

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rochester M. Johnson (CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUL-1997 14:54:53.00

SUBJECT: transcript attached

TO: Charles W. Burson (CN=Charles W. Burson/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

WPC
R jJ_hqxq
4a}_?)sACHFa.t{<"Z:l,S&]C <"U<
#-T^cRB\6'/Rl3 y2vv '&(W/u@v)A'm9(eP%
=Etv}IUx5U<2T\$O9L"4r6y"C26-v%kXiX9:z'6VJb~f([C!\$m>.aUb\$u 7=S_%sewTC}'kCwEuD~6<R
A/utglo;|--)\=t~pt
O}@y"^>Vy".dUhX5@/qtU:%RU@X0[n0@w@4UNU:UN n U:
UN.UN|<6X9'("Courier 10cpiX)L Z(CG Times Regular(32\$
! #|xx<6X9'("Courier 10cpiXx6X@8;X@(\$

' (# eXXeTHEPAGINATIONOFTHISDOCUMENTISUNOFFICIAL JULY15,1997SENATEGOVERNMENT
TALAFFAIRSCOMMITTEEHEARINGTRANSCRIPTWITNESSES:UTOMO(pp.247),HAMPSON(pp.4768),AR
THUR(pp.68103)#e
[##Xb3Xe<#
^E_['aEbcEduUvL"99P9

' (# eXX
eTHEPAGINATIONOFTHISDOCUMENTISUNOFFICIAL JULY15,1997SENATEGOVERNMENT
NTALAFFAIRSCOMMITTEEHEARINGTRANSCRIPTWITNESSES:UTOMO(pp.247),HAMPSON(pp.4768),A
RTHUR(pp.68103)#e
[##Xb3Xe<# (hH
Z6Times New Roman Regular<6X9'("Courier 10cpi
(hH
Z6Times New Roman Regular

|
' (# eXXeTHEPAGINATIONOFTHISDOCUMENTISUNOFFICIAL JULY15,1997SENATEGOVERNMENT
TALAFFAIRSCOMMITTEEHEARINGTRANSCRIPTWITNESSES:ARTHUR,HAMPSON,UTOMO#e
[##Xb3Xe<#
<6X9'("Courier 10cpi(hH
Z6Times New Roman Regular(hH
Z6Times New Roman Regul

ar

! 7b3XXdd7X\XXXXX\dv vv vddd uutJulianaUtomo(pp.247)t t] ` [t^]T]^t\_ \_`Thom
asHampson(pp.4768) (HaroldArthur(p`tc`p`ct`p.`ta`l`atb68103)b_ _
tSENATEGOVERNMENTALAFFAIRSSPECIALINVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE HOLDSDAYFOUROFHEARIN
GS

ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE JULY 15, 1997 SPEAKERS: U.S. SENATOR FRED THOMPSON (R-TN), CHAIRMAN U.S. SENATORS SUSAN M. COLLINS (R-ME) U.S. SENATORS SAM BROWNBACK (R-KS) U.S. SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI (R-NM) U.S. SENATOR THAD COCHRAN (R-MS) U.S. SENATOR DONNICKLES (R-OK) U.S. SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER (R-PA) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. SMITH (R-NH) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT BENNETT (R-UT) U.S. SENATOR JOHN GLENN (D-OH), RANKING U.S. SENATOR CARL LEVIN (D-MI) U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN (D-CT) U.S. SENATOR DANIEL K. AKAKA (D-HI) U.S. SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN (D-IL) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT G. TORRICELLI (D-NJ) U.S. SENATOR MAX CLELAND (D-GA) MICHAEL MADIGAN, CHIEF MAJORITY COUNSEL ALAN BARON, CHIEF MINORITY COUNSEL JULIANA UTOMO, HIP HING HOLDING SEEMPLOYEE, INC
CONSULTANT THOMAS HAMPSON, SUMMARY WITNESS ON LIPPO GROUP HAROLD ARTHUR, FORMER LIPPO EXECUTIVE JAMES A. ALEXANDER, FORMER LIPPO EXECUTIVE GARY CHRISTOPHERSON, FORMER WHITE HOUSE OFFICIAL PAUL BUSKIRK, COMMERCE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL PAUL AGREENE, FORMER EMPLOYEE, STEVENS, INC

THOMPSON: The meeting will come to order, please. The Senate Governmental Affairs Committee continues its investigation today into illegal and improper activities associated with the 1996 federal election campaigns. Last week, the committee heard testimony that Lippo executives and Lippo consultants and others sought to convince the Democratic National Committee to hire Mr. Huang as a fundraiser. Certain people were concerned about Mr. Huang's activities--putting the president in small dinner situations with foreign nationals who could not contribute, although they were supposed to be fundraising activities--and other matters that caused Mr. Sullivan and apparently some others to be concerned at the DNC. Then it turned out Mr. Huang facilitated the raising of hundreds of thousands of dollars in illegal contributions that have been shown by the committee's investigation to be of foreign origin. Today, we'll hear from some of the few people who worked at Lippo who have remained in the United States. We'll look at Mr. John Huang's activities when he worked at Lippo, including whether he engaged in illegal money laundering there. I think the significance there is that, apparently, both Mr. Huang and Lippo were perfectly willing and adept at putting illegal money into the United States. We'll also examine Lippo's relationship to the People's Republic of China. Then we'll consider Mr. Huang's activities while he was employed at the Commerce Department. We'll consider the nature of the information that he had access to. Some of this information can be disclosed in public session, but some of it will have to be disclosed in executive session of this committee. Then we will examine what communications he had during that time and what possibilities there were for the dissemination of that information. Last Friday following the completion of the appearance of the committee's witness, former DNC finance director Richard Sullivan, the DNC produced documents to the committee that had been copied to Mr. Sullivan, a memorandum--a series of memorandums--to Mr. Fowler from David Mercer (ph), who worked for Mr. Sullivan. (#- The documents--they were relevant to Mr. Sullivan's examination and were produced the day after Mr. Sullivan concluded his examination. These--we're going to make these documents a part of the record and follow up on them. They basically set forth pretty clear evidence that a foreign citizen--I think through his wife--offered to make a large contribution, \$100,000, to the DNC in return for assistance in arranging for a meeting with a top national security official. These documents clearly appear to be a part of what should have been the DNC response. We want to check on that and make sure and we'll have an appropriate response as far as the compliance issue is concerned. But we will make these a part of the record at this time, and follow up on that accordingly. Before we call our first witness, I'll call on Senator Glenn for any statement he wants... GLENN: Mr. Chairman, I have no opening statement today. We discussed this on the--the stuff you entered into--the material you entered into the record here. We want to check some of those things out, too. So we look forward to discussing that. THOMPSON: All right. GLENN: Thank you. THOMPSON: OK. We'll call Juliana Utomo, please. Mr. Wexler (ph), good morning. WEXLER (ph): Good morning. THOMPSON: Ms. Utomo, thank you for being here. THOMPSON: Would you please stand and raise your right hand please. Do you promise that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Thank you very much.

uch. ,(#- I understand that you have no opening statement, so if we may, we'll just proceed with the questions. Is that... WEXLER(ph): That's correct. THOMPSON: OK with you? WEXKER(ph): That would be fine. THOMPSON: All right. Thank you. Mr. Madigan. MADIGAN: Good morning, Ms. Utomo. UTOMO: Good morning. MADIGAN: Thank you very much for being here this morning. UTOMO: You're welcome. MADIGAN: Let me start by asking you a little bit about your educational background. Could you tell the committee about it? UTOMO: My background is from architecture, engineering, and also construction management. MADIGAN: And in about 1988, did you begin work for one of the Lippo companies in the United States? UTOMO: Yes, with HipHing Holdings. MADIGAN: Could you perhaps pull that microphone a little bit closer? Tell the committee, if you would, how it came to be that you began work for HipHing Holdings. Did Mr. Riady hire you? UTOMO: Yes, he did. MADIGAN: And how did that happen, briefly, if you would? UTOMO: Actually, we study, we finish master degree at Cleveland, Ohio in May 1988, and my husband got a job in Los Angeles, so I just sent a resume to HipHing Holding to Mr. Riady, if there is any opening for me. MADIGAN: Now during the first period of time that you worked for HipHing Holdings, did you report directly to Mr. Riady? , " , UTOMO: For the first few months, yes. MADIGAN: Did there come a time when you worked for HipHing that you reported to Mr. John Huang? UTOMO: Yes. After Mr. Riady left. MADIGAN: Now tell me, if you would, when that was to the best of your recollection. UTOMO: Approximately in 1989 or '90. I cannot remember exactly the year. MADIGAN: Around the time period of 1989 to 1990, Mr. Riady left the United States and moved back to Jakarta. Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now when you were first with HipHing Holdings, Mr. Riady lived in Los Angeles, is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Up until this time frame that you told us about? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now am I correct that you worked at HipHing on a full-time basis until 1996 and that you still work for HipHing now on a consulting agreement? Is that right? UTOMO: Yes, but after March '94 I didn't come for the full eight hours. MADIGAN: During the time that you worked in HipHing, let's take the 1992 to 1994 time frame, did you report directly to Mr. Huang during that time frame? UTOMO: Yes for proper legal matters. MADIGAN: Now your offices at that time, where were they located? UTOMO: At 711 West College Street. MADIGAN: And is that the same building that houses the Lippo , " , bank? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: What floor were you on in the building? UTOMO: I move several times from third floor to the sixth floor. MADIGAN: And where was Mr. Huang's office? UTOMO: At sixth floor. MADIGAN: Same floor as you were on? UTOMO: Yes. But only for three or four months. Is that in the same suite. MADIGAN: Now to your knowledge, has HipHing Holding ever made a profit? UTOMO: I don't know exactly, because I didn't take care of the books until late March 1994. MADIGAN: But you know, don't you, that the only property that HipHing Holdings has is an empty parking lot in Los Angeles. Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: There are no other assets. UTOMO: No, as... MADIGAN: That you know of. UTOMO: As I know, yes. MADIGAN: Now, during the time that you were with HipHing, how did HipHing stay financially afloat, if it is only an asset was an empty parking lot? UTOMO: Based on the documents that were requested for capital injection. MADIGAN: You would request funds from Lippo Jakarta and the , " , funds would be wired into Los Angeles, is that right? UTOMO: I cannot say if Lippo from Jakarta. I don't know exactly the source. But we send the request to Jakarta office. MADIGAN: Well, we'll talk about that in a minute and I'll show you a couple of documents. You always sent the documents to a Mrs. Ing(ph), is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And you knew that she was in Jakarta and that her office was on the same floor as Mr. Riady, right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now, during the time that Mr. Huang worked at HipHing, HipHing made political contributions, did it not? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And Mr. Huang handled all that for HipHing, am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Let me show you, if I might, and put upon the screen here Exhibit Number 101. Now Exhibit Number 101, Ms. Utomo, is a check dated August 12th, 1992 in the amount of \$50,000 payable to the DNC Victory Fund, is that right? UTOMO: It appears so, yes. MADIGAN: And tell me if you would who's signatures are on that check. UTOMO: My signature on the top and Mr. August Setiawan(ph) on the bottom. MADIGAN: Mr. Setiawan(ph), is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And at that time, what position in HipHing did Mr. Setiawan(ph) have? , " , UTOMO: He is the person that handled the funds. MADIGAN: Was he the comptroller of the company, so to speak? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did there come a time when he left the United States and went back to Jakarta? UTOMO: Pardon me, sir? MADIGAN: Did Mr. Setiawan(ph) leave the country and go to Indonesia? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: So he's not here today? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Now let me ask you to look at Exh

ibit 102, if we could put that upon the screen. Now Exhibit Number 102 is a memorandum dated August 17, 1992 from Mr. Huang and Mr. Setiawan (ph) to this Mrs. Ing (ph) that we spoke about a minute ago, am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And you've seen the set type of memorandum before, have you not? While you worked at Hip Hing? UTOMO: Just recently. MADIGAN: But while you worked there, you sent memorandums yourself to Mrs. Ing (ph) in order to have money wired from Jakarta back to Hip Hing in the United States, am I right about that? UTOMO: Yes. This is like the form we use for this. MADIGAN: The same kind of form that you use. We'll look at a few of them in a moment. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: But let's look at this particular one. You see in the first paragraph where it says, please kindly wire \$146,500? ,", UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did I read that correctly? And it says to the Lippo Bank Los Angeles, attention John Huang, and August Setiawan (ph), is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now this memorandum then lists the expenses that the funds are needed for. And in the second line, it says, DNC Victory contribution, \$50,000. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did I read that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now, you did this on a regular basis in terms of sending memoranda to, over to Jakarta and having money wired back, is that right? UTOMO: Before March '94 I don't know if it's regular or it's just once in a while. MADIGAN: Let's look at Exhibit Number 103 if we could. Now Exhibit Number 103 is the income statement for Hip Hing Holdings for the year ending December 31st, 1992. And it shows that Hip Hing lost \$482,000 that year, am I right? UTOMO: It appears so, yes. MADIGAN: From this document? UTOMO: From this document. MADIGAN: Now let me ask you if I might look at Exhibit Number 108. MADIGAN: Now is Exhibit 108 a memorandum that you prepared? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And it's in the same format as the Exhibit 102 memorandum that we were just looking at. Am I right? ,", UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And it was sent to the same Mrs. Ing (ph) for reimbursement of expenses, correct? UTOMO: That's correct. MADIGAN: Now let's go back to May and let me show you another couple of exhibits here. Let's look at Exhibit Number 104. Exhibit Number 104, we'll take them one at a time, perhaps, if we can. The first one on Exhibit Number 104 is a check dated September 23, 1993 for \$15,000, payable to the DNC, am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now who's signatures are on that check? UTOMO: The top one is Mr. Huang, and the second one is Mr. August Diawan (ph). MADIGAN: Now the second check, which is written on Exhibit 104, which is written four days later, also for \$15,000, also to the DNC, are the same two signatures on that check? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And Mr. Huang's being the signature on top? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And how about the third check on Exhibit 104, which is a check dated September 23, 1993 from 15--for \$15,000 to the DNC? Same two signatures on that check? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now the bottom two checks are from two different Lippo-related companies, correct? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: The first is San Jose Holdings, Inc. UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: Is that right? And you did work for that company while you were working out at Lippo also. Am I correct about that? UTOMO: Yes. They assigned me to handle their properties. MADIGAN: Was it Mr. Riady that asked you to work on the San Jose matter originally? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And did Mr. Huang also handle any political contributions that would be made by the San Jose company while you were there? UTOMO: I don't know exactly. MADIGAN: During the time that you worked in the Lippo offices there with respect to Hip Hing and San Jose and the Toy company, it was Mr. Huang, was it not, who handled all these political contributions that would be made? UTOMO: I didn't handle the bookkeeping and the checks. So sometimes I don't know who's direction, because the checks were kept by Mr. August Diawan (ph). MADIGAN: But Mr. Huang is the one that had to approve these things. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And if you were going to send requests back to Jakarta for money, Mr. Huang would have to approve that, wouldn't he? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Let me ask you to look at another exhibit. Let's look at Number 105. Now Number 105 is another income statement for Hip Hing Holdings, this time showing that for the year 1993, Hip Hing lost another 493,000. Am I correct? That's what the document shows? UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: Now let me ask you a question, if I might, about the bonus that Mr. Huang received when he left the Lippo companies. You were aware, weren't you, that he did receive a bonus because several large wires came in that you asked about at the time? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And what were you told with respect to why these wires were coming in? UTOMO: He said it's for his severance pay. MADIGAN: And Mr. Huang told you that directly? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Let me ask you to look at Exhibit 106. If you can put that upon the screen. Now Exhibit Number 106 is a memorandum dated June 27, 1994, to Mr. Huang from the managing director of the Lippo Group. Is that right? UTOMO: It appears so, yes. MADIGAN: And do you know

ow him? The managing director who's listed down there? UTOMO: I know the name only. MADIGAN: And have you seen that name in connection with correspondence back and forth between Lippo and the United States and Lippo/Jakarta? Am I right? UTOMO: No. This is... MADIGAN: Where-- I'm sorry. UTOMO: Just from their brochure, their catalogues. MADIGAN: From the Lippo brochures, you recognize his name? UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: But you yourself did not have any dealings with him directly during the time you were at Lippo? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Let me invite your attention to the first paragraph of the memo, where it says, "I have received your memorandum dated June 13, 1994, and learned of your decision to accept the appointment from the Clinton administration to serve as the principal deputy assistant secretary of commerce." Do you see that language? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: I read that correctly, didn't I? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now, when you look down on the document, it says "severance bonus \$425,000; unused vacation \$17,500; and Mercedes \$25,000." Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Do you know, by the way, where the letter is that-- or the memo that's referenced here that John Huang wrote requesting his bonus? Because the committee has never been able to obtain it. UTOMO: No, I never seen one. MADIGAN: Did you see it at the time? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Mr. Huang never showed you the memo by which he would have requested his bonus and severance package? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Take a moment, if you will, and look at the next page of exhibit 106. Now this is a general ledger for HipHing Holdings for the period ending March of 1994, just a couple of months before Mr. Huang went to work at the Commerce Department. ,", These are documents that you're familiar with, I take it, in the 1994 timeframe? UTOMO: Yes, I guess this was prepared by the CPA. MADIGAN: The Lippo CPA? UTOMO: The HipHing Holding's CPA. MADIGAN: HipHing's CPA? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And down in the middle, it says "John Huang bonus, \$230,000." Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now that's in addition to the numbers we were talking about a moment ago. Is it not? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now let me ask you to look at the third page of exhibit number 106. Well, actually, before we do that, that adds up to what? \$600-- and something thousand if you add the \$468 and the \$230? Math was never my strong suit, but it's somewhere approaching a half a million dollars, isn't it? UTOMO: Yes. This appears. MADIGAN: Now the third page of exhibit 106 I'll represent to you is a part of a document that was filed by Mr. Huang when he entered the employment of the federal government at the Commerce Department. Do you see down on the bottom left-hand corner of that document where it says, "Lippo Group/USA"? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And then there is in handwriting-- does that look like Mr. Huang's writing by the way? UTOMO: I'm not sure. ,", MADIGAN: Do you see where it says 1-2-3. And then the first says "Lippo Group, B-E-N-E," it looks like, and across the line, it says "salary and severance bonus" and then "\$71,050"? And then number 2 says "Lippo Bank/California director's fee and bonus" another \$18,950. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And number three, he lists HipHing Holdings-- salary, bonus and severance bonus, another \$788,750. Do you see that language? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now that adds up to about \$900,000-- something. Do you-- and I know you haven't seen this document before, but do you know where the \$788,000 figure came from that Mr. Huang listed on his commerce document? UTOMO: No, I don't know. MADIGAN: Do you know why he would list payments from the Lippo Bank and HipHing Holdings and the Lippo Group? UTOMO: I don't know, sir. MADIGAN: During the time that you worked there, was Mr. Huang a director or a member of the board of the Lippo Bank as well as his position at HipHing Holdings? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did you have any responsibilities in connection with Mr. Huang's position in the bank? UTOMO: No at all. MADIGAN: Where did the people in the bank-- the Lippo Bank-- office, as opposed to where the HipHing office was during the time that you were there? UTOMO: It's the same floor, but a different suite. ,", MADIGAN: Now, where were you in proximity to where Mr. Huang was during the time that you worked there? UTOMO: I was on the sixth floor one time, the same floor, but different office; and then I moved to the third floor, and he was still in sixth floor. MADIGAN: During the time that you and Mr. Huang were both on the sixth floor... UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: ... what did he do? UTOMO: I don't know exactly. MADIGAN: What was his job as you understood it? UTOMO: Just if I need an approval for special expenses I need to go to him for his approval. MADIGAN: During this period of time when you had to go to Mr. Huang for his approval, did Mr. Riady visit from time to time? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Now once Mr. Riady left and you said in the '89, '90 timeframe, he maintained his house in Los Angeles, did he not? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And am I correct that his house was in the Brentwood area? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Do you know exactly where it was? Had you ever visit

edit?UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:Now,amIcorrectthatpresentlyMr.Riadyisbuildinganewhouse?UTOMO:Yes,that'scorrect. ,", MADIGAN:WhatdidthedowiththeBrentwoodhousethatyouhad visited?UTOMO:Theytearitdownandthenbuiltthenewone.MADIGAN:Andwhenisthenewhouses upposedtobefinished?UTOMO:Approximatelyanotheroneortwomonths.MADIGAN:Haveyouspo kenttoMr.Riadyaboutthatnewhouse?UTOMO:No.MADIGAN:HasMr.Riady spokentoanyoneelseth atyouknowaboutcomingbacktohisnewhousethathe'shavingbuiltinBrentwood?UTOMO:Idon' tknow.MADIGAN:Doyouknowanyonewho'sinvolvedwiththathouse,theconstructionofthatho use?UTOMO:Thearchitects.MADIGAN:Andarethey--dotheyhavesomerelationtoHipHingHold ings?UTOMO:No.MADIGAN:Thenhowdoyouknowthem?UTOMO:Thearchitectcontactmeto--soeve ryMondaysendmebillsforthecontractorsolissuethecheckforthem.MADIGAN:Sothearchite ctthat'sbuildingMr.Riady'shouseaswespeak,theysendthebillstoyou?UTOMO:Yes.Actual ly,thehouseisnotdirectly--I mean,notbelongtoMr.Riadyanymore.ItbelongstoLippoHold ingsAmerica,Inc.MADIGAN:IsLippoHoldingAmericaoneoftheLipposubsidiariesintheUnit edStates?UTOMO:Idon'tknowexactlyhowit'sconnectedtoLippoinJakarta,butthenameisLi ppo. ,", MADIGAN:Well,we'lltalkaboutthatinamoment.Letmeaskyoutolookatexhibitnu mber107,ifwecouldputthatup.Now107isanotherr memorandumthatyouwrotetothisMrs.Ing(p h),isthatright?UTOMO:That'scorrect.MADIGAN:Andthismemorandumisaddressedtoheratt heLippoGroup,amIright?UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:Andthat'sinJakartawhereyousendthis?UTOM O:Yes.MADIGAN:Andthismemorandum,liketheothers,requeststhatmoneybesentfromJakart abacktotheUnitedStates,isthatright?UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:AmIreadingthatright?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN:DoyouknowapersonbythenameofMeliTom(ph)?UTOMO:Yes.Imetheronce.MADIGA N:DoessheworkforLippo?UTOMO:HipHingHoldingspayhisconsultantfee.MADIGAN:Lookifyo uwouldforamomentatexhibitnumber108.Ithinkyoumeanttosayherconsultingfee,nothis.I sthatright,Mrs.Utomo?UTOMO:Yes.Sorry.MADIGAN:Inotherwords,HipHingHoldingspaidaco nsultingfeetoMaeleyTom?UTOMO:Right. ,", MADIGAN:Lookifyouwouldatexhibit108.And welookedatthatamomentago.That'sanotherr memorandumfromyouandMr.HuangdatedJuly5,19 94,again,toMrs.Ing(ph)withtheLippoGroup,right?InJakarta?UTOMO:Shehasthesameoffi cewiththeLippogroup,butIdon'tknowexactlywhatishertitle.MADIGAN:Right.She'stheon ethatwejustlookedatamomentagowherethedocumentsaid,Mrs.Ing(ph),LippoGroup,right? UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:Andshe'sthesameladyyoumentionedamomentearlierinthetestimonywh ohadtheofficeonthesamefloorasMr.RiadyinJakarta?UTOMO:Right.MADIGAN:Butyoujustdo n'tknowasyousittheretheexacttitlethatshehad,amIright?UTOMO:Yes.WEXLER(PH):Ibeli eve,Mr.Madigan,shealsodoesn'tknowwhoformallyemploysMissIng(ph).MADIGAN:Let'sloo katnumber108.Inthemiddleofthatpage,itsaysconsultingfeeandtheninhandwritingoutat thesideitsaysMaeleyTom,\$6,600.Doyouknowwho'shandwritingthat?UTOMO:Mr.Huang.MA DIGAN:Andisthathissignatureupatthetopofthatmemorandum?UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:Ifyoulo okoveratthesecondpageofexhibit108,againdowninthemiddlewhereitsaysconsultingfeeand reimbursement,MaeleyTomandAssociates,thistime\$18,000.Doyouseethat?UTOMO:Yes. ,", MADIGAN:DoyouknowwhatshedidfortheHipHingcompany?UTOMO:No.MADIGAN:Youseethe lineabovethatonthedocumentwhereitsays,tripstoLittleRockandWashington,D.C.6/19to6 /26,1994?UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:That'sjustafewweeksbeforeMr.HuangstartedattheCommerc eDepartment.DoyouknowwhatthistriptoLittleRockwasaboutorwhyhewentthere?UTOMO:No. MADIGAN:Allright,letmeaskyoualittlebitmoreaboutthat.ThetriptoLittleRockwiththec ost\$6,293,andabovethatonthedocumentitsaysJ.H.reimbursement,thisisallmoneythat is reimbursedinthewiretransfersthatHipHingreceivesfromJakarta,correct?UTOMO:I'msor ry.Pardonme?MADIGAN:Thisdocumentthat,number108...UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:Thisparticul aronethat'sdatedAugust9,1994,this,liketheotherswe'vebeenlookingat,is,ifIunderst anditright,isaformdocumentthatyousendovertoJakarta,correct?UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:An dthenJakartawiresmoneybacktoyou...UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:...asspecifiedinthisdocumen t.UTOMO:Right.MADIGAN:NowItakeitthatsomebodymusthave,atsomepointintime,instruct edyouastohowtodothis,amIright?UTOMO:Yes.IjustfollowwhatMr.AugustDiawan(ph)hasdo ne ,", beforeMarch'94.MADIGAN:SoMr.Setiawan(ph)usedtohandlethetransferspriorto '94,andthenin'94,youtookoverthetransfers?UTOMO:Yes.MADIGAN:Andyoudidthemortried todothemthesamewaythatMr.Setiawan(ph)toldyouthathedidthem?Isthatright?UTOMO:Yes

.MADIGAN:OK.Andyoudon'tknow,asyousithere,whatanyoftheseexpenseswerefor,forexamp
le,inthetrip to Little Rock, or why they would be reimbursed by Jakarta? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: I
sthat right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now if we look over to the next exhibit, the next part of numbe
r 108, actually. MADIGAN: It's a September 28, 1994, memo, the same format. Give me 22nd. What d
id I say? I'm sorry, September 22nd. I'm sorry, the September 22nd memorandum, 1994. Yes, Your
Honor. (LAUGHTER) Going back to a prior life, I'm afraid. Yes, Senator. It's the last page of ex
hibit 108. And this time the memo is just from you, again to Mrs. Ing (ph). ,", And down in the m
iddle of this exhibit, it also has a consulting fee for Maeley Tom in the amount of \$4,913. Is tha
t right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Do you know who she reported to? UTOMO: To Mr. Hanna (ph). MADIGAN
: I'm sorry? UTOMO: To Mr. Joe Hanna (ph) in Jakarta. MADIGAN: And she reported directly to some
one in Jakarta? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: So she did not report to someone in the United States with r
espect to what she was doing for these consulting fees? UTOMO: No, no. MADIGAN: And down a bit fa
rther, the Little Rock Limousine, Ltd.--\$1,013. Do you know what that was for? UTOMO: It is for
limousines. I can--I don't know exactly what for. MADIGAN: Do you know what the--this particu
lar limousine expense was used for? This is dated now September of 1994. Mr. Huang is already in t
he Commerce Department. Do you know what that was for or who used the limousine? UTOMO: At that
time, sometimes Mr. Hanna (ph) also visit United States. MADIGAN: And this particular, do you k
now? Or are you--I don't want you to guess. Just tell me what you know about things. UTOMO: I don'
t recall. MADIGAN: OK. Now today, you have a consulting agreement with--with Hip Hing. Is that
right? ,", UTOMO: Yes, that's correct. MADIGAN: And what do you do basically for the compan
y today? UTOMO: Take care properties belong to San Jose Holdings, Toy Center Holding, and Hip
Hing Holdings, and also Lippo Holding/America. MADIGAN: Well, let me have this other exhibit
presented if I can, which we just obtained. If we can mark it 108 A or something of that nature. Th
is is a copy of your consulting agreement that I asked your attorney to give me last night. Do you
have that there? WEXLER (ph): I don't believe that's in the book. MADIGAN: We'll have somebody
bring it down in a moment. UTOMO: Yes, thank you. WEXLER (ph): This is marked exhibit 122. MADIG
AN: All right. We'll call it exhibit 122 then. It's dated November 17, 1996. Is that right? UTOM
O: Yes. MADIGAN: Now this is a multi-paged document, but it basically sets forth in the first two
pages, if I understand it correctly, the current arrangement that you have with Hip Hing. UTOM
O: Yes. MADIGAN: And was this prepared for you by Mr. Setiawan (ph)? UTOMO: We do it together. Im
ean... MADIGAN: This was... UTOMO: It was agreed by both sides. MADIGAN: And was he in the Unite
d States at the time? ,", UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And how did it come about that your status woul
d change from a full time employee, if you will, to a consulting arrangement? Was that Mr. Setia
wan's (ph) idea? UTOMO: No, because I have two very young children to take care, so I cannot go to
the office exactly eight hours a day. MADIGAN: And at this point in time, they also moved the Lip
po offices or say the Lippo Group companies were moved from Los Angeles out to a different place
, right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Where were they moved to? UTOMO: To Rosemead (ph). It's about jus
t 15 minutes by freeway--10 or 15 minutes by freeway from the Lippo Bank's office. MADIGAN: Wer
e you involved in the move of the offices? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: What happened to all the documen
ts that were in the offices in Los Angeles? We haven't been able to get our hands on too many of the
m. Do you know? UTOMO: We bring all of the documents to the next office. MADIGAN: All of the Hip Hi
ng documents? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: How about the documents for the variety of other Lippo-rel
ated companies? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And when you entered this agreement in November of '96, t
he remainder of the exhibit shows resignation letters from the various companies, is that rig
ht? UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: Why was that done? Do you know? UTOMO: I'm sorry. Pardon me? MAD
IGAN: The documents say that you resigned from Hip Hing, from Calbot Holdings Inc., from Lippo
Energy Co., and from Lippo Holding America Inc. Do you know why that was done? UTOMO: Because I w
as the officer of these companies. MADIGAN: Was that done in conjunction with the move of the of
fices from downtown to the suburb? UTOMO: No, because I resigned from Hip Hing just to make sure
that I resign from all the companies. MADIGAN: So to make sure the books were straight, you resi
gned from all the companies and entered a consulting agreement just with Hip Hing. UTOMO: Yes.
MADIGAN: OK. Thank you very much. GLENN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to have Mr. Baron to t
he previous question please. BARON: Thank you, Senator Glenn. Good morning, Ms. Utomo. Ms. Ut
omo, Mr. Madigan in his questioning to you said that, suggested that Hip Hing owned an empty lot

in Los Angeles. Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes, that's correct. BARON: And that lot is used and has been used as a parking lot, is that correct? UTOMO: Some of it. BARON: OK. And do you have any idea, am I correct that that parking lot has been assessed as being worth several million dollars? UTOMO: That's correct. BARON: And am I correct that originally the idea was to develop that open lot into some other kind of property with a building on it, or other kinds of development? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And did there come a time because of the economic conditions in California that the plan to develop the lot were abandoned? UTOMO: That's correct. BARON: Now there was a so in Mr. Madigan's questions, he raised the fact that Mr. Setiawan (ph) is gone from the country. He left and went back to Indonesia. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. That occurred back in 1994, did it not? UTOMO: Yes. Approximately March. BARON: Not recently. He hasn't been back to work at Hip Hing or for Lippo Banks since that time, has he? UTOMO: No. He came when we have to move the office and then to count down agreement. BARON: Right. But he hasn't come back to work here for a long period of time. He basically moved back to Indonesia in 1994. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now, were you aware during the time period that you worked with Mr. Huang that he was very active in many Chinese-American community organizations? UTOMO: I don't know. BARON: You don't know. Do you recall him being active in the Asian Bankers Association? Would you be aware of that? UTOMO: I don't know. BARON: Do you recall him being active as an invited member of the Committee of 100, which is an organization headed by Yo-Yo Ma and J.M. Pei. UTOMO: I don't know. BARON: You don't know about that. UTOMO: No. BARON: Now, does the parking lot generate revenue for Hip Hing? UTOMO: There's income from parking lots. BARON: Right. Is Hip Hing, to your knowledge, incorporated as an American company even though it's owned by a foreign company? UTOMO: Yes, it's state of California. BARON: It's incorporated in the state of California. UTOMO: Right. BARON: And so it pays property taxes here in the United States? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And there's also an entity known as the Toy Center. UTOMO: Right. BARON: And that is another entity with which you are familiar as part of the Lippo organization? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And what kind of property does the Toy Center own? UTOMO: Toy Center has three-story buildings. Is about approximately 13,000 square. And then is 90 percent leased and tenants pay the rent. BARON: How about an entity known as San Jose Holdings? Are you familiar with that entity? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. And that is also an American Company. It's incorporated in California as is the Toy Center. Is that correct? UTOMO: Right. BARON: And what asset does San Jose Holdings own? UTOMO: Has three parcels of property. One is five-story building. BARON: And does it generate income? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. Now, can we look at some of the exhibits that you reviewed with Mr. Madigan? Let's look at number 103, if you would. BARON: Do you have that in front of you? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now that is an income statement for Hip Hing Holdings for the period 1992? Am I correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it shows that there was total income for Hip Hing of a little over \$38,000 -- \$38,400? Is that correct? UTOMO: That's correct. BARON: And that is the year in which the \$50,000 check to the DNC was made out and sent, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: So Hip Hing had about \$12,000 less in income generated in this country than the \$50,000 that was contributed to the DNC, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. It appears so. BARON: Now let me direct your attention to number 105, if you would. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now that is an income statement for the year 1993 for Hip Hing Holding, is it not? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it shows total income of approximately \$35,000, \$35,200 to be exact? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now let's go back to 104, and in 1993 we see a check to the DNC for \$15,000. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And that's in September of '93. UTOMO: Right. BARON: And that is on the account of Hip Hing Holdings. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And in 1993, as far as you know, that's the only political contribution that Hip Hing made in 1993, as far as you know? UTOMO: Is from this statement it appears -- is \$32,000. BARON: OK. Let me ask you this. They had more income than \$15,000 in 1993, is that correct? UTOMO: Correct. BARON: OK. And take a look if you would at, it's the document behind 105, it is a 1993 income statement for San Jose Holdings. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now with that total income of \$172,108, is that correct? UTOMO: Right. BARON: And so, and that's for 1993. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And if you go back two pages, in September of '93, San Jose Holdings made a contribution to the DNC in the amount of \$15,000? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. So it had income in excess of the amount that was contributed to the DNC that year, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Please turn to the next page where you have an income statement for Toy Center Holdings of California, Inc., do you see that

t? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it had--and this is for the period of 1993, correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it had income of \$132,404.24 to be exact, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Please turn back to the check that was issued in September of '93 on the account of Toy Center Holdings of California Inc. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And that was in the amount of \$15,000? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And so, Toy Center Holdings of California had substantial income in excess of the \$15,000 that was contributed, is that correct? ;", UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now I'd like to explore a little bit, if we might, the bonus that was paid to Mr. John Huang. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Am I correct--well, let me check if you know--that Mr. Huang would have received a bonus annually, that that was a typical part of his compensation? UTOMO: I don't know exactly. BARON: OK. Do you know when he received a bonus for 1993, the year before he left? UTOMO: Don't remember. BARON: Do you know when annual bonuses are paid? UTOMO: Usually is close to the end of the year, maybe January or February. BARON: OK. Of the following year? UTOMO: Of the following year. BARON: So a check in, say, January or February of '94 would be a 1993 bonus. Would that be fair? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. Now if I could direct your attention to document 106, which you've seen before. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: All right. Turn to the next page. It's a general ledger for Hip Hing Holdings for the period ended March 31, '94. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And do you see there a reference to a bonus to John Huang in the amount of \$230,000? ;", UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Is it fair to conclude that that represents Mr. Huang's 1993 bonus being given to him, reflected on the ledger, at the beginning of '94? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. And that was 230,000? Right? UTOMO: That's correct, yes. BARON: OK. Now go back one page, and that is a memorandum--this is 106 now. This is a memorandum dated June 27, 1994, to Mr. Huang, which sets out his severance bonus, as distinguished from his annual bonus. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Is that correct? And the severance bonus is \$425,625. Is that correct? UTOMO: According to this, yes. BARON: Right. At it appears on the page. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Which is roughly double--actually, somewhat less than double his annual bonus. UTOMO: Right. BARON: Now, I'd like you--I'd like to have you put up on the screen a check dated 7/15/94 to Mr. Huang in the amount of \$284,798.74. Do you see that on the screen in front of you? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Am I correct that that represents the net check to Mr. Huang for his severance bonus? That is, net after taxes have been taken out? UTOMO: That's correct. ;", BARON: Mr. Utomo, after Mr. Huang left to go to Commerce... UTOMO: Yes. BARON: ...did you ever speak to him over the telephone? Did he ever call you, or did you ever call him? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And approximately--I'm not asking you an exact count--but what's your best recollection of how many times you spoke to him over the phone while he was at Commerce, either by a call that was initiated by him, or one that you initiated to him? UTOMO: Maybe around five. BARON: Around five. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And what was the subject of the conversation, if you recall? UTOMO: Because it's just close after he left as there is still some mail that I have to forward to him. BARON: Forwarding mail to him? UTOMO: There is--mail came (ph). BARON: Right. UTOMO: And then still go to Hip Hing Holdings. BARON: Right. UTOMO: So I forwarded it to him. BARON: Did Mr. Huang ever ask you to relay information to Mr. Riady? UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to relay any information to someone else in Asia? ;", UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to relay information to somebody at the bank? UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to transfer his call to you or your call to him to Mr. Riady? UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to transfer or connect his call to anyone in Asia? UTOMO: No. BARON: Am I correct that the usual expenses for operating Hip Hing Holding was approximately 28,000 a month? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Indulge me on a moment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no further questions of the witness. MADIGAN: Just a few, if I might, Ms. Utomo. THOMPSON: This will come on Senator Collins' time, because he had previously given me permission. (LAUGHTER) MADIGAN: Thank you, Senator. I'll be very brief. Mr. Barontook you through exhibit 105, which has all the income statements for Hip Hing, San Jose Holdings and Toy Center (ph) and asked you only about the income. Each of those statements show expenses as well as income. Right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And each of those statements show that each of those companies for each of those years lost money. Right? UTOMO: It appears on this (ph). ;", MADIGAN: Now let me just invite your attention back to exhibit 101, which is the \$50,000 check to the DNC in 1992. There's no question but that that money was requested by you to be wired from Jakarta to reimburse the money spent on that check, right? According to this document. UTOMO: It wasn't by me. MADIGAN: No, I'm sorry. Let's take a look on a step at a time. Let's look at--number 101 is the check, right? UTOMO

