nothing except what is almost contemptuous because it says we would have to conclude our public hearings by April 5. That is silly.

The majority is committed to getting all the facts about Whitewater. It is now clear that our Democratic colleagues simply are not.

Let me ask the question: If Whitewater is much to-do about nothing, as the White House claims, why are Democrats afraid of the hearings? Why are they afraid to let them go forward? What are they afraid of? What does the White House want to hide from the American people? You cannot say it is much to-do about nothing, and then oppose having the hearings.

Second, it is absolutely disingenuous, as some have claimed, that this has cost the American people $30 million. The fact is our committee has spent about $900,000, and a total of about $450,000 last year; so, that when they come up with this $30 million, in an attempt to ascribe it to the work of the committee, it is disingenuous and they are playing fast and loose with the facts.

There are a number of unanswered questions. Let me just pose some of them.

Who put the Rose Law Firm building records in the White House residence? How do you think they got there? How? Do you think the plumber brought them there? The carpenter who was making repairs? The men who were working to fix the air-conditioning? Do we really believe they brought it there? Do we think the butler brought them there? Or, rather, did these records—that were being worked on by Mr. Foster and contained his handwritten notes in the margins—come from Mr. Foster's office? Did they come there at the explicit directions of the First Lady to her chief of staff? We have had the testimony of a young man, Mr. Castleton, who says that he was told that he was bringing the records up because Mrs. Clinton wanted to look at them.

Indeed, if she did not look at them as she claimed, how did the records wind up there? If all the records were just simply shipped off to her lawyers, how do they get over there?

So we have a question as to how did these billing records mysteriously appear. Remember, those records were subpoenaed by the special prosecutor. How did they get into the White House residence? My colleague from North Carolina has said that one of the most secure rooms in the United States of America would be one of the rooms in the residence of the President and First Lady. Incredible.

Another question is, did the Clintons know that James McDougal was covering their Whitewater losses for them? He is presently under trial in Little Rock, AR. He ran a bank that was a criminal enterprise—we found that out—Madison Savings & Loan. Some of the bankers I have met recently said, ''Senator, please do not say it was a bank; it was a savings and loan.'' And, indeed, they lost over $60 million worth of taxpayers' money.

If one follows just some of what we have uncovered, one sees sham transactions, one after another, where insiders were asked to buy land and hold land for that bank, would be given 10 percent commissions for a land transaction in which it was a total sham, in the end costing the taxpayers—this S&L eventually collapsed and left the taxpayers with a $60 million bill to foot.

Did the Clintons take improper tax deductions on their Whitewater investment? It is a question. The committee is working on that and looking at that. Maybe, indeed, the White House does not want us to have those answers or hold public hearings. I guess if you took improper tax deductions, you might not want that to come out. Did Governor Clinton direct special favors to McDougal to keep Madison afloat? If the President—then Governor—did not do any of these things, fine, then let the record clear that question. It would seem to me if he did, maybe that is why we are hearing all of this puffery, smoke, and bellowing that this is politics having these questions answered.

Did the Governor help Dan Lasater, a convicted distributor of cocaine, get bond contracts with the State of Arkansas? Did he or did he not? I do not know. But again, the question is, if he did not, then fine, let us at least go through this and clear the record. Then, I would be the first to say that is absolutely an unsubstantiated allegation. Did Governor Clinton exchange favors for campaign contributions from officials of the Perry County bank? These officials, by the way, were just indicted last month. We did not just come out with these names. Did that happen or did it not? These are just some of the unanswered questions.

I think that we have an obligation to get the facts. Sixteen days of filibuster. Now, the New York Times said that a Democratic filibuster against a vote on additional funding would be ''silly stonewalling''. They said:

> No argument about politics on either side can outweigh the fact that the White House has yet to reveal the full facts about the land venture, about the Clintons' relationship to McDougal's banking activities, Hillary Rodham Clinton's work as a lawyer on Whitewater matters, and the mysterious movement of documents between the Rose Law Firm, various basements, and closets in the Executive mansion. The committee, politics notwithstanding—

This is the New York Times.

> has earned an indefinite extension, and a Democratic filibuster against it would be silly stonewalling.

That is not my statement. That is the New York Times, certainly not a spokesperson for the Republican Party or Republican philosophy.

Yesterday, the Washington Post said essentially the same thing. Let me quote what it said:

> Lawmakers and the public have a legitimate interest in getting answers to many questions that prompted the investigation in the first place and those that have been raised in the course of it by the conduct of many administration witnesses. If Democrats think that stonewalling or stalling will make Whitewater go away, they are badly mistaken. The probe is not over, whether they tried to call it off or not.

Again, that is the Washington Post.

So my colleagues on the other side may attempt to keep the investigation and the funding for it from going forth. Again, I have offered to curtail the committee's work to 4 months. I think we would be making a mistake in setting an arbitrary date certain, but in the interest of moving the process forward and of attempting to depoliticize it, I am willing to do so.