: Yes. MADIGAN: And 102 is a document that is from John Huang and Mr. Sethiwan (ph), which, according to the document, specifically seeks reimbursement for the \$50,000 given to the DNC from Jakarta. Correct? Isn't that what the document says? UTOMO: It appears... MADIGAN: According to the document. I understand you didn't write it. UTOMO: Uh-hmm. MADIGAN: Am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Nothing further, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Anything further with this witness? BENNETT: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Senator Bennett. BENNETT: I have some questions for this witness, if I may. THOMPSON: Our order here-- I suppose out of the rest of Senator Collins' time, you may use the rest of Senator Collins' time. BENNETT: They are relatively few. Ms. Utomo, did any of these companies ever make any money? To your knowledge? ", UTOMO: There is income. BENNETT: I didn't ask income. I'm talking bottom-line profit. Did any of these companies ever make any money? BENNETT: We do not have an income statement showing that any of them did. UTOMO: It appears so, yes. BENNETT: It appears so that they did? UTOMO: It appears so that some of this one here is a loss. BENNETT: Yes. UTOMO: Yes. BENNETT: That all of them lost money. If I could take you to, very quickly, exhibits 103 and 105, and the income statements that are in there-- in every instance, as part of the losses that are shown, one of the items of expense is contribution and donations. Exhibit 103-- contribution and donations were \$55,400. Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BENNETT: Do you know if that includes the \$50,000 to the DNC? UTOMO: I don't know. I didn't prepare this one. BENNETT: I see. The same is true in number 105. Hip Hing Holdings lost, or gave, contribution of \$32,000. That's the year that \$15,000 went to the DNC. Do you know if that's included? UTOMO: I don't know. BENNETT: I see. I shan't pursue it, but the time pattern is in all of the other income statements. And my only point, Mr. Chairman, is that political contributions are not legally deductible. If this income statement was used for tax purposes and there was a tax deduction claimed for these contributions, that would be illegal under ", the tax law. I have nothing further, but I wanted to point that out. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Bennett. Anything further for this witness? LEVIN: Mr. Chairman, I just have a brief question actually. Do you have available to you the income statements for San Jose Holdings and Toy Center Holdings for 1992? Is that something you could readily put your hand on? I don't think these were marked as exhibits. WEXLER (PH): If they're not in the book, we don't have them in front of us. LEVIN: All right. Mr. Chairman, these are... THOMPSON: ... what we're dealing with here. MADIGAN: (OFF-MIKE) documents. I've never seen them. I don't know where they... THOMPSON: I don't know that we've ever seen those documents. Could we have... LEVIN: These are in our book here. So... At any rate, I would just offer these into the record. THOMPSON: Well, what are they? LEVIN: These are the Toy Center income statements and the San Jose Holdings income statements for the year. THOMPSON: Could we have-- could we see copies of-- could we have copies? LEVIN: If I can just say what they show-- they basically show the same pattern, that there's income and that there's expenses. And I can just offer these. I can read them. It's the same-- exact same pattern that's been described before. ", For San Jose, there was income of \$155,000, expenses of \$330,000; and for Toy Center, it's income of \$167,000, expenses of \$199,000. Are those the documents that you're looking at as well? UTOMO: Yes. LEVIN: And that raises the question, I guess, as to the-- which Senator Bennett, I think, may be referring to-- I'm not sure-- as to whether or not the question of contributions from American corporations, which are owned either directly or indirectly by foreign corporations, when they're allowed to make contributions from income earned in the United States, whether or not that means net income or gross income. And apparently, there's no clear guidance on that. And that may be something we ought to repair in the law if there is no guidance in the law, Mr. Chairman. I would just simply offer this as-- these exhibits. In the case, however, in one of these income statements for one year, in that case, that \$50,000 contribution in 1992, there neither gross nor net income was sufficient to cover the \$50,000 contribution. So in that case, unless the argument is that this is a legal contribution for some other reasons, such as the fact that maybe it didn't go to a candidate's campaign but went to a party, then that is a different issue. But there's one and possibly two corrections in the law that I would suggest we ought to be looking at in the area of foreign contributions, which are illustrated by these documents. And I would offer these-- Mr. Chairman, I can offer them later. It's not a... THOMPSON: Well, they'll be made part of the record. LEVIN: Yes. Those are the only questions I have of this witness, except I would point out that 1992 contribution of \$50,000, Mr. Chair

man, is the same year that we have been pointing out the foreign contribution allegedly through Mr. Kojima... THOMPSON: And you were wondering why I was being so liberal before? LEVIN: Yes, right, right. , ", (LAUGHTER) But at any rate, we will come back to that issue since it happens to be the same year-- 1992-- as this \$50,000 contribution. But I'll save that for another date. THOMPSON: Well, don't get too optimistic because the-- seriously, I do think that things that show a pattern of conduct are certainly-- are certainly permissible. And we may have-- we may have someone on each side there that fits that bill. Miss Utomo, thank you very much for being here. LIEBERMAN: Mr. Chairman... (UNKNOWN): Mr. Chairman... THOMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Didn't realize there were others. Anyone else over here? Go ahead. LIEBERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, Miss Utomo. Thank you for being here. I just want to understand about your original connection to Hip Hing. I understood when you graduated from school, your husband had obtained a job in Los Angeles, and then you sent a resume. Did you know about Hip Hing? Or did you know the Riady family before then? UTOMO: Not Riady family, just the Lippo Bank. LIEBERMAN: You knew about the Lippo Bank. UTOMO: Because Lippo Bank is one of the biggest in Indonesia. LIEBERMAN: Yes. So you had no personal contact with the family, but you sent the resume because the Lippo Bank name was familiar to you? UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: OK. And you arrived there in 1988 or '89? , ", UTOMO: September '88. LIEBERMAN: '88. And was John Huang already working there at Hip Hing when you arrived? UTOMO: No, I didn't see him. LIEBERMAN: So-- but he started working at Hip Hing shortly thereafter? Am I right? UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: 1989. UTOMO: Approximately, yes. LIEBERMAN: Yes. And am I correct that he worked there until 1994? Or 1993? UTOMO: '94 approximately July. LIEBERMAN: When he went to work for the Commerce Department. So it was a period of about five years that you worked there together. Were you the only two employees of Hip Hing? UTOMO: Mr. Augustode Awan (ph). LIEBERMAN: That's right. UTOMO: Yes. And there is-- was a secretary. LIEBERMAN: Yes. UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: And did you have offices-- one large office or office next to one another? UTOMO: My office with Mr. Huang's office is next on the floor like three or four months. LIEBERMAN: OK. For three or four months, your office was right next to Mr. Huang's? , ", UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: And then in the other time, you were on the same floor, I assume. Is that correct? UTOMO: Once in a while not the same floor. LIEBERMAN: Sometimes not. UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: But meantime, he was the supervisor of Hip Hing at that point? In other words, you were clear that you were working for him? UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: OK. And can you tell us from your experience with him over this five-year period anything about what Mr. Huang's duties were? What was he doing during that period of time? UTOMO: I guess he works also for the bank. LIEBERMAN: He did some work for the bank. UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: Did he do anything regarding Hip Hing itself? UTOMO: If I need approval from him, I just came to him. That's it. LIEBERMAN: If you need what? UTOMO: Approval-- for... LIEBERMAN: Approval, yes. UTOMO: ...for irregular expense. LIEBERMAN: But as far as you can remember, most of his time was spent on bank work? UTOMO: I don't know. , ", LIEBERMAN: You don't know. UTOMO: No. LIEBERMAN: Even though you were there with him for that four or five years. But... UTOMO: I don't see him every day. LIEBERMAN: Yes. OK. Did anyone-- obviously, we're interested here in political contributions from Hip Hing-- did anyone ever discuss with you why Hip Hing was making political contributions? UTOMO: No. LIEBERMAN: Did-- when you signed the \$50,000 check to the DNC Victory Fund, did anybody explain to you what it was? UTOMO: No. LIEBERMAN: So they just asked you to sign it? UTOMO: Right. LIEBERMAN: And without knowledge, you signed it. Without knowledge of what the purpose was is what I meant to say. UTOMO: Yes, that's correct. LIEBERMAN: OK. All right, I don't have any other questions, Mr. Chairman. It does seem to me that through this witness we have-- although I suppose questions could be made about the income and loss statements-- there's a pretty clear document there requesting reimbursement for a \$50,000 donation to the DNC Victory Fund, which certainly looks like the movement of foreign money into an American campaign in 1992. I thank the chair and I thank you, Miss Utomo, for your testimony. UTOMO: If I may add-- actually the DNC exact (OFF-MIKE). I didn't know until recently. , ", LIEBERMAN: Could you say that again? The DNC... I didn't hear the second word. WEXLER (ph): She didn't know what the DNC stood for until recently. LIEBERMAN: Oh, didn't know what it was. So this was literally a blank check that you-- that you signed. I mean, who asked you to sign the check? UTOMO: I cannot remember. LIEBERMAN: You don't know whether-- well, whom might it have... UTOMO: But usually Mr. Augustode Awan (ph) or Mr. Huang. LIEBERMAN

AN: Or Mr. Huang. One or the other... UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: ... would have asked you to sign. OK.
. Thank you. THOMPSON: Mr. Torricelli. TORRICELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Utomo, did it
ere appear to be anything unusual in your mind about the organization of any of these three corp
orations-- Toy Center, San Jose or HipHing-- in how they were organized or operated as corpora
tionsestablished for the purpose of holding real estate? UTOMO: No. TORRICELLI: In fact, are
n't they actually, in the real estate industry, fairly standard enterprises organized for th
elargely or exclusive purposes of holding real estate for development? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICEL
LI: During the course of the operations from 1991 to '93, by my records, HipHing Holdings made 1
6 political contributions; the Toy Center Holdings 10; San Jose Holdings, six. But in each and
everyone of those instances, there was sufficient revenue in the , , account from income t
o the properties with the sole exception of the contribution to the Democratic National Commi
ttee, which apparently was illegally reimbursed. Is that your own impression? UTOMO: I don't
know, because before March '94, I didn't handle all the bookkeeping. And actually, I just lea
rned a little bit by little bit regarding the financial statements after March '94, because my b
ackground was not in the... TORRICELLI: Well, as you've reviewed the records of each of these
three corporations, is it not accurate that from what you can decipher, in each and every instan
ce where there was a political contribution, there was a domestic source of revenue equal to or
greater to the level of the political contribution, with the exception of the DNC contributi
on issue? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: So it would appear-- although you do not have direct knowl
edge on all of these, because you were not handling the books at all times-- we have a total of 32 c
ontributions by these three corporations, and in only one instance does it appear that there w
as not a local source of revenue in excess of the amount of the contributions? UTOMO: It appears
so. TORRICELLI: That would appear that for those who believe that anyone or all of these compa
nies were established solely for the purposes of being an illegal conduit of funds, that it wou
ld-- the facts would not seem to support that contention? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: Do you reco
gnize, Miss Utomo, that it is the belief of some that these corporations may have been establis
hed for the purposes of putting foreign money into the domestic political process in this coun
try. But it would be your contention, based on your own limited experience, that that was not th
e function, the intention or even the purpose of any one of these companies? Isn't that your tes
timony? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: It is also the belief of some that these companies , , or i
ndividuals associated with them may have been representing foreign governments intending t
o contribute to the American political process. But it is your testimony that that, to your kno
wledge, was not the instance in these circumstances? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: It is the belie
f of some that Mr. Huang may have in fact been representing a foreign government in a conduit of c
ontributions. But to your knowledge, having worked with Mr. Huang and these companies, in fac
t having had an office next to his, having been associated and responsible for some of the bookk
eeping and the paper work of these companies, is it your testimony that you have no knowledge th
at those were the circumstances either? UTOMO: Yes. I don't know. TORRICELLI: The property a
t question owned by HipHing was worth at various times several million to \$7 million? UTOMO: Th
at's correct. It's, I guess, at that time more than \$10 million. TORRICELLI: But you were unsu
ccessful in finding the means because of market conditions to develop it? UTOMO: Yes, the mark
et was (OFF-MIKE) down (ph). TORRICELLI: I've noted in your contributions, considerable c
ontributions, to state parties or California political figures that were through one of the th
ree corporations, is that accurate? UTOMO: I'm sorry? TORRICELLI: Well, I've noticed that y
ou contributed through one or many of these companies to various political figures in Califor
nia. UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: The company obviously was losing considerable money. It held dr
ealestate, but it continued to pay taxes, pay bills, and meet its obligations in holding reale
state that was generating no profit and in fact losing capital. Isn't that accurate? UTOMO: It
appears so. , , TORRICELLI: It definitely appears so. Do you have any knowledge whether,
as a result of all these political contributions through each of these companies over all thes
e years to all these California political figures, there was ever any effort or intention or an
y evidence that any time effort was expended to either assist in the development of the propert
y or change its zoning or change its circumstances that would have made it more profitable? UTO
MO: No. TORRICELLI: So, in fact, despite these political contributions, whatever relation

ships were established or advantages were regained, none appear to have been used for any direct economic benefit of the company? UTOMO: No. TORRICELLI: Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. MADIGAN: Just very briefly, Miss Utomo, when you summarize the documents that have been placed in front of you, and you look not only at revenue, but you look at the expenses per year, starting in 1992 with Hip Hing Holdings and moving to 1993 with Hip Hing Holdings, San Jose and the Toy Center, the documents show that every single year for each of those companies they lost money, right? UTOMO: Yes. THOMPSON: All right. Senator Akaka. AKAKA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Miss Utomo, did you ever discuss political contributions with Mr. Huang? UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Or with Mrs. Sathiwan (ph)? UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Did you ever hear them discuss political contributions? UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Did you ever make a political contribution yourself? , ", UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Well, I want to thank you so much for coming. I want to add my welcome to you. And may we apologize for dragging you all the way from California here to this hearing? And I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank you for coming from California. UTOMO: Thank you. AKAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Anything further? Thank you very much, Ms. Utomo. We appreciate your being here with us. And you're excused. And we will take a 10-minute recess. Let's try to start back promptly after 10 minutes. (RECESS) THOMPSON: Let's come to order please. Then next witness will be Mr. Thomas R. Hampson. Mr. Hampson will be able to explain a little bit more about the organization of the Lippo Group. Mr. Hampson, would you please stand and raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the testimony you're about to give? HAMPSON: I do. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. Senator Bennett. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Mr. Hampson, let's lay out your background and your qualifications. I understand you're president of Search International, a research and investigations firm. Will you tell us what that firm does? HAMPSON: Well, we're based out of Chicago, and it's a firm that I founded 14 years ago. We conduct research and investigations worldwide, and we specialize in qualifying prospective business, ", partners or acquisition targets on behalf of four corporate clients. We also provide competitive assessment and business intelligence services. BENNETT: Do you specialize in American companies that need information about foreign companies? HAMPSON: Yes, sir. BENNETT: So we can look to you as an expert to understand how foreign commerce works and how foreign companies are organized? HAMPSON: Yes. BENNETT: Mr. Hampson, did you hear the testimony of the previous witness? HAMPSON: No, I didn't. BENNETT: Well, let me characterize it because I'd like your comment on it. As I saw it, coming from a business background myself, we have here a series of small firms--by small, I mean none of them is doing more than a quarter of a million dollars a year in total revenue, and some of them doing substantially less, one of them doing less than \$50,000 a year in revenue. But we have a series of them--half a dozen or so--none of which has ever made any money. All of them have expenses that are in excess of their income, in some cases substantially in excess of income. And yet they continue, from year to year to year to year, with no action on the part of management to try to solve their financial difficulties. The executive whose name seems to be connected with all of these firms earns \$90,000 a year, receives an annual bonus of \$230,000, and upon leaving, is given a severance pay approaching half a million dollars. In your research, have you come across any circumstances like that? Do you consider that a normal activity on the part of a foreign company trying to do business in the United States? HAMPSON: I haven't seen anything like that before. , ", BENNETT: This is not standard real estate operations, in your opinion? HAMPSON: No. BENNETT: Would you like to apply for a job where you would get salary and bonus of that kind, presiding over companies that continually lose money? HAMPSON: I don't know that I would. BENNETT: Well, I think that's a pretty good job, Mr. Chairman, to get that kind of income and be presiding over companies that never ever produce any kind of revenue. Well, let's go on to the area that we want to go through with you. THOMPSON: Could you pull your microphone a little closer. BENNETT: There's been a lot of conversation about the Lippo Group, and we'd like you to explain to us what the Lippo Group is. Based on your background and your investigation of this, you're in a position to tell us. What is the Lippo Group? HAMPSON: It's a multi-billion dollar confederation of companies controlled by the Riady family of Indonesia. It's a conglomerate very much like AT&T, although it's not as large--or ITT. Also, there's no central company that manages and directs the various units. In fact, there's no real entity known as the Lippo Group. Although the

e's no central structure, the group of companies is controlled by an interlocking network of family relationships. Mochtar Riady started the company more than 30 years ago by piecing together a group of different firms. He started with a retail banking base in Indonesia, but the Lippo Group has expanded to encompass banking, finance, insurance, property development, communications and manufacturing interests. The financial side of the business was intentionally developed and structured to facilitate international trade, initially in the Asia area, and later, it was expanded into the West. Although the principal figure in the Lippo Group is Dr. Mochtar Riady, an Indonesian of Chinese descent, today his two sons--Stephen and James--manage the entire Lippo empire. Stephen Riady is responsible for most of the Hong Kong operations of the Lippo Limited--Lippo Group, such as Lippo Limited and the Hong Kong Chinese Bank. HAMPSON: His activities are primarily focused on banking and property development in Hong Kong and mainland China. James Riady is responsible for the Lippo Bank, flagship Lippo Bank of Indonesia, and also Lippo Land (ph), which is headquartered in the Indonesian area and is developing property in Indonesia as a subsidiary--or a suburb of Jakarta. BENNETT: What are they doing in the United States? Is it real estate development? Is it banking? Is it insurance? What are they... HAMPSON: The primary operation in the United States is the Lippo Bank. It has headquarters in Los Angeles. And then--but it has also several branches--one in San Francisco; San Jose; and Westminster, California. BENNETT: Do they make money? HAMPSON: It doesn't seem that they make that much. I don't have access to their financial records. BENNETT: Do you know of any American entity of Lippo that does make money, based on public documents? HAMPSON: No, I don't personally. BENNETT: So they're in the United States, but there's no evidence that they're making any money in the United States? Their money is all made elsewhere in the world? HAMPSON: Well, no, I--what I did was evaluate the public record documents that are available through a variety of online databases. And a lot of those specific financial records are not available. BENNETT: I see. HAMPSON: They have, you know--they are--most of them are privately held corporations that don't produce any public documents, that show their financial statement. BENNETT: So it would be unfair for me to conclude that they are not making money on their American operations? HAMPSON: Yes, that would be unfair, I think. BENNETT: I see. I don't want to be unfair. HAMPSON: At least from what I know. BENNETT: OK. Well, what is the connection between Lippo and the People's Republic of China? HAMPSON: Well, over the past few years, the record is very clear that the Lippo Group has shifted its strategic center from Indonesia to the People's Republic of China. Lippo currently is involved in dozens of large TL joint ventures on the mainland, including construction and development of apartment complexes, office buildings, highways, ports and other infrastructure. Lippo's principal partner on the mainland is China Resources, a company wholly owned by the government of the People's Republic of China. The interrelationship of the Lippo and the government-sponsored companies such as China Resources has grown markedly since 1993. Lippo's first known business connection with a PRC-controlled company was in late 1991, when the Hong Kong Chinese Bank attempted to involve China Resources in acquiring the Hong Kong branch of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International, better known as BCCI. The deal fell through when China Resources backed out. However, in late 1992, China Resources purchased 15 percent of Hong Kong Chinese Bank. Subsequently, at a critical time, when the Indonesian interests were under great financial strain, and indeed, there was a brief run on the Lippo Bank, China Resources injected tens of millions of dollars into the cash-starved Lippo Land. Finally, in mid-1993, China Resources increased its stake in the Hong Kong Chinese Bank to 50 percent. Press reports indicate that China Resources paid 50 percent over the market price of the stock, more than a \$125 million premium. Since 1993, the Lippo Group and China Resources have grown closer and closer, with dozens of shared development projects throughout mainland and China. Just two weeks ago, Stephen Riady announced that the name of Lippo's Hong Kong Chinese Bank would be changed to Lippo China Resources to reflect that China Resources is now an equal partner. By way of illustrating the change, I prepared several charts. There's a 1992 chart over here on my right. I can't see it, but... BENNETT: I can see it, but I can't read it. HAMPSON: Well, both the 1992 chart and the 1997 chart are analytical charts. They are intended to evaluate the relationship that exists between the various entities. I've provided--put the information in a very large database. And establish connections between the various groups, wh

ich show how the entities are related to each other and what direction ownership interest is involved. HAMPSON: They are not intended to be flowcharts. What I'd like to do is refer you to several exhibits. Exhibit Number 117, if you could put that on the screen, is a chart that shows the Lippo Group in 1997. And it greatly simplifies and makes more clear the relationships that exist and that existed at this time. As you can see on the right of the chart, Lippo Limited, headed by Stephen Riady, and a subsidiary is a Hong Kong, China, bank. They're relocated on the mainland and involved in a number of different development projects in mainland China together. These are only a small list of those that are available. On the left-hand side of the chart, you'll see the extreme left--you'll see the financial activities, centered in Indonesia, that provide the Indonesians side of their financial network that they've set up. In the middle is Lippo Land (ph), and the various--or the two different development projects in Indonesia that Lippo has started back in about the mid-'90s. All of these entities have connections to the People's Republic of China, and essentially, that's what this chart over here shows in a very much--in a very complicated way. However, that type of representation is extremely important to evaluate the detail of the relationships, because it's from the detail that we get the general relationships that exist. ,". These second chart that you can see is Lippo Group in early 1992, Exhibit 118. You can see all of the major entities on these charts. But at that time, there was no known business connection between the Lippo Group and China Resources, which is essentially the People's Republic of China. BENNETT: So your point is that in the five-year period, Lippo went from a family-owned entity headquartered in Indonesia to a joint venture, in effect, with the Chinese government, with the primary source of activity headquartered in the People's Republic of China. Is that a fair characterization of what you're saying? HAMPSON: Yes. BENNETT: Tell us a little more about China Resources and what they can bring to the table as a joint venture partner. HAMPSON: Well, China Resources is a huge trading company. It's a hundred percent owned by the government of the People's Republic of China. It's involved in everything from peanut stop property development, and from mineral to machinery. It has hundreds of subsidiaries. It's as big as the Lippo Group. Its purpose is to foster trade and to promote development of the mainland's economy. Through business ties it has established, the group seeks out technology that the country needs and buys it. China Resources also has a more geopolitical purpose. It is well-established in the public record that the government of the People's Republic of China uses China Resources as an agent of espionage, economic, military and political. If its agents can't buy the technology, they obtain it by other means. They acquire interest in companies in order to use them as surrogates, as well as to provide cover for covert operatives. The company is kind of like a smiling tiger--it might look friendly, but it's very dangerous. BENNETT: Well, now, let's talk about the Lippo activities in the United States currently, because your implication is that the China Resources, by virtue of its relatively new association with Lippo, can come through Lippo entities into the United States. I don't want to lead you. But is that a fair characterization of what you're leading to? ,", HAMPSON: It's possible. Right now, if I'd refer you to Exhibit Number 19--119, this is another chart that was prepared. This largely is developed from a document produced by Hip Hing Holdings Company. As I mentioned earlier, most of the operations of the Lippo Group in the United States are very closely held and private. There's not a great deal of information about them. And we don't know very much about the activities, at least I don't. I mean, there's not that much in the public record that's available. But you can see... BENNETT: We now know that at least San Jose Holdings, Toy Center and Hip Hing Holdings don't make any money, and never have, based on the testimony we've had before. HAMPSON: OK. BENNETT: All right. Go ahead. I didn't mean... HAMPSON: I was just going to point out that you can see that the Lippo Bank in California is the primary--really the primary active operation of the Lippo Group that I'm aware of, at least from the public record documents that are available. The rest of it are privately held companies that all have ties back into the Lippo Group operations internationally. BENNETT: Do you have any information on the public record that would indicate there was any activity on the part of the Chinese government through China Resources, through Lippo, in the United States in any of these organizations? HAMPSON: I have no knowledge of that. BENNETT: Do you have any knowledge that it has not happened? HAMPSON: No. BENNETT: So, that's something we'll have to pursue other than through public documents. HAMPSON:

N: Yes. BENNETT: Aside from the fact that your charts give us terrible eye strain, I want to thank you for coming to help us get a better understanding of exactly what it is we're dealing with. Thank you. ", Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further. THOMPSON: Senator Glenn. GLENN: Mr. Baron. BARON: Thank you, Senator. Good afternoon, Mr. Hampson. We just made it by two minutes. You described earlier that you are the president of Search International, and you described what Search International is. How many employees does Search International itself have? HAMPSON: Five. BARON: And you're based in Chicago? HAMPSON: In Chicago, yes. BARON: And are all five investigators? Or does that include clerical people? HAMPSON: Well, I don't have any clerical people. I do have an administrative assistant. BARON: OK. So you have four investigators and an administrative assistant? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Now, in gathering information on a foreign company, am I correct that you would typically use many databases that are public? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And is it fair to say that in putting together your analysis that much of the material you've relied on today is available in the public domain? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: This would include Lexis-Nexis, Dun & Bradstreet--databases of that sort? ", HAMPSON: Yes, sir. BARON: OK. Now, in your gathering of information concerning the Lippo Group, did you have access to anything done by the Harvard Business School in 1993? HAMPSON: Yes, I did. BARON: And do you recall that at the Harvard Business School profile describes the Lippo Group, based in Indonesia, as an unconsolidated federation of companies with a multi-billion dollar asset base, a second major base in Hong Kong, and activities throughout the Pacific Rim which enjoyed remarkable success. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Do you agree with that? HAMPSON: Yes, I do. BARON: Does that confirm your own analysis? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And am I correct that you learned in your analysis and research with regard to the Lippo Group that it is a profit-driven entity. I mean, it is what we would think of as a capitalist venture. HAMPSON: Oh, yes. BARON: All right. And do you recall also, according to the Harvard Business School profile that the Lippo Group was able to attract and hire experienced, well-regarded executives? Do you recall that? HAMPSON: Yes. Yes, I do. BARON: High-caliber professionals, I think, is one of the phrases. Now, the population of China has an excess of a billion people. Am I correct? ", HAMPSON: Yes, it does. BARON: And it certainly is also one of the largest markets in the world. Is it not? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And, of course, as an entity, it and through its various arms, it has money that it wishes to invest. Does it not? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And much of that investment is outside of China. Is it not? HAMPSON: Yes, it is. BARON: And there's nothing unusual about that inherently. Is there? HAMPSON: No. BARON: Am I correct that in China, doing business--and we're talking about the PRC--if you're doing business in China, doing business with Chinese companies means doing business with companies owned by the Chinese government, such as China Resources. HAMPSON: Not always. BARON: I don't mean always, but if you--if one wishes to do business in China, very often one ends up dealing with an entity such as China Resources, which is owned by the government. HAMPSON: Right. BARON: Now, am I correct that the Lippo Group also has relationships with countries other than China? And by China, I'm talking about mainland China. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Countries like Taiwan? HAMPSON: Yes. ", BARON: Japan? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: France? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: England? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Now, the charts that you have provided don't say anything about there being any Chinese government money in any of Lippo's American entities, do they? You're not in a position to say that, are you? HAMPSON: No, I'm not. BARON: So they don't show any Chinese money in Lippo/USA or in Hip Hing Holdings or in Toy Center Holdings. You don't know that, do you? HAMPSON: No, I don't. BARON: San Jose Investments? HAMPSON: I don't know. BARON: But as far as you know, there's no Chinese government money in any of Lippo/USA's entities? HAMPSON: I wouldn't know one way or the other. BARON: Right. If you had seen evidence of it, you would have brought it forward, would you not? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Now, you indicated that Lippo has business ventures jointly with China Resources, a company that is either partially or entirely owned by the Chinese government. Is that correct? ", HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And one of those ventures is the Hong Kong Chinese Bank, I believe? HAMPSON: Yes, it is. BARON: All right. Now, I believe you've also testified that the Lippo Group is a huge international conglomerate. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: At our best count, it has about 143 subsidiaries all over the globe. Does that sound right? HAMPSON: I think there's more than that. BARON: Give or take a couple? HAMPSON: No, there's quite a bit more than that. BARON: OK. HAMPSON: This is only a small representation of the companies that

atare available. In fact, this is just the core relationship that exist. The chart would be much, much bigger if we had all of the additional companies listed on it. BARON: All right. I'd like to have the chart over on the easel. Please put it in a position so the witness can see it. May be you ought to take down the... (UNKNOWN): You can't take that... BARON: ...there we go. Now, do you recognize those as Lippo joint ventures that a part of them make up of the various investment that the company has? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Am I correct--I'm sorry. HAMPSON: I don't recognize a couple of them off the top of my head. But I do--I see several of them that I remember. BARON: Right. And the fact that you don't remember may be because they have so many, and you just don't remember them. HAMPSON: That's right. BARON: OK. And indeed, am I correct--did you come across the fact that even Pat Robertson does business with Lippo? HAMPSON: No, I didn't come across that. BARON: Well... (LAUGHTER) HAMPSON: I wasn't looking for him. BARON: Well, there he is. You recognize the face? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: OK. And we assume that Pat Robertson's investment in Lippo was not part of some grand scheme to permit the Chinese government to infiltrate our political system? HAMPSON: I wouldn't know. (LAUGHTER) BARON: OK. Mr. Hampson, are you aware that Boeing has business ventures involving companies in which the Chinese government has a stake? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: General Motors has the same kind of relationship with Chinese companies in which the Chinese government has a stake. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Eastman Kodak has business ventures of that type. Do they not? HAMPSON: I don't know. BARON: It wouldn't shock you to find out that they did? HAMPSON: No. BARON: It's a great place to sell film, would it not? Over a billion in population. HAMPSON: I would think so. BARON: Are you aware that Microsoft has business ventures involving companies in which the Chinese government has a stake? You're aware of that? HAMPSON: No. BARON: It wouldn't shock you to find out that that was the case, though, would it? HAMPSON: No. BARON: Coca Cola, all-American company like that, has business ventures with the Chinese government, with companies in which the Chinese government has a stake. Do you know--are you aware of that? HAMPSON: No, I wasn't. BARON: Does it shock you? HAMPSON: No. BARON: I have nothing further. THOMPSON: Why don't we let the senator go ahead. LEVIN: Just a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman. Shall I proceed? THOMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: Did you read the Harvard study, by the way, on Lippo? HAMPSON: Yes, I did. LEVIN: Did anything you found in the public record conflict with the Harvard study that you read? HAMPSON: No. Not that I recall. LEVIN: When you looked at the public record on Lippo and you saw that one of the holding companies was HopHing, is that correct? (OFF-MIKE) a chart? HAMPSON: HipHing. LEVIN: HipHing, I mean. HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: You have Hip Hong? HAMPSON: Well, I didn't put it in there. LEVIN: All right. Well... HAMPSON: I see. I know it's HipHing. LEVIN: It's HipHing. And when you looked at the public record on HipHing, did you--we're you able to determine what their income was in 1992? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: Were you able to determine what their gross or net income was in '92? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: That wasn't in the public record? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: Do you know whether or not, for instance, they grossed even \$100,000 in '92? HAMPSON: I have no idea. LEVIN: Did you do a thorough examination of the public record? HAMPSON: I did a very complete database research on a number of different records. I wouldn't consider it exhaustive. LEVIN: But you did a reasonably thorough database search? HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: And that did not disclose whatever their net or gross income was in '92? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: This gets into the question of how, then, does a political party receive a contribution check out whether or not there was a adequate either gross or net income to cover that contribution. LEVIN: Now, you're not able to answer that. I'm not asking you the question. But that's what your testimony raises here. A check comes in for \$50,000. If it's not from a foreign source, it is clearly legal. People can argue as to whether or not it is from a foreign source it's legal or not. But it shouldn't be received in any event. As far as I'm concerned, it shouldn't be legal. But the check comes in in 1992, and they hire somebody like you. How many weeks have you been working on this? HAMPSON: A couple. LEVIN: A couple of weeks. So they hire somebody like you for a couple of weeks, say, here's this check for \$50,000 and check the database and see what the sources are. But in any event, it does raise the question as to how when dozens or hundreds of checks come in, what is the vetting procedure which is reasonably expectable of a party or a campaign, because even your reasonably thorough public search of the public record doesn't disclose this kind of a figure or what that gross or net figure could--was in that particular year. My next question is this: You've indicated that there's a greater focus now

n China on the part of the Lippo Group, is that correct? HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: In the last five years. Is that fairly typical of a lot of companies, that there's been a shift of focus in the last few years to China as an opportunity for profit? Is that happening with a lot of entities? Boeing, others have been mentioned. Is that... HAMPSON: A lot of companies are making investments in China. I haven't seen a lot of companies becoming partners with a company like China Resources, however. LEVIN: You indicated China Resources, I thought--didn't you say had hundred of subsidiaries or hundred of... HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: And do you know approximately how many of those--do you call them subsidiaries or joint ventures? HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: Do you know--have you tracked the growth of those subsidiaries and joint ventures in the China ventures? HAMPSON: No. I only tracked those entities that I could tie into the Lippo Group. LEVIN: So that you're not able to tell us, for instance, whether or not there's twice as many, five times as many, 10 times as many subsidiaries now that joint--that China ventures is involved in as there were in 1992? HAMPSON: No, I wouldn't know. LEVIN: Do you know, in terms of the Lippo Group's income, do you know what percentage of the income or the assets of Lippo Group are now in China compared to five years ago? HAMPSON: It's very difficult to tell. I couldn't even begin to speculate. LEVIN: OK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Senator Lieberman, we may have--we have a vote on, but we may have time for you if you want to... LIEBERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to do this quickly. Mr. Hampson, going back to that Harvard study, very briefly, on one of the exhibits in it, they list country representatives for the Lippo Group. They have five countries in it. Next to the United States--this is as of 1992--John Huang is listed. On the basis of the review you did, do you have any understanding of what it would mean for John Huang to be the country representative for the Lippo Group here in the United States? Was he--is he chief officer or a sales rep? Or... HAMPSON: I don't know. LIEBERMAN: You can't tell. OK. Second, the Lippo Group and the individuals associated with it contributed substantial amounts of money to American political campaign over the last several years, amounts of money that are questionable or raise questions because the company wasn't doing--the Lippo Group wasn't doing that much business here in the United States. But one of the theories raised does not go to China, but goes to Jakarta and Indonesia. And the question I want to ask you is, in your review, did you--on the basis of your review, can you tell us anything about the relationship between the Lippo Group and the Indonesian government? HAMPSON: I didn't look at that. LIEBERMAN: OK. Final question. China Resources Holding Company. I believe you indicated that that holding company, which bought a 15 percent interest in Lippo Group in '92, and now, I believe, holds a 50--in the Lippo Hong Kong Bank... HAMPSON: Yes. LIEBERMAN: ...now holds a 50 percent interest, had been used for espionage purposes by the Chinese government. What is the basis of that conclusion that you've made? HAMPSON: There's a number of published reports in the media about this. There was a BBC broadcast a few years ago where it quoted an intelligence agent on that particular subject. There were a couple of other references, too, that I can't--I have it in my materials, but I can't recall the exact source. LIEBERMAN: OK. So, again, these were from public sources, not, from classified information? HAMPSON: No. LIEBERMAN: Thank you. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: All right. No. I thought we'd bring him back if you--we have a vote on. Let's recess for lunch. And let's reconvene at 2:15? 2:15. (RECESS) THOMPSON: Senator Glenn, did you have further question of this witness? GLENN: Mr. Chairman, just one minute worth. I was going to ask before we went out for the break whether, you know, the title of your company would indicate that you do search abroad and I was just wondering if you do actual personnel searches in a foreign country, and the obvious followup question would be we got a couple of dozen people out some place out there that we'd like to find. Do you think you could find them? (LAUGHTER) HAMPSON: We might. GLENN: That's not the right answer. Do you think you can or cannot do it if you're the wrong company to do that? HAMPSON: Well, we could find them if we're given enough time. GLENN: Well time is of the essence in this case. I'm reasonably serious about this too. I'd like to have a bipartisan effort. Let's find some of these people and if we find them see if we can talk to them. Do you do that kind of work, or are you mainly involved with corporate and business connections as your, as the writeup of your background indicates? HAMPSON: Most of it is corporate work that we do. GLENN: OK, you've ever done work like that, like I'm talking about? HAMPSON: The only thing--we've tracked down many people for, witnesses or whatever purpose it might be. GLENN: Well this might be some

something we'd want to take and make a bipartisan effort to see if you could go out there and find some of these folks. If you could, I'd be all for it. Don't know whether we could get them to talk on the way we're there, but we might try it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Madigan, did you have a couple of brief questions? MADIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just briefly. Mr. Hampson, if you would look back for us at the chart on the right, which has understood your testimony is the configuration of the Lippo Group today as we sit here. Is that right? HAMPSON: Yes. MADIGAN: Now what does the chart on the right reflect as to the present interest today of China Resource in any Lippo entity? HAMPSON: The chart shows that most of the Lippo entities represented on this display have at least some ownership interest by China Resources Holding. MADIGAN: And so I can follow this--actually can't see it all that well from here--with the different colored lines, is the present interest that China Resources has in any Lippo entity reflected on this chart reflected on this chart by a particular color line? HAMPSON: Yes, the purple lines show ownership interest by both China Resources and the Lippo Group. MADIGAN: So it's the purple line on this chart that would reflect that. Is that right? HAMPSON: Yes. MADIGAN: Now to your knowledge, does China Resources have any ownership interest in Coca-Cola, Microsoft, General Motors, or any of the other companies being asked about by Mr. Baron? HAMPSON: No, sir. MADIGAN: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: That's all that we have, Mr. Hampson. I will point out that I was handed at the intermission the advisory opinion of the Federal Election Commission, 1992-16. Says, "contributions by domestic subsidiaries of foreign nationals." Apparently, in order to be legal, a domestic subsidiary must make a political contribution out of net profits and not revenues. And so with that we will excuse you, Mr. Hampson, and thank you very much. HAMPSON: Thank you. THOMPSON: We're going to call Harold Arthur as our next witness. THOMPSON: Mr. Arthur, I'm sorry. I'm not going to ask you to stand again. Would you please raise your right hand, please? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? ARTHUR: I do. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Arthur. I'll call on Senator Collins. COLLINS: Good afternoon, Mr. Arthur. I know that you have a lengthy opening statement, which I can assure you with the chairman's concurrence will be submitted for the record, and which has been provided to all members of this committee. So, unless you'd like to make a few opening remarks, we'll proceed to questions. ARTHUR: Proceed. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Arthur. Mr. Arthur, I understand that you are a long-time officer and director of Lippo Bank, and that you currently serve as chairman of the board of directors, is that correct? ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: Mr. Arthur, who owns Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: Mr. James Riady. COLLINS: And is it accurate that some 98 percent or 99 percent of the stock is owned by Mr. Riady. ARTHUR: That's my understanding. COLLINS: OK. Is Lippo Bank part of the Lippo Group that we've heard discussed earlier today? ARTHUR: The Lippo Group consists of a consortium. It consists of a group of small or large different types of entities, all with the commonalities of being related in some respect to the Riady family. COLLINS: I'm going to take that as yes and as consistent with your deposition in which you are asked was there anyway in which the bank was not part of the Lippo Group, and you responded that there was no way. Do you still stand by that statement in your deposition? ARTHUR: Of course. COLLINS: Thank you. As part of your duties during the period that you occupied the position of CEO of Lippo Bank, you attended Lippo Group conferences in Jakarta, where senior executives throughout the group were brought together, is that correct? ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: And what was the purpose of those conferences? ARTHUR: To introduce the various entities which were considered to be part of the group to one another for the purpose of knowing what the business relationships could be developed, and what marketing functions we could share. COLLINS: OK. Were Mr. James Riady and Mochtar Riady in attendance at those meetings? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: During your tenure at Lippo Bank, you worked with an individual named John Huang. Could you tell us what position or positions Mr. Huang held at Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: Mr. Huang was the president and chief operating officer of the bank in 1986 to 1988, I believe. I was the CEO at that time, until--let me start over again. I was the CEO from '84 until '87, and John joined the bank as president and COO in '86, and he held that position until '88. COLLINS: Thank you. Beyond his director's duties at the bank which he subsequently went to after he was no longer COO, did Mr. Huang also serve as the United States representative of the Riady family? ARTHUR: That was my understanding. COLLINS: Are you aware, M

r. Arthur, that in 1992, the Lippo Group attempted to purchase the Hong Kong branch of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International, which is known as BCCI? ARTHUR: I understand that is correct. COLLINS: OK. Do you happen to be aware of the fact that the Riady sent Mr. Huang to Beijing to negotiate aspects of that transaction with the Chinese government? ARTHUR: I don't know. COLLINS: OK. Mr. Huang maintained an office at Lippo Bank, didn't he? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: I'd like to direct your attention to an exhibit. It's exhibit 109, that's in your book. And it'll all be brought up on the screen. ARTHUR: OK. COLLINS: The first page of this exhibit is a little bit hard to see on the screen. Maybe we can go to the second page, which labels the various rooms. What we're looking at is the layout of the Lippo Bank executives' suite during the period that we're discussing. Could we have page two of the exhibit put up? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: This may make it easier to follow. Would it be fair to say that this is a small office suite and that you sat in close proximity to Mr. Huang's office for the better part of the four years, day in and day out? ARTHUR: That's correct. But the names are wrong. COLLINS: The names are wrong? OK. But it is correct that you were in close proximity to his office. Is that correct? ARTHUR: My office was (OFF-MIKE) -- it is labeled James Per Lee. COLLINS: OK. So it's right directly next to it. ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: Thank you for that clarification. Mr. Arthur, would it be fair to say that during this four-year period, that you developed a close business relationship with Mr. Huang? ARTHUR: I developed a relationship with Mr. Huang. Not a close business relationship, no. COLLINS: I just want to direct your attention to your deposition, if I could, just on that point, just for clarity. On page 17 of your deposition, you were asked, did you come to have a personal relationship with Mr. Huang? And your response was that -- quote -- "I have had a close business relationship with John for many years." ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: OK. Based on your connections with Mr. Huang during this four-year period, what were your observations about what Mr. Huang did in his office day in and day out? ARTHUR: In the -- in his office? COLLINS: Yes. ARTHUR: I really haven't -- I haven't -- I really don't know what he did in his office. He was not in the bank. COLLINS: But... ARTHUR: The office was a space that was leased. And he occupied the office. COLLINS: But you did sit in the next office for a period of years. You shared a secretary at some point. Is that correct? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: And you travelled with him occasionally to -- is that correct -- to Jakarta? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: No. Did you ever travel with him? ARTHUR: I don't think I've ever travelled with John. COLLINS: OK. You shared a secretary. You sat next door. By your deposition, you said that you developed a close business relationship. ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: But you don't have a sense of what he did, day today? ARTHUR: I don't. COLLINS: Is that because he held very closely to him his activities for other subsidiaries of the Lippo Group? ARTHUR: No, not necessarily. We never discussed his relationship with the Lippo Group. COLLINS: And you never discussed what he was doing? What his duties were? ARTHUR: No. I presumed it was business relations and customer development. COLLINS: Mr. Arthur, are you aware of the news reports that surfaced last fall stating that Mr. Huang had made numerous phone calls to Lippo Bank from his office at the U.S. Department of Commerce? ARTHUR: I am aware of the news paper reports. COLLINS: Would it be fair to say that you and the CEO, Per Lee, and your fellow board members at the bank were concerned when you read, "the press accounts that John Huang had made numerous phone calls to the bank while in the employ of the U.S. Department of Commerce"? ARTHUR: I was not concerned. Mr. Per Lee cannot answer for. He's not there. COLLINS: OK. In response to those press reports, however, it's my understanding that Mr. Per Lee performed an investigation into the phone calls. Is that correct? ARTHUR: I understand that he did. COLLINS: And his preliminary investigation revealed, from his perspective, that there had been 60 contacts between Mr. Huang and the bank after he left Lippo Bank. Is that correct? ARTHUR: I'm not -- I don't know. COLLINS: OK. That is our understanding based on Mr. Per Lee's deposition. Now, I'd like to direct your attention to another exhibit. It's exhibit number 114. What I'm showing you here is a phone bill and it indicates that Mr. Huang's Lippo Bank calling card was in use making calls from Mr. Huang's Commerce Department phone, as well as his home phone in Silver Spring well after he left the bank in July of 1994. And I'd like you to take a look at this particular exhibit. This particular exhibit shows that there were 41 phone calls in 23 days -- 41 phone calls in 23 days -- that were charged to the Lippo Bank calling card between July 18th and August 9th, 1994. This raises a question in my mind. After he left the bank, was Mr. Huang authorized to continue to

use his Lippo Bank calling card? ARTHUR: I am sorry. I cannot answer your question. If Mr. Per Lee were here, he could. COLLINS: Would it be typical for an employee who has left the employ of the bank, a former employee, to continue to have access to a Lippo Bank calling card? ARTHUR: I can't answer that question. COLLINS: Well, in your experience of being the CEO of the bank, can you recall any cases where an individual who was leaving the employ of the bank was given permission to continue to use the bank's calling card? ARTHUR: We would not have given permission. COLLINS: You would not have given permission. As I mentioned, Mr. Per Lee's preliminary investigation indicated that there was some 60 calls that--or 60 telephone contacts that he could document. Would you be--you said you weren't really that concerned about that. Would you be more concerned if you were to learn that the staff of the committee has documented more than 230 telephone contacts between Mr. Huang and Lippo Bank after he left the bank? Would that heighten your concern? To go from 60 to 230? ARTHUR: Mr. Per Lee told me he had made the survey, that no--none of those calls were directed to any of the senior officers of the bank. I would not have been concerned. COLLINS: Well, let me ask you another question. You're not concerned at 60 calls. You're not concerned at 230 calls. Would you be concerned if I told you that the staff has documented that there were more than 400 telephone contacts between Mr. Huang, while he's working at the United States Department of Commerce, and various Lippo entities or people working for various Lippo entities? That just to put that in context, that a amount to more than a call per business day during John Huang's entire tenure at the U.S. Department of Commerce. ARTHUR: I am not aware of any of those phone calls. I really have no knowledge of what you're talking about. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Arthur... ARTHUR: I'm sorry, but that's... COLLINS: No, I understand what you're saying. COLLINS: I guess that I'll say, as one member of this committee, that to have 400 telephone contacts between John Huang while he is an employee of the United States Department of Commerce and people working for various Lippo entities makes me wonder who Mr. Huang was really working for during his time at the Department of Commerce. That seems to be an extraordinary amount of contact. But let me turn to a different issue. I'd like you to next look at what is labeled "special exhibit number 1" and I don't know whether you have a copy of that. We'll wait for a moment to make sure that copies are provided to you, and to all members of the committee. I'm sorry--it has been labeled. I'm mistaken in calling it special exhibit number 1. It is exhibit 125. ARTHUR: Haven't I seen this, have we? COLLINS: Do you have that now in front of you? ARTHUR: I do. I do. COLLINS: OK. This is a letter written by John Huang while he is a director of the Lippo Bank. It's on Lippo Group stationery. It's dated October 7th, 1993. And it's to Jack Quinn at the White House. In this letter, Mr. Huang is thanking Mr. Quinn for a September 24th meeting with Mr. Huang and Mr. Shen Jueren, who is the chairman of China Resources. We've heard a lot about China Resources from the previous expert witness. In addition, in the letter, Mr. Huang refers to a previous meeting that occurred in Los Angeles on September 27th, and in the letter he states, quote, "that Vice President Gore was just super." We heard this morning from our--this morning and then also a little bit this afternoon--from our expert witness, Mr. Hampson, that China Resources is, in fact, owned and operated by the government of China and that numerous press reports state that it's well-known that China Resources is at times used as an intelligence gathering front for the Chinese government. Were you aware that Mr. Huang had taken the chairman of China Resources to the White House for a meeting? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: Were you at all aware that Mr. Huang was having communications with the White House? ARTHUR: I'm sorry. Would you repeat? COLLINS: Were you aware that Mr. Huang was in contact with the White House on any issues or to arrange any meetings? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: Let me go to some additional exhibits. It's exhibit number 115. This is a letter, again, from Mr. Huang dated February 18th, 1993, again on Lippo Bank stationery and it's signed John Huang, vice chairman of the board of Lippo Bank. And it's to President Clinton and it is--it is thanking him for a meeting that he has attended at the White House. And he talks about--he praises the president's speech, etcetera. It's followed up by a February 22nd letter referring to that same meeting, in which Mr. Huang asks for the photograph taken by the White House photographers of himself, Mr. Mochtar Riady and James Riady. Were you aware of any of these contacts between Mr. Huang and the White House on behalf of the Riady family? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: OK. I'd like to go to another exhibit. It's a June 1st letter, again from Mr. Huang, again on Lippo Bank stationery, again he identifies himself as vice chairman. It's a Ju

nelst, 1993, letter and he's thanking a White House official for having the president meet with James Riady and himself in April. Were you aware of this? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: OK. Do you know anyone else whom Mr. Huang introduced the chairman of China Resources to while he was here in Washington, whether at the White House or elsewhere? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: OK. Mr. Arthur, in 1996, was Mr. Huang still a director of Lippo Bank? This would be-- he would be employed by the ,", Democratic National Committee at this point. ARTHUR: I can't remember. COLLINS: Do you want to take a few minutes? Would you be able to... ARTHUR: In 1996? COLLINS: Right. In 1996. ARTHUR: No. He was not a director. COLLINS: No, he was not a director? Did he have any affiliation with Lippo that you are aware of in 1996? ARTHUR: He has had no affiliation with Lippo Banks since he resigned his directorship and joined the Department of Commerce. COLLINS: So Mr. Huang had left Lippo. He then went to work at the Department of Commerce, and by 1996, he was working for the DNC. And he had no affiliation with Lippo at all at that point to your knowledge, is that correct? ARTHUR: Not in an official capacity of any kind. COLLINS: Mr. Arthur, let me show you a document that I want to ask you about. This is Exhibit Number 126. Do you have that document in front of you now, Mr. Arthur? I don't want to proceed until you do. ARTHUR: I do. COLLINS: This essentially is a registration sheet or a sign-up sheet that Mr. Huang submitted to the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation Conference that was held in April of 1996. Do you see where it says name, and John Huang has, or someone on his behalf at the Lippo Group, has filled in John Huang? ARTHUR: I see John Huang and Lippo Group. COLLINS: I'm sorry? ARTHUR: And Lippo Group. ,", COLLINS: And under the company, Mr. Huang has indicated that he's affiliated with the Lippo Group? ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: And then there's an address that is indicated that is 711 West College Street in Los Angeles. Is that the address of the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: That is the address of the Lippo Bank. COLLINS: OK. Do you also see that Mr. Huang lists his title as an adviser to the Lippo Group? ARTHUR: I see that. That's not the Lippo Bank, you understand. COLLINS: I do understand that. But do you have any idea why in 1996 Mr. Huang would be listing the Lippo Bank as his address, as his work address? ARTHUR: The Lippo Group address was formerly the bank address. I don't know what the current address should be. COLLINS: Do you have any idea of why at this point, when Mr. Huang, remember now, has left? He's gone to work at the Department of Commerce for a little less than a year and a half. He's then gone to work for the DNC, and he's still listing the Lippo Group as the company for which he works. ARTHUR: I'm sorry. I have no knowledge. COLLINS: Does it surprise you to learn today that Mr. Huang was holding himself out in 1996 as an adviser to the Lippo Group while he was employed by the Democratic National Committee? ARTHUR: I can't answer your question. I don't have any knowledge. COLLINS: I know you don't have personal knowledge that this was done. But does it surprise you to learn that? ARTHUR: A little. (LAUGHTER) ,", COLLINS: You're a hard man to surprise, Mr. Arthur. (LAUGHTER) Again, this incident, like the 400 phone calls that were between Mr. Huang and various Lippo Group entities while he was employed by the United States Department of Commerce, again raises the question, in my mind, for whom is Mr. Huang really working. I'd like to return to another issue. COLLINS: I'd like to now talk about Mr. Riady. And I'm talking about Mr. James Riady. ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: Was Mr. Riady active politically when you knew him? Well, I know you still know him. But when-- in your tenure at the bank? ARTHUR: He has always supported political action committees, that type of thing. COLLINS: Was he... ARTHUR: But I have no knowledge-- no direct knowledge. COLLINS: Do you know whether he was a big contributor to political campaigns? ARTHUR: I know nothing about it, his contributions. COLLINS: OK. Well, let me show you a series of exhibits. We'll start with exhibit number 124 that we're going to put up on the screen. Now recall-- or I don't know whether you heard this morning, but we had a witness who testified that James Riady subsequently moved back to Jakarta in 1990. Is that your understanding, that he returned to Jakarta in 1990? ARTHUR: I believe it was before that. COLLINS: It may have been even before that? ARTHUR: (OFF-MIKE). ,", COLLINS: But in any event, by 1990, Mr. James Riady is living in Indonesia. Is that correct, to your knowledge? ARTHUR: Mr. James Riady was living between Indonesia and the United States. COLLINS: OK. Let me just direct your attention to the first page of this exhibit. And this is a check in the amount of \$15,000 drawn on James Riady's account at Lippo Bank. And it's made out to the DNC Victory Fund. It's dated August 13, 1992. Have I correctly represented the check that's in front of you? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: OK. And let's go on to the series of other checks that are on the next

tpageoftheexhibit. Thetopcheckisfor\$75,000. Again, it'sdrawnonMr. Riady'ssaccountatLippoBank. Andit'smadepayabletotheLouisianaStateDemocraticParty. Isthatcorrect?ARTHUR: That'scorrect. COLLINS: Andifwelookatthesecondcheckfromthetop, thisone'sdrawnontheaccountofEileenRiady. Couldyoutelluswhothatis?ARTHUR: ThatisJamesRiady'swife. COLLINS: AnddoesMrs. RiadyalsoliveinJakarta?ARTHUR: SheliveswithJames, whereverhelives. (LAUGHTER) COLLINS: Goodanswer. Isit--toyourknowledgein1992, aretheylivinginJakarta?ARTHUR: Tomyknowledge, Icannotrespondtothat. COLLINS: OK. Let'sproceeddowntheshheet. Therearetwomorechecks, bothdrawnonEileenRiady'ssaccountatLippoBank. (BELL) , " , Oneisfor\$50,000, andoneisfor\$5,000. ARTHUR: Yes. I'msurprisedtheonefortheArkansasStateDemocraticwasonly\$5,000. But(OFF-MIKE). (LAUGHTER) COLLINS: Well, theremayhavebeenothers. Thisisjust--ifyouturnthenextpage, Ithinkyou'llbereassuredthatArkansashasnotbeenslighted. ThenexttwochecksthatI'mgoingtodirectyourattentiontowillbeindeedreassuringonthatpoint. Atthetopofthepage, thereisanOctober'92checktotheArkansasStateDemocraticPartyfor5,000. Andthenaverylargecheckfor75,000totheArkansasStateDemocraticParty, againdrawnonMr. Riady'ssaccount. Mr. Chairman, I'lljustaskfortheremainderofthecheckstobeenteredintotherecord. ItincludesachecktotheMichiganStateDemocraticPartyfor75,000, drawnonMr. Riady'ssaccount; onetotheOhioStateDemocraticPartyfor75,000; andonefortheDNCVictoryfundonMrs. Riady'ssaccountfor15,000. TherearefurtherchecksalsototheDemocratic--theCaliforniaDemocraticPartyVictoryFund, theDNCVictoryFund. Again, CaliforniaDemocraticPartyandtheDNCVictoryFund. AllthesechecksaredrawnnoneitherJamesRiadyorEileenRiady'ssaccountsattheLippoBank. THOMPSON: Allright, thankyou, SenatorCollins. SenatorGlenn. (UNKNOWN): Mr. Chairman, ifIcanmake... COLLINS: Thankyou, sir. (UNKNOWN): ...onequickcorrection. They'realldrawnonthesameaccount. Presumablyit'sajointcheckingaccount. Butthey'realldrawnonthesameaccount, justdifferentnames. Thesenatorwasindicatingtheyweretwoseparateaccounts. COLLINS: TheSenatoriscorrect. (UNKNOWN): They'rethesameaccount. , " , THOMPSON: Yes, thankyou. GLENN: Mr. Baron. BARON: Thankyou, SenatorGlenn. GLENN: Mr. Baron. BARON: Thankyou, SenatorGlenn. Goodafternoon, Mr. Arthur. ARTHUR: Goodafternoon. BARON: Mr. Arthur, therewassomecolloquybetweenyouandSenatorCollinsregardingwhenMr. andMrs. JamesRiadmighthavemovedtoJakarta, toIndonesia. AndIbelieveyouindicatedinyourtestimonythattheymaintainedhomesinbothIndonesiaandtheUnitedStatesintheearly1990s, isthatcorrect?ARTHUR: They'vemaintainedahomeinthisLosAngelesareaofCaliforniaIbelieve since1987. BARON: Right. AndIdon'tknowifyoudoknowthis, butI'mgoingtoaskyou. AmIcorrectthattheRiadsdidn'tmovebacktoIndonesiafromCaliforniauntilaround1994? Doesthatsquarewithyourrecollection?ARTHUR: I'msorry. Idonotrecallwhenthey movedback. BARON: OK. Thankyou. Now, we'vehadtestimonythattherecameatimewhenMr. JohnHuangassumedthepositionattheDepartmentofCommerce. ARTHUR: Yes. BARON: DidyouplayanyroleinhelpingMr. Huangreceivethatappointment?ARTHUR: Absolutelynot. BARON: WhendidyoufindoutthatMr. HuangwasgoingtobemovingtoWashington to assumethatposition?ARTHUR: InJanuaryof'94. BARON: Andhowdidyoucometolearnofit? , " , ARTHUR: IvisitedwithMr. JamesRiadyathishomeinBrentwoodwiththepurposeofinforminghimthatIthoughtit wastimeIhunguptheglovesandretired. AndItoldhimIthoughtIhaddbeen there long enough, andweneedednewblood. HeaskedifI wouldstayonasadirector, andIsaidI hadn'tthoughtaboutit. HesaidheunderstoodthatperhapsMr. Huangwouldhaveanappointmentwiththegovernment, andifso, hewouldbeleavingthedirectorship. BARON: Andthat'swhenyoufirstlearnedaboutit?ARTHUR: That'swhenIfirstlearnedaboutit. BARON: And, bytheway, Mr. Arthur, Ithinkwemayhaveslightedyourverydistinguishedcareerinbanking. You'vespentabout45years inthebankingindustry, haveyounot?ARTHUR: Alittlemorethanthat, butyou'reclose. BARON: Giveortake. AndamI notcorrectthatwhenyoufirstcame aboard, thebankhathadbeenacquiredbyMr. Riadywasinalotofdifficultyandthatindeed, asIunderstandit, theonlyreasonthebankwas, thattheylettthebankstayopenwasbecause theybroughtyou, Mr. Riadybroughtyouintotakecharge, isthatcorrect?ARTHUR: Ibelieve that'swhattheexaminerstoldme. BARON: DoyouknowwhetherMr. RiadyoranyoneelseconnectedwiththeLippoBankorLippointerestsplayedanyroleinMr. HuangobtainingapositionatCommerce? Doyouhaveanyknowledgeofthat?ARTHUR: Ihavenoknowledge. BARON: Howoftendidyou talktoMr. Huangwhenhewa

sat Commerce? Were there occasions when he would call you or you would call him? ARTHUR: I haven't ever talked with Mr. Huang since--well, I'll take it back. I was a fundraiser for President Clinton in August, April, whenever. I've forgotten. And I saw John. At that time he was not in the Department of Commerce, however. I believe he was at DNC. BARON: This was after he'd left Commerce? ARTHUR: I think so. ", BARON: Right. And with regard to any telephone contacts, these alleged 400 telephone contacts, were you privy to any of those? ARTHUR: I haven't been involved in any conversation with Mr. Huang except casually over cocktails at that meeting. BARON: It ake it--have you ever acted as a conduit for information from Mr. Huang to Mr. Riady or any other member of the Lippo Group in Asia in any capacity? ARTHUR: No, sir. BARON: Now, you knew Mr. Huang for about how long a period of time? ARTHUR: I met Mr. John Huang in 1984. That was shortly after I had joined the bank. I joined the bank on June 15th, 1984. I met Mr. Huang on a visit to Hong Kong in November, and he had just joined the group, I understand. That's my understanding. BARON: OK. And you then knew him as a colleague thereafter? ARTHUR: I knew him as a person who had been introduced as a new member of the so-called group. BARON: Now, did you become familiar with Mr. Huang's activities in the Asian-American community? ARTHUR: I was comfortable with his activities in the Asian-American communities. BARON: Indeed, did you understand that perhaps that was part of his function was community outreach into that community on behalf of the bank and the interests? ARTHUR: When he joined Lippo Bank, he was one of several candidates. We filled the position of president and chief operating officer, and he joined the bank, I believe it was October of '86, and was in that capacity until July of '88. ARTHUR: At that point, his duties were community outreach, public relations, business development in the Asian-American community, because that's the job we were in. ", BARON: And it's true that the Lippo Bank--in particular, its constituency for its business--was focused on the Chinese-American community in the area. ARTHUR: Absolutely. BARON: Were you aware that Mr. Huang was elected to leadership positions in such institutions as the California-Taiwan Trade & Investment Council? ARTHUR: I'm sorry. BARON: I'm sorry. Are you aware or were you aware that Mr. Huang had been elected to leadership positions in such organizations as the California-Taiwan Trade & Investment Council? Does that ring a bell? ARTHUR: That rings a bell, and there were several others. BARON: Well, I let's try some of the others. Do you recall that he was a director of the Chinatown Service Center in Los Angeles? ARTHUR: No. BARON: How about co-chair of the United Way Chinese Business Initiative? ARTHUR: No. (LAUGHTER) BARON: How about co-chair of the Pacific Leadership Council? ARTHUR: No. BARON: Was he--do you recall that he was a member of the California State World Trade Commission? ARTHUR: No. BARON: I'm striking out. I say, when you say you're not familiar with it, you're not saying it didn't occur, but that you just don't have the knowledge. ARTHUR: I don't have knowledge. ", BARON: OK. Are you familiar with the Committee of 100, which is a by invitation only group of Asian-Pacific-American leaders, which is headed by I.M. Pei, the distinguished architect, and Yo-Yo Ma, the very famous cellist? ARTHUR: I am not familiar with that at all. BARON: OK. When Mr. Huang left the Lippo Bank in 1994, I take it you had known him for close to 10 years. Is that about right? ARTHUR: That's correct. BARON: Can you tell us your personal opinion of Mr. Huang based on your personal interaction with him during that decade. ARTHUR: I've always considered him to be a very fine, honest--I can't even think of the right word--he was very personable. He was very, very gentle. My wife used to describe John as the most gentlemanly man she had ever known. Except for my wife, that's not bad. (LAUGHTER) BARON: Did you have any reason in that decade of interaction with him to doubt this veracity? ARTHUR: None whatsoever. BARON: Did you ever accompany Mr. Huang to Washington, D.C.? ARTHUR: No. BARON: Do you recall giving a deposition to the committee in which you told the committee that John Huang and others knew me better than to solicit you for a contribution to the DNC because they knew you were a good Republican? ARTHUR: I'm a good Republican. BARON: Have you ever discussed political contributions with Mr. John Huang? ARTHUR: No, I haven't. BARON: With Mr. James Riady? ", ARTHUR: No, I haven't. I'll take that back. I did discuss a political contribution with Mr. James Riady in 1985, I think it was. March Fong Yu (ph) was running for secretary of state. And James said, "Wouldn't I like to contribute to her campaign." I said, "She's a Democrat." He said, "I know, but you know where." I did contribute. That's my contribution. BARON: One more thing, Mr. Arthur. Were you aware of whether Mr. or Mrs. James Riady during 1992 were green card holders? ARTHUR: As far as

I know, they were green card holders. BARON: And I know you're not an election law expert. But do you know whether that had any effect on the legality of them making political contributions in 1992? ARTHUR: I really have no knowledge. BARON: Thank you very much. THOMPSON: OK. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if I could just make one quick comment for the record. THOMPSON: Senator Collins. COLLINS: I just want to make clear that the Riady checks that I introduced for the record were produced pursuant to a subpoena out of the custody of Hip Hing Holdings, the Lippo entity that we heard about this morning that was managed by Mr. Huang. COLLINS: and I also wanted to just thank Mr. Arthur for responding to my questions. ARTHUR: Thank you. GLENN?: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Senator Lieberman. LEVIN: Senator Levin has... THOMPSON: Senator Levin. LIEBERMAN: Thank you. LEVIN: I think you indicated in response to Mr. Baron's question that you had a history in banking and that were indeed perhaps brought into the Lippo Bank because of your record in banking. Is that correct? ARTHUR: That's absolutely correct. LEVIN: And they were having some problems when you came there in the mid-'80s, a number of problem loans apparently, particularly to recent immigrants. Is that correct? ARTHUR: No. LEVIN: Pardon? ARTHUR: No, sir. That's not correct. They had problems with the former president of the bank. LEVIN: The former president of the bank. ARTHUR: Who disappeared one day. LEVIN: Oh. Sure he wasn't a recent immigrant, huh? (LAUGHTER) ARTHUR: No, he wasn't. LEVIN: During some of the time that you were connected to the bank as an officer/director, the bank was being supervised by the FDIC, you've testified. Is that correct? ARTHUR: The bank was and is supervised by the California State Department of Banking. It's insured by the FDIC. LEVIN: It was--did the bank make any attempt at any time that you know of to take advantage of the Riady's family with President Clinton in any of its regulatory problems? ARTHUR: Never at all. LEVIN: Did you ever see the bank try to win any favors or special treatment? ARTHUR: No, sir. LEVIN: Did you ever, to your knowledge see Mr. Huang seek such favored or special treatment? ARTHUR: No. LEVIN: I think you indicated that one of Mr. Huang's duties was outreach, including political outreach. Is that... ARTHUR: No, sir. I said community outreach. LEVIN: Community outreach, all right. You were asked questions about by Senator Collins about the meetings between--at the White House, where Mr. Huang was sending (OFF-MIKE). ARTHUR: Yes. LEVIN: Was that surprising to you, those meetings? That he would go to the White House? ARTHUR: Not particularly. LEVIN: You were asked about a number of checks in 1992. And I want to ask you about another incident in 1992 and see what, if any, recollection you have about it. And that was a check which a man named Michael Kojima... (LAUGHTER) Does that name strike a bell? ARTHUR: I thought it was funny. (LAUGHTER) LEVIN: Huh? ARTHUR: I thought it was rather funny. The pronunciation is absolutely right. LEVIN: Does the name strike a bell? ARTHUR: It does. LEVIN: Did your bank--was your bank owed money by Mr. Kojima? ARTHUR: Mr. Kojima was a guarantor on two or three loans with the bank. LEVIN: And did you end up being owed a lot of money by Mr. Kojima? ARTHUR: We sued, and we got a judgment. LEVIN: Did you see an article that Mr. Kojima made a major contribution in the same year, 1992, to the Bush dinner? ARTHUR: Is that... LEVIN: Did you see an article about that? ARTHUR: The answer is yes. It was brought to my attention by our attorneys who were the ones who got the judgment against Mr. Kojima. LEVIN: In what year did they bring that to your attention? ARTHUR: Whenever the picture was published. LEVIN: Would that have been about 1992? ARTHUR: If that was about 1992. LEVIN: And did it surprise you that he had any assets to make that kind of a contribution to the Bush dinner? ARTHUR: Yes. As a matter of fact, I think your question was, how did he get the money and why haven't we got it? LEVIN: Thank you. That's all my questions. THOMPSON: Senator Lieberman. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Arthur, thanks very much for your cooperation this afternoon. Do I understand correctly, that you were the CEO of the bank that the Lippo Group bought and changed to the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: No. I was the--James Riady bought Bank of Trade, San Francisco. LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: He bought it. He gained a majority interest in the Bank of Trade, San Francisco, on June 14th, 1984. LIEBERMAN: And then... ARTHUR: And I was employed by the bank to take care of the problems they had. LIEBERMAN: And that's how you first came to know Mr. James Riady? ARTHUR: That's the day I met him. LIEBERMAN: Right. Right. And then, did that become the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: The name was changed. LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: In 1990, I believe it was... LIEBERMAN: OK. ARTHUR: ...from Bank of Trade to Lippo Bank of California. LIEBERMAN: Right. Generally speaking, how--we know that the Lippo Group and their various holdings internationally are quite

substantially--but how would you describe the size of the Lippo Bank in California? ARTHUR: Very small. LIEBERMAN: Very small. Are the assets public information? ARTHUR: Yes. When I joined the bank, there was \$30 million in --, --, total assets. LIEBERMAN: Right. And now? ARTHUR: Currently, it is \$90--about \$93 million. LIEBERMAN: OK. So by most accounts, that's a pretty small bank these days? ARTHUR: It's a very small bank. LIEBERMAN: OK. Is it a profitable bank? ARTHUR: It has been since the first of January. LIEBERMAN: Of this year? ARTHUR: This year. LIEBERMAN: Previous to that? ARTHUR: We've had some fairly heavy losses relating to the economic condition that existed. The first five years that I was involved with the bank, it was profitable. LIEBERMAN: Understood. Let me ask you now--because you testified earlier about the room arrangement and your office was right next to Mr. John Huang's--can you tell us how often Mr. Huang was at his office at the bank? Did he tend to be there every working day? Or... ARTHUR: He was there a lot. I have no idea. LIEBERMAN: Really? Even though you were right next--your office... ARTHUR: I didn't pay attention to Mr. Huang. LIEBERMAN: Yes. ARTHUR: I had my own problems. LIEBERMAN: Understood. But generally speaking, would you say that he was there most of the average working week? --, --, ARTHUR: Generally speaking, yes. LIEBERMAN: And did he work a normal day on those days when he would just--you know, what I'm saying--nine to five or eight to whatever... ARTHUR: His hours were like mine. LIEBERMAN: Yes. Which were atypical working day. What were your hours? ARTHUR: Depending upon the situation that existed that I knew I'd walk into, it was either 6 o'clock in the morning... LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: ...or 9 o'clock in the morning... LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: ...and I would leave when the work day was over. LIEBERMAN: Sure. It is that we all understand that most of the time that Mr. Huang was there, he was not working on bank business but working for the Hip Hing Holding Company. ARTHUR: That's my presumption. LIEBERMAN: Right. And you've testified earlier that you don't know exactly what he was doing for Hip Hing. ARTHUR: I do not. LIEBERMAN: OK. Let me go now to the Riadys. James Riady we have talked about. Am I correct that Stephen Riady is his brother? ARTHUR: Stephen Riady is his brother. LIEBERMAN: And Mochtar Riady is the father. --, --, ARTHUR: That's correct. LIEBERMAN: OK. Do you know all three of the Riadys? ARTHUR: I have met all three. LIEBERMAN: Right. But the closer relationship you had, I presume, was with James because... ARTHUR: With James. He's the owner of the bank. LIEBERMAN: He was the owner of the bank. Do you have a basis for knowing about any of their relationships, of the three Riadys with John Huang? ARTHUR: I do not. LIEBERMAN: Let me ask you this. Did you see Mr. James Riady and John Huang together at any point? ARTHUR: I have. LIEBERMAN: And how would you describe that relationship? ARTHUR: I hadn't thought about it. I don't know how I would describe it. LIEBERMAN: Yes. Did they appear to be very close? Trusting relationship? I don't want... ARTHUR: I think it was a trusting relationship, but I do not know what they were talking about. I don't know what the relationship consisted of. LIEBERMAN: Right. Right. OK. Let me go on to the political activities which you've answered some questions on. Just to clarify--did you ever discuss the making of political contributions beyond what you've testified with either John Huang or James Riady? ARTHUR: No. --, --, LIEBERMAN: Did you know at the time that the Lippo companies were making political contributions? That is the holding companies? ARTHUR: No. LIEBERMAN: OK. Let me ask this general question, last, second to last. LIEBERMAN: It is a matter of record that the three Lippo holding companies and, as has been indicated here earlier, the Riady themselves, made substantial contributions to American political entities in the '91, '92, '93 period. I've tallied up--and it looks to me that between all of them, the total comes to more than \$800,000 in that three-year period. And we have heard all sorts of theories floated about about why they might have made such large contributions in a country in which their business interests were relatively small compared to the overall size of the Lippo Group activities. The bank was small. It lost money in all years except the one you've just described this year. The three holding companies were losing propositions. Mr. Arthur, you were part of the organization, attended some meetings in Jakarta in which the Lippo Group's plans, I presume, and ideas were discussed. I don't mean necessarily political. Bottom line--you know a lot more about the Lippo Group and Mr. Riady and Mr. Huang than we do, certainly than I do. What is your view about why they may have made these substantial contributions to American political entities during that period of time? ARTHUR: Friendship. LIEBERMAN: Friendship. With whom? ARTHUR: I know that James Riady because closely acquainted with the then-Governor Clinton, and

hey developed a--I believe they developed a personal friendship. LIEBERMAN: But as far as you know, again based on your associations with the Lippo Group, the contributions were not the basis--or were they the basis?--for asking for any special favors from the government? ", A RTHUR: I do not believe so. LIEBERMAN: To the best of your knowledge. ARTHUR: To the best of my knowledge, no. LIEBERMAN: Final question. And this is--well, I'll just ask it. Some have charged, as you know, that John Huang was a spy for either the Lippo Group or the Chinese government. And you knew him. You've told us what you thought about him. You worked right next door to him. I'm interested in hearing your reaction to those charges. And I suppose more specifically, in your experience with Mr. Huang, did you see anything that would support those claims? ARTHUR: I think the answer, if I may... LIEBERMAN: Please. ARTHUR:...to the claims is hogwash. And the answer to your other specific question is--no, I never saw anything that would indicate that. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Arthur. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. Senator, I think you point out something that is very relevant and very interesting and that is the fact that we would consider it odd that the heavy political contributions was not necessarily proportionate with the business interest involved. We assume nowadays that the money flowing into campaigns is proportionate with the interest involved, and the question raised to what extent those who are receiving the money can help those who are giving them the money. And that's part of what we're very much about here, the fact that that question is so readily raised and is so--is so relevant to our current process. But I will call the next senator who wants to question. And Senator Torricelli? Senator, excuse me. Senator Smith, did you... TORRICELLI: Go ahead. I'll follow. ", THOMPSON: We'll take it in order. Senator Smith, if you're ready. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of follow-ups. I was not here when you responded originally, early, to Senator Collins' questions regarding your relationship with Mr. Huang. But I know you did say that, although your offices were close to each other, you really didn't have a lot of knowledge about what he was doing. How well did you know him? Would you consider him a social friend? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: You indicated, though, that you had no reason to doubt his veracity. SMITH: I think that's the term you used a moment ago. How could you draw that conclusion if you don't know him very well? ARTHUR: As a business associate, I think I knew him very well. I knew him for 13 years. I have known him for 13 years. SMITH: All right. And I would agree with you if you knew a person as a business associate for 13 years and you said to this committee or anyone, I worked with him for 13 years. I know him pretty well. I know what he was doing. But you're saying you worked with him all these years and you didn't know what he was doing. I mean, that's still your testimony, isn't it? You didn't really have direct knowledge about what Mr. Huang was doing in that office with you. ARTHUR: That's correct. I knew he was there representative--I think his official capacity was the U.S. representative of the Lippo Group, now what that representative, what it's occupation is, I presumed, and I still presume, that it had a lot to do with image building, with--I think that is my presumption. SMITH: But outside of the office, and you did mention one, a political event where you saw him, but outside the office, are you saying that you did not socialize with Mr. Huang? ARTHUR: Only at bank functions like Christmas parties and soon (OFF-MIKE) meetings, but not as a social event. ", SMITH: You did say, however, in your deposition that you, and I guess you did qualify that somewhat, but you did say that you felt that you had a close business relationship with him. ARTHUR: I do. SMITH: But yet you didn't, again, didn't know what he was doing in that office next to you, correct? ARTHUR: I had no desire to know. My close business relationship with him related to his activities with, as a member of the bank's board of directors in connection with the bank. I knew him when he was the president and COO and I was the CEO, and I had very direct relationships with him at that time. SMITH: In a response to a question I believe from Senator Lieberman, I may be incorrect on that, you indicated that, quote, you were not particularly surprised that Mr. Huang had visited the White House and met with Mr. Riady and the president. Why were you not surprised? ARTHUR: I understood that they were friends. SMITH: Pardon me? ARTHUR: I understood that they were friends. From Arkansas days. SMITH: That Mr. Huang and the president were friends? ARTHUR: And the president. Yes. SMITH: What kind of a person, how did Mr. Huang conduct himself when he came into the office in the morning? Was he outgoing? Was he withdrawn? Did he speak about what he did the day before, the night before, or did he say...? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Just walked into his office and said nothing? ARTHUR: He said hello, good morning. And so did I. SMITH:

H: If you and I were business associates and we had an office next to each other, and you had a visit with the president of the United States, and you came back into the office the next morning, would you think I would be somewhat surprised if you didn't tell me you visited with the president of the United States? ARTHUR: That is a tough question for me. And the reason is, that I would, I was not surprised to learn that he had visited the president. SMITH: Would it surprise you to know that during the course of the time that Mr. Huang was working with you at the Lippo Bank that he visited the White House 52 times in a period from 1993 through June of 1994? ARTHUR: When I read that in the newspapers, I was surprised. SMITH: Why would you be surprised? ARTHUR: I didn't know it was that often. SMITH: And during the time that he made those 52 visits to the White House, and that we have, and I would just enter into the record Exhibit 70, and you should have a copy of it there, put it on the monitor, which is a Secret Service log from the executive office of the president which we got by subpoena, which has a list of the number of visits that Mr. Huang had with the president of the United States or the White House. And I would just point out for the record and ask for your response here, I've known some presidents in my time. I've been invited once to the White House residence by President Bush. SMITH: I'm sure many of us, as United States senators, have had an opportunity to visit. Mr. Huang, if you look here, when now has no government relationship--he now works for a private company--if you look on here, you'll see on the March 15th, at 8 o'clock, almost 9 o'clock in the morning, he had a visit with the president of the United States in the White House, in the residence of the White House. On May 5, 1993, a visit with the president of the United States in the residence of the White House. On the 21st of 1993, president of the United States in the residence of the White House. On August 2, 1993, with the president of the United States in the residence of the White House. And then if you go on to--I believe there are four or five references to meeting with the president of the United States in the residence. Does that surprise you at all? ARTHUR: I'm sorry, this is the first I've seen this. SMITH: Well, I mean the issue--assuming this document is correct and the Secret Service is accurate here, which I don't think anybody would challenge, would it surprise you to know that a colleague that you worked with every day had five visits in the residence, not in the Oval Office, in the residence of the White House with the president of the United States and he didn't tell you about it? Does that seem strange. ARTHUR: There would be no reason for him to tell me about it. SMITH: Why? ARTHUR: Because I am in the bank, a completely separate entity. We did not discuss business between us, other than relate to the bank where he was a director. SMITH: Well, Mr. Arthur, I mean, I don't know you, and I don't mean to challenge your veracity, and I'm not trying to challenge your veracity. But I am trying to challenge your recollections a bit. (LAUGHTER) You mentioned that your wife had said that she found Mr. Huang to be one of the kindest and gentlest people that she'd ever met. ARTHUR: That's correct. SMITH: Well, you don't form that kind of conclusions about people that you don't know, that you don't socialize with and you don't have some interaction with. Isn't that fair? ARTHUR: The interaction that we had was at bank meetings--I'm talking about bank parties, Christmas parties--perhaps twice a year. SMITH: Again, let me just recap one final point, Mr. Chairman. Your testimony is that you worked with John Huang in the same office for two years, shared a secretary, and that he visited the residence of the White House, met with the president of the United States--we assume--five times in the course of a year-and-a-half, and he never told you about it? ARTHUR: That's correct. SMITH: Never said a word about it to you? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: How about to your wife? ARTHUR: No. He would not have talked to my wife. SMITH: So he never ever said: Hey, I saw it. It was really great. I went up. And I, you know, we went into the residence and looked out the window off the Truman balcony? Never, never, not a word about it ever, nothing? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Do you have any idea why he would meet with the president of the United States? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Do you have any idea why he would go to the White House 52 times in the course of a year and a half? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. I might point out to--Exhibit 70, I say, was not subpoenaed. That was turned over pursuant to our request, was given to us by the White House. But it was not subpoenaed. (UNKNOWN): I apologize for that. THOMPSON: Not subpoenaed. Senator Torricelli. TORRICELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much. Mr. Arthur, good afternoon. ARTHUR: Good afternoon. TORRICELLI: I was going to begin, Mr. Arthur, by thanking you for being here. But, in fact, your attendance, I take it, was involuntary. You were subpoenaed. But I

t's every kind of you to be with us nevertheless. ARTHUR: Thank you. TORRICELLI: Even kinder, Mr. Arthur, because I understand, in recent years, actually you haven't been well, and at times, have been ill. ARTHUR: I've had one or two problems. TORRICELLI: How many years has it been since you were the chief executive of the bank at issue, Mr. Arthur? ARTHUR: I retired from the bank as the CEO. I believe it was February 28, 1994. TORRICELLI: I see. So it's been more than three years since you were the chief executive of this bank, and in the interim, unfortunately, you have been ill. But I take it, you needed to be called her today because you are far and away the most knowledgeable person on the current operation of the bank. ARTHUR: I'm sorry. If Mr. Per Lee were here, he would argue with you. TORRICELLI: So, Mr. Arthur, you're here today testifying before the committee, although you haven't worked in the bank for three years. You haven't been well. And you do not believe you are the most knowledgeable person on the operation of the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: Not since 1994. TORRICELLI: And who is Mr. Per Lee? ARTHUR: Mr. Per Lee is the now president and chief executive officer of the bank. TORRICELLI: Would he be the most knowledgeable person about the --, " , operation of the bank in recent years? ARTHUR: Yes. TORRICELLI: Wasn't Mr. Per Lee questioned by the committee and scheduled to be here today, too? ARTHUR: I understood he was. I received a call Saturday afternoon which -- where they indicated that his testimony was not required and he did not need to be here. TORRICELLI: Was no longer required? ARTHUR: That's correct. TORRICELLI: Didn't that strike you as unusual that you would be asked to come before the committee as an expert on the operation of the Lippo Bank, but Mr. Per Lee, despite the fact that you've been retired these years, and Mr. Per Lee, who not only is the chief executive, but in fact conducted an internal review of the very issues being questioned by this committee, was disinvited to attend? ARTHUR: I was surprised. TORRICELLI: So am I, Mr. Arthur. It is, however, a fact that Mr. Per Lee did conduct an internal review of the communications between Mr. Huang and the bank. Do you have knowledge that that, indeed, occurred? ARTHUR: I think that I have already testified that -- yes, I had knowledge because he told me he had made the survey as a result of the newspaper articles. TORRICELLI: I apologize for referring to it again. You understand the workings of both this committee and this Congress, referring to something once or testifying on one or even a number of occasions is sometimes not sufficient. So excuse me if I return to it. ARTHUR: I understand. No, I understand. , " , TORRICELLI: Mr. Per Lee actually, when he was questioned, in his deposition, if I could refer to it -- on page 97, starting at line 22 -- let me walk through this briefly. And the question: "As I recall from our previous conversation and also from a cursory review of these documents, it is apparent that the bulk of these phone calls from the bank to Mr. Huang's office at the Department of Commerce were coming from Judith Stera's (ph) line. Did you reach the same conclusion?" Answer, Mr. Per Lee: Yes. "Question: Did you make some effort to ascertain why she was making so many phone calls?" Answer: Yes. "How did you go about that?" Answer: I called her line. "Question: What did she say?" I called her twice with a matter of months in between the calls, and each time she told me essentially the same thing. It was that when John left -- that is left as the director of the bank and went to the Commerce Department -- he had a lot of associations with people in Los Angeles and people were calling and looking for him. "I mean, they knew he was in the Commerce Department because the press and all that, but didn't necessarily know how to get a hold of him. And they would call the bank." Juwadi (ph) would talk to these people and relay messages to him at the Commerce Department -- that so-and-so was calling and looking for you. "Again, on page 99, line 9: "Question: Did you discuss with Mr. Segeda (ph) the circumstances which led him to place a half dozen phone calls to Mr. Huang? , " , " Answer: Yes. "Question: What does Mr. Segeda (ph) say?" Answer: The calls were basically related to that period of time when Mr. Ning (ph) was here in D.C. He was ill. He had a serious heart problem. There was a flurry of calls during that period while he was convalescing here in Washington. "I would assume, Mr. Arthur, if Mr. Per Lee had not been disinvited today, it was probably his intention to refer to his deposition and give an explanation and end the mystery of what these calls were about. Would you make that same assumption? ARTHUR: I would presume so. TORRICELLI: Indeed, it's my information from the committee staff that there were probably about approximately 70 calls made by Mr. Huang to the Lippo Bank and probably 100 of those were returned. An analysis of those calls, as done by Mr. Per Lee, is that in 24 of them were from his secretary of the approximately 70. And of those 24 of the 70 calls that were made, they averaged 3.5 min

utes. On the question of communications directly with the management of the bank, to Mr. Perlman, there was only one phone call and it lasted for 21 minutes. You've worked for a variety of banks through the years, Mr. Arthur, during your long and distinguished banking career. TORRICELLI: After you have left employment in one institution and gone to another, did you find occasions to call your previous employer or have phone calls referred from your previous employer to your current employer? ARTHUR: Many times. TORRICELLI: Would it be unusual during the course of the year that your former secretary would call once every several days and convey a message that someone had called looking for you and you would answer that phone call? ARTHUR: Quite possible. TORRICELLI: Indeed, if you were in fact in the Commerce, Department and still representing the interests of the Lippo Bank and deal in serious business matters, wouldn't be unusual if the average phone call lasted two or three minutes? Could you conduct serious business on behalf of the Lippo Bank at the Commerce Department in phone calls that averaged two or three minutes? ARTHUR: I wouldn't think so. TORRICELLI: I wouldn't, either. Mr. Arthur, before your very able management was able to deal with the problems of the Lippo Bank and re-establish it on a sound financial footing, Senator Levin referred to the fact and asked the question about whether there had been any involvement by Mr. Huang or other officials of the Democratic, Republican parties, the state of California or the United States government. There were three cease-and-desist orders issued by the FDIC. Did you receive any assistance politically from anyone in dealing with those cease-and-desist orders? ARTHUR: Absolutely not. TORRICELLI: There were some communications and issues, as in any banking institution with a federal reserve bank. Any one call or make inquiries for you over at the Federal Reserve system? ARTHUR: We're not a member of the Federal Reserve system, but the answer is no. TORRICELLI: And how about with the California state bank regulators? I noticed there were considerable contributions to California political figures. Did anyone help you with the California state banking regulators? ARTHUR: No, sir. TORRICELLI: Mr. Arthur, there was a quote--Speaker Gingrich made a considerable accusation against the institution when he said the bank engaged in money laundering, there were violations of money laundering statutes. You were quoted as saying Speaker Gingrich's comments were inaccurate, irresponsible and without foundation. As a good Republican, is that an accurate quote on your behalf to these accusations? ARTHUR: It is indeed. TORRICELLI: You regret making that comment about Speaker Gingrich, calling him "irresponsible, inaccurate and without foundation"? ARTHUR: No, as a matter of fact, I think it was a little gentle. (LAUGHTER) TORRICELLI: Could you for us, Mr. Arthur--you now serve as the chairman of the board of the bank? ARTHUR: Yes, sir. TORRICELLI: Could you list for this committee--during the difficult times of the bank, you certainly were in need of references of considerably new depositors. It is never without need to get new loan business. Mr. Huang, obviously, was someone who knew people with considerable financial resources in the country and people with considerable commercial interests. Senator Glenn, could you just... GLENN: You can have part of my time. TORRICELLI: Thank you very much. Could you list for the committee of the references that Mr. Huang made that were of considerable assistance in these years to the Lippo Bank of customers or loan businesses that you think made an appreciable difference in the economic recovery of the bank? ARTHUR: No, I do not have those records. TORRICELLI: Well, you're chairman of the board. Does anything come to mind of a major reference of a depositor or loan business that was so considerable that you, as chairman of the board, noticed this? ARTHUR: If they were so considerable, the chief executive officer would have reported to the board. He has reported nothing to the board to my knowledge. TORRICELLI: So, in fact, as chairman of the board of the bank, in spite of the fact that Mr. Huang obviously had some considerable access to both loans and deposits, you as chairman of the board have no knowledge of any considerable references that were financially helpful to the institution? ARTHUR: That's correct. TORRICELLI: Finally, Mr. Arthur, you recognize that the work of this committee in ensuring that a foreign government did not interfere in the political process of this country... ARTHUR: Of course. TORRICELLI: ...compromise our security or gain access to classified information is of extraordinary importance as the primary focus of this committee. ARTHUR: I understand. TORRICELLI: I know, Mr. Arthur, you've given your life to the banking industry and have loyalty to the institution that you have served. Should we all be reassured that you recognize the relative importance of the work of this committee

tee? TORRICELLI: And if you believe for one moment that a foreign government was getting access to political institutions of this country, getting access to proper information, you would not for a moment, because of your loyalty to these individuals or to any of these institutions, for one moment hesitate to bring before this committee that information and ensure that the interests of the country were protected? ARTHUR: I would not hesitate for one minute. TORRICELLI: Mr. Arthur, as a-- you have been very helpful to this committee. You recognize the minority is unable to call witnesses of our own at this stage of the proceedings. Fortunately, the majority has been good enough to call witnesses that seem almost routinely to be helpful to the points we want to make. (LAUGHTER) And you have been no exception, and I thank you very much. THOMPSON: Mr. Madigan. MADIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of questions, --, Mr. Arthur. Did you become aware that Mr. Per Lee's study that found only 60 calls was, in fact, wrong? ARTHUR: I have done not know anything about the details of Mr. Per Lee's study. MADIGAN: Did you know that it didn't check any calls from the bank to Mr. Huang's home in California? ARTHUR: I'm sorry. I repeat, I did not-- I know of none of the details. MADIGAN: Then you didn't know then that it didn't check any calls from the bank to the home in the Washington, D.C., area or to the office he used at Stevens, is that right? ARTHUR: No. MADIGAN: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: All right. So Mr. Arthur, thank you very much. This will conclude our Lippow witnesses. I know that so many would like to stay around here another hour or two and hear other Lippow witnesses, but rest assured that Senators Torricelli and the minority will have an opportunity from time to time between now and November to call any Lippow witnesses that they want to call. But we appreciate your being here with us today. And Senator Glenn unless you have objection, I'm going to recess for the evening. GLENN: No objection. THOMPSON: We reconvene at 10:00 in the morning. FDCH Transcript Service July 15, 1997 9:59:59 There are no more items to read. 9:59:59 XLXXX*## mXXL#9:59:59 U.

S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS HOLDS HEARING (ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE) JULY 8, 1997 SPEAKERS: U.S. SENATOR FRED THOMPSON (R-TN), CHAIRMAN U.S. SENATOR WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR. (R-DE) U.S. SENATOR TED STEVENS (R-AK) U.S. SENATORS SUSAN M. COLLINS (R-ME) U.S. SENATORS SAM BROWNBACK (R-KS) U.S. SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI (R-NM) U.S. SENATOR THAD COCHRAN (R-MS) U.S. SENATOR DON NICKLES (R-OK) U.S. SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER (R-PA) U.S. SENATOR JOHN GLENN (D-OH), RANKING U.S. SENATOR CARL LEVIN (D-MI) U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN (D-CT) U.S. SENATOR DANIEL K. AKAKA (D-HI) U.S. SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN (D-IL) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT G. TORRICELLI (D-NJ) U.S. SENATOR MAX CLELAND (D-GA) [*] THOMPSON: Come to order, please. Senator Glenn and I both each have-- we each have matters to bring up this morning that are a renewal. I'd like to lead off even before opening statements and read a separate statement. Our ability to relate this information in a public forum just came about. And it's important that it be placed on the public record, I believe, as soon as possible and in a careful and accurate manner. So I would like to turn our attention to one of the most troublesome areas of this investigation. I speak of allegations concerning a plan hatched during the last election cycle by the Chinese government and designed to pour illegal money into American political campaigns. The plan had a goal-- to buy access and influence in furtherance of Chinese government interests. By the very nature of the topic, I must keep my remarks brief. However, I will relate what I can. The committee is investigating the existence of an alleged --, Chinese plan, to the fullest extent possible. Although we have encountered limitation on the information available, including those attendant to a pending criminal investigation, the committee has uncovered a significant amount of documentary and other relevant information. Our work in this area will continue. For now, the committee is able to report some of its basic findings, which are as follows: A story about the existence of a Chinese plan to subvert our election process is intertwined with the state of America's relation with China and Taiwan in recent years. Let me provide some context up front about those relations. Although the United States maintains no official ties with the government of Taiwan or diplomatic relations with the government of China, they have long been influenced by our ties to Taiwan. This is largely because the government of China considers Taiwan a rogue province and suspects it of seeking independence from the mainland. In 1994, Beijing lodged an official protest over an administration proposal to modestly increase contacts with Taiwan. This precedes difficulties of U.S.-China relations that would arise

he following year. In May of 1995, Taiwanese President Li Tung-hui was granted a visit to-- a visit to the United States. President Li's trip, which included stops in Alaska, California and New York, was highlighted by a visit to his alma mater, Cornell University. The visa, granted after a political struggle between Congress and the White House, represented a shift in administration policy. President Clinton initially opposed the visa, but eventually agreed to the visit. The move caught the government of China off guard. It had apparently underestimated Congress' influence over the process. Though caught off guard, Beijing was quick to voice its outrage and to engage in a series of overt retaliatory measures. China suspected arms-- suspended arms control talks with Washington; postponed cross-strait talks with Taiwan; canceled official visits to and from the United States; amassed troops along the coast facing Taiwan; and recalled its ambassador to the United States. ,", THOMPSON: But not all of China's actions were overt. Secretly, Beijing worked to prevent similar diplomatic surprises from occurring in the future. The committee believes that high-level Chinese government officials crafted a plan to increase China's influence over the U.S. political process. The committee has identified specific steps taken in furtherance of the plan. Implementation of the plan has been handled by Chinese government officials and individuals enlisted to assist in the effort. Activities in furtherance of the plan have occurred both inside and outside of the United States. Our investigation suggests that the plan continues today. In general terms, the plan undertakes a series of steps as the officials rise through the ranks to higher office of these efforts are typical appropriate steps foreign governments take to communicate their views on United States' policy. They include retaining lobbying firms, inviting more congresspersons to visit China, and attempting to communicate Beijing's view through media channels in the United States. However, other parts of the plan direct actions that are illegal under U.S. law. Although most discussion of the plan focuses on Congress, our investigation suggests it affected the 1996 presidential race and state elections as well. The government of China is believed to have allocated substantial sums of money to achieve its objectives. Another aspect of the plan is remarkable, because it shows that the PRC is interested in developing long-term relationships with persons it has identified as up-and-coming officials at state and local levels. The intent is to establish relations that can be cultivated as the officials rise through the ranks to higher office. When the FBI learned of these matters, it opened a foreign counterintelligence investigation and has developed and gathered a large volume of detailed information on the plan's implementation. In May and June of 1996, having determined that the gravity of the situation warranted specific action, the FBI briefed the Intelligence Oversight Committees in the House and Senate, as well as six members of Congress. The FBI determined it might be a target of the Chinese effort. The Bureau later briefed a seventh member in October of 1996. The FBI continues to investigate possible illegal activities ,", connected to the plan. Importantly, the FBI also told the White House about the Chinese plan in June of 1996, when FBI agents briefed two representatives of the National Security Council. The FBI placed no limitations on sharing the information, much of which the White House had independent access to through other means. This raises questions about who in the White House should have known or actually knew of the Chinese plan, and how it came to be implemented. My comments provide only a broad outline of the Chinese plan. The great majority of information about this matter cannot be discussed further in open session. The committee expects to hold closed executive sessions sometime soon to consider this matter more closely. That concludes my initial statement. Now I would like to proceed with my opening statement for these hearings. On March 11 of last year, the United States Senate voted unanimously, 99 to nothing, to authorize an investigation into improper or illegal campaign activities involving the '96 federal election cycles. Now Article I of the Constitution grants Congress its legislative powers. Implied in those legislative powers is the power to investigate. So from time to time throughout our history, when matters of grave concern to this country and this body have arisen, Congress has exercised its legislative power through hearings, congressional hearings such as the ones that we begin today. Now these hearings serve two purposes. THOMPSON: One is a legislative function-- in other words, taking a look at our laws, seeing whether or not they need to be changed, amended, deleted, added to; an examination that also involves the question of whether or not our problem is with our laws, our system

em, or those who are implementing our laws. A second function--and some consider this to be a even more important function--is the one of disclosure to the public. It's an opportunity for the Congress and this committee in this setting to disclose to the American people, to see how the government is operating, to pull back the curtain and give the American people an unfiltered view as to exactly how their system is working. Now within this broad outline, I think it's important for us to, "remember what these hearings are and what they are not. They are not trials where people are prosecuted. They are not soap operas that are designed to titillate. And they are not athletic events where we keep a running score. Rather, these hearings are serious looks at how our government is working, how our government is operating, and it's designed at the end toward seeing if we can't make our system, make our government work even better. Now a lot of facts are already out on the public record. In fact, there's been an outpouring of information and allegations and stories over the last several months in the media. And I'm sure that there's been so much troubling information out there that the average citizen has great difficulty in keeping from getting lost in all of it and putting it all together. And I think that sometimes the temptation under those circumstances is to just throw your hands up and maybe look for one key witness or one piece of evidence, one document, or maybe even a tape that would explain it all. But the truth seldom emerges in that way. But the truth often emerges in various other ways. That's the obligation of this committee, to find the truth. Our obligation is to take this virtual blizzard of information, add to it facts which we have discovered in our investigation, add depth, add perspective and context, and pull it all together and try to present it to the American people in a way that's understandable. And I believe that we can do that. And if we do that, at the end of the day, I am confident that the true picture will emerge. Now the allegations before us are extremely serious. They include illegal foreign contributions and other illegal foreign involvement in our political process. Money laundering. Influence peddling. Violation of the Hatch Act, which prevents fundraising on government time and government property. Violation of the Ethics in Government Act. Violation of the conflict of interest laws. Improper use of the White House in fundraising activities, and questions of whether our domestic and foreign policy was affected by political contributions. Now these matters go to the basic integrity of our government and our electoral process, and these matters will constitute the first, "phase of four hearings. There apparently was a systematic influx of illegal money into our presidential race last year. We will be wanting to know who knew about it, who should have known about it, and whether or not there was an attempt to cover it up. Now it has been pointed out that certain witnesses have fled the country or that certain witnesses will take the Fifth Amendment and refuse to testify, as is their right. It's also been noted that this committee has a cut-off date. Some people have expressed concern that all this will allow people to somehow thwart the purposes of this investigation to find the facts and to establish the truth. THOMPSON: However, it should be remembered that much evidence is available to us. Many witnesses are available to us who will give truthful statements about what they know. And if anyone should unlawfully impede or misinform this committee, there are criminal sanctions available. Now valuable information can be obtained in various ways. It seems that due to the facts that these hearings were about to start, that the White House has decided to release certain information before the committee had a chance to, in other words to pre-empt it. Since this is information that the American people, I believe, have been entitled to for a long, long time, I welcome this preemption. And I can only assume that this investigation goes forward, they will have the opportunity to pre-empt many times in the future. Now when the first phase of these hearings are complete, we will begin the second phase, which will address the broader issues concerning our electoral process, including the role of soft money and the role of independent groups. Now while most of the activities in these second phase are presumably legal, I believe that, frankly, that the common practices in these areas by both parties are a far cry from the original intent of the framework of our current campaign finance laws that were passed right after Watergate. I personally believe that we can do much better than the campaign finance system that we have today. However, we cannot move forward unless we have accountability for the past. And we cannot allow calls for campaign finance reform to act as a shield to keep from thoroughly examining those whomay have broken our existing laws. Otherwise, calls for reform will be viewed as

imply as partisan, and the cause of campaign finance reform will be hurt and, ", not enhanced. Now these hearings come at a time in this nation of economic prosperity. But they also come at a time when the American people are increasingly cynical about their government. We have less than half of our people voting now. I believe that part of this is due to what has happened to our political process, as evidenced by the matter that this committee will be considering. The American people see their leaders go to greater and greater extremes to raise unprecedented amounts of money to fund their political campaigns. Power is at stake, and the ends justify the means. And I believe that this thirst for increasing amounts of political money and what people are willing to do to get it lie at the heart of this investigation. Now while these hearings are clearly necessary, we must realize that this process does not come without a price. Some say that the revealing of fun and unpleasant information about our government and about our system itself further fuels the cynicism that I referred to. However, we decided over 200 years ago that we could stand the truth, that we could be trusted with it, and that we could conduct from time to time this kind of self-examination and come out the stronger for it. It's also pointed out as a downside of these kinds of hearings that congressional investigations offer the opportunity for rank partisanship, which further debases our system. It seems to be true that the American people often expect the worst out of us in Congress, and we seldom disappoint them. But it doesn't have to be that way. We as Democrats and Republicans have much more in common than the things that divide us. We all have our primary allegiance to this nation. We all believe in the rule of law. THOMPSON: And anything that attacks the fundamental things that we hold precious as a country are things that are going to be of grave concern to all of us. So this committee is presented with a unique opportunity. We can conduct a good, thorough investigation, assess responsibilities where appropriate, and make recommendations as to how we can improve our system in the future. ",

We can conduct these hearings without a lot of partisan bickering. A lot of people say let the chips fall where they may. We can say it and actually mean it. This committee demonstrated dearly on its commitment to fairness, something I'm very proud of. This committee unanimously voted to have a scope that would allow us to look at Democrat and Republican activities alike, where appropriate. Now if the American people see us honestly trying to get the facts in a professional manner, treating each other and treating our witnesses with dignity and courtesy, I believe that it will enhance the status of this institution. More importantly, I think it will enhance our government in the eyes of the American people at a time when our government sorely needs it. That's our opportunity, and that's our obligation. Senator Glenn. GLENN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our democracy--this representative form of government of the people, by the people and for the people--is based on that greatest of all political documents, the Constitution. And it promises for our people the greatest freedom, the greatest protections and the greatest framework to pursue individual opportunities, along with the greatest hope for the future of any nation on earth. But a written constitution does not form the government. People form a government and lead our country to its future under the Constitution. Throughout most of American history, that role has been filled by our political parties. They have put forward their concepts and ideas about where the country should go and what our stature should be in the world community. And after the push and pull of public debate and political campaigns, the American people make their choice, and we move on. For the most part, our political system has served us well. It has worked to implement our constitutional government. But within the ongoing constitutional political experiment in democratic self-government, this unique work in progress, there is one linchpin, without which such an intricate, complex system cannot continue to ", function as intended. Our democratic framework system of freedoms, protections and opportunities, and our whole political system function only to the degree that they have the faith, the trust and the confidence of the American people. Poll after poll and election after election have shown an increasingly dangerous and growing skepticism of our system. In the eyes of most people, the timbers of our political structure have developed a rot that must be dealt with. Or it can spread to dangerous proportions, adding to distrust and cynicism and doubt of those who won't participate, who drop out or they join protest groups with varying motivations. And that rot is the pernicious effect of huge amounts of money in today's political spectrum, both Republican and Democratic. The abuses have been bipartisan, and our investigations must be bipartisan.

is an if the results of these long and expensive efforts are to have sufficient credibility to be used as a base for meaningful campaign finance reform. GLENN: With the committee's expertise and long investigative history, we've not only been assigned a major responsibility, but also a great opportunity to start restoring faith that our government and political systems represent all the people, all the time, not special interests, and all the people part time. But that will be accomplished only if the investigation is done right. And what do I mean by that? Well, I mean that we must show the American people the truth about our campaign finances system--that your chances of winning are dependent on how much money you raise, that fundraising has become so all-consuming it has pushed both parties to seek to get as close to the edge of the federal election laws as possible, and that in their zeal to seek the edge of the law, both parties have, at times, stepped over the edge. In exposing this system it is not so much that we expect to surprise the American people. Unfortunately, sleazy fundraising practices are just what the American people have come to expect, and this expectation preceded the 1996 federal elections. If we wish to surprise the American people, we will do so by showing them that we in the Congress recognize that the system is broken, needs to be fixed, in fact must be fixed, and that we, "I", recognize that the lack of trust the American people have in their government stems, at least in part, from the perception that the Congress has been bought by big-money contributions, by corporations, others, special interests giving contributions in return for legislative or other political favors. I'm in favor of rooting out and exposing all the information on fundraising abuses without fear or favor, whether on the Democratic or Republican side, wherever the trail leads us. We should examine any illegalities involving foreign or domestic money. We should examine whether federal election laws have been broken or have been abused by individuals and organizations, and willful violators should be severely punished. But if that is all we do, we will have failed in this investigation and failed miserably, because even if it is not explicitly stated in the Senate resolution that launched this investigation, the measure of success for this investigation will be whether it produces congressional action for campaign finance reform, substantial reform, not the little bit of reform some in the Congress might advocate to reduce public pressure. What will we need to produce this success? Well, first the investigation and these hearings must be seen as fair, bipartisan, focused on the activities of both parties. Unfortunately, for the past six months we've had problems in this respect, and I hope that this is behind us. Another factor in the success of this investigation is whether we will examine thoroughly, with respect to fundraising by both parties, the following issues: one, foreign money. What evidence is there that foreign money was actively solicited in the 1996 federal elections? We do know that some foreign money came to the Republican Party, and I'll explain that in more detail later. Did it happen in Democratic fundraising circles as well? Let's find out. GLENN: I'm all for finding out. Also, is there any real evidence that the Chinese government or any other foreign government actually infiltrated the American government via campaign contributions? If there was Chinese government money illegally entering the American political system, is there any evidence that such money went to candidates of only one political party? "I", Now beginning in February of this year, there have been stories in The Washington Post, The New York Times and The L.A. Times about Chinese government plans to influence the American political system. This past April, The Los Angeles Times reported that in 1995, the Chinese government formulated a plan to use about \$2 million to influence legislative branch elections, both Republican and Democratic, in 1996. The article reported that the plan was formulated because the Chinese government was upset at the recent visit of Taiwan Prime Minister Lien. As a result, the Chinese government apparently recognized that it needed to conduct more lobbying on its behalf. Part of the plan, therefore, apparently called for Chinese officials to meet to influence people with a focus on legislators. As the article noted, the type of lobbying activity is legitimate, is done by many foreign countries and domestic interests. Well, that's mainly what we know for sure about the Chinese plan at the moment. According to the press, the Chinese government intended to use a relatively modest amount of money to gain influence in the Washington lobbying game, and it intended to do this by focusing on the legislative branch of government. Now, I mention these reports here because I am greatly concerned about how the reports are sometimes discussed by individuals in this body and in the press. I've heard

language like infiltration, foreign spies, foreigners, as we're jeopardizing our national security. Well, on this issue, the committee should go just as far as the fact stake, recognizing that it's the FBI that's in a much better position to-- than a congressional committee do on espionage investigation. We must be careful, however, not to jump to conclusions that are based on a partial story with ambiguous information. But wherever the trail leads, let's look at it. And we want to do it fairly. This committee, if we go back in our records, we have a very unhappy history in that respect, as far as ambiguous information goes. During the 1950s, we can all recall what happened on this committee, and I doubt anyone here wants to return to those dark days. Now, the second issue that we-- other issues we must examine during these hearings, the second one is the misuse of tax-exempt and non-profit organizations. There are numerous and credible allegations, that such organizations were illegally employed, perhaps on both sides, but we know of some on the Republican side in 1996. We have those documented. Did the Democrats receive similar illegal help? Let's find out. Number three, contributions given in the name of another person-- did both parties violate that?-- because that is an illegal practice under our campaign finance laws. Well, the vice chairman of Bob Dole's campaign was fined \$1.6 million and put under house arrest for this practice. GLENN: This committee will also investigate similar allegations regarding a Democratic fundraising event at a Buddhist temple in California. Are there other cases we should look at? We should find them if they're there. Number four, the use of soft-money contributions. This is a most important issue that the chairman has indicated will be examined in phase II of the hearings. If there's some element of the campaign fundraising system crying for reform, it's soft money. Unlimited funds-- unlimited funds-- being given to the political parties, which have resulted in not only continually raising the ante in political campaigns, but have resulted in distorting the political agenda of both parties. Now all these issues have fueled the cynicism I spoke of earlier that currently infects the American body politic. Who can blame them when they see what campaign contributions given by special interests have produced in terms of favors to those interests? We've heard a great deal-- a great deal these past months-- about Democrats and perks and access. And Americans have every right to be concerned about special favors for campaign contributions. Mr. Chairman, in my full statement, I give a number of examples of Republican favors also back and forth, as well as some Democratic. And as I see it, it sort of comes out as a match on both here, as far as transgressions of the past. And I would ask my-- I don't want to read all of those-- I'd ask my entire be included in the record. THOMPSON: Made part of the record. GLENN: Yes, thank you. Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to one specific case, however, that the committee has been investigating. And it is a very clear case of foreign money channeled through a Florida corporation to the National Policy Forum, and ultimately, to the Republican National Committee. On one level, this is an extremely complex story. It's a story of a multimillionaire and his Hong Kong corporation, a desperate, cash-strapped Republican Party, and how they combined to finance the Contract With America in 1994, and then two years later, to infuse the Republican Party with three-quarters of a million dollars in foreign money. At its core, this is also a simple story. It's a story of greed and trust betrayed, as I see it, of a national chairman who betrayed the trust of a wealthy foreign donor, his own party and the American people when he tried to circumvent the campaign finance laws of this country. This summer, you will hear many examples of foreign money being funneled to the Democrats and to the Republicans. But this story, as far as I know right now, is the only one so far where the head of a national political party knowingly and successfully solicited foreign money, infused it into the election process and intentionally tried to cover it up. We'll be holding hearings on the National Policy Forum and Young Brothers later in this summer, perhaps later this month. And I want to give you just a short preview of what we have learned. The National Policy Forum was established in 1993 as a think tank to develop Republican ideas and policies. Republican officials claimed that it was independent of the party, and thus would not be subject to the laws and regulations that apply to the Republican National Committee and other political organizations. In fact, the National Policy Forum was an arm of the Republican National Committee. It was a subsidiary, in the words of a top Republican official. One way the Republicans used their subsidiary was for what can only be described as the laundering of illegal foreign money. GLENN: Now I have a few slides that tell this story

here, and I think -- I hope the audience can see these. They're on the monitors, our monitors up here, and I think the larger monitors back there. ,", The first document's a memorandum titled NPF Action. It's from Scott Reed, the executive director of the RNC, to officials at the NPF, including the chairman, Haley Barbour. This document was created in anticipation of the formation of the NPF. And under the heading of fundraising, the sixth item, as you can read, is for foreign, which strongly suggests that Mr. Reed contemplated tapping foreign sources for funding the NPF. The document's also interesting because it reveals that at its inception, the NPF was a little more than a front for the RNC. Here's a high-ranking RNC official recommending the structure, the personnel and the mission for the NPF. A few weeks later, the National Policy Forum is officially launched, and Haley Barbour, the RNC chairman, as well as the chairman of the NPF as well, declares that this organization will be separate from the Republican National Committee. Barbour also announces the selection of Michael E. Baroody as NPF's president. The next document is a memorandum from Mr. Baroody providing Mr. Barbour with some reasons for resignation. By this time, Mr. Baroody has been at the NPF for a little over a year, has had a chance to see how the organization works. He is dissatisfied to the point of resigning, and he writes to Mr. Barbour, quote: "We also discussed your belief that considerable money could be raised for this effort from foreign sources. It told you again, even before starting at NPF, I thought you were right about the possibility foreign money could be raised, but I thought it would be wrong to do so." The idea, nonetheless, seemed to hold some fascination and continued to be discussed until well after Denning came on the scene." End of quote. This seems to jibe with what RNC Executive Director Scott Reed wrote to Barbour in the earlier memo. The Baroody letter is an extraordinary document. Here's the president of the NPF stating quite clearly that the organization is nothing more than a Republican front group, describing the so-called separation between the RNC and the NPF, in his words, "a fiction." In an effort to learn more from Mr. Baroody (ph), this committee served him with a subpoena, and a few weeks ago, we asked him a series of questions under oath. Mr. Baroody refused to say anything about the letter. In fact, on more than 100 occasions, his attorney instructed him not to answer the questions posed to him by this committee, even questions directly asking him about foreign money at NPF. ,", I should note, Mr. Chairman, that we do appreciate very much the order you recently issued instructing Mr. Baroody to answer the questions we believe to be within the scope of this investigation. It was a tough statement. We appreciate it. You were right to put it out. Other former officials of the NPF and the Republican Party have also withheld information from this committee, seriously undermining our efforts to uncover the complete story. And we hope they'll be more forthcoming in the weeks ahead. However, even without the cooperation of those Republican witnesses, we have this letter and other documents that speak for themselves. The references to foreign money and "the fiction," as they say it, in quotes, the fiction of separation between the NPF and RNC, are right there in black and white. Mr. Baroody's worst fears are realized shortly after he resigns when, at the request of Chairman Barbour of the RNC, foreign money is used to guarantee a loan to NPF to the ultimate benefit of the RNC. GLENN: Young Brothers Development Corporation, a foreign-owned company based in Hong Kong, directs a \$2.1 million loan through its Florida-based shell corporation, Young Brothers, USA. The Florida company's only assets come straight from Hong Kong. This shell organization provides the loan guarantee to the National Policy Forum, an organization which is an arm of the Republican National Committee. The National Policy Forum and its chairman, Haley Barbour, immediately funnels \$1.6 million to the Republican National Committee and its chairman, Haley Barbour. As you can see here, corporate money that started in Hong Kong is spread out all over the country by the RNC to help pay for elections in 1994. This slide shows that foreign money helps make a major difference in November when the Republicans do capture the Congress for the first time in 40 years. In states where the money flowed right before the election, Republicans won congressional races. Now that, of course, could be a happy ending, at least for Haley Barbour and the RNC, but the story doesn't end there. In fact, some ways it's just beginning. After using the Young Brothers money to fund the Republican victory, Mr. Barbour decides that the NPF should just keep the money. He asked Young for forgiveness (ph). Young says ,", no. NPF fails to make the next payment on the loan guaranteed by Young Brothers, perhaps to test Mr. Young's resolve. Young says, pay up. In '95, Barbour travels to Hong Kong to visit Am