Let me suggest that there is a common theme to the number of lingering questions. As Pulitzer prize-winning author, James Stewart, states in his new book ''Blood Sport'':

> The question of whether specific laws were broken should not obscure the broader issues that make Whitewater an important story. How Bill and Hillary Clinton handled what was their single largest investment says much about their character and integrity. It shows how they reacted to power, both in their quest for it and their wielding of it. It shows their willingness to hold themselves to the same standard everyone else must, whether in meeting a bank's conditions for a loan, taking responsibility for their savings, investments and taxes, or cooperating with Federal investigators. Perhaps most important, it shows whether they have spoken the truth on subjects of legitimate concern to the American people.

Mr. Stewart is not some partisan author out to get the Clintons. He has a reputation for being fair and thorough. In fact, the Clintons, through their close associate, Susan Thomases, first asked Mr. Stewart to write this book. He even had direct access to Mrs. Clinton early on. Mr. Stewart has uncovered a number of important facts about Whitewater. He has identified new witnesses. In an excerpt published in Time magazine, Mr. Stewart raises serious questions about the Clintons' role in managing the Whitewater investment after 1986. Although the Clintons have always claimed to have been passive investors in Whitewater, Mr. Stewart found that Mrs. Clinton actively managed the Whitewater investments after 1986.

Mr. President, we will continue to seek a solution to this impasse. Yesterday—and I repeat it today—we offered to extend our hearings by 4 months. But I do not think that we can simply allow this kind of obstruction and stonewalling to keep us from attempting to get the facts.

Now, if those facts clear the Clintons and their associates, the American people have a right to know; they really do. The White House has the opportunity to help in insisting that we conduct these hearings expeditiously, yes, but in a manner that will get the truth out there, and if it vindicates them, then that should be the case. Now, if indeed they have no concern about their actions, then it would seem to me that the proper course of action would be to authorize the committee to do its work and get to the job of doing its work, and attempt to get those witnesses that we now do not have access to as soon as the case is over in Little Rock. Certainly, we would hope within the next 6 to 7 weeks it will be concluded. Maybe we will not be able to get some or any of those witnesses, but at least we will have made our good-faith effort in attempting to do so, and to do so in a way that does not impinge upon or impair the work of the special counsel.

So I believe that the facts are clear. I think the American people are entitled to get this information, and I

think what we are facing here is a politically orchestrated attempt to stop the committee from doing its work. That does not reflect well upon the Senate, the White House, or either of the political parties. The process is one that should be continued. It should be continued because otherwise the questions will remain: What are they hiding? Why are they afraid?

Again, while the resolution calls for no time limitation, let it be clear that this Senator will be happy to amend that to 4 months. We have not gotten any satisfactory reply with respect to our offer. It is an offer that I make here on the Senate floor again. There are limitations when you do that, as described by the former Senate majority leader, a Democrat, George Mitchell, when he said, ''When you set a time line, you then get people who look to work at that as a mark to delay the hearings, delay the release of information.'' Notwithstanding that, we would be willing to submit that as a timeframe in which to try to complete our work, the work of the committee.

Some people have said to me, ''What happens if it appears that the Democrats are going to continue to filibuster, Senator? What will you do?''

We will be forced to go forward with our work. It will be more difficult, and we have a busy agenda for the Banking Committee, but, nevertheless, we have to do the best we can; come in early; work as many hours as we can; deal with the various maneuvers that our Democratic colleagues will undoubtedly employ in attempting to keep the committee from doing its work. But a large share of the work that we are embarked upon could be undertaken by the Banking Committee. It would be difficult in terms of resources, but we will do it. It will certainly be, I think, very burdensome as it relates to some of the burdens that will be placed upon the staff of the Banking Committee, the time of the Banking Committee and its members.

I also point out that there are certain perils for those who may want to circumscribe and carefully proscribe the scope of the inquiry. As authorized pursuant to the Resolution 120 we have limited the scope of our inquiry. If we were to take this up with the Banking Committee, in many cases the scope would not be nearly as limited. I can assure my friends and colleagues, if that is the route they choose to take, then they will create a situation in which they have to understand that the scope will be broadened.

I say that because they should understand there will come a point in time when we would then have to fall back to the use of the Banking Committee as opposed to going forward with the special committee that has carefully proscribed a methodology for which we could proceed. I think we would be making a great mistake. I hope we can work out a compromise. Let the chips fall where they may; the offer is on the table, and I hope that we can settle this thing without a prolonged debate. Otherwise, we will be back here tomorrow, we will be back here the next day, and we will be back here next week. The question is, What are my friends at the White House afraid of?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized. He has 26 minutes 30 seconds remaining on his time, and the Senator from New York has 2 minutes 31 seconds on his time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota and then 6 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii.

Just before doing that, I want to put an editorial in the RECORD because sometimes we get caught up in the debate and we do not get them in. I listened to my colleague from New York cite editorials. This one is from Friday, March 8, just this past Friday, from Newsday, from the Nassau County edition of Newsday.

I ask unanimous consent that the full editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Newsday, Mar. 8, 1996]

ENOUGH WHITEWATER HEARINGS

The Senate Whitewater Committee ran out of time and money on Feb. 29, but it still wants more of both to embarrass President Bill Clinton. Senate Democrats have threatened a filibuster to keep Chairman Alfonse D'Amato (R-N.Y.) from getting $600,000 to continue an open-ended investigation that could stretch to Election Day and beyond.

The Democrats are right about this. In fact, their counteroffer to D'Amato—$185,000 to wrap up his inquiry in five weeks, at most—is too generous. After 41 days of public hearings and 121 witnesses, D'Amato has nothing of substance to show for the $950,000 the committee has already spent. It's time to hand off to Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth Starr and see how far he can carry the ball.

This is all the more so now that Starr's office is actually trying a case against Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton's former Whitewater partners. The defendants want the president to appear as a witness in that case, and he should. The only question is whether he should testify in person, on tape, via satellite or whatever. There's precedent for presidential trial testimony on tape, and that should be good enough this time.

But no more money for Senate hearings. The Senate Watergate Committee, pursuing impeachable offenses by the Nixon administration, called only 37 witnesses. The joint committees on the Reagan administration's illegal arms deals with Iran and the Nicaraguan contras heard a mere 28. The Senate has had enough time for a partisan probe of decade-old Arkansas savings-and-loan deals. If the independent counsel leaves any loose ends, there'll be time to crank it up again.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I will quote from it just very quickly in part.

The Senate Whitewater Committee ran out of time and money on February 29, but it still wants to embarrass President Bill Clinton. Senate Democrats threatened to filibuster to keep Chairman Alfonse D'Amato from getting $600,000 to continue an open-ended investigation that could stretch to election day and beyond. The Democrats are right about this. In fact, their counteroffer to Chairman D'Amato of $185,000 to wrap up his inquiry in five weeks, at most—is too generous. After 41 days of public hearings and 121 witnesses, Chairman D'Amato has nothing of substance to show for the $950,000 the committee has already spent. It is time to hand off to Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth Starr and see how far he can carry the ball.

Then later on in the editorial they say in the closing paragraph:

But no more money for Senate hearings. The Senate Watergate Committee, pursuing impeachable offenses by the Nixon administration, called only 37 witnesses. The joint committees on the Reagan administration's illegal arms deals with Iran and the Nicaragua contras heard a mere 28. The Senate has had enough time for a partisan probe of decade-old Arkansas savings and loan deals.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, sometimes I walk into the Chamber of the Senate and I think that I have stumbled into the wrong Chamber. I hear the debate, and I think that is not what is being discussed. In the debate a few minutes ago it was said that the Democrats are stonewalling on Whitewater. I guess I do not understand. I must have missed something. We commissioned a Whitewater inquiry last May—May of last year. We provided nearly $1 million for a special investigative effort in the Congress last year.

Now we are saying we are willing to provide additional resources, and you ought to wrap this up in the next 5 weeks—5 weeks. And somehow we are stonewalling on Whitewater? I mean, it is plenty cold in Montana and North Dakota these days, and the heat bills are plenty high. I was thinking maybe if we took some of this hot air out there, it would heat the two States for the entire winter. Stonewalling on Whitewater? What on Earth are people talking about?

This is a manifestation of Parkinson's law. If you study Parkinson's law, one of his laws was that the amount of time needed to do a job always expands to the amount of time available to do the job. This is the manifestation of Parkinson's law. This inquiry, after spending $26 million on the independent counsel and still counting—this inquiry which is the political inquiry—now they want to extend to election 1996.

Some of us say maybe you ought to get up early in the morning now. Maybe you ought to go 5 days a week now. Maybe you ought to get the witnesses in now for the next 5 weeks and finish this investigation. As for me, it does not matter with respect to these records. Get a rental truck, back it up to the White House, get a vacuum cleaner, find a bunch of people that can read, and read all the records. As far as I am concerned, whatever the truth is let the truth come out. But do you need from last May until the election

day of 1996 to demonstrate what this issue is? I think not. That is not what the issue is here. There is a right way to do things and a wrong way to do things.

We have said, in the next 5 weeks finish this investigation. Do your work. And what we are told by the other side is we are stonewalling. What a bunch of nonsense. While we are doing this, we are saying this is the most important thing for the Congress to do. Do you know what we are not doing? We are not having hearings on the issue of health care and Medicare and what we ought to do to solve that problem. Nobody is having hearings on the issue of jobs. Why are we losing jobs in this country? Why are jobs moving out of our country? Why does our Tax Code contain this insidious incentive that pays corporations to shut their plants in this country and move them overseas, and why does not somebody in this Congress do something about that? Nobody is holding hearings about what our monetary policy to doing to this country. Why cannot we have more than a 2.5-percent economic growth? What about the Fed and the Fed's policies? Nobody is talking about hearings on a whole range of issues dealing with the things that are central to people's lives.

This is the number of hearings. There were 41 days of hearings since last May on Whitewater, 12 days on crime, 3 days on education, no hearings on the economy and jobs, and no hearings on Medicare and health care. The question is, What is the priority?

I want to get to the bottom of Whitewater. We have had 100 FBI agents and independent counsel that spent $23 million, and we have had a special inquiry in Congress since last May. Now we have people telling us we want to go for another 4 or 5 months. You know that some of us serve here because we are interested in doing the people's business, part of which deals with the issue of jobs, health care, the economy, education, and a whole range of things. Get every record you want. Get every record you can. Study it forever. But I do not think we ought to have an unlimited amount of money given by the taxpayers for an unlimited inquiry to take us to election day 1996. Let us finish this in the next 5 weeks. Let us decide to do this and do it right; finish the testimony, finish the report, report back to the Senate, and then let us get on with the other business that confronts the American people.