brose Young on his yacht and again plead for forgiveness, and Young says no. A few more months pass. Haley Barbour and Ambrose Young travel to China together and meet with the Chinese foreign minister--Barbour still pressing for forgiveness; Young is holding firm. Spring of '96 when the Dole campaign is strapped for cash, the RNC desperately needs money, and the Republicans look like they might lose Congress if they--that they have held for only two years, and the NPF defaults. They just won't pay. Needless to say, the RNC won't pay either, despite Haley Barbour's early assurance to Ambrose Young. Angry letters are exchanged between lawyers. Richard Richards, the former chairman of the RNC, tries 10 times to call the current chairman, Haley Barbour. Mr. Barbour won't talk to him. On September 17th, Dick Richards writes to Chairman Barbour a letter which recounts the history of the loan. He says, quote, "I have recently heard from Mr. Young in Hong Kong, and needless to say, he's somewhat distressed about the non-payment by the forum." Just prior to the election of 1994, I was asked by Fred Volcanzik (ph) to help facilitate a loan in excess of \$2 million to assist to help pick up 60 targeted House seats. Funds were transferred from Hong Kong to Young Brothers, USA, a Florida corporation of which I am the president. Shortly after the loan was made, you journeyed to Hong Kong and approached Mr. Young for the first time about the question of forgiveness of the loan. "There cannot be any dispute that this was a loan. Mr. Young made it in good faith to assist you in capturing some targeted congressional seats." That's in the letter. Indeed, the RNC had \$1.6 million to fund the Contract With America in '94. GLENN: Two years later, it saved \$750,000 to fund the election in '96, all thanks to the efforts of a wealthy man from Hong Kong and the concerted effort by Haley Barbour and the NPF to privately exploit this generosity while publicly hiding it. ,", Now that's an encapsulation of the story. As always, the devil is in the details. There are more details to flesh out. We will be able to, as I indicated earlier, we'll tell the complete story later this month, we hope this month, and the American people will learn exactly what happened. I began my remarks by referring to the cynicism that the American people feel for so much of what we do. High among the reasons they give for their cynicism is the way that money influences campaigns. Indeed, according to a recent Wall Street Journal poll, almost two-thirds of all Americans favor banning soft-money contributions from our elections system because they realize that it predictably, invariably, inevitably cheapens our democracy. Another reason for their cynicism is a partisan ship that increasingly seems to distort our work in the Congress. Just as surely as cash cheapens the work that we do, partisanship does so as well, and the American people know it. Indeed, some 70 percent of all Americans believe that both parties believe that both parties are equally guilty of campaign fundraising abuses. So, Mr. Chairman, let's honor this body--and the American people who have given us the great privilege of serving in it--with an investigation that is serious, it's balanced and it's fair. And let us then act to rectify the campaign finance problem afflicting both parties in a way that restores some measure of faith in our system to the American people whose daily lives are affected by that system. Mr. Chairman, I have one other issue. And this is a very important one to discuss before concluding. One of the most disturbing, and most focused-on by the press, allegations in this investigation has been the suggestion that an individual placed in a position of trust in our government may have been engaged in espionage, or at least, economic espionage, passing classified information to persons unauthorized to receive this information. If true, charges of spying or of being an unregistered foreign agent could follow. I'm referring of course to Mr. John Huang, who was hired at the Department of Commerce and given a security clearance. It's been suggested that Mr. Huang leaked classified information while at Commerce to his former employer and possibly to a foreign government. Few charges could be more serious. ,", Sometime ago, minority counsel Alan Baron approached Mr. Huang's attorney to explore the possibility of Mr. Huang appearing to testify before this committee. Those discussions have continued and come to fruition in not only the last few days, but the last few hours, over the weekend and indeed in some respects just this morning. And I wish to report that counsel for Mr. Huang has stated that Mr. Huang is willing to come before the committee and not exercise his Fifth Amendment rights. He will respond to any question the committee may ask on any aspect of our investigation. He will ask for limited immunity only. GLENN: Limited immunity, because of certain FEC and Hatch Act allegations against him. Now, let me explain. One thing that has been clear from the beginning of any discussion with Mr. Huang's attorney

ney, under no circumstances would Mr. Huang be immunized from prosecution for any act of espionage or for any offense prosecutable for the disclosure of classified information or for acting as an agent for any foreign government. Moreover, Mr. Huang would be subject to prosecution for perjury or for giving a false statement to investigators if he did not tell the truth. I can now report that Mr. Huang has agreed through his counsel to testify with a limited immunity relating to any criminal charges that could result. Now, limited immunity would not apply to the criminal charges. To testify without immunity relating to criminal charges that could result in the committed espionage, or even economic espionage, if he disclosed classified information to anyone not authorized to receive it; if he acted as an agent for any foreign government; if he commits perjury; if he makes any false statement under oath. While Mr. Huang will answer questions on any subject, his testimony can be used against him in a prosecution for any of these charges. It's my view that upon completion of the opening statements today, the committee should go into executive session to consider such a proffer. I further believe that the committee should solicit and receive the views of the Department of Justice before it makes a final determination as to whether it believes the limited grant of immunity sought by Mr. Huang should be afforded. Well, as you yourself stated, we are not bound by the views of, " , the Department of Justice, it is appropriate for us to obtain the department's input. I've been advised that Mr. Huang's attorney, Mr. Cobb, who is a highly respected defense attorney, is prepared to proceed immediately to make a presentation and proffer to the Department of Justice on behalf of his client. Mr. Chairman, I make this clear: I'm not entirely prepared today to take a position on the issue of immunity, limited immunity, for Mr. Huang at this point, because I wish to know what the Department of Justice has to say also, even though it is not the controlling factor, as you pointed out. Given the fact, however, that Mr. Huang would not be immune from prosecution for espionage or the unauthorized transfer of classified information, and would also be subject to prosecution for perjury, I believe this may be a very unique and inexpensive opportunity to inform ourselves and the American people about an issue that has been of serious concern to all of us. Of course, it is also true that Mr. Huang would still be wide open to questions in those areas for which he has received immunity. He could still be questioned in those areas. And this would include all aspects of his fundraising, which has been the subject of such intense scrutiny. Now, one issue which concerned me, and I'm sure many others here today, is why Mr. Huang would be motivated to come forward on the basis that I have described. Now, I do not know Mr. Huang. GLENN: I don't know that I have ever met him. But he's been described to me as a man proud of his heritage, proud to be an American citizen. I've been advised that a guiding principle in his life has been to promote the interests of the Asian-American community. He believes the interests of that community have been harmed by the allegations surrounding him. And I am told that is why he wants to come forward and address the allegations and speculations before this committee. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from counsel, Mr. Cobb, that I gave you a little earlier today. I would ask that that be included in the record. I believe a copy has been distributed to all the members at the desks. " , THOMPSON: Without objection, it will be made a part of the record. GLENN: As I said, as far as I know, neither I nor any of my staff have ever met Mr. Huang, and I am in no position to assess his reputation or motives beyond what I have been told. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my effort to bring Mr. Huang before this committee serves to underscore my full commitment that all the facts be presented to the American people on a bipartisan basis. The issues surrounding our national security and the issues surrounding campaign finance reform override partisan concerns. We have arrived at a point where we can reshape the political landscape, and we can redefine the political process. I hope that all of us will have the strength to rise to that occasion and do what is best for our country. Thank you. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Glenn. I propose that we go on with opening statements. We certainly do want to discuss this new information. I think it's very important. And I think it's encouraging. There are some serious questions that have to be asked about it, however, and I know that other members of the committee will want to discuss that to exactly how we move forward. But I welcome very much these developments. Senator Collins. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today we embark on a difficult task. We have been asked to judge conduct in which all of us who are involved in partisan political activity will be seen to have an interest, an undeniable self-interest. In discharging this responsibility, we on the

committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, must demonstrate that we are guided by one goal and one goal only: the pursuit of truth on behalf of the American people. We can do no less, as the matters we will be scrutinizing affect the process by which we choose our leaders, a process that defines the very essence of a free society. ", It has already been widely reported that we will be examining very troubling allegations about the involvement of the Democratic National Committee and the White House with foreign money. As we do so, the challenge for the Republic is on this committee will be to remain objective and fair-minded in the face of mounting evidence of potentially very serious wrongdoing. For their part, my Democratic colleagues must show a willingness to go wherever the evidence leads and not restrict the committee's ability to gather information. They must also resist the temptation to make dissimilar conduct look similar in an effort to dismiss serious legal and ethical breaches with the time-worn excuse that everybody does it. The White House and others under scrutiny must be much more forthcoming. The president cannot credibly preach the gospel of campaign finance reform unless his aides and supporters are prepared to let the light of day shine on their activities during the 1996 campaign. The public, too, has a role to play in making these hearings successful. The American people, understandably weary of scandals and skeptical about the prospects for change, must ultimately become engaged in this matter. I disagree with those who view the jaded attitude of the public toward campaign finance abuses as good news. For me, it sends a stronger message than the loudest shout of protest. Silence does not mean approval. To the contrary, it means not only disapproval, but a complete lack of faith that we are capable of improving the system. We must attempt to use these hearings to persuade the public that this is not a hopeless quagmire. During the next several months, we can be certain that we will witness some conflicting versions of events, some of which may never be resolved. COLLINS: But what already seems clear, based on the allegations that have appeared in the press, is that we are here today largely because of an ethical indifference which some at the Democratic National Committee and the White House displayed toward fundraising in the 1996 presidential campaign. Indeed, as important as it is to uncover abuses, it is probably more important to understand causes. Toward that end, let me suggest ", three components of the ethically lax atmosphere which gave rise to the events that bring us here today. The first was a mania for money. This is certainly not new in the political life of our country. But driven by the high cost of television ads, it has reached epic proportions. Indeed, the television ad race has become the political counterpart of the nuclear arms race, characterized by the same insecure feeling that one can never have enough. Even the limits placed on spending in presidential campaigns did not stop the escalation, as candidate ads were replaced by party ads, funded in part by soft money raised from questionable sources. The second component was a failure to distinguish between the ethically right and the technically legal. Instead, there was a willingness to cut every corner, bend every rule, and invoke every technicality. When the argument is that moving from one room in the White House to another makes the solicitation of funds legal, we have at best compliance with the letter and not the spirit of the law. Until it becomes part of our political ethos to honor the purposes underlying our campaign finance laws rather than trying to subvert them through legalistic loopholes, there may be merit to the contention that our laws will never be tight enough to withstand the mania for money. The third component was a utter lack of concern for the source of contributions. Accepting money from a Buddhist temple flies in the face of a prohibition against political contributions from religious groups. Accepting money from an impoverished Indian tribe exploits those who are dependent on the federal government. And accepting money from suspected criminals suggests that money talks regardless of what it has to say. For some, it seems that the contributors tent can never be too big, with the only requirement imposed on those seeking entry being, "Show me the money." It is this third component which has raised one of the major concerns to emerge from the 1996 presidential campaign and which must be most closely examined in these hearings. Specifically, it is imperative that we get to the bottom of the allegations involving foreign money. COLLINS: Let me take just a moment to explain why these allegations are so serious. Much of the solicitation of foreign money ", was allegedly done by an individual who recently had been receiving classified information of potential interest to the would-be contributors. This combination of possessing government secrets and soliciting political contributions

rom overseas donors, possibly even foreign governments, should make even the most hard-boiled political veteran nervous. This is particularly true when the individual in question has been unwilling to disclose his activities without a grant of immunity for fear of incriminating himself. Moreover, the world must have confidence that our foreign policy decisions are based on American interests. Even the appearance that they are tainted by contributions from persons connected with foreign governments undermines our national credibility. It is ironic, Mr. Chairman, that after China regained control of Hong Kong, one of the first acts of the newly created Hong Kong legislative body was to ban foreign contributions. We proudly hold our country out as the nation's--as the world's--greatest democracy, the model for countries emerging from totalitarian rule. The spectacle of huge amounts of money from wealthy foreign contributors pouring into our presidential races sends a message to emerging nations that democracy in America is not about carrying out the will of the many, but about catering to the interests of the few. Mr. Chairman, campaign finance practices have become the source of great confusion in this country. This committee has the perhaps unenviable task of creating clarity out of chaos by exposing illegal and unethical practices and by leading the national debate on the rules that govern the electoral process. I commend you for assuming this responsibility, for your leadership in this regard, and I look forward to working with you and the other members of the committee in the coming months.

THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Collins. Senator Levin. LEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What this committee and the American people are going to hear about in the next few weeks and months are the symptoms of a disease of the American body politic, a disease we can call the money chase, and from which no party and few candidates are immune. ,", To inoculate our democratic system against this disease, we passed a series of laws in the 1970s to limit the role of money in federal elections. It was our intent, at that time, to protect our democratic form of government, which relies so heavily on the interchange of ideas and actions between the government and the private sector. LEVIN: To protect our form of government from the corrosive influence of the unlimited and undisclosed contributions, we wanted to ensure that our elected officials were neither in reality nor in perception beholden to special interests or able to contribute large sums of money to candidates and their campaigns. These laws were designed to protect the public's confidence in our democratically elected officials. And for many years, those laws worked fairly well. The limits that they set are impressive, and those limits are still on the books today. Individuals are not supposed to give more than \$1,000 to a candidate per election or \$5,000 to a political action committee or more than \$20,000 a year to a national party committee or \$25,000 total in any one year. Corporations and unions are prohibited from contributing to any campaign. Contributions from foreign countries, foreign citizens and foreign corporations are prohibited. And presidential campaigns are supposed to be financed with public funds. That's the law that's on the books today. Yet in this series of hearings, we're going to hear about contributions of hundreds of thousands of dollars from individuals, corporations and unions. We're going to hear about contributions from foreign sources, and we're going to hear about presidents and presidential candidates spending long hours on fundraising tasks. Now how is that possible, we ask? Well, what has happened is that a pretty good law setting limits on size and source of contributions has some soft spots, which over the years both parties took advantage of. Both parties pushed up against those soft spots and created holes in the law--big loopholes--that allowed the big money to pour in, so that now there are no effective limits at all. Now we face the daunting task of trying those loopholes, to make ,", the law whole again, and in making it whole, to make it effective. Some of what we're going to hear about in the next few weeks and months involves possible illegal conduct. But the vast majority of what we're going to hear about, and the bulk of the activity that creates concern and has the largest effect on the campaign process right now is what's legal. It's what's allowed by those loopholes. And most of it involves the so-called soft money or unregulated money. Look at the data on this first chart--on just what the Democratic National Committee did. Only 172 of over 2 1/2 million total contributions received by the DNC in the 1994-96 election cycle had to be returned. That's six thousandths of 1 percent. And only a limited number of those were returned because they may not satisfy applicable legal and regulatory requirements. And the other part of that chart shows that just a tiny percentage of the contributions which were received

, the dollar that were received, were returned. The real problem, the real big problem with the way we finance campaign today, is what's legal. LEVIN: Because the way both parties in the Federal Election Commission have gotten around the law of the 1970s is by establishing a whole separate world of campaign finance. And that's the world of so-called "soft money"--contributions not technically covered by the limits under current law. In the 1996 election, as you can see from this chart, the Republican Party raised more than \$140 million in soft money; the Democrats raised over \$120 million. That's the real problem, and that's how we get to these enormous sums of money in the last campaign, like the \$1.3 million that the RNC received from one company in 1996 and the \$450,000 that just one couple gave to the Democratic National Committee in the same year. Once that soft money loophole was opened, once the loophole was viewed as legitimate, the money chase was on by both parties. Couple that with the high cost of television advertising and you have the money chase involving just about all candidates. The chase for money has led most of us in public office or seeking public office to push the envelope, to take the law to the limits to get the necessary contributions. The money chase led President Clinton to invite contributors to stay in the Lincoln Bedroom overnight. It led President Bush in 1992, "touse White House stationery to announce a briefing by Cabinet members and the president himself for three Republican contributor groups at the Old Executive Office Building, with a reception to follow in the Indian Room. That's what this invitation is all about--White House stationery, when President Bush was in the White House announcing the briefing for the major contributors and fundraisers to the Republican Party. And at the bottom, it says, "The president and Mrs. Bush thank you for coming to the White House." The money chase led the Democratic National Committee to use coffees and other perks involving the White House and President Clinton for top contributors in 1996. And that's what this memo is all about, from Martha Phipps, who worked with the Democratic National Committee chairman and suggested various perks, like a seat on Air Force One and overnight stays at the White House in order to help raise money. And it led--the money chase did--the Republican National Committee to hold a private reception at the White House and a private lunch at the vice president's house for top fundraisers for President Bush when he was in office in 1992. The offer gave the benefits it listed, including a private reception hosted by President and Mrs. Bush at the White House, including a luncheon at the vice president's residence. And then it said that the benefits to be received by the table buyers and the fundraisers--and here I quote this 1992 invitation--"the benefits were based on receipts." The money chase led the Republican National Committee to overlook the debtor status of a man, Michael Kojima, who was identified by the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office as America's worst deadbeat dad, "but who contributed a half million dollars to sit next to President Bush at the 1992 President's Dinner. It was reported just on the news last night that Japanese citizens provided some or all of the money to Michael Kojima for that contribution. But the money chase also led the Democratic National Committee to accept a third of a million dollars from Yogesh Gandhi, who also turned out to be heavily in debt. The money chase led the head of the Republican National Committee, Haley Barbour, to use as a subsidiary of the Republican, "National Committee--the National Policy Forum--to obtain some \$750,000 in a foreign contribution from the Young Brothers of Hong Kong. LEVIN: This document, which has been referred to also by Senator Glenn, a memo outlining the NPF fundraising, is a memo from Scott Reed, executive director of the Republican National Committee, to Haley Barbour and Mike Baroody, Republican chairman and NPF president, respectively. And it's the most dramatic document that I've seen. Indeed, it's the only document that I've seen where there is evidence that party leaders intentionally went after foreign dollars. The money chase also pressures political supporters to cross lines that they shouldn't in order to help their candidates get needed funds. It led a national finance chair of Senator Dole's campaign to engage in a five-year laundering scheme, which funneled \$120,000 through a secret Hong Kong trust to his employees who contributed to the candidates he supported. It led members of a family--father, mother and daughter--to funnel \$50,000 through company employees and stockholders to Democratic candidates that they supported. Both of those incidents that I've just described have led to convictions. The money chase is also leading foreign governments to think that U.S. politics is an arena in which they have to compete. We saw just last week that one paper featured a story that foreign governments spent \$86 million

lobby the U.S. government in the first six months of 1996. Japan alone spent \$17 million in six months. The Chinese expenditure, which has been referred to this morning, was a small fraction of the \$86 million. It was aimed at lobbying and influencing the Congress. China's target in 1995 and '96 was not the White House. It was the Congress. It's the money chase, the money chase which is driving the illegal and improper conduct that is the subject of these hearings. The money chase in political campaigns is a serious disease which has become chronic. Most of us have been affected by it. Most of us have spent too much time fundraising, and in the process, pushing the fundraising rule to the limits. We know in our hearts that the money chase is a bipartisan problem, and that a bipartisan investigation into a number of aspects of it is the right way to go. Experience surely tells us that the only reform that we will achieve is a bipartisan reform. If these hearings get to illegal practices that would otherwise go unpunished, that would be useful indeed. If these hearings get to activities that, as currently allowed but which should not be, and if that arouses public opinion so that Congress will end the money hunt, that would be a major contribution to restoring health to the body politic. But if we just blow into town, rough up a few low-level rustlers and hustlers, point fingers at the other guy but never at ourselves, produce a summer spectacle for the country and the world but leave no solid record of legislative reform behind, we will be doing something far worse than missing an opportunity. We will be deepening public pessimism and thickening the public gloom about this democracy's ability to restore public confidence in the financing of our campaigns and our elections. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Levin. Senator Brownback. BROWNBACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I certainly want to start my comments by commending you for your tremendous leadership in bringing hearings on this very serious matter to the point where we are today. I think you've demonstrated extraordinary resolve and skill in your determination to make these hearings bipartisan, and to make them fair and thoughtful, as all of these have as much as possibly can. Mr. Chairman, today your committee undertakes a solemn constitutional responsibility of the Congress. BROWNBACK: This committee has been charged by the Congress and by the Senate with investigating illegal and improper activities in the 1996 election cycle, the most troubling of these being allegations against the current administration as relating to the conduct of foreign policy, the safeguarding of state secrets, and possible breaches of national security. Congress has a legitimate and appropriate role protecting the integrity of elections and in assuring a foreign policy conducted in the national interest. The most important questions before us deal with a convergence of these concerns. Therefore the fundamental question of these hearings is whether this administration faithfully executed its responsibility to protect the American national interest, or if that function was infiltrated and compromised. This issue overwhelms all others. Mr. Chairman, oversight is a critical part of any congressional work, but only rarely does it focus on issues of this magnitude. During this Congress, we will do what the American people sent us here to do. We'll work together to provide pro-job, pro-family tax relief, preserve and protect Medicare, and take common sense steps to make our streets safer, our schools better and our families stronger, and, yes as well, we will balance the budget. The current dispute regarding the matters under this committee's jurisdiction cannot be allowed to impede that agenda for American renewal. Similarly, Mr. Chairman, every senator has constructive ideas for how we can improve the political process through legislation. Hopefully, these hearings will provide the necessary impetus for enacting some of those improvements. They are certainly needed. However, our central focus must be the transgressions which may have compromised the interest of the United States, and even endangered American lives. The issue is American integrity. Politics is just the wrapping paper. More pointedly, was John Huang, or others, highly placed industrial spies? I'm delighted to hear the possibility of his testifying, and I look forward to reviewing that. I'm most concerned about allegations that certain campaign activities were not merely illegal or improper, but may have put political or personal gain ahead of the economic interest, foreign policy or national security of the United States. To me, these are without question the most serious allegations before us, and they deserve our intense focus. It is my hope that in these hearings we will find answers to the following questions: Were existing U.S. laws broken? Did foreign governments or foreign conglomerates infiltrate our political process with a scheme to influence

election for their own ends? What was the nature of this scheme? What were the foreign ties after? Were their efforts successful in whole or in part? Did high-ranking officials of the executive branch of our government give classified information to foreign governments or foreign corporations directly or indirectly? Was the foreign policy of the United States altered due to influence by illegal foreign campaign contributions? Were the lives of national security officers put in jeopardy by the leaking of classified government information? Was the integrity of the United States government compromised by the influence of illegal foreign campaign contributions? ", The confidence of the American people in our federal government has been shaken by these allegations. Only through a full and fair investigation of these charges can we restore the American people's confidence in our constitutional system. Mr. Chairman, the American people are watching. And we owe it to them to conduct ourselves in a non-partisan manner with the highest degree of civility, objectivity and integrity. BROWNBACK: That I hope will be the legacy of these hearings, Mr. Chairman. The American people are watching. Thank you very much, and I yield back the remaining portion of my time. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Brownback. Senator Lieberman. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, our committee has traveled along a road full of bumps and distractions to reach this hearing room today, and now we face an extraordinary challenge, opportunity and responsibility. The way here was not smooth because the subject of our investigation is not ordinary. We are here to investigate the political system in which we all live and to investigate as well many people who live there with us. There will be political consequences, some serious, from what we do and say and find here, and that naturally has caused anxiety, pressure, defensiveness and partisan bickering. The time for all that is over now. The chairman's gavel has fallen, and the nation is watching. More to the point, history is watching. Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn, fellow members of the committee, the challenge we face here is critically important to our country, and we must rise to it, because the way in which money is given and spent for political campaigns in America has gone so far out of control that it threatens the integrity and legitimacy of our government. We, members of this committee, may never in our lives have a better opportunity to strengthen our democracy than we have in this investigation and its concluding report. Our opportunity to expose, " ", what money has done to America's democracy. Our responsibility is to do so without regard to partisan loyalties or political consequences. Mr. Chairman, as we listen to the testimony of the witnesses that will come before us and as we question them, it is important to remember that we are neither prosecutors nor defense attorneys. It would be grossly inappropriate for us to act at these hearings as if we were. There are plenty of prosecutors at work and plenty of defense attorneys who have been hired. We must be what we are, senators selected by the people of our respective states, sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and to protect it from all enemies foreign and domestic. In these hearings, I am afraid, we will find evidence that you don't have to carry a military weapon to be a foreign or domestic enemy of the United States and its Constitution. All you need is a checkbook. We must be finders of fact and searchers for truth. And when we learn the truth, we must tell it to all who will listen so that the prosecutors will be better enabled to pursue past wrongdoers and the people will be emboldened to demand better protection in campaign laws from future wrongs. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we must be careful not to be overzealous, lest we risk allowing this to degenerate into a partisan witch hunt or a bipartisan headline hunt. With each witness we question, we must seek only the truth, no more and no less, and we must accept that truth and not try to force it improperly into any preconceived construct that any of us may bring to the table. Fact is that serious charges have been made against individuals, groups and even foreign governments. We must make sure that at the end of the day, we judge the truth of those charges on the content of the hard evidence offered during these hearings, not on mere inferences and innuendoes. LIEBERMAN: Time and the testimony will tell what crimes have been committed, but there is one thing I'm convinced will be clear from the evidence that will be presented in the two phases of our investigations. Our current campaign finance system, borne of misdeeds, exposed in similar hearings almost 25 years ago, as a system progressively in need of repair and reform in the years since then, finally broke down in 1996. The evidence will reveal that people in both of our major " ", political parties were driven by an apparently unquenchable thirst for cash in a frantic race to exploit and de-

de in factor in spirit the very campaign laws that had been passed after Watergate to put a limit on political contributions and to clearly reveal the source of all those contributions. In the search for soft money, for example, political operatives of both parties pushed up the limit of what was acceptable for individuals or groups to give to campaigns--from thousands of dollars to tens of thousands of dollars to hundreds of thousands of dollars, as if they were bidding at Christie's auction of Princess Diana's clothing, except that what was for sale here was nothing less than the fabric of American democracy. What was compromised here was the fundamental promise of equality that our democracy makes--in this case, the equality of opportunity to influence our government that each one of us as Americans is promised by the Constitution. On a person, one vote. Surely, those who give hundreds of thousands have greater access and influence than the great majority of average Americans, who do not. And that majority of average Americans see this. They understand it. They're not fooled. It makes millions of them angry at their government, and millions more returned off by and to their government. Either response is a serious threat to the legitimacy and credibility of our democracy. Mr. Chairman, the harder and faster the parties and candidates ran after money in 1996, the less vigilant they became in protecting the process from those who sought to use political contributions for illegal or unethical ends. As fewer were asked of contributors, naturally the influence peddlers and the con artists saw their opportunity, and they worked the system for their own gain. Too many people, domestic and foreign, sought and gained access to candidates and elected officials by the vice of their improper contributions rather than the virtue of their ideas. When standards slide and laws are not enforced, people's worst nature is always encouraged. Of course, not everyone involved in the 1996 federal elections went down the wrong road. In fact, most did not. But enough did to create the crisis we face and result in the hearings we begin today. , In the first phase of these hearings, we will focus quite appropriately on the extent to which so-called foreign money from either governments or private hustlers or both may have entered the 1996 American federal elections. These are serious and consequential charges that may send people to jail and alter the course of America's relations with other countries. Those who have done wrong ought to be exposed and ought to be punished. LIEBERMAN: But Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not overlook the larger fact that these foreign corrupters, who thought they could purchase influence in American government, would not have been emboldened to try to buy if they did not believe there were those who were ready and willing to sell, if they did not think there was effectively a "For Sale" sign hung out on America's government. For that, it is Americans, not foreigners, who are profoundly guilty. Mr. Chairman, I know that this committee has gone to the four corners of the globe to find evidence of foreign infiltration of American politics. That is right, and it is proper. But in another sense, we already know where and who the enemy is. It is domestic. And it is us. It is a campaign finance law that we have allowed to atrophy and to be evaded, a law that no longer works, that no longer protects our government, its leaders or its people, its people whose apathy, anger and mistrust have been dangerously deepened by the misdeeds that will be described in these hearings. Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn, fellow members, if we carry out our responsibilities here honorably and well, these hearings will not only shed light on the truth of what happened in the 1996 federal elections, they will light a fire in the belly of the American people and in us, their elected representatives on Capitol Hill, and give us the courage and the capacity to set right what we know is wrong. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Lieberman. Senator Domenici. DOMENICI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Glenn and fellow senators. As I see it, history seldom marks its moments with precision. , Yet these hearings are one of those moments. The issues we will address touch upon our nation's basic sovereignty. Our democratic system is, by the division of powers intrinsic to its structure, a public spectacle. That is by design. Walter Lippmann once said, "The great virtue of democracy, in fact, its supreme virtue, is that it supplies a method for dragging realities into the light, of summoning our rulers to declare themselves and submit to judgment." Supreme Court Justice Brandeis put it another way. "Sunlight is the best disinfectant," he said. If leaders are to instill public confidence in their decisions, they must have the trust of the people. And when questions emerge regarding the conduct of public officials awarded a public trust, the American people have a right to answers. That is why, as difficult as it may be, in the legi

slative branch, we have a constitutional duty to conduct this investigation. We are here to perform that duty and to engage in that responsibility. And I believe we must examine the events which took place during the last election and attempt to give the American people some answers to some very unsettling questions. Some would suggest the answers are simple, and we don't really need these hearings. We only need to reform the campaign laws of our land. And some, who have already talked with the American people here today on the other side of the aisle, would talk as if reform is what these hearings are all about. Well, reform may be needed. But reforming the law will not solve the problem if officials are already ignoring or violating those already on the books. And I'd like to take a moment to reference just a few existing laws on the books, because as this drama unfolds, I think we will continue to harken back, at least in the first phase, what are the existing laws and who has violated them. DOMENICI: Let me cite one: Two U.S. Code, Section 441--and I quote--"It's unlawful for a foreign national directly or through any other person to make a political contribution in a federal election." Also, it makes it illegal for a person to solicit, accept or receive a contribution from a foreign national. One other section, 441(f), the same part of the code, prohibits making a contribution in the name of another. That is, it prohibits money laundering and makes it illegal to knowingly accept such a contribution. As part of the inquiry, we must seek to find out whether these laws were violated and if there are attempts made to purposely skirt these laws. Did the Democratic National Committee or the White House violate the prohibition against taking campaign money from foreign nationals and the prohibition against laundering foreign contributions through U.S. citizens and companies. The American people have a right to know and deserve answers regarding the mysterious activities of John Huang, Charlie Trie, Pauline Kanchanalak and Johnny Chung. Also, one further section, Section 18 USC, Section 607, makes it a crime for any person to solicit or receive a campaign contribution--and I quote--"in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by an officer or an employee of the United States." Seem to me a very clear and forthright statute. To me, we need explanations. Are we to excuse the executive branch fundraising activities that seem to fall in these categories? I am troubled that by what happens to have been a conscious effort to evade these statutes. As always I keep an open mind and listen with interest to the facts presented during this inquiry. But I will be looking for answers to some questions about our nation's security, the role of foreign corporations, foreign agents and foreign money in our electoral process and in the executive branch and its minions. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I'm the longest serving senator participating in these hearings. I came to Washington 25 years ago, and as soon as I arrived, the Watergate investigation of the executive branch was the issue before this brand new senator who had never been a legislator in his life. I was awed by the enormity and the importance of the issue raised by those hearings. But I was also impressed, Mr. Chairman and fellow senators, by the sense of constitutional duty and bipartisanism displayed by members of both sides of the aisle in those hearings. I raise this issue not to draw factual parallels between the hearings. Each congressional investigation is different. Whether this particular investigation will be of significance will depend upon the facts and how those facts are presented to the American people. But I hope we conduct this inquiry with the same sense of bipartisanism and constitutional duty that was present in the '70s hearings I just referred to. The American people have a right to know, and Congress has a constitutional responsibility to investigate whether the executive branch and the national parties and their committees were willing to place the pursuit of campaign money ahead of other concerns, including sovereignty and national security. The people of our country have a right to know and Congress has a constitutional responsibility to investigate whether the executive branch appointees, otherwise unqualified, but well-connected with rich and powerful interests, were placed in positions in government with access to classified information based solely on the amount of cash they could accumulate for the 1996 presidential election campaign. The people have a right to know and we have an obligation to investigate whether vital classified information was improperly obtained and leaked to foreign corporations and government by these individuals. DOMENICI: The American people have a right to know and we have a responsibility to examine whether foreign nationals, some of them known criminals, were given access to the president of the United States at the White House and at fundraising events in exchange

for questionable campaign contributions. And the American people have a right to know and we have the highest duty to determine whether there was a concerted plan by foreign government to infiltrate our electoral process. These are important issues, Mr. Chairman, and we need to make them clear. Some may want to change the focus of these hearings, but we are here to follow the facts wherever they lead, not to engage in an exercise in partisanship. The Watergate hearing showed us that a serious issue can be handled in a dignified impartial way. Collectively we should follow that example. Mr. Chairman, you have been steadfast in your willingness to look into the activities of both parties. You and your staff have done an tremendous amount of work in a short period of time to get us to the point where we can begin these hearings. Your job has not been an easy one, Mr. Chairman, and I commend you for the way you've conducted the business of the committee so far and look forward to the month to come when I'm sure you will continue to do the same. We have a constitutional duty to carry out during the next few, several months. We should get on with our work in a fair and even-handed way, and let the facts speak for themselves. I start with the premise that senators on both sides of the aisle share this commitment. If we do, we will get our job done. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Domenici. Senator Akaka. AKAKA: Chairman Thompson, Senator Glenn, members of this committee, we have overcome tremendous odds to arrive at this moment. There are many issues for this committee to investigate: allegations of foreign money influencing federal campaigns, the use of federal facilities to raise money, dramatic increases in soft-money donations, unregulated independent expenditures and issue advocacy, and improper use of tax-exempt organizations. Initially, I feared that the aisle separating our two parties had engulfed our good judgment and clouded our vision. Recently, I was discouraged by the lack of cooperation, which was blocking my hope of a bipartisan investigation. I felt the cynicism held by the American people for the elected officials would only deepen without a full and open hearing. This committee was on its way to undermining the investigation and confirming the belief that Congress doesn't get it when it comes to reforming our campaign financial system. I sincerely hope that the expressions of goodwill and desire to conduct open and bipartisan hearings are not 20-second sound bites. The allegations of illegal and improper activities relating to the 1996 election cycle are serious. They touch Democrats and Republicans alike. And they threaten to undermine the integrity of our elections system. Mr. Chairman, I am, however, confident that we will conduct our inquiry in a bipartisan and fair manner which has been a hallmark of the Governmental Affairs Committee. Last Friday, our nation celebrated its Independence Day, marking America's break with England and its beginning as the world's greatest democracy. AKAKA: Our forefathers built this country on the premise of free and open elections. We do not need to be reminded that, although our citizens are free to vote for whomever they wish, running for public office in the United States demands great financial resources. I am astonished that given the tremendous explosion in campaign expenditures, that anyone would oppose reforming our nation's campaign financial laws. And yet throughout the initial process of putting together this investigation, we had to contend with colleagues opposed to revising campaign financial laws. Although we are told that the only wrongdoing was on the part of the White House, let us not forget the Republicans, who raised far more money during the 1995-96 election cycle than the Democrats. There will be issues discussed, testimonies received and documents reviewed that will make the members of this committee uncomfortable, because we are investigating the system under which we were elected. We have a responsibility to closely review all allegations brought before this committee no matter how unimportant they may seem. It is our responsibility to scrutinize all allegations brought before this committee. However, without also reviewing the way we run our national elections and revamping our campaign financial laws, we will fail the American people. This investigation must make a good case for laying a foundation to improve our campaign financial laws. With less than 50 percent of voting age Americans going to the polls in the last election, so much is at stake. The public is cynical. And who can blame them? The deep distrust of this nation's elected officials by the voters will continue if the only thing that comes from these hearings is political rhetoric. We must set our goal, the enactment of substantive campaign financial reform legislation. And conversely, only when the American voters demand a change in the way we run elections, will those who oppose reform drop their objections. The strength of campaign fina

ncereformrests with the American people. And I am hopeful that these hearings will generate a quickened movement to enact legislation to stop some of the practices we are about to investigate. My expectations are high. And my belief in the American people is strong. We have an extraordinary opportunity to redouble our campaign to ensure that we do not finance law on a bipartisan basis. I also wish to affirm my belief that if this committee is seriously committed to investigating the breadth of allegations into abuses of federal election laws, we cannot be caught up in partisan posturing and name calling. Let us not tolerate assumptions made on the basis of an individual's race or ethnic background. I ask my colleagues to remember that the United States is a nation of immigrants. Let us take to heart the lessons of history when waves of Irish, Italian, German, Jewish and other immigrants were negatively stereotyped. We are not here to conduct a witch hunt. We must ignore the temptation to assign guilt by association, especially ethnic association. Other than indigenous peoples, American Indians, Alaskan natives, native Hawaiians, American Samoans and Chamorros from Guam and Northern Marianas Islands, the proud people whomake up this country came from somewhere else. AKA: While I am three-quarters native Hawaiian, my great grandfather emigrated to the kingdom of Hawaii from China, which classifies me as a native Hawaiian-Chinese-American. But foremost, I am an American, like some of the individuals of non-European heritage who have come before us as witnesses. Mr. Chairman, I am seriously concerned with the negative impact of the allegations of fundraising abuses that have had on the Asian-Pacific American community. I do not have to remind my colleagues of the contributions Asian-Pacific Americans have made to our society. And yet, despite well-known contributions, Asian-Pacific Americans have been targeted and misrepresented from the moment the press saw a good story in the allegations of foreign contributions to the 1996 elections. When the news of possible fundraising abuses first broke last fall, the media was quick to toss around references -- Asian connections, Asian funds network, people with tenuous connections to this country -- phrases applied equally to people who are American citizens and non-citizens alike. Fortunately, the press has become more attuned to the distinctions between a U.S. citizen, a legal permanent resident and an alien, Asian from another country, although one news magazine this week used the expression Asian-American network in a story on these investigations. It is this lack of distinction by both the media, members of Congress and the public that threaten to cast doubt on the integrity of Asian-Pacific Americans. Our country has a deep history of racial discrimination against U.S. citizens of Asian descent, naturalized citizens and their foreign-born relatives. And it would be a disservice to our democracy to fall prey to the evils of prejudice again. Asian-Pacific Americans have been singled out for joining together to support candidates of their choice during the last election cycle. Contributions made by persons with Asian or ethnic surnames have been scrutinized, and donors asked for bank records and verification of citizenship. We should be gravely concerned if foreign companies or countries have influenced our electoral process. I strongly condemn illegal fundraising activities. But I do not hold all Asian-Pacific Americans responsible for the alleged actions of a few. Asian-Pacific Americans should not be held to a higher standard than other citizens, nor should we believe that all Asian-Pacific American political contributions are suspect. We must not be guilty of selective harassment of those with Asian surnames. Such actions only underscore the Asian-Pacific American community's fear that they are being held responsible for the alleged transgressions of some individuals who happen to be of Asian heritage. With the majority of Americans choosing not to vote, let us not discourage Asian-Americans from participating in the development of public policy because they believe the system is against them. As we investigate the allegations of fundraising abuses, let us remember that bigotry, prejudice and discrimination are unacceptable to this committee. Let us also remember that the Asian-Pacific American community supports Republicans, Democrats and independents. There are allegations that the only reason why Asian-Pacific Americans participated in the last election was to influence U.S. immigration policies. Let me remind everyone that an unlikely alliance of high-tech companies, the Christian Coalition, Americans for Tax Reform, business groups, religious organizations and immigration rights groups joined forces to fight cuts in legal immigration. AKA: During last year's debate over the immigration bill, the elimination of most provisions dealing with legal immigration was not the result of a concerted effort by the Asian