We have enormous challenges. We have budget challenges. We have deficits. We have jobs, health care, and education. I have recited plenty of them to do. But the interesting thing is that no one seems very interested in focusing on those challenges. My constituents are interested. They are very interested in the question about what makes our education system work better. How do we advance the interest of our kids to have the best education system in the world? What do we do about jobs that are leaving the country? What kind of policies can we put in place to deal with that? That is what my constituents are interested in.

I am not suggesting that you have no business in the Whitewater inquiry. I voted for the funding last May for $1 million, and I will vote for additional funding. My objection is to what I think is kind of a thinly disguised approach by some to say we want unlimited time here; we want to work 2 or 3 days a week; we want to sort of move along leisurely. If you were hauling mail, you would go out and hire horses, I guess, and create some sort of ''Pony Express'' these days. That is the speed with which we see this inquiry moving.

All we are saying is let us get this job done. We have said we will provide appropriations for 5 weeks' additional inquiry, write a report, and let us finish it. There has been no other inquiry in the history of Congress that I am aware of that accepts this as a precedent. Nothing comes close to what you are suggesting and what has been done here. The Senator from Maryland has made that point over and over again. Yet we have people stand with indignation and say, ''You all are stonewalling.'' What a bunch of nonsense.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on May 17 of last year, this Senate voted 96 to 3 to create a special committee to investigate the so-called Whitewater affair. This bipartisan vote established the special committee with its primary purpose to get all the facts on Whitewater to the American people.

This bipartisan Senate vote imposed a February 29, 1996, deadline for the committee to complete its work to ensure that the facts were presented to the American people in a balanced and timely manner and before the country entered the politically charged atmosphere of a Presidential campaign.

Yet, as I listen intently to the ongoing debate, much of the bipartisan spirit which this body exhibited on May 17 no longer exists. Regretfully and sadly, it appears that the Republican majority has now chosen to forego bipartisanship in an effort to indefinitely extend the special committee's mandate, at a cost of $600,000, and prolong the investigation into the 1996 Presidential campaign.

This Republican extension request is unprecedented, and it is unreasonable. The U.S. Senate has never before conducted an open-ended political investigation of a sitting American President during a Presidential election year.

During the course of this debate, reference has been made to the 1987 Iran-Contra hearings. The committee was able to complete its investigation in a 10-month period within the deadline set by the Congress. The Iran-Contra affair was an international event that had major consequences beyond our shores. It involved the constitutional relationship between the executive and legislative branches in the shaping of foreign policy. It involved the credibility of our foreign policy. It involved our relations with other countries and it involved the actions of our intelligence service and some of our Nation's most closely held secrets.

Because of the profound issues in question, we in Congress were compelled to investigate the episode, and for precisely the same reason we were compelled to ensure that the Iran-Contra investigation was conducted in an atmosphere free of partisanship and theatrics. I strongly believed then, as I do now, that the Nation would be ill-served by a congressional panel wantonly weakening a President for presumed political benefit.

The Iran-Contra Committee was obligated to investigate the conduct of the highest Government officers, and we were determined to let the facts lead us to where they willed. But we did not perform this task in a way that suggested to our adversaries that we were a nation divided. I believed we avoided this impression because of the lessons learned during the Watergate investigation.

The Senate committee that investigated Watergate, on which I served, had the same mandate as do today's select committees: to seek the facts about the event in question and propose legislation to prevent a repetition.

The structure of the Watergate Committee encouraged partisanship. There were majority and minority lawyers, majority and minority investigators, majority and minority secretaries and clerks. Even the committee's budget was divided into Democratic and Republican portions.

After the conclusion of the investigation, the committee's minority counsel and now our very distinguished colleague, Senator FRED THOMPSON, wrote that loyalty to the Republican minority was ''one all-important criterion'' for hiring his staff. ''We are going to try our best to have a bipartisan investigation, but if it comes down to the question of us and them, I don't want to worry about who is us and who is them.''

Mr. President, my one condition for assuming the role of chairman of the Senate Iran Committee was that there would be no majority and no minority staffs but a unified staff whose members reported to the committee as a whole and not to Democrats or Republicans. Our chief counsel, Mr. Arthur Liman, regarded all members of the committee as his clients, and, under his direction, our staff members worked side by side unconcerned whether their neighbor was one of us or one of them.

The structure of the staff would have been meaningless if the members of the

committee were determined to make the Iran-Contra investigation a partisan matter. This did not happen.

Our colleague, former Senator Warren Rudman of New Hampshire and vice chair of this Senate Iran-Contra Committee, was empowered to make decisions in my absence. We collaborated on everything, and we divided the responsibility for witnesses among all members of the committee so the hearings became a collective matter. At no time during our closed committee meetings did any member raise political issues or hint at a Democratic attempt to smear the President or a Republican scheme to cover things up.

In comparison, nearly 17 months had elapsed from the date the Senate created the Watergate Committee until the committee report was published. The Watergate hearing itself dragged on for more than 8 months. The Iran-Contra Committee worked hard to accomplish its work within a 10-month period, hearings included. Yes, there were requests by Democrats and Republicans that we seek an indefinite time limit on the hearings, but the chairman of the House committee, Representative HAMILTON, and I, in conjunction with our vice chairs, strongly recommended against an open-ended investigation. We sought to ensure that our investigation was completed in a timely fashion to preserve the committee's bipartisanship and to avoid any exploitation of President Reagan during an election year.

The Special Committee on Whitewater has had 41 days of hearings, five public meetings, and now has made an unprecedented and unreasonable request to indefinitely extend the special committee's mandate. It will be a $600,000 tab, and I suppose it will prolong the investigation into the Presidential campaign with a possibility of politically damaging and embarrassing the incumbent President.

Mr. President, the Democrats are committed to ensuring that the American people know the facts on Whitewater but that it be done in the same bipartisan fashion as the Iran-Contra hearings, and not for the exploitation or for the embarrassment of the sitting President.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, while the distinguished Senator from Hawaii is still in the Chamber, I commend him for his statement and underscore—underscore—the responsible manner in which he dealt with the Iran-Contra issue.

At the time, there were Members of the Congress, a Democratically controlled Congress, who wanted to extend those hearings well into 1988, a Presidential election year, for political purposes. And that was obvious. The Republican leader of the Senate, Senator DOLE, strongly urged there be a time limit on the work of the committee. He was fiercely opposed to the notion of an open-ended extension and was very clear in making that point in debate on the floor and off the floor in comments to the media.

Senator INOUYE, who chaired the special committee in the Senate, and Congressman HAMILTON, rejected this proposal by some Democrats to prolong the hearing into the election year and therefore exploit, for political purposes, President Reagan's difficulties, and they settled on a reasonable time period. In fact, they moved it up in response to the representation made to them by Senator DOLE.

It was Senator DOLE at the time who pressed very hard that there should be a reasonable time limit, that it should stay out of the election year. In fact, Senator DOLE, on the floor, said: ''I am heartened by what I understand to be the strong commitment of both the chairman and vice chairman to avoid fishing expeditions. I am pleased to note that, as a result of a series of discussions which have involved myself, the majority leader, and the chairman and vice chairman designate of the committee, we have changed the date on which the committee's authorization will expire.'' And they moved it forward.

Senator INOUYE took the lead in achieving that constructive and responsible result. I simply want to underscore it and contrast it with the situation we are now facing, where we have a proposal, now, for an unlimited time period, an additional $600,000.

I yield myself 1 more minute.

Furthermore, in order to complete its work, the Iran-Contra Committee, on which I was privileged to serve, under the very distinguished chairmanship of the Senator from Hawaii, held 21 days of hearings in the last 23 days, in late July and August, in order to complete its hearings. Contrast that with the work of this committee, which held 1 day of hearings in the last 2 weeks of its existence in the latter part of February; which held only 8 days of hearings in the entire month of February, whereas the Iran-Contra Committee held 21 days of hearings in order to wind the thing up.

The minority leader has made, I think, a very reasonable proposal in terms of providing some additional time to finish this matter up. The committee should intensify its schedule and complete it on time, and it ought to follow the example set by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii when he chaired the Iran-Contra Committee and worked assiduously to keep partisanship and politics out of the inquiry and to keep the inquiry out of the election year.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 10 minutes remaining. The Senator from Maryland has 8 minutes, 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I find all of this debate about Iran-Contra very interesting. I was not here for it, and so I enjoy being brought up to date on past history. It is interesting, but it is irrelevant to the issue before us because the issue before us is: Are there still things yet to find out about Whitewater which need to be found out? This has nothing whatever to do with whether or not the Iran-Contra Committee was able to find out what it needed to find out from Ollie North in the timeframe that it set for itself. This has nothing to do with the timeframe of the Whitewater Committee, which is trying to find out information that has been denied it by a series of circumstances, some of which I believe are deliberate.

I make that statement, recognizing that it, perhaps, is emotionally charged for some. I try to stay away from emotionally charged statements on this issue because I realize how easily this can get out of hand. But I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of those who have been called before the committee to withhold information from the committee and to see to it that the committee does not receive that which it needs. I know of no such charges that have been made in past investigations, and, even if they were, frankly, they are irrelevant to this issue.

This issue is very simple, again, Mr. President. It is simply this: What is there yet to find? What will it take us to find it? It has nothing to do with any past investigation of any other circumstance. It has to do with this investigation of this set of circumstances. What is there yet to find, and what will it take us to find it?

The editorials that have been quoted here—I have quoted them, the New York Times, the Washington Post, others. The most recent one I will return to again, as my distinguished chairman has. But it makes this point, relating to the question of, ''Can the committee not wind its affairs up?'' This is what the Washington Post has said. I repeat it again:

> . . . here is part of the problem; The McDougals and Governor Tucker are currently unavailable for Washington testimony as they are defending themselves against a 21-count indictment handed up last August alleging fraud and conspiracy on their part. It came courtesy of independent counsel Kenneth Starr and a federal grand jury in Little Rock. Judge Hale, whose earlier guilty plea slims down considerably his chances of ever returning to the bench, is similarly occupied in Arkansas and unavailable to be heard by anyone in Washington. He is the prosecution's key witness against the governor and the McDougals. Their trial, which just got started, is one reason the Whitewater committee hearings have been dragged out.