-Pacific American community. It was the effort of a diverse coalition that included the most conservative and most liberal groups in this country. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I think that it is appropriate that I highlight the motto of our state, which was first pronounced in Kawaiaha'o Church, the Coral Church of Hawaii, by Kamehameha the Third. And he said, "Uamauke'ea, oka'a inaikapono," which means, the life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness. As we conduct these hearings, I think it behooves us to keep this in mind, particularly the concept of pono or righteousness. If we do this, I believe that the end of the day--at the end of the day, we shall have done what is right for our nation. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving me this time, and I look forward to these hearings and anticipate as spirited, informative time. Thank you. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Akaka. All very valid comments. We will be in recess for 10 minutes. (RECESS) THOMPSON: Senator Cochran. COCHRAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the tone you have set for these hearings in your opening statement. It was a commitment to fairness, thoroughness, common courtesy and respect for others. I hope we will all respond in a positive way to this challenge you have given our committee. We do have to acknowledge first that this investigation is a work in progress. Our efforts to learn the truth are ongoing. There are still documents to be reviewed, witnesses to be interviewed, depositions to be taken. So what the public will see and hear at this beginning point of the hearings is just a sampling of what we have learned so far. We also should acknowledge that we've had some disappointments. Some witnesses have disappeared; some documents have probably disappeared. Some witnesses have indicated that they'll take the Fifth Amendment. President Clinton has not called on his White House staff for the Democratic National Committee to cooperate in the search for the facts. This is also disappointing. It may contribute to an atmosphere that suggests it is OK to avoid discussing what really happened. One thing that we know happened in advance of the campaign last year was the development of a unique relationship between the purposes of these hearings and to help the Senate decide if the law should be changed to make it crystal clear to all what is legal and what is not. There also will be evidence produced at these hearings of a deliberate pattern of collusion with the Democratic National Committee about budgets, fundraising targets, personnel and methods to achieve political and campaign goals by using federal government resources. The line that usually is drawn between governing and party building was not only blurred by this administration, it was erased. Another finding that I believe these hearings will disclose is that there developed at the Clinton White House an aggressive plan to use the office of the president to raise an unprecedented amount of money, rewarding large donors with travel aboard Air Force One, overnight stays at the White House, and special briefing on administration policy plans. Some have suggested that these activities were not illegal. One of the purposes of these hearings is to help the Senate decide if the law should be changed to make it crystal clear to all what is legal and what is not. There also will be evidence produced at these hearings of a deliberate pattern of fundraising by a vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, John Huang, that involved contributions from persons and corporations that are prohibited by current law from making such contributions. Our first witness will be Richard Sullivan, who was the finance director at the Democratic National Committee. I expect he will help us understand how the fundraising operation was organized and how White House officials were involved in these activities. He will be able to confirm, for example, that Harold Ickes presided over these so-called weekly money meetings, most of which were held at the White House. He will also help us understand how John Huang came to be vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. After all the evidence is in, I hope the final result will be more sensitivity to and respect for the laws we have that govern our elections and a clearer understanding by the Senate of the need to improve and strengthen these laws to protect the electoral process, from abuse in the future. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Cochran. Senator Durbin. DURBIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn. The specter of the Watergate hearing looms in the hall of the Capitol Hill like Banquo's ghost, reminding us of that historic moment in the Senate's history, at times inflaming political memories, challenging us to equal its work. And I think it is a fact that every investigation since Watergate has been held to its standard. We have gathered an historic array of resources for this investigation. More taxpayer dollars will be spent on this 1997 committee investigation than any investigation in the history of the Senate. DURBIN: Four-point-three mi

l lion this year, and clearly, as much or more next year or beyond. This committee has hired 70 staff, 50 attorneys. To put that in perspective, there are 30 attorneys working full time in the public integrity section of the U.S. Department of Justice. We have nine full-time FBI agents detailed to this committee. We have issued almost 200 subpoenas, and we have authorized extensive travel overseas in pursuit of our investigation. The men and women serving on this committee bring a wealth of personal and political experience to the assignment. Whether our ranks include another Sam Ervin or Howard Baker, we don't know. But there's every reason to believe that the wisdom of our political process will be vindicated again during the course of this investigation. But unfortunately, all of these resources notwithstanding, this committee investigation was launched under a dark cloud. Since our first organizational meeting (OFF-MIKE) for fairness and impartiality. In preparation for today's hearing, I took a look at the opening testimony of the first day of the Watergate hearings, May 17, 1973, and a quote from Senator Howard Baker that perhaps the chairman may be familiar with. He said he was skeptical about whether or not it could be a fair hearing. And then he said: "But any doubts that I might have had, about the fairness and impartiality of this investigation have been swept away during the last few weeks. Virtually every action taken by this committee since its inception has been taken with complete unanimity of purpose and procedure." The integrity and fairness of each member of this committee and its fine professional staff had been made manifest to me. And I know that it will be made manifest to the American people during the course of this proceeding. "This is not in any way a partisan undertaking," Senator Baker said. "But rather, it is a bipartisan search for the unvarnished truth." I regret that neither this senator nor many on this side of the aisle can make the same statement today. But I hope, even though we have been denied the opportunity to issue subpoenas that we think will bring about a fair presentation of the evidence, there is still hope. Even though subpoenas which we have issued against Republican sources have not been enforced, there is still hope. Even though the procedure of this committee still seems to be somewhat secretive as to where we are headed and who will be called as witnesses, there is still hope. And what was probably resolved between the chairman and Sam Dash over a cup of coffee 24 years ago has now been relegated to an avalanche of contentious e-mail between our staff attorneys. But there is still hope. It remains to be seen whether this sad state of affairs can or will be changed today or in the near future. We've missed an opportunity to date, but we can still rectify it. Mr. Chairman, I think it is curious, as we embark on this investigation, that we consider for a moment the subject of the investigation. If we asked American families nationwide the most important issues facing Congress, it is not likely that they would include in any list, five or 10, this issue of campaign finance reform and the integrity of campaign fundraising. And yet if we ask the same American people their opinion of us, members of the Senate, members of the House and Congress, we know that over the past 30 years it has disintegrated. It is very low, and, unfortunately, going lower. There are several facts that are before us that should give us pause. As we dream up more ingenious ways to raise money for our political campaigns, and more ingenious ways and scientific ways to spend it--through polling and focus groups and our television, radio and direct mail, e-mail, you name it--there's a curious fact. The more money we spend on each election cycle, the fewer Americans vote. They are telling us--they are voting with their feet, and they are leaving the polling places. They are telling us they have no confidence in this process. At that same opening statement in the Watergate hearing 24 years ago, Senator Sam Ervin said at that hearing: "Our citizens do not know whom to believe. And many of them have concluded that all the processes of government have become so compromised that honest governance has been rendered impossible." I think we have an opportunity at this hearing to not only investigate wrongdoing--whether it's by Democrats, Republicans, foreigners or Americans--but also to initiate a real, true and honest reform of our campaign finance system. DURBIN: Someone on the other side has called this issue, quote, "a diversion," close quote. I don't think it's a diversion. I don't think it's inconsistent or impossible to consider both wrongdoing and reform. And Watergate taught us the lesson that out of the wrongdoing of that episode, we did initiate campaign finance reform. I hope that we can be inspired to do the same here. Let me speak for a moment about the China card that has been played today and in preparation for this hearing. It's been described in a variety of ways in opening statements. I've heard the terms industri-

alspies. I heard from a colleague over the weekend the term foreign espionage, foreign infiltration of our political process. If this has occurred, it should be dealt with seriously. But I am troubled as much by what we are not investigating as what we are. Every press account of foreign effort to involve itself in our political process points to that involvement primarily at the congressional level. And yet this committee will not touch that issue. We will not even address this infiltration or alleged infiltration of foreign sources and foreign money into our own elections. , ", There have also been allegations of foreign money in state and local races. That is beyond our jurisdiction, not the sort of thing that we want to get into. And when you go to the matter of foreign involvement at the presidential level, it is sad to report that most of the activity, the discovery activity and investigation of this committee, has been directed primarily at the Democratic Party and President Clinton. I can assure you that all of the accounts that I have read, classified and unclassified, indicate that this foreign involvement was truly bipartisan. As critically important as the influence of foreign money is in our electoral process, I fear we will find politicians and monied interests playing this China card to avoid real reform. If China played no role in the last campaign, we would still have a serious national scandal in our campaign finance system. The problem is not just foreign money; it's good old American money. It's hard money, soft money and mystery money. When fundraising fever is raging, parties and candidates rationalize ways to raise money which they're embarrassed to admit after the election. And as we gingerly step through this political minefield, trying to pick and choose appropriate outrages, we ignore the big picture, which unfortunately includes the accusers as well as the accused. Real reform, comprehensive reform, is the only answer. And I must say quite honestly, despite all the lip service paid to this issue, there is no evidence in this session of Congress of any will by the majority to move the issue of campaign finance reform. The president challenged Congress in his State of the Union address to present a bill to him by the 4th of July, and it did not occur. To my knowledge, no bill has been set for here. So while we invest great amounts of time and money in the investigation of wrongdoing in campaigns, we put precious little, if anything, into the question of how to change the system and restore public confidence. I'm proud to be a member of the Senate. I am proud to represent the state of Illinois. Like every member of this panel, though, I will tell you that I am not proud of the political processes that we all had to endure to come here. If it is not corrupt, it is corrupting. , ", And it must be changed. And if this committee loses sight of that as its ultimate goal, I believe that we will only add to the cynicism of the American people. I hope, in the final analysis, these hearings will be constructive, not destructive. I hope they will help restore public confidence and reassure the American people that our system has integrity, and that any breaches of law, rules or national security interests, if they in fact occurred, are dealt with justly. Further, I hope we'll seek comprehensive campaign finance reform to reduce this endless chase for campaign funds. Only then can we honestly say that the awesome responsibility we have accepted as members of this important committee at this time in history has been fulfilled. DURBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Durbin. Senator Nickles. NICKLES: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I'll try and be fairly brief. Let me just make a couple of comments. One, I really hope that this hearing will be bipartisan. We are fulfilling one of our constitutional responsibilities by having oversight to find out whether or not the laws have been adhered to by Congress, by the administration. We have checks and balances in this government where actually we do have oversight over the law, and we are supposed to find out whether or not the laws have been broken. My colleagues have said--several colleagues have said, well, we need to really move this forward so we can change the laws and reform campaign laws. That may well be, but we have laws on the books, and we need to determine whether or not those laws have been complied with. And something's really wrong, Mr. Chairman, when we find out existing laws as interpreted not just by Republicans but also by Democrats. I looked at a memo that was given by Ab Mikva, counsel to the president, talking about what's legal and what's not legal in the White House. It's an excellent memo. It was very closely tailored to one that Boyden Gray had given during the Bush administration. I'm looking at the comments, what he says as far as what is legal, he says government buildings including the White House offices and meeting rooms should not be used for meeting in gross events organized , ", by campaign or political committee. It also says no fundraising

phone calls or mail may emanate from the White House or any other federal building. That's from the Democratic general counsel. Now I might mention this administration's had five general counsels, and maybe that's part of the problem. But this memo was written in April of '95. And it wasn't adhered to. And some colleagues have said, or kind of implied, well, both parties have kind of pushed the envelope. Maybe that's true, but I think in this case this administration in many, many cases, and some individuals leading to the highest individuals in the White House, have moved beyond pushing the envelope. Just give you an example. I think something's really wrong when you have an official, John Huang, who receives a top security clearance without a background investigation five months before he begins work at Commerce Department. I also find it really wrong when he keeps that security clearance for a year after he goes to the DNC. That's more than unusual. It's more than unusual to find that this level of an employee would have, reportedly by one account, 146 classified briefings. At least over 100. That's a lot. It's more than unusual to find out that this individual had meetings in the White House at least 94 times, frequent access to the president of the United States. That's very unusual. That's more than pushing the envelope. It's more than pushing the envelope when you have the vice president attending a fundraiser at a tax-exempt Buddhist temple, and then not calling it a fundraiser, but clearly it was a fundraiser, and then when Buddhist monks and nuns who've taken vows of poverty are given thousands of dollars to donate to the DNC following the fundraiser. In cases where one doesn't realize it, the law covers this. The law prohibits any person from making a political contribution in the name of another person, section 441.f, or a foreign national make a political contribution, section 441.e. When President Clinton offers the White House Lincoln Bedroom for overnight stays to 938 people who collectively contributed over \$10,000, million, many of which \$50 or \$100 thousand for those sleepovers, that's more than pushing the envelope. When he's asked how to energize major fundraisers, President Clinton wrote on a memo--this is President Clinton's writing--"Ready to start the overnights right away. Give me the top-10 list back along with the \$100 thousand and the \$50 thousand list." Again, read the statute. Read Ab Mikva's memo. It is unlawful, quote, "for any person to solicit or receive any contribution in any room or building occupied by discharge of official duties." That's the statute. I think the statute is very clear. Some of our colleagues are talking about let's change the law. NICKLES: The law, as interpreted by White House general counsel and a clear interpretation of the statute, it looks like more than the envelope has been pushed. It looks like the law has been violated. And I could go on and on. When DNC donors, former White House staff, coffee attendees and top fundraisers flee the country or they take the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination when asked about the source of donation or fundraising activity--a lot of the major players are fleeing. That's not cooperation. That's a mass exodus, in hope that maybe this hearing will blow over at the end of the year. Mr. Chairman, when you said originally that you didn't want to have a time limit, I see why. Now, I will tell my colleagues I was one that wanted a time limit. I wanted to divide it into this thing, do our work and be done with it. Get the facts out. Let the facts fall where they may be, Democrat or Republican. Let's find out who violated the law. Let's lay it out. Let's have the exposure and find out what happened. Let the chips fall where they might. But if several of the major players are either going to take the Fifth or they're going to flee the country, then that really brings into question the cooperation or maybe the interest of some people just to prolong it and hope that they'll be successful in installing this thing out. On the coffees--when you have 1,510 people attend 103 coffees at the White House, raising more than \$27 million, that's more than pushing the envelope, and again, seem to be directly contradictory to the memo and also to the statute. ", When the coffee attendees come as representatives of groups that receive approximately \$30 billion in federal government contracts and over \$825 million in grants and loans from government entities, that looks to me like it may well be a violation of the law. Quote--"It's unlawful for any person to solicit any contribution from an entity with contracts with any federal government agency." That's Section 441.c. And Mr. Chairman, I could go on. When Pauline Kanchanalak visits the White House over 26 times with 10 meetings with President Clinton and is allowed to bring in three foreign business clients who invest heavily into China into the White House for coffee with the president in exchange for \$85,000 that was not even her own money--Ms. Kanchanalak apparently left the country after congressional subpoena

were issued. Federal law prohibits any person from making political contribution in the name of another person. That's slaughtering money. And again, have we had any cooperation concerning where abouts or participation in submitting information or testifying before this committee? And I could go on. When a convicted drug dealer, Mr. Cabrera, contributes \$20,000 to the DNC and gets invited to the White House Christmas party with the Clintons and attends a dinner in Miami with Vice President Gore--and I could go on and on. Mr. Chairman, we talk about security briefings; and you talk about the lack of security; or you talk about drug dealers; or you talk about Mr. Tamraz, who had an outstanding international arrest warrant for allegedly embezzling \$200 million from a Lebanese bank--and he's advised by the National Security Council not to meet with President Clinton, but yet he has that meeting--he has access to the White House, and he donates \$50,000 and then \$100,000 to the DNC, you said what went wrong. How could that happen? And then you find out that there's an ex-barbouncer, Craig Livingstone, who is placed in charge of White House security. And then you find out that he has access to over 900 confidential FBI files, almost all on Republicans, you say what went wrong. That's against the law. How could that be? How could that happen? When you have the FBI agents who are working with the White House, Mr. Aldrich and Mr. Sculimbrene, who were basically forced out, forced out of service with the FBI, the Secret Service is curtailed. It leaves the administration without any security procedure to prevent, " ", felons and international arms dealers from attending White House events. It shows you there's a real breakdown. A real breakdown. When you have the associate attorney general, Webb Hubbell, who's convicted of bilking his clients out of thousands of dollars, and then you find out that he received \$100,000 from Lippo Group, after he leaves the administration. NICKLES: So there's a lot of interconnecting here, Mr. Chairman. I think we need to get the facts out. And we need to get the facts out in a fair and impartial manner, and an informative way not to crucify or not to prosecute, but just to get the facts out. Just to let people find out what happened. And I'm all for changing the law. I've heard some colleagues say well, maybe we need to move to these second phase and go into campaign reform. This is not actually the committee that does campaign reform. That happens to fall on the Rules committee and some of us serve on both committees. But we're happy to work on campaign reform. But I think first we have to find out existing law--has it been broken? And I've heard several people say well, no laws have been broken. It looks to me--and I've looked at several. I quoted a half a dozen, I could quote many more, laws that look very clear, look very plain, look to be broken. I hope this committee will dwell into that, examine what happened, try and find out what's wrong and then move to work to make sure that it doesn't happen again. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Nickles. Senator Torricelli. TORRICELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, not wanting to be the first person to speak before this committee and mislead in any way, I will not promise to be brief. I do, however, choose to begin my own participation, as many other members of the committee have, by citing that first day in what is still the standard for this institution and the hearing process, when Senator Sam Ervin brought down the gavel in the Watergate hearings. I do so because I believe his words are instructive as a standard, a warning and an admonition. He said, and I quote: "The Congressional investigation can be an instrument of freedom, or it can be freedom's scourge. A legislative enquiry can serve as a tool to pry open the barriers that hide government corruption. It can be a catalyst that spurs Congress and the public to support vital reforms in our nation's laws. Or it can be a base for our principles, invade the privacy of our citizens, and provide a platform for demagogues and the rank and file partisans." Mr. Chairman, Senator Ervin on that day, and later Senator Inouye in the Iran-Contra hearings, set a standard that should be remembered by every member of this committee. They were fair, they were bipartisan, they were substantive and they remained true to their objective. The Senate has also had moments that do not provide opportunity for equal pride. Senator McCarthy's investigation into the Army and the State Department and later, indeed, Whitewater itself. Investigation that proved unnecessary distractions, more forums for personal ambition than meeting the legitimate goals of the institution or the country. These are the historic extremes that represent the choice before this committee. I, like other members of this committee, have had our moments of discouragement as we prepared for this day. Perhaps there's reason for some new optimism. Promise that at long last Republican-affiliated organizations will receive subpoenas; promise

hat when these initial hearings conclude in a few weeks the National Policy Forum will at last be held to answer for its own foreign connections and sources of contributions. We'll see. Mr. Chairman, if it is, however, established that a suspect by you and other members of the committee that the Chinese government contributed funds to the Democratic or Republican National Parties, if the policy influence of this country and our interests were compromised, I begin this hearing by simply suggesting to my colleagues this is a problem that we Americans in some measure brought upon ourselves. The American campaign finance system has been an accident waiting to happen. TORRICELLI: Our system of campaign finance is an invitation to any interest with a desire to compromise the policy of the United States, and to use money as a lever of power. We are not the first generation of Americans to face a declining public confidence in our system of government and the abuse of the electoral process. From the abuse of the patronage system in the 19th century to the secret accumulation of contributions in Watergate, " ", United States history has been a cycle of reform and abuse, as the political system adjusts to change in the political culture. Now that burden of change arises again. And the responsibility rests with this Congress. No less than in the 19th century, from Andrew through to the reforms of Teddy Roosevelt and Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, we have a new problem of changing the culture of how American finances its campaigns. There is simply one startling difference. One stark contrast. Each and every other generation of Americans recognizes the problems, and their Congress convened to legislate a solution. The silence in this Congress to this new problem of campaign finance has been deafening. As the committee meets, President Clinton's goal of a July 4th deadline for the Congress to consider and pass campaign finance reform has passed. It is not unusual for congressional deadlines not to be met in passing legislation. But what is more extraordinary is not simply that the date passed without enactment of reform, but no bill has been considered. No date has been established. Indeed, there is no realistic prospect of campaign finance reform this year. We may, indeed, in the coming days and weeks learn much about the campaign finance system that requires change. I have no doubt we will. But which member of the Senate today could not offer their own testimony about problems that we already know to exist and their prescription for change? My worst fear, as this committee convenes, to begin its own hearings, is that our work, no matter how well-intentioned by some, becomes nothing more than another excuse by many to delay consideration of fundamental reform of the system. Mr. Chairman, a century ago, Speaker Reed noted that there is no intellectual argument so persuasive as the possession of a majority of votes on a committee. The majority of this committee has voted to subpoena the AFL-CIO because of concern of the coordination of soft money expenditures, but shielded the Christian Coalition, the National Rifle Association and a variety of other organizations suspected of the same activities from subpoena or any scrutiny. The majority has voted to subpoena the Democratic National Committee and allowed the Republican National Committee to respond " ", with utter contempt to attempts by this Senate and this committee to inquire into its own activities, and to those of the National Policy Forum. And there appears to be no intention and little willingness to explore what, in my judgment, was the single greatest change in the political culture of the 1996 elections. Which was the use of non-profit, tax-free organizations, a model of which was created by Speaker Gingrich, but duplicated by presidential campaigns and, indeed, by many members of Congress. TORRICELLI: It appears to be receiving no interest nor scrutiny in this committee's activities. We have, Mr. Chairman, left the impression that there is a partisan problem financing campaigns in the United States. Despite the fact that it is now established that the National Policy Forum and the Republican National Committee are the largest established recipients of foreign contributions. There is, Mr. Chairman, no partisan problem with campaign finance in the United States. There is an American problem. And it is a overwhelming problem. We have as well, Mr. Chairman, convinced the American people that this is principally a problem of the executive branch of government with its relationships with foreign governments. Although as hearing follows hearings and month follows month, I believe it will be established that the principal problems of foreign money may more properly reside with the Congress and the objectives of certain foreign governments to influence this government may be more centered on the operation of this Congress. And indeed now we are told today that the Clinton administration, facing the prospect of these hearings, has not been cooperative,

testimony has been withheld. Although the record could not be further from the truth. The president's principal aides have all been subjected to hours of testimony and a quarter of a million pages of documents have been provided to the committee. Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for anyone. There are no heroes and many victims of this system. The need is to follow the truth wherever the truth might lead. I do, however, finally, want to assume responsibility that I know other members of the committee rightfully feel as well. Forty years ago, another chairman of a congressional committee, a senator also from the state of Tennessee, convened a inquiry into wrongdoing in our country. It is among the first memories I have of government in the United States, and probably the first hearing of the United States Senate I ever witnessed. It was only on a flickering television screen, but I will never forget it, and even if I tried, my family would never allow me. It was Estes Kefauver. He left the American people with the unforgettable impression that because of the misdeeds of a few individuals, there was a general problem of the role of Italian Americans in the commerce of this country. The pain, Mr. Chairman, that many Americans felt on that day must not and will not be allowed to be visited upon Asian Americans in the coming weeks. There is a rising prosperity, awareness, and interest of Asian Americans in the political prospect of this country. It is in the best traditions of the United States that Asian Americans of long ancestry or recent arrival in the United States are taking their rightful place in participating in the governance of this country. If there was a problem with a few, it is not the problem of the many. The fact that a few individuals can be provided for testimony cannot be allowed to become an excuse to victimize the role of Asian Americans generally in this society. TORRICELLI: I trust all of us will begin this hearing with that in mind. Finally, Mr. Chairman, while there is much to discourage the American people as they listen to this testimony in the coming days about our political process, there's also something that we need to remind ourselves. In only a few years, when the 20th century ends, there will only be two nations that continue under the same basic system of laws and governance with which they began the 20th century. The United States is one of them. Our capacity for both self-criticism and change is a reason for our enduring system of government. There is much wrong with the political system of the United States. There is also much that is right, and it is the principal reason why our system of free government endures. We may discover many problems with the Clinton campaign and how Bill Clinton sought re-election. But this fact also remains. Bill Clinton is the first president in American history who received the contribution of over one million Americans who believed in his campaign, his promise and his governance. He also received the volunteer support of millions of Americans, who have also believed in him and his campaign. Those few individuals who, unfortunately and even tragically, participated in this system, much to the embarrassment of that campaign and our country, and who no doubt also did the same in congressional campaigns, the Dole campaign and other political operations, cannot be seen to detract in any way from those millions of Americans who believed in their country, their president and followed their belief into an active involvement. Good people are still inspired to serve and participate in the greatest participatory democracy in history. In that, through all the days to follow, we should all take great pride. We are neither the first nor the last Congress of the United States that will deal with the problem of money and political campaigns. Every generation has had this responsibility to ensure the integrity of our system of government, while also encouraging participation and dealing with the reality of the need to finance the national political debate. I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to participation in these hearings. I trust they will be fair and informative and instructive. But mostly, a prelude to this Congress meeting in our generational responsibility to legislate reform and change in this system that will ensure its highest integrity and the confidence of the American people. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Torricelli. Senator Specter. SPECTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Opening statements are always difficult. And I think today has been no exception. And we're anxious, in the words of the Olympians, to let the games begin. But I do believe that the re has been a foundation laid from which this committee can move very usefully. My sense is that the contentions have been worked out about the subpoenas. And there will be full opportunity for Democrats as well as Republicans to have subpoenas issued. And that the various groups will be treated evenly. And that if you take the groups mentioned, that there will be fair treatment

on all sides. And to the extent that that has not been accomplished, I think it can be accomplished in fairly short order. I do believe also that where there is concern about congressional matters not being heard, that this committee will, in due course, take those matters up. They are within our purview. And where we talk about some state and local matters, the Congress has authority to deal there, and perhaps we will. SPECTER: We'd have to broaden our mandate, but that is possible. And I think it is highly significant that some of those who spoke in terms of shortening this committee's work are now talking in terms of elongating this committee's work, whereas others have left the jurisdiction or have taken their privilege against self-incrimination so that we have our work cut out for us. And as I hear the statements today, I am personally optimistic that this committee will follow the Teapot Dome hearings of the '20s and the Truman procurement hearings and the McClellan hearings and other hearings and do a real job. And I believe that we will not have a campaign finance reform in America until the American people demand it. And there is the potential in this committee to create that demand, and that is the job which we have before us. I had planned to take most of my time, and still will to some extent, to discuss a couple of the factual matters. And at the outset, I think it is important to note that there are important investigations on soft money for Republicans as well as Democrats. And the National Policy Forum has been mentioned repeatedly here today, and I concur with the Democrats that that has to be gotten into. And I think it is important to note that the chairman rejected an effort by the National Policy Forum to limit the scope away from 1994 and issued an order, as it is his prerogative, to include that. ", When we talk about the problems, I think it is understandable that there would be more on the Democrats' side because the Democrats have controlled the White House. I have a chart which had been presented for putting on the screen, and when it was put on the screen, it was virtually unintelligible. So I've had a blow-up of it made. And this chart is a depiction of a series of financial transactions on the Kanchanalak family, whose leader was Pauline Kanchanalak, Mrs. Pauline Kanchanalak, who has evaded process and is now in-- well, you couldn't hear me. It didn't matter if I didn't know where she is now. (LAUGHTER) Where is she, Michael? In Thailand. And this chart shows a-- this chart shows a tracing of some \$457,500 with money starting from Chong Poon (ph) Kanchanalak, who is Pauline Kanchanalak's husband, going through mothers-in-laws and sister-in-laws and ending up in the Democratic National Committee or in a goodly number of state committees. SPECTER: In the course of the hearings, this will be analyzed in some greater detail. But it is illustrative of a complex jigsaw puzzle that we have to work with there. The participation of Mr. John Huang is a very important participation. And we had a number of discussions about how the committees should treat Mr. Huang. And today's hearing has been interesting, because in the last 24 hours, we found some important matters. As the chairman, Senator Thompson, has outlined-- and this was only concluded late yesterday-- that we were able to make a presentation of the involvement by the government of China at the highest levels in seeking to influence the American political process. And in the spirit of healthy competition, we had an interesting disclosure by Senator Glenn, the ranking member, about the possibility of having immunity for Mr. Huang. Nothing like a little good, healthy competition between the parties here. And I think if we keep it in ", the right spirit, we can move ahead. And the proposed immunity granted to Mr. Huang is really fascinating, for many reasons. He had at least 37 brieferings by the CIA. And he saw a number of documents which they can't even tell us, which raises a real question about our superspies-- don't even know what they have done. And they can tell us only as to 15 documents where he made comments. And I reviewed those. And they are highly sensitive. They deal in sources and methods. They are matters we would not tell the Brits, who are our closest allies; and yet the CIA made those available to Mr. John Huang. And shortly after he saw those, he went to an outside office and made faxes and made telephone calls and visited the Chinese Embassy, with all the earmarks of disclosure of highly sensitive governmental information, which is espionage. And it carries a life sentence, and in some cases, it could carry the death penalty. I don't know if that's applicable here. We'd have to see. When Mr. Huang talks about immunity only as to a couple of charges, it is a fascinating proposal, because the history has been that once there is immunity even to a limited extent, it works out to be complete immunity. Usual immunity is supposed to be only for the testimony given. But it frequently turns out, without being unduly complicated, a transactional immunity. And from the cases involving Admiral Po

indexer and Colonel North, we know that once the immunity starts, the criminal cases are gone. But my own personal view is that it is worth immunizing Mr. Huang, providing he tells us the truth and the whole truth. It has not been said today, but it ought to be emphasized, that a congressional committee takes priority over criminal prosecutions, because the public policy is that what we do as a congressional committee is more important than an individual criminal prosecution, because we change the laws for the future, so that when we deal with immunity, it has to be granted by the court, and the attorney general can raise an objection. But I, for one, would be willing to give Mr. Huang immunity, "I", because he is a very central figure. He brought Mrs. Pauline Kanchanalak to the White House. He brought many people to the White House. And only one of the specific matters--and that involves Wang Jun, which is worth noting, a major dealer in Chinese arms--AK-47s smuggled into the United States, sale of arms to Iran and Iraq, admitted to the White House at a coffee for a campaign contribution of \$50,000, the president himself late conceding that it was totally inappropriate. There is a great deal more to be said, but I'm about to the end of the 10 minutes, which, I think, is as long as any opening statement ought to be. But I approach these hearings with optimism that we can work out the issues on a fair and bipartisan basis, and that we can use a head into the soft money. One other item I do want to mention, and that is, it is to phase II, but just for a moment. The kind of ads which were put again by both parties, and the issue is clear that if you have an advocacy ad which is coordinated, it violates the federal election law--and that is language taken as a whole that can have no other reasonable meaning than to urge the election or defeat of a clearly identified federal candidate. SPECTER: There is a great deal more to be said, but I'm about to the end of the 10 minutes, which I think, is as long as any opening statement ought to be. But I approach these hearings with optimism that we can work out the issues on a fair, bipartisan basis, and that we can use a head into the soft money. One other item I do want to mention, and that is to phase II, but just for a moment--the kind of ads which were put again by both parties. And the issue is clear that if you have an advocacy ad which is coordinated, it violates the federal election law--and that is language taken as a whole that can have no other reasonable meaning than to urge the election or defeat of a clearly identified federal candidate. And this is one which is illustrative of the Democrats. But there are Republicans similar. And this is an ad which, according not only to Dick Morris, but also Leon Panetta, but type of an ad which was edited personally by the president. Quote--"Sixty-thousand felons and fugitives tried to buy "I", handguns, but couldn't, because President Clinton passed the Brady Bill. Five-day waits, background checks." But Dole and Gingrich said no. One hundred thousand new police, because President Clinton delivered. Dole and Gingrich voted no, want to repeal them. Strengthen anti-drug programs. President Clinton did it. Dole and Gingrich, noway. "Their old ways don't work. President Clinton's plan, the new way, meeting our challenges, protecting our values." Hard to see how any interpretation of that television commercial could be construed to be anything but an advocacy of the election of President Clinton--re-election--and the defeat of Senator Dole. And that is the second part of four challenges of soft money. And I believe this committee will rise to the occasion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Specter. Senator Cleland. CLELAND: Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I guess it's a bad time to quote Confucius... (LAUGHTER)...but Confucius 2,500 years ago had an interesting saying that I think bears on our business as we conduct these hearings. Confucius said that a great nation needed three things: first of all, a strong defense; secondly, a vigorous economy; and third, faith of people in their government. He said you could probably have a great nation, maybe without a strong defense. You could maybe even have one without a vigorous economy. But you cannot have a great nation without faith of people in their government. I think that's the ultimate goal of four hearings. It's not just to examine the people and situation through this investigation, or even pass campaign finance reform--laws of which I am a co-sponsor--but to restore some confidence and some faith of people in their government to make sure that we continue as a great nation. I believe in this system. I've served this government. I'd "I", serve it again. My first act as United States senator was actually to take an oath that said I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose

se of evasion; that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I'm about to enter, so help me God. That was my act as a member of the Senate. One of the reasons I wanted to be on this committee, though, was what happened before I became a member of the Senate, in the campaign, where I was outspent two-to-three-to-one. And I realized I was up against the odds. In the days and weeks ahead, in our conduct of this serious investigation into alleged improper and illegal activities connected with the 1996 campaigns for federal office, the faithfulness of members of this committee to the oath I've just stated will be sorely tested. For in addition to the individuals and organizations we'll be examining, we, too, are on trial before the American people. As a new member of the Senate, I've become impressed with the seriousness of purpose and the competence of my colleagues on this committee and our staffs. The challenges for us are indeed serious and severe, because we sit, in essence, as prosecution, defense, judge and jury. We're all interested parties. And all apart of the very system which we're now investigating. The entire web of alleged abuses, which are the subject of this investigation grow out of one, and only one, prime factor--there's relentless, unrelenting, unending, unforgiving pursuit of campaign dollars. Back in Georgia, we had a governor, Governor Marvin Griffin (ph), he used to say about raising political money, the only thing tainted about money is it's tainted mine and it's tainted enough. (LAUGHTER) Unfortunately, that attitude predominates all too often. To be sure, there are numerous variations in terms of sources and uses of money in politics, including the very serious matter of foreign influence. ,", But the campaign chase for dollars is at the heart of these allegations. It's one of the most serious problems we face as a country in conducting this American experiment in democracy. I suggest to my colleagues that this is the central issue with which this investigation and this committee must come to grips. The distinguished chairman and the senator from Maine have joined with me and other members of the Senate as co-sponsors of the bipartisan McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. CLELAND: I truly believe that had that bill or something like it been in place in 1996, we wouldn't be sitting here today. And I say to all the members of this committee that, if we don't help through our action here, build a fire to enact such reforms in this Congress, regardless of what we're able to uncover here, we will have failed in our larger mission of ensuring the American public that such abuses will not occur again. Part of this reform effort must be an examination of issues related to certain tax-exempt and non-profit organizations. These entities will not be part of the initial round of our investigation, but will be a focal point of phase II, which is to begin later. Nonetheless, I believe it's important that we note in the beginning of our work that the scope of our inquiry into campaign finance issues we must confront goes well beyond the matter of foreign money and influence. For example, a February 22nd report in Congressional Quarterly stated--and I quote--"Tax-exempt organizations are emerging as a potent weapon in the political arms race to amass an arsenal of campaign donations. While the vast majority of tax-exempt organizations promote causes such as sheltering the homeless or assisting the disabled, some money-hungry campaigns have used them to skirt campaign finance laws. When abused, tax-exempt say, a tax-exempt organization becomes little more than a shell or conduit for money to flow in and out of a politician's campaign." Unquote. The article goes on and continues, and puts the question of soft money and potential tax-exempt non-profit abuses into perspective. Quote--"The latest figures filed at the FEC show that party committees raised a combined total of \$264 million in soft money in 1996. That's three times as much as was raised by them in 1992 and 13 ,", times what they raised in 1980, the first election to allow soft money. But at least that money can be tallied. No one knows how much money was raised by the over 600,000 tax-exempt groups in the 501(c)(3) category, and the almost 140,000 tax-exempt groups in the 501(c)(4) class, because the FEC does not track it and the IRS does not disclose it." Unquote. Let me make very clear the vast, vast majority of these--hundreds of thousands of groups--are not implicated in any way in these charges. And indeed, the tax-exempt and non-profit world plays a vital and positive role in our country. But for a small portion, there is at least some reason to believe that they may have engaged in improper or even illegal campaign-related activity. Among the questions which must be answered are the following: "Did the organization in question engage in partisan activity in violation of laws prohibiting both 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations from conferring any private benefits, including benefits for a single political party? Did the orga