I will repeat that, Mr. President. ''Their trial is one reason the

Whitewater Committee hearings have been dragged out.''

It is not a conspiracy on the part of the Republicans. It is not an attempt on the part of the Republican National Committee to delay this into an election year. There is a trial going on, over which the Republicans on the committee have no control, that is preventing these witnesses from coming before us. This is why we are asking for a time that will allow us to deal with those witnesses when they become available. We do not know when this trial will be over. If we knew with certainty when the trial would be over and when these witnesses would be available, I, for one, would be willing to set a date, appropriately far off into the future, that would allow us time to deal with these witnesses. We do not know. We cannot know. And, therefore, it does not make sense for us to set a firm date.

Back to the editorial, quoting:

> The other reason is the protracted battle with the White House over subpoenaed documents and the very slow and uncertain way certain important documents finally are produced.

In other words, the delay in the eyes of the Washington Post has not been because the committee wants to drag it out for political reasons; it has been because the White House has been unresponsive.

I am a member of this committee. I have been to as many of the proceedings as I possibly could, given the schedule and the other challenges that apply. I thought I knew this controversy fairly well. I have now picked up the recent copy of Time magazine and read the first installment of a book that was written, initially at the recommendation of Susan Thomases, one of the President and First Lady's closest friends and confidants, in an attempt to make sure the whole story got out.

She went to the author and said, ''Will you write a good book on this?''

The author spent an hour and a half in the White House with Mrs. Clinton, and she said, ''I will cooperate with you, and I will see to it that everybody connected with me will cooperate with you. We want the truth to come out.''

Now, we have the book that was created by that genesis and I can only describe it as devastating. It is devastating to those who say, ''There is no there there.'' It is devastating to those who say the Republicans are on a partisan activity, because nothing significant really happened.

As I say, I am a member of this committee. I thought I knew this issue fairly well, until I read this week's issue of Time magazine and found out there is a whole lot more that I did not know about, and I have been a member of the committee attending these sessions.

So, Mr. President, I conclude by saying there is plenty more yet to find out, and I am sorry if it did not come out in the same timeframe as other investigations have had. But that is entirely beside the point.

The point is, I repeat again, what is there yet to find out and what will it take for us to find it? The answer to that question dictates that we proceed in the fashion that the distinguished chairman, Mr. D'AMATO, has asked us to proceed.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the time.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 42 seconds remaining on his side of the aisle.

Mr. BENNETT. I apologize to the Senator. I thought I had more time than that. I yield all 42 seconds to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, as we have just heard, Time magazine has released excerpts from a new book, ''Blood Sport,'' which is one of the most revealing and down-to-Earth accounts of Whitewater we have had. It certainly is easier to follow than anything we have seen, doing the best we could with the Whitewater hearings: Coming in a day, skip days, a day out. It has been very difficult for the average citizen to follow what we have been doing and what we have been trying to pursue.

This book chronologically identifies exactly what went on and what happened. I think, again, it points to the very great need for us to continue the hearings, and the public will see the need, once they read the book and read the excerpt that was in Time magazine.

It shows the Clintons to be much more active partners in Whitewater than any of us believed at one time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. All time has expired on the chairman's side of the aisle.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we provide 4 additional minutes to be equally divided, so that we each have 2 minutes.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Four additional minutes for each side.

Mr. D'AMATO. I asked for 4 minutes, 2 minutes for each side.

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

The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, it shows the Clintons were much more actively involved than we had any idea; that the McDougals put far more money into the project than did the Clintons; and that they clearly used money from the savings and loan to supplement the Whitewater venture. I think we need to and should pursue it.

Further, there is a new revelation of how Mrs. Clinton received legal business from Madison. She told the public that a young associate, Mr. Massey, brought the business to the law firm. Then Mr. Massey appeared before us and said he did not bring any business to the law firm. So then she said it was Vince Foster who brought it. She changed her mind. McDougal said that Bill Clinton urged him to give business to Hillary Clinton because the Clintons needed the money.

The book reveals that there was a clear witness to that, Susan McDougal's brother, and I think we need him to testify as soon as possible.

Many people might say, ''So what, 20 years ago, why is it relevant today?'' There are a number of reasons. First, the White House is engaged in a massive coverup of the entire episode, an inept coverup, but at least an attempt to cover up.

We now know what the First Lady truly meant when she told Maggie Williams she did not want 20 years of her life in Arkansas probed by the Senate. We now know why. But it is a true indication of the way they ran things in Arkansas, and they clearly have demonstrated they are going to run them the same way in Washington. They sure tried to run them the same way. Old habits die hard, and we have seen the same characteristics that we know of in Arkansas come about in Washington.

I hope we can end the filibuster and let the Senate vote and then let the American people decide if Whitewater hearings are worth pursuing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 10 minutes, 30 seconds.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to be very clear with respect to the reasonableness of the issue that is before us. When Senate Resolution 120 was adopted, it was adopted and encompassed within it certain premises, all of which are now being departed from or violated by the proposal offered by the Senator from New York.