nization exceed legal limits on non-partisan campaign activity, which is the case in the case of 501(c)(3) organizations prohibiting participating directly or indirectly in any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate"--end of quote--"for federal, state or local office, and in the case of 501(c)(4) groups, prohibit these entities from engaging in non-partisan campaign activity as their primary activity?" Another question--did the organization make any false statements or omit material information in its application to obtain tax-exempt status? Did the organization receive and spend money in the amount of \$1,000 or more to influence a federal election while failing to register as a political committee? Did any of the organization's advertisements, voter guides, direct mail or telephone calls in excess of \$1,000 contain express advocacy, which under the law must be reported to the FEC and raise it in accordance with so-called hard-money requirements? Another question--did any of the organization's advertisements contain candidate advocacy which violated the spirit, if not the letter, of federal election law pertaining to issue advocacy? ,", Did the organization use foreign money to finance campaign activities, which would be illegal? These are important questions, because as our oath of office indicates, danger to our republic and its system may emanate from domestic, as well as foreign, sources. I look forward to a full airing of these matters as we continue. There have been many fine words spoken today about our commitment to fairness, to bipartisanship, to pursuit of the truth. There have been some serious charges made about abuses which may have compromised our national security. Words are important in setting out our preconceptions, goals and intentions. But the public and history will judge us primarily on our deeds over the next coming months. CLELAND: And they will judge us not only over how well we pursue and expose individual cases of wrongdoing, but also, I would suggest, they'll judge us even more on whether or not we help lead the way in fixing a campaign finances system which has gotten out of control, as these hearings will so clearly demonstrate. In the words of W.C. Fields, "It's time to take the bull by the tail and face the situation." (LAUGHTER) It is time to face the situation that our system is broken and must be fixed. It's time to face the situation that our democracy is becoming an auction rather than an election. It's time to face the situation that those who spend the most money win over 90 percent of the time. It's time to face the situation that at we place a "For Sale" sign on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. It's time to face the situation that more often than not, special interests, particularly on the Hill, predominate over public interest. We have the best government money can buy. But that is not what Jefferson and Franklin and Adams and Madison and the other founding fathers intended when they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in creating this country. Let us renew that pledge today. Let us pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor toward improving this democratic system for which so many young Americans have given their lives. ,", Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Cleland. Senator Smith. SMITH: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm the 15th of 16 senators to give the opening statement here. It reminds me of the gentleman whom I married a woman who had eight previous husbands. I know what I need to do, but I've got to figure out how to make it interesting. But I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership in this matter to get us to where we are today. You've been subjected to some personal attacks, and you've held up under some pretty intense fire, kept your composure, and I commend you for your leadership. The matters before this committee are very, very serious. Never before in the 211-year-old history of our nation have allegations this serious about the role of foreign influence on an American election been raised. Did a foreign government deliberately scheme to pump large sums of its money into a U.S. presidential campaign and some congressional campaign in order to influence the outcome of those campaigns? Did foreign contributions to U.S. political campaigns result in policy changes favoring the giver? Was foreign policy compromised? Did an agent of a foreign government and/or a foreign multinational corporate conglomerate use campaign fundraising connections to infiltrate the executive branch of our government, gain access to our government's most sensitive secrets, and then conduct espionage for its foreign bosses? Did such a foreign agent infiltrate the highest levels of our nation's two principal political parties in order to help funnel one of the two of our top political parties in order to funnel his foreign boss' money into our political system? If these things happened--and we don't know that they have--then how and why did the responsible officials of our government

fail to prevent them from happening? Who are those responsible? Or perhaps it might be better aid, who are those that were irresponsible? Are they guilty of benign neglect? Or are they guilty of conspiracy to undermine our national security? These are dark questions, Mr. Chairman, and they demand clear answers. It's the urgent priority of these hearings to get those answers. As this committee begins what I hope will be bipartisan hearings, our investigation faces a number of very serious obstacles--many have been alluded to here in previous statements--obstacles that are going to make the truth very, very difficult to attain. We have key witnesses who have notified the committee that they will assert their Fifth Amendment privileges against self-incrimination and refuse to testify or perhaps place limits or conditions on how they testify regarding what they know about the truth of the allegations before us. SMITH: We have key witnesses who have fled the country and are hiding out overseas, ironically some of them in China, because they do not want to come before us and tell the truth. Mr. Chairman, I couldn't help but think of President Harry Truman as I prepared for these hearings today. He had this insight that every body new about on his desk, "The Buck Stops Here." And I'm hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that we'll see some of President Truman's spirit, dignity, grit and personal responsibility in the current White House's approach to these hearings. President Clinton knows John Huang. He knows him personally. He knows that Huang is asserting his Fifth Amendment rights in refusing to testify. President Clinton has known Charlie Trie of Little Rock as a friend for 20 years. Trie's hiding out in China so that he too can avoid testifying. I wonder what President Truman would have to say about all this were he to be here under these circumstances. It's only subject to conjecture, but frankly I believe he'd get on the phone and I think he'd say to John Huang whoseerved in the administration and who worked as a senior level Democrat National Committee adviser, I think Truman would say get your rear end before this committee, Mr. Huang, and tell the American people the truth. I believe that President Truman would tell Charlie Trie, come out of hiding. Come home. Step up to the plate. Tell the truth. You're an American citizen. And your country deserves to know the truth. You have brought embarrassment to the presidency, to the country, and to me personally. I would like to think, Mr. Chairman, that President Clinton, in fact, has done or will be doing these very things. If he has, then I hope that he will tell this committee about it so that we can be satisfied that everything possible is being done to secure the testimony of Mr. Huang, Mr. Trie, and anyone else that we need to talk to to learn the truth. Of course, you cannot force people to testify. You can't do that, Mr. President, but you can make the attempt. To do less, anything less, is to further exacerbate the blight on the presidency, on our presidency, that now exists. Mr. Huang, Mr. Trie, and many of the others mentioned here worked for you. They embarrassed you. They let you down. Harry Truman would say, give 'em hell. In order to get these answers, Mr. Chairman, we must leave our partisan hats at the door. The cynics, the Congress-bashers, and many in the media will play up all the partisan bickering--every word of it. Yes, the Congress happens to be controlled by Republicans. And yes, the executive branch happens to be controlled by Democrats. And yes, the Republican-controlled Congress is investigating allegations of wrongdoing in a Democrat administration. But if these allegations are proven correct, the perpetrators bring discredit upon our nation, our presidency, and a major political party. They violated a trust that was given to them, and they're not worthy of defense by honorable people in their party. The people who did these things are not Democrats. They're a disgrace. Now some in the media on this committee have said that everybody does this. A pox on all of your houses. We should look equally at both parties. In fact, the media and some in the other party scurried around frantically trying to find some scandal, some similar scandal that might in some way deflect the criticism of this administration. And they found one with the National Policy Forum and we'll have to see if the facts support the contention that it is equally as serious. And we're willing to look at it, and I am willing to look at it, and I will look at it. But that's not what this investigation is about, Mr. Chairman. And it's ludicrous to imply that it is. When Sam Ervin, who's been mentioned here today, led the Watergate investigation, Howard Baker didn't try to find a Democrat scandal so that he could force equal attention. He joined the investigation, Senator Baker did, and the truth about a Republican president was the result. I'm currently the chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee--a different perspective that I bring to this committee. If we receive allegations of wrongdoing by a Repu

blican senator in that committee, we don't put off investigating those charges until we find a Democrat senator with similar problems. The ethics committee of three Republicans and three Democrats looks into the matter rather than on a bipartisan basis, and reaches its conclusions based on the facts of the case and that particular senator. Mr. Chairman, it's true that the scope of this investigation includes not only the allegations of illegal foreign contributions to the DNC, and possible economic espionage, but also possible foreign contribution entering the Republican Party, and how soft-money contributions are impacting U.S. elections. SMITH: But to place soft-money reforms on the same plane as the very serious allegations of foreign contributions and influence that has been discussed here today is an insult to the intelligence of the American people, and those people who put it on that same plane know it. Mr. Chairman, I want to add one final personal reflection. I used to be a civic teacher in the public schools of New Hampshire. I used to teach my students about how the framers designed our constitutional system and how our modern day government is intended to work. I taught them that things will go wrong from time to time, but it's not the system that's at fault. People make mistakes. They make mistakes of judgment, and sometimes they engage in deliberate wrongdoing. But I tried to instill in my students a faith in our system and a desire to participate in it as honest and patriotic young men and women. And when things do go wrong, don't turn off. This is a time that we need you more than ever. What particularly saddens me, Mr. Chairman, about the obstacles that this committee faces is that those obstacles are sending exactly the wrong signal to those young people, and indeed, all of the ,", American people. When the most serious allegations are made and the people who know the truth flee, hide or take the Fifth to avoid telling the truth, that just feeds the cynicism that is so evident in this country. It especially saddens me that is also turning off those very young people that I taught. All Americans have a right to expect that people who serve in positions of trust in this government should tell the truth. The obstacles that this committee is facing--the flight overseas, the Fifth Amendment--are there because these individuals believe themselves to be more important than the truth, more important than their country, more important than the embarrassment to their president, to their Congress. Truth, after all, ought to be the highest ideal. Aristotle once said, "Plato is dear to me, but dearer still is truth." I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the major witnesses to whom I have referred will put aside their narrow self-interest, recognize as Aristotle did that truth is dearer still, and tell the committee and the American people the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Would n't it be refreshing if all parties here accused would voluntarily step up to the plate, come before the committee, tell the truth, so that we didn't have to have an investigation? In the darkest days of the revolution, Thomas Paine said: "These are the times that try men's souls, and sun shine patriots and summer soldiers will shrink in this crisis from the service of their country. But those that stand it now deserve the love and thanks of man and woman." This isn't the American Revolution, and it's not on the same plane. But in this particular crisis, the summer soldier and the sun shine patriot will cry partisanship, will whine, will equate the need for soft-money reforms with illegal foreign contributions, and will say, everybody does it, let's just reform the process. But Mr. Chairman, those who stand it now--and I include you in that category--those who stay focused on getting the truth, those who try to rid this terrible pollution of foreign contributions and economic espionage from our government will deserve the thanks of their countrymen. And history, Mr. Chairman, will be our judges. We can prove the cynics wrong and give my former students and their children proof that in spite of the flaws, we can conduct our ,", oversight responsibilities with bipartisanship and dignity and that our system does work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Smith. Senator Bennett. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am grateful that a number of members of the press have stayed. I know the members of the Senate feel some compulsion to stay. The horse is smelling the water. We're removing toward the barn. This is the last one. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to stand before the easel. I, being at the end of the stream, wasn't aware of the high-tech circumstances available to us, and my charts are very definitely low-tech. But I would appreciate the opportunity of presenting them. Mr. Chairman, there's an old statement about the very best place to hide a leaf. And the answer is, on the floor of the forest, surrounded by all the other leaves. BENNETT: We've had a number of leaves thrown at us in this debate. And I want to pick up one particular leaf

off the floor of the forest and spends some time on it, because I think it is the key of what we're talking about. It will come as no surprise that we're talking about John Huang. John Huang has three pressures on him, as I see it--the first one coming from the Lippo Group; the second one from the Chinese government; and the third from President Clinton. And I'm going to talk about all three, in that order. Let's talk first about the Lippo Group. I will not resurrect the spirit of Sam Ervin, but I do go to another dead official, in this case Alan Dulles, whom some consider the founder of the modern CIA. He made this comment in his memoirs. He says: "One of the great intelligence services of the 19th century was maintained not by a government, but by a private firm--the banking house of Rothschild. They benefited the clients as well as themselves by their superior intelligence-gathering duties." I quote Mr. Dulles to indicate that it is not unusual, , , , , unprecedented or unhistorical for a bank to be concerned about significant intelligence-gathering activities. And Mr. Huang worked for an international bank. He worked for them for a long period of time. The deposition that we have read indicates that no one's quite sure what he did for them. But they do know he handled a great deal of money. Now, Mr. Riady, the head of Lippo Group, referred to Mr. Huang while he was at the Commerce Department as "my man in the American government," in this tradition of a bank having an intelligence officer well-placed. Mr. Huang may have felt he was Mr. Riady's man as well. I show you this facsimile of a check, perfectly legitimate, perfectly legal campaign contribution by Mr. Huang. But not everything, Mr. Chairman. First, the date--December of 1995. Mr. Huang, at the time, was an employee of the United States government, at the Commerce Department. But what did he put on his FEC report, telling the FEC his employment? He said he was vice president and chairman--vice president of the Lippo Bank, chairman of the Lippo Group. He apparently considered himself Mr. Riady's man in the government, if at the time he made a campaign contribution, he did not report himself as a government employee, which he was. Instead, he reported himself still working for Lippo. Now, that's Lippo's interest--intelligence information in the spirit of international bankers throughout the years. Let's talk about the Chinese government and their interest. The chairman has read a statement this morning about the Chinese government and their interest in this campaign, starting with Taiwan in 1995. In fact, the Chinese government has been interested in this kind of thing for much longer than that. This is a statement taken from the testimony of a Chinese intelligence recruit. His name is Bim Wu (ph). He was recruited in 1989 in China by the Ministry of State Security, the Chinese equivalent of the CIA. They said Bim Wu (ph) would become a successful businessman. You would patiently, steadily work your way up into the U.S. power , , , , structure. You would come to know congressmen and senators, and perhaps one day, even be able to report information from the White House. Now, Mr. Wu (ph) got as far as the first sentence. With Chinese money, he became a successful businessman. Unfortunately for him, he was arrested for violating U.S. export laws. He was given his choice of being deported to China or standing trial in the United States. He chose to stand trial in the United States, and he's now currently a guest of the U.S. taxpayers at a federal penitentiary in Pennsylvania. He prefers that to returning to China, because he got no farther than this. But the Chinese clearly were making an effort to find people who would patiently, steadily work their way up into the U.S. power structure. BENNETT: What kind of people are they looking for who will do this? William Colby, a former head of the CIA said, "The perfect operator in such operations is the traditional gray man, so inconspicuous that he can never catch the waiter's eye in a restaurant." This is the kind of person that we are looking for in the American apparatus to meet the Chinese pressure on Mr. Huang. We know the Chinese officials working through Lippo made contact with Mr. Huang prior to his entering the Commerce Department and coming to work for the U.S. government, that the Chinese were aware of him and aware of his upward mobility in the government. Now, when Mr. Huang came to the Commerce Department from the Lippo Group, the undersecretary of the department, Mr. Garton (ph), dictated a policy in writing in a memo to Mr. Huang's direct superior, the assistant secretary, Mr. Meissner, stating that "because of Mr. Huang's background at Lippo in the banking business dealing with Asia, Mr. Huang was to be walled off from anything dealing with Asia and the Pacific." Understand Mr. Huang was one of six deputy assistant secretaries reporting to Mr. Meissner, but he was the principal deputy assistant secretary. That means the other deputy assistant secretaries, one for each of these areas--Europe and the Americas, Africa, Japan and Asia and the

Pacific--each of these five reported to Mr. Huang as the principal deputy assistant secretary, and he acted as the assistant secretary when Mr. Meissner was out of town. , ", Mr. Meissner was a notorious traveler. He was out of town a great deal of time, which meant that a lot of the intelligence information available to Mr. Meissner became available to Mr. Huang while Mr. Meissner was out of town. Of course, information was available to Mr. Huang when Mr. Meissner was in town as well, but the specific requirement from Mr. Garton (ph) was that Mr. Huang was to be walled off from dealings with Asia and the Pacific. In April of this year, in federal court, John Dickerson (ph), the briefer from the CIA who briefed Mr. Huang, reported in the court that Mr. Huang's primary interest was China with subsidiary interest in Vietnam, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Indonesia and Malaysia. In other words, Mr. Huang--instead of staying away from this area as he was ordered to do in writing--spent the majority of his time in this area. It is interesting that in his briefings--and you see these are the areas he's supposed to be concerned about--Mr. Huang seldom, if ever, raised any issue about Japan. If we're going to talk about America's trading activities and you are the principal deputy assistant secretary dealing with U.S. trade policy, you want to know what's going on with Japan. Mr. Huang seemed to have no interest in Japan whatsoever. It may be just coincidence, but Lippo has no activities in Japan compared to the activities they have in these other countries where Mr. Huang had regular, continuing briefings in violation of Commerce's sound directive. Now, one other thing that is very interesting is that Mr. Huang, in addition to his briefings and his continued contacts with Lippo, had serious continuing contacts with the Chinese Embassy. BENNETT: Again, a man who by written instructions from the undersecretary is not supposed to be in this area, is not only in this area regularly in his briefings and his intelligence, but also in this area regularly with his contacts. Thus, the possibility of the pressure from the Chinese. Finally, pressure from the Clinton on Mr. Huang. Here is a list with which we're really familiar, but I decided to put it up again, of Bill Clinton's career after leaving college. Immediately after leaving Yale Law School in 1974, he ran for the U.S. House of , ", Representatives. Two years later, he ran for attorney general. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for president. And of course, two years later, he ran for president again. All of us in this room who have run statewide campaigns can have an appreciation for how much money it takes to run a statewide campaign again and again and again. Mr. Huang and the Lippo Group met Mr. Clinton, then attorney general, roughly at this point on the chart, and participated in helping finance every campaign for the next 16 to 20 years. Pressure on Mr. Huang, pressure from Lippo, pressure from the Chinese, pressure from Mr. Clinton. Each one wanted something different from Mr. Huang. Some wanted only information. Some wanted campaign contributions. When Mr. Huang left the Commerce Department, I believe that the folks who put pressure here became the recipient of the pressure here. That is, the pressure for more campaign contributions, pressure that had been put on Mr. Huang and responded to for a 20-year period, turned into pressure back to people with whom he had previously had contact, and there we have the problem. Mr. Chairman, this leaf is worth examining. It is a very serious one, and it goes beyond some of the other leaves that have been strewn around in this circumstance. It raises for me one overwhelming question, which I will pursue throughout his first phase of the hearings. That question is this: Who was John Huang's patron? We are talking about patronage jobs here--a patronage job at the Department of Commerce, a patronage job at the Democratic National Committee. These are not merit jobs. These are not career jobs. They are patronage jobs, and they are achieved under the pressure of a patron. I want to know who is John Huang's patron. Who put him in the Commerce Department and saw that he stayed there even though he was operating in a way violative of the written directions of that department? Who put him at the national committee and saw that he stayed there even though the contributions that he raised eventually were sufficiently tainted that a majority of them had to be returned? , ", He didn't get to the place that he got by virtue of his personality. He got there because he had a patron, and I think as well if this leaf off the floor of the forest, we should ask ourselves how that. Thank you. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Bennett. As Senator Glenn suggested, let's discuss as a committee now for a few minutes as to how we want to proceed as far as Mr. Huang and his

attorneys are concerned. As Senator Glenn said, we just received this letter from Mr. Huang's attorney in one of the leading and most prestigious law firms in Washington, D.C., as well as elsewhere. THOMPSON: And basically, as I read the letter, he is offering to testify for what he calls "limited immunity," and that is that he would have immunity for everything except two basic categories. One would be the classification or the disclosure of classification information. He would not have immunity for that. And he would not have immunity for matters relating to espionage. For all other things, such as campaign money laundering and things of that nature or anything else, he would have immunity for. Clearly, anything that is going to make it so that Mr. Huang can come before us and give us truthful and complete information is something that we are very, very much interested in, in this committee. Clearly, we will pursue that. Clearly, we're being offered an arrangement that we're going to have to seriously consider once we find out exactly what it is. But let's step back a moment and put it in perspective and remember where we are. Mr. Huang recently was quoted as being in New York and making a speech when he said, sure, he'd be glad to testify before the committee. Mr. Madigan called his counsel at that time--I think that was about three weeks ago--and asked him about that. His counsel said he was misquoted, that he was not. He was going to take the Fifth Amendment. Mr. Madigan has had three separate contacts--I believe in addition to that--over the last few months with his counsel, at which time in every case, no proffer was offered, and a statement was made that he was going to take the Fifth Amendment. Now, as I understand it--and I congratulate Mr. Baron for being ,", the bearer of this--he's made us an offer here for what he calls limited immunity. The only problem with that is that he is asking us for something that we probably legally cannot give him. I've not had a chance to research the law on this, but my feeling is that there's no such thing as limited immunity, that you can have immunity for one set of flaws and not immunity for another set of flaws, that you either have immunity or you don't. Now it might be that we might, under some circumstances, want to give him complete immunity. But of course, in order for that, as Senator Glenn and I have discussed, he would need to come in and make a proffer. In other words, you don't buy a pig in a poke. You don't give anybody immunity unless you know that their testimony will be helpful and you know it won't be held against them if the immunity deal falls apart. But you have to have through counsel or otherwise some indication of what they're going to be testifying to under any circumstances. And I certainly think we need to proceed on that basis. But let's proceed with a certain amount of caution and understanding. Ironically, I said in my opening statement, which I prepared a little while ago, that our tendency is to want, in all this jumble, to want to have one key witness or one document to come in and explain it all to us. That's a danger. There's no quick fix to this process, and there is no easy solution. Usually, the way you get to Mr. Huang is you work up to toward a Mr. Huang with people such as the Buddhist monks, and we still have immunity questions lying out there for them. So this is in a little bit of inverse order. So I rush to the top, so to speak, of the evidence chain is something that we ought to proceed with a certain amount of caution. I'm delighted at the prospect, but you know, I've been down to many trails to be totally convinced of what we're dealing with. I hope we're not dealing with a situation where Mr. Huang's counsel is proposing something to us that we know we cannot deliver legally. And then after we deal with it for a few days and a few witnesses who, I think, are going to provide very interesting testimony, by the way, starting tomorrow, that all the talk and all the concentration is what's Mr. Huang going to do, and by the time we find out he's not ,", going to do anything, we are along way down the road and some valuable testimony has been overlooked. THOMPSON: Those are my concerns, Senator Glenn. I applaud you for bringing this to our attention. And I otherwise think we need to move forward on it expeditiously, just to see what they have to say and what they have to offer. GLENN: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Yes, Senator Glenn. GLENN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with much of what you've said. And I--the definitions of what is limited immunity, what those limitations would be, is something that yet is to be worked out. We have the indication of what the intent is from the counsel for Mr. Huang. And that's what this was this morning was basically a letter of intent. It did not try and spell out all the detail of what an actual proffer would put forward to us. I think it's incumbent on us to get to that proffer just as fast as we possibly can, get it in at the earliest possible time, have counsel, both counsels, chief counsels, work with Mr. Cobbin and see if we can't get an agreement there on exactly how the proffer would work and what the imm

unity would be. And I would say that if the immunization is as limited, perhaps, as you indicated, then I'm not sure where that leaves us with the Buddhist monks and everyone else who would follow under those same interpretations and the other that might be granted immunity later. But that's beside the point. One witness and one quick fix, as you referred to it, might be able to short-circuit a lot of the rest, save us a lot of time and get to the basis of this, without having to work up layer by layer by layer by layer to try and build a case against someone. If that particular person that the case is being built toward is willing to come in in the first instance and answer all the questions you're retrying to build to, it would seem to me the first thing we should do is get that proffer in here and look at it. I see nothing wrong with that. I certainly can't believe that our best interests would be served by turning down the offer that has been made. Your last statement, that we should proceed with caution, I agree with that. I agree with that with every one of our witnesses, including this one. ", And as I stated in my statement, I have not decided which way I would vote on immunity myself without having the proffer and without knowing what the Justice Department opinion of this was, albeit we are the final authority on whether we wish to issue some kind of immunity or not. So I would just propose that we go ahead with this and that we authorize--we not authorize--that we direct our counsels jointly to talk to Mr. Cobb and try to work this out, work out a proffer to bring before the committee at the very earliest time. THOMPSON: Well, I would join in that. And if there's no objection, that's the way we will proceed. Is there anyone who has any further comment? Senator Lieberman. LIEBERMAN: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the possibility that Mr. Huang would come and testify before us is something that we had not expected, and in that sense, presents us with an option that we did not know we had. But I want to second what you've said and what Senator Glenn has said. We ought to be very cautious before we rush to exercise this option. In one sense, this is the star witness that the committee has been looking for. On the other hand, the immunity that's being requested is immunity from prosecution for election law violations which, while not as significant as espionage, nonetheless are at the heart of what's--what we're really concerned about here. And I think we've got to tread very cautiously here, and we've got to ask ourselves, as our counsels begin to work with attorney for Mr. Huang, as to whether Mr. Huang will offer us testimony that will advance the focus of this investigation and to weigh that against the compromising of the possible prosecution of Mr. Huang and others with whom he has been associated on election law violations. LIEBERMAN: Finally, I'm going to personally apply the same standard to this as I have to the other requests for immunity that the committee has made, which is to ask the Justice Department first what they think about it. There--and if they have no objection, that would certainly make the road a lot easier for me, and I presume, the whole committee. If they do have objections, it's still possible we might decide on our own good judgment to grant immunity. But I think that's the--", a source counsels gather, we ought to also try in a speedy way, Mr. Chairman, to sit with the Justice Department to find out what they have to say about this. DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Senator Domenici. DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman, first, I think the opening session bodes well for a successful hearing. But there will be many bumps. Some may even be even big mountains that we have to get over. Frankly, the letter that comes from Mr. Ty Cobb, signed by somebody other than he, in his behalf... GLENN: We since have the original signed letters sent to us this morning. That was faxed over this morning to us about 8:50 this morning. We do now have a letter that's been signed by... DOMENICI: Thanks, Senator. But my point--that was just kind of a parenthetical, which I shouldn't have thrown in. Let me just suggest--this letter makes me put my guard up about this immunity. First of all, I heard my distinguished friend from Alaska raise the issue of Asian bashing. And this lawyer raises it here in his letter. I don't believe there's any Asian bashing even on this committee, on the United States Senate, that even reaches the proportion of being minuscule. So you know, to raise that issue in this letter causes me to wonder about what they're up to. Secondly, we had a difficult time in this committee getting the attorney general to tell us we can have immunity, my recollection is, on 12 or 15 Buddhist monks and nuns. The extent of their involvement was a \$5,000 contribution, which they were probably the vehicle for laundering. We don't have any evidence that they would be prosecuted for anything. As a matter of fact, so me indication from the attorney general that they wouldn't, because they're too far down the street from the temple. Now I believe that that process of trying to get them immunized took us an inordinate

amount of time because the other side wasn't willing to let us have immunity. They have since, with reference to two or three or three or four, said let's immunize them. ,", Now my point is that this fellow, from everything we know about him, really needs immunity. Well, that's the way I see it. Totally the truth, if I were he, I would come here running trying to get immunity. But the point of it is, we have to be very judicious, because this man must--and we must find a mechanism to be sure that he is going to tell us what he knows. You grant immunity on some weak proffer that says I'll talk about this and that, you have no assurance when it comes time to answer the question that he'll tell you anything. Now I think you can direct your counsel. Whether I'm going to vote on what they recommend--I mean, to me, we've got to make sure that they are saying to us what I'll tell us what he knows, and it will relate to these issues. He will not be evasive. He will not regularly claim he can't remember. We've got documents to refresh recollection about this guy. So while it is a nice gesture, it is suspicious. After three months of negotiating with him, it wasn't available. Told our counsel that he wasn't going to be there. And all of sudden, it shows up today. And I noticed, for some reason, the spinning was wonderful here today. I mean, that's why that little line--there is the spinners who stay on this side and the press on that side. And the spinning of this document was enormous. I didn't see any of us down there spinning. So I guess we know who's spinning it. But the truth of the matter is--the truth of the matter is we have to find out a lot more about what he's going to tell us before we grant this kind of immunity. DOMENIC: And in the meantime, fellow senators, we ought to get on with immunizing these little nuns and monks so we aren't worried about discriminating against them. We won't give them immunity, and we give this kind of guy immunity. I mean, that doesn't strike me very--as being very, very right. I have to leave. But I stayed around here to make that little statement and to congratulate you on the hearing. GLENN: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Thank you very much. Senator Glenn. ,", GLENN: Mr. Chairman, let me answer--and this--the answer to this is we get the proffer in. If it's weak, well, it's weak, and we don't accept it, because a proffer is supposed to spell out what the person is going to testify to in response for what immunity you're going to give, and that's the basic reason for it. We don't have that yet. We have a letter of intent. And so to characterize it in some way as being weak at this point, it may come in as a very strong proffer for all I know. As far as--and I would not--I would caution that we note that this with what's happened over at the Justice Department, because you know, we know what the delays were there. We had some lawyer problems with other commitments and soon. There was a delay there. The attorney general, Janet Reno, has guaranteed us that if at all possible, she will turn these things around where possible within 24 hours. Now whether she can meet that goal or not, I don't know. The difficulty in immunizing the Buddhist group from out there that was sent, that was given to us in a bloc, was the fact that they are working through these--and we already have four of them through and approved now--and they're reworking as rapidly as they can to get the other three through also, as I understand it. I think to try and go without them running through this would take--would run the risk of seeing us may be get into, get ourselves in the middle of immunizing someone that they may behave really, substantial case built up against, and that they're prepared to take to a grand jury. And we'd be immunizing without knowing that. And whether they're Buddhist monks or nuns or whatever, they might very well have charges like that against them for all I know. So all we've asked is a sign-off over there that no such--or it's left up to us for our consideration. If there are considerations like that over there, then we want to know about it. And then, as the chairman has pointed out several times, we are the final judge. And we have asked that that decision over there, that there be given a maximum of 10 days for the Justice Department to act on these. And if they have not acted at that time, the chairman has indicated--and I think properly so--that we then would go ahead if we wanted to. We would make that judgment at that time. I just don't see any problem here with getting a proffer, because that's the next step. All we have now is a letter of intent. We ,", can't say whether it's a weak proffer, a strong proffer, a middle proffer or whatever. We won't know until we get it. And all I've asked for this morning is the opportunity to have our staffs be directed to go, and that's what we voted a moment ago with the unanimous consent request that the chairman made. I would repeat something I said a while ago. I don't know how I would vote on immunity at this point. I, too, want to see the proffer. I, too, want to know what comes out of the negotiations with the attorney general. And at that time, I'll be satisfied to make my own

n judgment. But I do think this is a great opportunity, and I'm glad I understand that there was no objection before. And so the committee has voted to authorize our staff to go ahead, and that's obviously the logical next step, and I'm glad to see you take it. Thank you. THOMPSON: Sure. Thank you, Senator Glenn. I think we're all basically saying the same thing. And we will just let the lawyers do what lawyers are supposed to do at this stage, and that is to--and it's happened before, and it'll happen again. When these matters come up, you talk to the other lawyer and see what they've got to offer. And then we'll get back together and see the nature of the proffer that we would expect and start narrowing the difference if we can. So, Mr. Madigan and Mr. Baron will do that. I'd like to announce that we will start in the morning at 9 o'clock and go straight through until 1 o'clock. There were some schedule problems with some of our people we've asked to be here with us tomorrow. And so we're trying to accommodate them. So we will adjourn until 9 o'clock in the morning. FDCH Transcript Service July 08, 1997 55 There are no more items to read. 58#p#===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rochester M. Johnson (CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUL-1997 10:40:20.00

SUBJECT: 7/15 TRANSCRIPT AND CURRENT INDEX ATTACHED

TO: Matthew I. Fraidin (CN=Matthew I. Fraidin/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

WPC
R jJ_hqxq
4a}_?)sACHFa.t{<"Z:l,S&]C <"U<
#-T^cRB\6'/RI3 y2vv ' &(W/u@v)A'm9(eP%
=Etv}IUx5U<2T\$O9L"4r6y"C26-v%kXiX9:z'6VJb~f{[C!\$m>.aUb\$u 7=S_%sewTC}'kCwEuD~6<R
A/utg1o;|--)=t~pt
O}@y"^>Vy".dUhX5@/qtU:%RU@X0[n0@w@4UNU:UN n U:
UN.UN|<6X9'("Courier 10cpiX)L Z(CG Times Regular(32\$
! #|xx<6X9'("Courier 10cpiXx6X@8;X@(\$

' (# eXXeTHEPAGINATIONOFTHISDOCUMENTISUNOFFICIAL JULY15,1997SENATEGOVERNMENT
TALAFFAIRSCOMMITTEEHEARINGTRANSCRIPTWITNESSES:UTOMO(pp.247),HAMPSON(pp.4768),AR
THUR(pp.68103)#e
[##Xb3Xe<#
^E_['aEbcEdtuUvL"99P9

' (# eXX
eTHEPAGINATIONOFTHISDOCUMENTISUNOFFICIAL JULY15,1997SENATEGOVERNMENT
NTALAFFAIRSCOMMITTEEHEARINGTRANSCRIPTWITNESSES:UTOMO(pp.247),HAMPSON(pp.4768),A
RTHUR(pp.68103)#e
[##Xb3Xe<# (hH
Z6Times New Roman Regular<6X9'("Courier 10cpi
(hH
Z6Times New Roman Regular

|
' (# eXXeTHEPAGINATIONOFTHISDOCUMENTISUNOFFICIAL JULY15,1997SENATEGOVERNMENT
TALAFFAIRSCOMMITTEEHEARINGTRANSCRIPTWITNESSES:ARTHUR,HAMPSON,UTOMO#e
[##Xb3Xe<#
<6X9'("Courier 10cpi(hH
Z6Times New Roman Regular(hH
Z6Times New Roman Regular

ar
! 7b3XXdd7X\XXXXXX\dv vv vddd uutJulianaUtomo(pp.247)t t] `]t^]T]^t_ _'Thom
asHampson(pp.4768) (HaroldArthur(p`tc`p`ct`p.`ta`l`atb68103)b_
tSENATEGOVERNMENTALAFFAIRSSPECIALINVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE HOLDS DAYFOUROFHEARIN
GS

ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE JULY 15, 1997 SPEAKERS: U.S. SENATOR FRED THOMPSON (R-TN), CHAIRMAN U.S. SENATORS SUSAN M. COLLINS (R-ME) U.S. SENATORS SAM BROWNBACK (R-KS) U.S. SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI (R-NM) U.S. SENATOR THAD COCHRAN (R-MS) U.S. SENATOR DONNICK LES (R-OK) U.S. SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER (R-PA) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. SMITH (R-NH) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT BENNETT (R-UT) U.S. SENATOR JOHN GLENN (D-OH), RANKING U.S. SENATOR CARL LEVIN (D-MI) U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN (D-CT) U.S. SENATOR DANIEL K. AKAKA (D-HI) U.S. SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN (D-IL) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT G. TORRICELLI (D-NJ) U.S. SENATOR MAX CLELAND (D-GA) MICHAEL MADIGAN, CHIEF MAJORITY COUNSEL ALAN BARON, CHIEF MINORITY COUNSEL JULIANA UTOMO, HIP HING HOLDING SEEMPLOYEE/CO

NSULTANT THOMAS HAMPSON, SUMMARY WITNESS ON LIPPO GROUP HAROLD ARTHUR, FORMER LIPPO EXECUTIVE

VE JAMES A. ALEXANDER, FORMER LIPPO EXECUTIVE GARY CHRISTOPHERSON, FORMER WHITE HOUSE OFFICIAL

IAL PAUL BUSKIRK, COMMERCE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL PAUL AGREENE, FORMER EMPLOYEE, STEVENS, INC

. '& [*] THOMPSON: The meeting will come to order, please. The Senate Governmental Affairs

Committee continues its investigation today into illegal and improper activities associated with the 1996 federal election campaigns. Last week, the committee heard testimony that Lippo executives and Lippo consultants and others sought to convince the Democratic National Committee to hire Mr. Huang as a fundraiser. Certain people were concerned about Mr. Huang's activities--putting the president in small dinner situations with foreign nationals who could not contribute, although they were supposed to be fundraising activities--and other matters that caused Mr. Sullivan and apparently some others to be concerned at the DNC. Then it turned out Mr. Huang facilitated the raising of hundreds of thousands of dollars in illegal contribution that have been shown by the committee's investigation to be of foreign origin. Today, we'll hear from some of the few people who worked at Lippo who have remained in the United States. We'll look at Mr. John Huang's activities when he worked at Lippo, including whether he engaged in illegal money laundering there. I think the significance there is that, apparently, both Mr. Huang and Lippo were perfectly willing and adept at putting illegal money into the United States. We'll also examine Lippo's relationship to the People's Republic of China. Then we'll consider Mr. Huang's activities while he was employed at the Commerce Department. We'll consider the nature of the information that he had access to. Some of this information can be disclosed in public session, but some of it will have to be disclosed in executive session of this committee. Then we will examine what communications he had during that time and what possibilities there were for the dissemination of that information. Last Friday following the completion of the appearance of the committee's witness, former DNC financed director Richard Sullivan, the DNC produced documents to the committee that had been copied to Mr. Sullivan, a memorandum--a series of memorandums--to Mr. Fowler from David Mercer (ph), who worked for Mr. Sullivan. (#- The documents--they were relevant to Mr. Sullivan's examination and were reproduced the day after Mr. Sullivan concluded his examination. These--we're going to make these documents a part of the record and follow up on them. They basically set forth pretty clear evidence that a foreign citizen--I think through his wife--offered to make a large contribution, \$100,000, to the DNC in return for assistance in arranging for a meeting with a top national security official. These documents clearly appear to be a part of what should have been the DNC response. We want to check on that and make sure and we'll have an appropriate response as far as the compliance issue is concerned. But we will make these a part of the record at this time, and follow up on that accordingly. Before we call our first witness, I'll call on Senator Glenn for any statement he wants... GLENN: Mr. Chairman, I have no opening statement today. We discussed this on the--the stuff you entered into--the material you entered into the record here. We want to check some of those things out, too. So we look forward to discussing that. THOMPSON: All right. GLENN: Thank you. THOMPSON: OK. We'll call Juliana Utomo, please. Mr. Wexler (ph), good morning. WEXLER (ph): Good morning. THOMPSON: Ms. Utomo, thank you for being here. THOMPSON: Would you please stand and raise your right hand please. Do you promise that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Thank you very much.