The first premise was that there would be a fixed deadline in the proposal that would seek to keep the inquiry out of the election year. That was the February 29 date, and it was agreed to.

We had overwhelming bipartisan support for the resolution that was adopted last year for this inquiry. Regrettably, the majority has now gone down a different track and made impossible, up to this juncture, a further bipartisan concord with respect to this matter.

Senate Resolution 120 was consistent with Senate precedents. The proposal that is now before us is a complete departure from Senate precedents. The proposal last year for a fixed-ending

date reflected the very argument that Senator DOLE made in 1987 with respect to Iran-Contra, where some Democrats wanted to extend it into the election year and he said that would not be a fair and reasonable thing to do. Senator INOUYE and others accepted that proposition, and they put on a deadline. It is very important that that be understood. The proposal before us departs from that essential premise.

Second, this committee had only 1 day of hearings in the last 2 weeks of its existence in the latter part of February. In Iran-Contra, we held 21 days of hearings in the last 23 days in order to complete the work. The distinguished minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, wrote to Senator DOLE in mid-January saying the committee should intensify its work through the balance of January and through February in order to complete on schedule. The committee did not do that.

Third, this resolution premises that there will be consultation between the majority and the minority. In fact, we had such consultation in the formulation of Senate Resolution 120, and when it was brought to the floor, it had been worked out on the basis of discussions between the majority and the minority. That has not taken place in this instance. In fact, Senator DASCHLE's letter to Senator DOLE remained unanswered for a month period. I know Senator DOLE was distracted with other matters, but nevertheless, we are still left with the problem with which we are confronted.

Finally, I want to underscore that the Office of Independent Counsel will continue its inquiry. It was an essential premise of the original resolution that we would not come in behind the independent counsel and, in fact, Chairman D'AMATO and I wrote to Mr. Starr at the beginning of October to make that very point. It was strongly argued that extending it out would turn it political.

Now it is becoming political; we simply have to recognize that. There are editorials around the country that are beginning to say that—here is one from Greensboro:

> A legitimate probe is becoming a partisan sledgehammer. The Senate Whitewater hearings, led since last July by Senator D'Amato, have served their purpose. It's time to wrap this thing up before the election season.

One from a Sacramento paper:

> Senator D'Amato, the chairman of the Senate Whitewater Committee and chairman of Senator Bob Dole's Presidential campaign in New York, wants to extend his hearings indefinitely or at least, one presumes, until after the November election. In this case, the Democrats have the best of the argument by a country mile. With every passing day, the hearings have looked more like a fishing expedition in the Dead Sea.

The minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, has made a very reasonable proposal.

The proposal for an indefinite extension, or this 4 months, which amounts to the same thing, is not reasonable. It is not consistent with the premises on which we got an overwhelming bipartisan consensus to pass the initial inquiry resolution.

I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the distinguished ranking member of the committee has said it so well and ably. I applaud him for making the case once more prior to the time we are called upon to cast our vote this afternoon. There is very little one can add to what he has said so well.

This is an unprecedented request. Everyone needs to be fully appreciative of the nature of what it is we are called upon to vote on here—an unprecedented request, an open-ended, unlimited request to continue this investigation forever if the majority chooses to do so—forever. There is no deadline, none whatsoever.

So, Mr. President, we have looked back to try to find some other occasion when a committee has sought that kind of authority to say, ''We don't know whether we're going to take a week, a month, 2 months, the rest of the session. We may even need to go into the next Congress. Who knows? What we do know is that we're not going to give you any specific timeframe within which we realistically think we can finish this investigation.''

So what does that tell you, Mr. President? What it tells me is that they want to keep open the option to take this right up until the very last day of this Presidential campaign. We are unwilling to accept that. We have indicated, in as clear a way as we possibly can, that we want to find a way to resolve this once and for all. We want a way to find a resolution in the amount of time and the amount of money to be dedicated to this investigation, even though now we anticipate more than $32 million in total, within the Congress and within the special investigation that is ongoing, has already been dedicated to this.

If we need to spend another $100,000, another $130,000, $140,000, we will do that. Our amendment suggests $185,000. Our amendment suggests that the investigation go on at least through April 3, and then gives the opportunity to write a report through May 10.

If we had used every day we had available to us, if the committee had taken the opportunity that they had available to them in using Mondays and Fridays and days throughout the week for which they chose not to have any hearings, we would not have to extend it. But for whatever reason, the committee chose not to meet on a lot of Mondays, they chose not to meet on virtually every Friday. There were a lot of days during the week, for whatever reason, they chose not to meet.

So it was not that we did not have the time. We simply did not use the time very wisely. And the majority, if they could do it over again, I am sure, would use that time more wisely. But now, to say that is the reason we want to carry this thing out forever is just unacceptable.

Mr. President, the second point I emphasize is that we have made a good-faith offer. That offer stands, although I will say that the clock is ticking. We are simply not going to extend this thing out over and over farther and farther just because we are not able to resolve this difference today. The clock is ticking. The calendar pages are turning. The offer that we have been given is unacceptable. The counteroffer, this notion that somehow we now could go 4 or 5 months longer, is also unacceptable. We do not want to make this a convention issue. We do not want to make it a Presidential campaign issue. We want to get the facts. We want to resolve these matters. We want to resolve this issue once and for all.

We can do that in a time certain. We can do that in a bipartisan way. We can do that working together to make the best use of the time, whatever additional time is requested. We can do all of that. But we have to resolve this matter. The standoff that we are in today is unacceptable. We do not like it. We know the majority does not like it. So let us sit down and try to find a way to resolve it. But let us recognize an unlimited request or any request that takes us into political conventions and the campaign season for 1996 is unacceptable, too.

So, Mr. President, reluctantly, I urge my colleagues once more to vote against this cloture motion. I believe that we will continue to be able to defeat the cloture motion for whatever length of time this unreasonable request is, the one before us. We can resolve it this afternoon. It is time we do so.

It is time we get on with the real business of the Senate. I hope we can do it sooner rather than later. I yield the floor and yield the remainder of our time.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. Res. 227 regarding the Whitewater extension.

Alfonse D'Amato, Trent Lott, C.S. Bond, Fred Thompson, Slade Gorton, Don Nickles, Paul Coverdell, Spencer Abraham, Chuck Grassley, Conrad Burns, Rod Grams, Richard G. Lugar, Mike

DeWine, Mark Hatfield, Orrin G. Hatch, and Thad Cochran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on Senate Resolution 227 shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under rule XXII. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 29 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—47

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	Wyden
Feingold	Levin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 53, the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3479

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Will the Chair explain to the Senate what the order before the Senate is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] is recognized to move to table the Hutchison amendment.

Mr. REID. I so move to table, and 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 agreeing to the motion to table the Hutchison amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 30 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Graham	Moynihan
Baucus	Gregg	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nunn
Bingaman	Heflin	Pell
Boxer	Hollings	Pryor
Bradley	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Jeffords	Robb
Bumpers	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerrey	Roth
Chafee	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
DeWine	Lautenberg	Specter
Dodd	Leahy	Thompson
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	
Glenn	Moseley-Braun	

NAYS—51

Abraham	Dorgan	Lott
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Lugar
Bennett	Ford	Mack
Bond	Frist	McCain
Breaux	Gorton	McConnell
Brown	Gramm	Murkowski
Burns	Grams	Nickles
Campbell	Grassley	Pressler
Coats	Hatch	Santorum
Cochran	Hatfield	Shelby
Cohen	Helms	Simpson
Conrad	Hutchison	Smith
Coverdell	Inhofe	Snowe
Craig	Johnston	Stevens
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Thomas
Dole	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Domenici	Kyl	Warner

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3479) was rejected.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Hutchison amendment.

The amendment (No. 3479) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3478

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Reid amendment, as amended.

The amendment (No. 3478), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NOS. 3480 AND 3481

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier today the majority leader sent to the desk two amendments relating to Bosnia on behalf of myself and him. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN and Senator BURNS be added as cosponsors to both amendments.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the first amendment regarding Bosnia, conditions the obligation of funds in this supplemental upon a certification that all foreign fighters, including Iranians are out of Bosnia, in compliance with the Dayton Accords.

Let me describe each amendment, turning first to foreign troops.

Article III of annex 1A is absolutely clear—Let me read it into the RECORD. This is part of the Dayton Accords. It says:

> All forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina as of the date this Annex enters into force which are not of local origin, whether or not they are legally and militarily subordinated to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina or the Republic of Srpska, shall be withdrawn together with their equipment from the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina within 30 days.

Just to make abundantly clear so that there was no misunderstanding of just what we meant by this provision, the annex spells out who was affected by this requirement. The accord explicitly states:

> In particular, all foreign forces, including individual advisors, freedom fighters, trainers, volunteers, and personnel from neighboring and other states, shall be withdrawn from the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In a December hearing before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Assistant Secretary Holbrooke reiterated the ''high importance'' the administration attached to full compliance with this provision.

Let me cite his testimony:

> It is imperative that the commitment made to have these elements removed be honored. They have said publicly they will do so . . . President Clinton raised this directly with President Izetbegovic in Paris.

During questioning he noted that Iranian and other freedom fighters were concentrated in the sector where United States troops are operating, ''so we are going to be watching this extremely carefully.''

When I asked Secretary Holbrooke what happens if they choose not to go, his answer was absolutely unequivocal:

> Choose not go go? This is the Bosnian government's home turf. This is the core of the Federation position. It is not their choice. If the government of Bosnia-Herzegovina says they will go, then either they go or the Bosnian government was not sincere in what it said. They must get them out and we will know if they are out or not . . . President Izetbegovic has publicly committed himself, not only to the public and the press, but to the President.

The deadline for the withdrawal has now come and gone. January 19 passed with Iranian's terrorist forces still operating in the American patrolled sector.

Secretary Christopher acknowledged the administration's ongoing concern about this issue during an appearance on the McNeil-Lehrer Show on January 23. At that time, he said:

> We will not go forward with the equipment and training unless they are in compliance with the agreement. They'll not have a right to the reconstruction fund unless they are in compliance with the agreement.

At the time, I was reassured that the administration shared the view many of us have here in Congress—Iranian troops represented a direct threat to American soldiers and to American long-term interests in stability.