uch. (#- I understand that you have no opening statement, so if we may, we'll just proceed with the questions. Is that... WEXLER(ph): That's correct. THOMPSON: OK with you? WEXKER(ph): That would be fine. THOMPSON: All right. Thank you. Mr. Madigan. MADIGAN: Good morning, Ms. Utomo. UTOMO: Good morning. MADIGAN: Thank you very much for being here this morning. UTOMO: You're welcome. MADIGAN: Let me start by asking you a little bit about your educational background. Could you tell the committee about it? UTOMO: My background is from architecture, engineering, and also construction management. MADIGAN: And in about 1988, did you begin work for one of the Lippo companies in the United States? UTOMO: Yes, with HipHing Holdings. MADIGAN: Could you perhaps pull that microphone a little bit closer? Tell the committee, if you would, how it came to be that you began work for HipHing Holdings. Did Mr. Riady hire you? UTOMO: Yes, he did. MADIGAN: And how did that happen, briefly, if you would? UTOMO: Actually, we study, we finish master degree at Cleveland, Ohio in May 1988, and my husband got a job in Los Angeles, so I just sent a resume to HipHing Holding to Mr. Riady, if there is any opening for me. MADIGAN: Now during the first period of time that you worked for HipHing Holdings, did you report directly to Mr. Riady? , " , UTOMO: For the first few months, yes. MADIGAN: Did there come a time when you worked for HipHing that you reported to Mr. John Huang? UTOMO: Yes. After Mr. Riady left. MADIGAN: Now tell me, if you would, when that was to the best of your recollection. UTOMO: Approximately in 1989 or '90. I cannot remember exactly the year. MADIGAN: Around the time period of 1989 to 1990, Mr. Riady left the United States and moved back to Jakarta. Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now when you were first with HipHing Holdings, Mr. Riady lived in Los Angeles, is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Up until this time frame that you told us about? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now am I correct that you worked at HipHing on a full-time basis until 1996 and that you still work for HipHing now on a consulting agreement? Is that right? UTOMO: Yes, but after March '94 I didn't come for the full eight hours. MADIGAN: During the time that you worked in HipHing, let's take the 1992 to 1994 time frame, did you report directly to Mr. Huang during that time frame? UTOMO: Yes for proper legal matters. MADIGAN: Now your offices at that time, where were they located? UTOMO: At 711 West College Street. MADIGAN: And is that the same building that houses the Lippo , " , bank? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: What floor were you on in the building? UTOMO: I move several times from third floor to the sixth floor. MADIGAN: And where was Mr. Huang's office? UTOMO: At sixth floor. MADIGAN: Same floor as you were on? UTOMO: Yes. But only for three or four months. Is that in the same suite. MADIGAN: Now to your knowledge, has HipHing Holding ever made a profit? UTOMO: I don't know exactly, because I didn't take care of the books until late March 1994. MADIGAN: But you know, don't you, that the only property that HipHing Holdings has is an empty parking lot in Los Angeles. Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: There are no other assets. UTOMO: No, as... MADIGAN: That you know of. UTOMO: As I know, yes. MADIGAN: Now, during the time that you were with HipHing, how did HipHing stay financially afloat, if it only as an empty parking lot? UTOMO: Based on the documents that were requested for capital injection. MADIGAN: You would request funds from Lippo Jakarta and the , " , funds would be wired into Los Angeles, is that right? UTOMO: I cannot say if Lippo from Jakarta. I don't know exactly the source. But we send the request to Jakarta office. MADIGAN: Well, we'll talk about that in a minute and I'll show you a couple of documents. You always sent the documents to a Mrs. Ing(ph), is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And you knew that she was in Jakarta and that her office was on the same floor as Mr. Riady, right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now, during the time that Mr. Huang worked at HipHing, HipHing made political contributions, did it not? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And Mr. Huang handled all that for HipHing, am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Let me show you, if I might, and put up on the screen here Exhibit Number 101. Now Exhibit Number 101, Ms. Utomo, is a check dated August 12th, 1992 in the amount of \$50,000 payable to the DNC Victory Fund, is that right? UTOMO: It appears so, yes. MADIGAN: And tell me if you would who's signatures are on that check. UTOMO: My signature on the top and Mr. August Setiawan(ph) on the bottom. MADIGAN: Mr. Setiawan(ph), is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And at that time, what position in HipHing did Mr. Setiawan(ph) have? , " , UTOMO: He is the person that handled the funds. MADIGAN: Was he the comptroller of the company, so to speak? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did there come a time when he left the United States and went back to Jakarta? UTOMO: Pardon me, sir? MADIGAN: Did Mr. Setiawan(ph) leave the country and go to Indonesia? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: So he's not here today? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Now let me ask you to look at Exh

ibit 102, if we could put that upon the screen. Now Exhibit Number 102 is a memorandum dated August 17, 1992 from Mr. Huang and Mr. Setiawan (ph) to this Mrs. Ing (ph) that we spoke about a minute ago, am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And you've seen the set type of memorandum before, have you not? While you worked at Hip Hing? UTOMO: Just recently. MADIGAN: But while you worked there, you sent memorandums yourself to Mrs. Ing (ph) in order to have money wired from Jakarta back to Hip Hing in the United States, am I right about that? UTOMO: Yes. This is like the form we use for this. MADIGAN: The same kind of form that you use. We'll look at a few of them in a moment. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: But let's look at this particular one. You see in the first paragraph where it says, please kindly wire \$146,500? ,", UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did I read that correctly? And it says to the Lippo Bank Los Angeles, attention John Huang, and August Setiawan (ph), is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now this memorandum then lists the expenses that the funds are needed for. And in the second line, it says, DNC Victory contribution, \$50,000. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did I read that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now, you did this on a regular basis in terms of sending memoranda to, over to Jakarta and having money wired back, is that right? UTOMO: Before March '94 I don't know if it's regular or it's just once in a while. MADIGAN: Let's look at Exhibit Number 103 if we could. Now Exhibit Number 103 is the income statement for Hip Hing Holdings for the year ending December 31st, 1992. And it shows that Hip Hing lost \$482,000 that year, am I right? UTOMO: It appears so, yes. MADIGAN: From this document? UTOMO: From this document. MADIGAN: Now let me ask you if I might look at Exhibit Number 108. MADIGAN: Now is Exhibit 108 a memorandum that you prepared? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And it's in the same format as the Exhibit 102 memorandum that we were just looking at. Am I right? ,", UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And it was sent to the same Mrs. Ing (ph) for reimbursement of expenses, correct? UTOMO: That's correct. MADIGAN: Now let's go back to May and let me show you another couple of exhibits here. Let's look at Exhibit Number 104. Exhibit Number 104, we'll take them one at a time, perhaps, if we can. The first one on Exhibit Number 104 is a check dated September 23, 1993 for \$15,000, payable to the DNC, am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now who's signatures are on that check? UTOMO: The top one is Mr. Huang, and the second one is Mr. August Diawan (ph). MADIGAN: Now these second check, which is written on Exhibit 104, which is written four days later, also for \$15,000, also to the DNC, are the same two signatures on that check? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And Mr. Huang's being the signature on top? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And how about the third check on Exhibit 104, which is a check dated September 23, 1993 from 15--for \$15,000 to the DNC? Same two signatures on that check? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now the bottom two checks are from two different Lippo-related companies, correct? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: The first is San Jose Holdings, Inc. UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: Is that right? And you did work for that company while you were working out at Lippo also. Am I correct about that? UTOMO: Yes. They assigned me to handle their properties. MADIGAN: Was it Mr. Riady that asked you to work on the San Jose matter originally? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And did Mr. Huang also handle any political contributions that would be made by the San Jose company while you were there? UTOMO: I don't know exactly. MADIGAN: During the time that you worked in the Lippo offices there with respect to Hip Hing and San Jose and the Toy company, it was Mr. Huang, was it not, who handled all these political contributions that would be made? UTOMO: I didn't handle the bookkeeping and the checks. So sometimes I don't know who's direction, because the checks were kept by Mr. August Diawan (ph). MADIGAN: But Mr. Huang is the one that had to approve these things. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And if you were going to send requests back to Jakarta for money, Mr. Huang would have to approve that, wouldn't he? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Let me ask you to look at another exhibit. Let's look at Number 105. Now Number 105 is another income statement for Hip Hing Holdings, this time showing that for the year 1993, Hip Hing lost another 493,000. Am I correct? That's what the document shows? UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: Now let me ask you a question, if I might, about the bonus that Mr. Huang received when he left the Lippo companies. You were aware, weren't you, that he did receive a bonus because several large wires came in that you asked about at the time? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And what were you told with respect to why these wires were coming in? UTOMO: He said it's for his severance pay. MADIGAN: And Mr. Huang told you that directly? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Let me ask you to look at Exhibit 106. If you can put that upon the screen. Now Exhibit Number 106 is a memorandum dated June 27, 1994, to Mr. Huang from the managing director of the Lippo Group. Is that right? UTOMO: It appears so, yes. MADIGAN: And do you know

ow him? The managing director who's listed down there? UTOMO: I know the name only. MADIGAN: And have you seen that name in connection with correspondence back and forth between Lippo and the United States and Lippo/Jakarta? Am I right? UTOMO: No. This is... MADIGAN: Where--I'm sorry. UTOMO: Just from their brochure, their catalogues. MADIGAN: From the Lippo brochures, you recognize his name? UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: But you yourself did not have any dealings with him directly during the time you were at Lippo? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Let me invite your attention to the first paragraph of the memo, where it says, "I have received your memo dated June 13, 1994, and learned of your decision to accept the appointment from the Clinton administration to serve as the principal deputy assistant secretary of commerce." Do you see that language? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: I read that correctly, didn't I? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now, when you look down on the document, it says "severance bonus \$425,000; unused vacation \$17,500; and Mercedes \$25,000." Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Do you know, by the way, where the letter is that--or the memo that's referenced here that John Huang wrote requesting his bonus? Because the committee has never been able to obtain it. UTOMO: No, I never seen one. MADIGAN: Did you see it at the time? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Mr. Huang never showed you the memo by which he would have requested his bonus and severance package? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Take a moment, if you will, and look at the next page of exhibit 106. Now this is a general ledger for Hip Hing Holdings for the period ending March of 1994, just a couple of months before Mr. Huang went to work at the Commerce Department. ,", These are documents that you're familiar with, I take it, in the 1994 timeframe? UTOMO: Yes, I guess this was prepared by the CPA. MADIGAN: The Lippo CPA? UTOMO: The Hip Hing Holding's CPA. MADIGAN: Hip Hing's CPA? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And down in the middle, it says "John Huang bonus, \$230,000." Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now that's in addition to the numbers we were talking about a moment ago. Is it not? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now let me ask you to look at the third page of exhibit number 106. Well, actually, before we do that, that adds up to what? \$600--and something thousand if you add the \$468 and the \$230? Math was never my strong suit, but it's somewhere approaching a half a million dollars, isn't it? UTOMO: Yes. This appears. MADIGAN: Now on the third page of exhibit 106 I'll represent to you is a part of a document that was filed by Mr. Huang when he entered the employment of the federal government at the Commerce Department. Do you see down on the bottom left-hand corner of that document where it says, "Lippo Group/USA"? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And then there is in handwriting--does that look like Mr. Huang's writing by the way? UTOMO: I'm not sure. ,", MADIGAN: Do you see where it says 1-2-3. And then the first says "Lippo Group, B-E-N-E," it looks like, and across the line, it says "salary and severance bonus" and then "\$71,050"? And then number 2 says "Lippo Bank/California director's fees and bonus" another \$18,950. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And number three, he lists Hip Hing Holdings--salary, bonus and severance bonus, another \$788,750. Do you see that language? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now that adds up to about \$900,000--something. Do you--and I know you haven't seen this document before, but do you know where the \$788,000 figure came from that Mr. Huang listed on his commerce document? UTOMO: No, I don't know. MADIGAN: Do you know why he would list payments from the Lippo Bank and Hip Hing Holdings and the Lippo Group? UTOMO: I don't know, sir. MADIGAN: During the time that you worked there, was Mr. Huang a director or a member of the board of the Lippo Bank as well as his position at Hip Hing Holdings? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Did you have any responsibilities in connection with Mr. Huang's position in the bank? UTOMO: No at all. MADIGAN: Where did the people in the bank--the Lippo Bank--office, as opposed to where the Hip Hing office was during the time that you were there? UTOMO: It's the same floor, but a different suite. ,", MADIGAN: Now, where were you in proximity to where Mr. Huang was during the time that you worked there? UTOMO: I was on the sixth floor one time, the same floor, but different office; and then I moved to the third floor, and he was still in sixth floor. MADIGAN: During the time that you and Mr. Huang were both on the sixth floor... UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: ...what did he do? UTOMO: I don't know exactly. MADIGAN: What was his job as you understood it? UTOMO: Just if I need an approval for special expenses I need to go to him for his approval. MADIGAN: During this period of time when you had to go to Mr. Huang for his approval, did Mr. Riady visit from time to time? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Now once Mr. Riady left and you said in the '89, '90 timeframe, he maintained his house in Los Angeles, did he not? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And am I correct that his house was in the Brentwood area? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Do you know exactly where it was? Had you ever visit

edit?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: Now, am I correct that presently Mr. Riady is building a new house?UTOMO: Yes, that's correct. ,", MADIGAN: What did he do with the Brentwood house that you had visited?UTOMO: They tear it down and then built the new one.MADIGAN: And when is the new house supposed to be finished?UTOMO: Approximately another one or two months.MADIGAN: Have you spoken to Mr. Riady about that new house?UTOMO: No.MADIGAN: Has Mr. Riady spoken to anyone else that you know about coming back to his new house that he's having built in Brentwood?UTOMO: I don't know.MADIGAN: Do you know anyone who's involved with that house, the construction of that house?UTOMO: The architects.MADIGAN: And are they--do they have some relation to Hip Hing Holdings?UTOMO: No.MADIGAN: Then how do you know them?UTOMO: The architect contact me to--so every Monday send me bills for the contractors so I issue the check for them.MADIGAN: So the architect that's building Mr. Riady's house as we speak, they send the bill to you?UTOMO: Yes. Actually, the house is not directly--I mean, not belong to Mr. Riady anymore. It belongs to Lippo Holdings America, Inc.MADIGAN: Is Lippo Holding America one of the Lippo subsidiaries in the United States?UTOMO: I don't know exactly how it's connected to Lippo in Jakarta, but the name is Lippo. ,", MADIGAN: Well, we'll talk about that in a moment. Let me ask you to look at exhibit number 107, if we could put that up. Now 107 is another memorandum that you wrote to this Mrs. Ing(ph), is that right?UTOMO: That's correct.MADIGAN: And this memorandum is addressed to her at the Lippo Group, am I right?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: And that's in Jakarta where you send this?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: And this memorandum, like the others, requests that money be sent from Jakarta back to the United States, is that right?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: Am I reading that right?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: Do you know a person by the name of Meli Tom(ph)?UTOMO: Yes. I met her once.MADIGAN: Does she work for Lippo?UTOMO: Hip Hing Holdings pay his consultant fee.MADIGAN: Look if you would for a moment at exhibit number 108. I think you meant to say her consulting fee, not this. Is that right, Ms. Utomo?UTOMO: Yes. Sorry.MADIGAN: In other words, Hip Hing Holdings paid a consulting fee to Maeley Tom?UTOMO: Right. ,", MADIGAN: Look if you would at exhibit 108. And we looked at that a moment ago. That's another memorandum from you and Mr. Huang dated July 5, 1994, again, to Mrs. Ing(ph) with the Lippo Group, right?In Jakarta?UTOMO: She has the same office with the Lippo group, but I don't know exactly what is her title.MADIGAN: Right. She's the one that we just looked at a moment ago where the documents said, Mrs. Ing(ph), Lippo Group, right?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: And she's the same lady you mentioned a moment earlier in the testimony who had the office on the same floor as Mr. Riady in Jakarta?UTOMO: Right.MADIGAN: But you just don't know as you sit there the exact title that she had, am I right?UTOMO: Yes.WEXLER(PH): I believe, Mr. Madigan, she also doesn't know who formally employs Miss Ing(ph).MADIGAN: Let's look at number 108. In the middle of that page, it says consulting fee and then in handwriting out at the side it says Maeley Tom, \$6,600. Do you know who's handwriting that is?UTOMO: Mr. Huang.MADIGAN: And is that his signature up at the top of that memorandum?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: If you look over at the second page of exhibit 108, again down in the middle where it says consulting fee and reimbursement, Maeley Tom and Associates, this time \$18,000. Do you see that?UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: Do you know what she did for the Hip Hing company?UTOMO: No.MADIGAN: You see the line above that on the document where it says, trip to Little Rock and Washington, D.C. 6/19 to 6/26, 1994?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: That's just a few weeks before Mr. Huang started at the Commerce Department. Do you know what his trip to Little Rock was about or why he went there?UTOMO: No.MADIGAN: All right, let me ask you a little bit more about that. The trip to Little Rock with the cost \$6,293, and above that on the document it says J.H. reimbursement, this is all money that is reimbursed in the wire transfers that Hip Hing receives from Jakarta, correct?UTOMO: I'm sorry. Pardon me?MADIGAN: This document that, number 108...UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: This particular one that's dated August 9, 1994, this, like the others we've been looking at, is, if I understand it right, is a form document that you send over to Jakarta, correct?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: And then Jakarta wires money back to you...UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: ...as specified in this document.UTOMO: Right.MADIGAN: Now I take it that somebody must have, at some point in time, instructed you as to how to do this, am I right?UTOMO: Yes. I just follow what Mr. August Diawan(ph) has done ,", before March '94.MADIGAN: So Mr. Setiawan(ph) used to handle the transfers prior to '94, and then in '94, you took over the transfers?UTOMO: Yes.MADIGAN: And you did them or tried to do them the same way that Mr. Setiawan(ph) told you that he did them?Is that right?UTOMO: Yes

.MADIGAN:OK.Andyoudon'tknow,asyousithere,whatanyoftheseexpenseswerefor,forexample,inthetrip to Little Rock, or why they would be reimbursed by Jakarta? UTOMO: No. MADIGAN: Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now if we look over to the next exhibit, the next part of number 108, actually. MADIGAN: It's a September 28, 1994, memo, the same format. Give me 22nd. What did I say? I'm sorry, September 22nd. I'm sorry, the September 22nd memorandum, 1994. Yes, Your Honor. (LAUGHTER) Going back to a prior life, I'm afraid. Yes, Senator. It's the last page of exhibit 108. And this time the memo is just from you, again to Mrs. Ing (ph). ,", And down in the middle of this exhibit, it also has a consulting fee for Maeley Tom in the amount of \$4,913. Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Do you know who she reported to? UTOMO: To Mr. Hanna (ph). MADIGAN: I'm sorry? UTOMO: To Mr. Joe Hanna (ph) in Jakarta. MADIGAN: And she reported directly to someone in Jakarta? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: So she did not report to someone in the United States with respect to what she was doing for these consulting fees? UTOMO: No, no. MADIGAN: And down a bit farther, the Little Rock Limousine, Ltd.--\$1,013. Do you know what that was for? UTOMO: It is for limousines. I can--I don't know exactly what for. MADIGAN: Do you know what the--this particular limousine expense was used for? This is dated now September of 1994. Mr. Huang is already in the Commerce Department. Do you know what that was for or who used the limousine? UTOMO: At that time, sometimes Mr. Hanna (ph) also visits United States. MADIGAN: And this particular, do you know? Or are you--I don't want you to guess. Just tell me what you know about things. UTOMO: I don't recall. MADIGAN: OK. Now today, you have a consulting agreement with--with Hip Hing. Is that right? ,", UTOMO: Yes, that's correct. MADIGAN: And what do you do basically for the company today? UTOMO: Take care of properties belong to San Jose Holdings, Toy Center Holding, and Hip Hing Holdings, and also Lippo Holding/America. MADIGAN: Well, let me have this other exhibit presented if I can, which we just obtained. If we can mark it 108A or something of that nature. This is a copy of your consulting agreement that I asked your attorney to give me last night. Do you have that there? WEXLER (ph): I don't believe that's in the book. MADIGAN: We'll have somebody bring it down in a moment. UTOMO: Yes, thank you. WEXLER (ph): This is marked exhibit 122. MADIGAN: All right. We'll call it exhibit 122 then. It's dated November 17, 1996. Is that right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Now this is a multi-paged document, but it basically sets forth in the first two pages, if I understand it correctly, the current arrangement that you have with Hip Hing. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And was this prepared for you by Mr. Setiawan (ph)? UTOMO: We do it together. I mean... MADIGAN: This was... UTOMO: It was agreed by both sides. MADIGAN: And was he in the United States at the time? ,", UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And how did it come about that your status would change from a full-time employee, if you will, to a consulting arrangement? Was that Mr. Setiawan's (ph) idea? UTOMO: No, because I have two very young children to take care, so I cannot go to the office exactly eight hours a day. MADIGAN: And at this point in time, they also moved the Lippo offices or say the Lippo Group companies were moved from Los Angeles out to a different place, right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Where were they moved to? UTOMO: To Rosemead (ph). It's about just 15 minutes by freeway--10 or 15 minutes by freeway from the Lippo Bank's office. MADIGAN: Were you involved in the move of the offices? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: What happened to all the documents that were in the offices in Los Angeles? We haven't been able to get our hands on too many of them. Do you know? UTOMO: We bring all of the documents to the next office. MADIGAN: All of the Hip Hing documents? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: How about the documents for the variety of other Lippo-related companies? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And when you entered this agreement in November of '96, the remainder of the exhibit shows resignation letters from the various companies, is that right? UTOMO: Yes. ,", MADIGAN: Why was that done? Do you know? UTOMO: I'm sorry. Pardon me? MADIGAN: The documents say that you resigned from Hip Hing, from Calbot Holdings Inc., from Lippo Energy Co., and from Lippo Holding America Inc. Do you know why that was done? UTOMO: Because I was the officer of these companies. MADIGAN: Was that done in conjunction with the move of the offices from downtown to the suburb? UTOMO: No, because I resigned from Hip Hing just to make sure that I resign from all the companies. MADIGAN: So to make sure the books were straight, you resigned from all the companies and entered a consulting agreement just with Hip Hing. UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: OK. Thank you very much. GLENN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to have Mr. Baron to the previous question please. BARON: Thank you, Senator Glenn. Good morning, Ms. Utomo. Ms. Utomo, Mr. Madigan in his questioning to you said that, suggested that Hip Hing owned an empty lot

in Los Angeles. Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes, that's correct. BARON: And that lot is used and has been used as a parking lot, is that correct? UTOMO: Some of it. BARON: OK. And do you have any idea, am I correct that that parking lot has been assessed as being worth several million dollars? UTOMO: That's correct. BARON: And am I correct that originally the idea was to develop that open lot into some other kind of property with a building on it, or other kind of development? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And did there come a time because of the economic conditions in California that the plan to develop the lot were abandoned? UTOMO: That's correct. BARON: Now there was a lot in Mr. Madigan's questions, he raised the fact that Mr. Setiawan (ph) is gone from the country. He left and went back to Indonesia. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. That occurred back in 1994, did it not? UTOMO: Yes. Approximately March. BARON: Not recently. He hasn't been back to work at Hip Hing or for Lippo Banks since that time, has he? UTOMO: No. He came when we have to move the office and then to counted agreement. BARON: Right. But he hasn't come back to work here for a long period of time. He basically moved back to Indonesia in 1994. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now, were you aware during the time period that you worked with Mr. Huang that he was very active in many Chinese-American community organizations? UTOMO: I don't know. BARON: You don't know. Do you recall him being active in the Asian Bankers Association? Would you be aware of that? UTOMO: I don't know. BARON: Do you recall him being active as an invited member of the Committee of 100, which is an organization headed by Yo-Yo Ma and I. M. Pei. UTOMO: I don't know. BARON: You don't know about that. UTOMO: No. BARON: Now, does the parking lot generate revenue for Hip Hing? UTOMO: There's income from parking lots. BARON: Right. Is Hip Hing, to your knowledge, incorporated as an American company even though it's owned by a foreign company? UTOMO: Yes, it's state of California. BARON: It's incorporated in the state of California. UTOMO: Right. BARON: And so it pays property taxes here in the United States? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And there's also an entity known as the Toy Center. UTOMO: Right. BARON: And that is another entity with which you are familiar as part of the Lippo organization? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And what kind of property does the Toy Center own? UTOMO: Toy Center has three-story buildings. Is about approximately 13,000 square. And then is 90 percent leased and tenants pay the rent. BARON: How about an entity known as San Jose Holdings? Are you familiar with that entity? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. And that is also an American company. It's incorporated in California as is the Toy Center. Is that correct? UTOMO: Right. BARON: And what asset does San Jose Holdings own? UTOMO: Has three parcels of property. One is five-story building. BARON: And does it generate income? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. Now, can we look at some of the exhibits that you reviewed with Mr. Madigan? Let's look at number 103, if you would. BARON: Do you have that in front of you? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now that is an income statement for Hip Hing Holdings for the period 1992? Am I correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it shows that there was total income for Hip Hing of a little over \$38,000 -- \$38,400? Is that correct? UTOMO: That's correct. BARON: And that is the year in which the \$50,000 check to the DNC was made out and sent, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: So Hip Hing had about \$12,000 less in income generated in this country than the \$50,000 that was contributed to the DNC, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. It appears so. BARON: Now let me direct your attention to number 105, if you would. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now that is an income statement for the year 1993 for Hip Hing Holding, is it not? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it shows total income of approximately \$35,000, \$35,200 to be exact? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now let's go back to 104, and in 1993 we see a check to the DNC for \$15,000. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And that's in September of '93. UTOMO: Right. BARON: And that is on the account of Hip Hing Holdings. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And in 1993, as far as you know, that's the only political contribution that Hip Hing made in 1993, as far as you know? UTOMO: Is from this statement it appears -- is \$32,000. BARON: OK. Let me ask you this. They had more income than \$15,000 in 1993, is that correct? UTOMO: Correct. BARON: OK. And take a look if you would at, it's the document behind 105, it is a 1993 income statement for San Jose Holdings. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now with a total income of \$172,108, is that correct? UTOMO: Right. BARON: And so, and that's for 1993. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And if you go back two pages, in September of '93, San Jose Holdings made a contribution to the DNC in the amount of \$15,000? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. So it had income in excess of the amount that was contributed to the DNC that year, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Please turn to the next page where you have an income statement for Toy Center Holdings of California, Inc., do you see that

t? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it had--and this is for the period of 1993, correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And it had income of \$132,404.24 to be exact, is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Please turn back to the check that was issued in September of '93 on the account of Toy Center Holdings of California Inc. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And that was in the amount of \$15,000? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And so, Toy Center Holdings of California had substantial income in excess of the \$15,000 that was contributed, is that correct? ,", UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Now I'd like to explore a little bit, if we might, the bonus that was paid to Mr. John Huang. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Am I correct--well, let me check if you know--that Mr. Huang would have received a bonus annually, that that was a typical part of his compensation? UTOMO: I don't know exactly. BARON: OK. Do you know when he received a bonus for 1993, the year before he left? UTOMO: Don't remember. BARON: Do you know when annual bonuses are paid? UTOMO: Usually is close to the end of the year, maybe January or February. BARON: OK. Of the following year? UTOMO: Of the following year. BARON: So a check in, say, January or February of '94 would be a 1993 bonus. Would that be fair? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. Now if I could direct your attention to document 106, which you've seen before. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: All right. Turn to the next page. It's a general ledger for Hip Hing Holdings for the period ended March 31, '94. Do you see that? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And do you see there a reference to a bonus to John Huang in the amount of \$230,000? ,", UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Is it fair to conclude that that represents Mr. Huang's 1993 bonus being given to him, reflected on the ledger, at the beginning of '94? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: OK. And that was 230,000? Right? UTOMO: That's correct, yes. BARON: OK. Now go back one page, and that is a memorandum--this is 106 now. This is a memorandum dated June 27, 1994, to Mr. Huang, which sets out his severance bonus, as distinguished from his annual bonus. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Is that correct? And the severance bonus is \$425,625. Is that correct? UTOMO: According to this, yes. BARON: Right. At it appears on the page. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Which is roughly double--actually, somewhat less than double his annual bonus. UTOMO: Right. BARON: Now, I'd like you--I'd like to have you put up on the screen a check dated 7/15/94 to Mr. Huang in the amount of \$284,798.74. Do you see that on the screen in front of you? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Am I correct that that represents the net check to Mr. Huang for his severance bonus? That is, net after taxes have been taken out? UTOMO: That's correct. ,", BARON: Mr. Utomo, after Mr. Huang left to go to Commerce... UTOMO: Yes. BARON: ...did you ever speak to him over the telephone? Did he ever call you, or did you ever call him? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And approximately--I'm not asking you an exact count--but what's your best recollection of how many times you spoke to him over the phone while he was at Commerce, either by a call that was initiated by him, or one that you initiated to him? UTOMO: Maybe around five. BARON: Around five. UTOMO: Yes. BARON: And what was the subject of the conversation, if you recall? UTOMO: Because it's just close after he left as there is still some mail that I have to forward to him. BARON: Forwarding mail to him? UTOMO: There is--mail came (ph). BARON: Right. UTOMO: And then still go to Hip Hing Holdings. BARON: Right. UTOMO: So I forwarded it to him. BARON: Did Mr. Huang ever ask you to relay information to Mr. Riady? UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to relay any information to someone else in Asia? ,", UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to relay information to somebody at the bank? UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to transfer his call to you or your call to him to Mr. Riady? UTOMO: No. BARON: Did he ever ask you to transfer or connect his call to anyone in Asia? UTOMO: No. BARON: Am I correct that the usual expenses for operating Hip Hing Holding was approximately 28,000 a month? UTOMO: Yes. BARON: Indulge me on a moment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no further questions of the witness. MADIGAN: Just a few, if I might, Ms. Utomo. THOMPSON: This will come on Senator Collins' time, because he had previously given me permission. (LAUGHTER) MADIGAN: Thank you, Senator. I'll be very brief. Mr. Barontook you through exhibit 105, which has all the income statements for Hip Hing, San Jose Holdings and Toy Center (ph) and asked you only about the income. Each of those statements show expenses as well as income. Right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: And each of those statements show that each of those companies for each of those years lost money. Right? UTOMO: It appears on this (ph). ,", MADIGAN: Now let me just invite your attention back to exhibit 101, which is the \$50,000 check to the DNC in 1992. There's no question but that that money was requested by you to be wired from Jakarta to reimburse the money spent on that check, right? According to this document. UTOMO: It wasn't by me. MADIGAN: No, I'm sorry. Let's take a look on one step at a time. Let's look at--number 101 is the check, right? UTOMO:

: Yes. MADIGAN: And 102 is a document that is from John Huang and Mr. Sethiwan (ph), which, according to the document, specifically seeks reimbursement for the \$50,000 given to the DNC from Jakarta. Correct? Isn't that what the document says? UTOMO: It appears... MADIGAN: According to the document. I understand you didn't write it. UTOMO: Uh-hmm. MADIGAN: Am I right? UTOMO: Yes. MADIGAN: Nothing further, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Anything further with this witness? BENNETT: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Senator Bennett. BENNETT: I have some questions for this witness, if I may. THOMPSON: Our order here-- I suppose out of the rest of Senator Collins' time, you may use the rest of Senator Collins' time. BENNETT: They are relatively few. Ms. Utomo, did any of these companies ever make any money? To your knowledge? ", UTOMO: There is income. BENNETT: I didn't task income. I'm talking bottom-line profit. Did any of these companies ever make any money? BENNETT: We do not have an income statement showing that any of them did. UTOMO: It appears so, yes. BENNETT: It appears so that they did? UTOMO: It appears so that some of this one net here is a loss. BENNETT: Yes. UTOMO: Yes. BENNETT: That all of them lost money. If I could take you to, very quickly, exhibits 103 and 105, and the income statements that are in there-- in every instance, as part of the losses that are shown, one of the items of expense is contribution and donations. Exhibit 103-- contribution and donations were \$55,400. Is that correct? UTOMO: Yes. BENNETT: Do you know if that includes the \$50,000 to the DNC? UTOMO: I don't know. I didn't prepare this one. BENNETT: I see. The same is true in number 105. Hip Hing Holdings lost, or gave, contribution of \$32,000. That's the year that \$15,000 went to the DNC. Do you know if that's included? UTOMO: I don't know. BENNETT: I see. I shan't pursue it, but the time pattern is in all of the other income statements. And my only point, Mr. Chairman, is that political contributions are not legally deductible. If this income statement was used for tax purposes and there was a tax deduction claimed for these contributions, that would be illegal under ", the tax law. I have nothing further, but I wanted to point that out. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Bennett. Anything further for this witness? LEVIN: Mr. Chairman, I just have a brief question actually. Do you have available to you the income statements for San Jose Holdings and Toy Center Holdings for 1992? Is that something you could readily put your hand on? I don't think these were remarked at in exhibits. WEXLER (PH): If they're not in the book, we don't have them in front of us. LEVIN: All right. Mr. Chairman, these are... THOMPSON: ... what we're dealing with here. MADIGAN: (OFF-MIKE) documents. I've never seen them. I don't know where they... THOMPSON: I don't know that we've ever seen those documents. Could we have... LEVIN: These are in our book here. So... At any rate, I would just offer these into the record. THOMPSON: Well, what are they? LEVIN: These are the Toy Center income statements and the San Jose Holdings income statements for the year. THOMPSON: Could we have-- could we see copies of-- could we have copies? LEVIN: If I can just say what they show-- they basically show the same pattern, that there's income and that there's expenses. And I can just offer these. I can read them. It's the same-- exact same pattern that's been described before. ", For San Jose, there was income of \$155,000, expenses of \$330,000; and for Toy Center, it's income of \$167,000, expenses of \$199,000. Are those the documents that you're looking at as well? UTOMO: Yes. LEVIN: And that raises the question, I guess, as to the-- which Senator Bennett, I think, may be referring to-- I'm not sure-- as to whether or not the question of contributions from American corporations, which are owned either directly or indirectly by foreign corporations, when they're allowed to make contributions from income earned in the United States, whether or not that means net income or gross income. And apparently, there's no clear guidance on that. And that may be something we ought to repair in the law if there is no guidance in the law, Mr. Chairman. I would just simply offer this as-- these exhibits. In the one case, however, in none of these income statements for one year, in that case, that \$50,000 contribution in 1992, there neither gross nor net income was sufficient to cover the \$50,000 contribution. So in that case, unless the argument is that this is a legal contribution for some other reasons, such as the fact that it may be it didn't go to a candidate's campaign but went to a party, then that is a different issue. But there's one and possibly two corrections in the law that I would suggest we ought to be looking at in the area of foreign contributions, which are illustrated by these documents. And I would offer these-- Mr. Chairman, I can offer them later. It's not a... THOMPSON: Well, they'll be made part of the record. LEVIN: Yes. Those are the only questions I have of this witness, except I would point out that 1992 contribution of \$50,000, Mr. Chair

man, is the same year that we have been pointing out the foreign contribution allegedly through Mr. Kojima... THOMPSON: And you were wondering why I was being so liberal before? LEVIN: Yes, right, right. , ", (LAUGHTER) But at any rate, we will come back to that issue since it happens to be the same year-- 1992-- as this \$50,000 contribution. But I'll save that for another date. THOMPSON: Well, don't get too optimistic because the-- seriously, I do think that things that show a pattern of conduct are certainly-- are certainly permissible. And we may have-- we may have someone on each side there that fits that bill. Miss Utomo, thank you very much for being here. LIEBERMAN: Mr. Chairman... (UNKNOWN): Mr. Chairman... THOMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Didn't realize there were others. Anyone else over here? Go ahead. LIEBERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, Miss Utomo. Thank you for being here. I just want to understand about your original connection to HipHing. I understood when you graduated from school, your husband had obtained a job in Los Angeles, and then you sent a resume. Did you know about HipHing? Or did you know the Riady family before then? UTOMO: Not Riady family, just the Lippo Bank. LIEBERMAN: You knew about the Lippo Bank. UTOMO: Because Lippo Bank is one of the biggest in Indonesia. LIEBERMAN: Yes. So you had no personal contact with the family, but you sent the resume because the Lippo Bank name was familiar to you? UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: OK. And you arrived there in 1988 or '89? , ", UTOMO: September '88. LIEBERMAN: '88. And was John Huang already working there at HipHing when you arrived? UTOMO: No, I didn't see him. LIEBERMAN: So-- but he started working at HipHing shortly thereafter? Am I right? UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: 1989. UTOMO: Approximately, yes. LIEBERMAN: Yes. And am I correct that he worked there until 1994? Or 1993? UTOMO: '94 approximately July. LIEBERMAN: When he went to work for the Commerce Department. So it was a period of about five years that you worked there together. Were you the only two employees of HipHing? UTOMO: Mr. Augustode Awan (ph). LIEBERMAN: That's right. UTOMO: Yes. And there is-- was a secretary. LIEBERMAN: Yes. UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: And did you have offices-- one large office or office next to one another? UTOMO: My office with Mr. Huang's office is next on the floor like three or four months. LIEBERMAN: OK. For three or four months, your office was right next to Mr. Huang's? , ", UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: And then in the other time, you were on the same floor, I assume. Is that correct? UTOMO: Once in a while not the same floor. LIEBERMAN: Sometimes not. UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: But meantime, he was the supervisor of HipHing at that point? In other words, you were clear that you were working for him? UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: OK. And can you tell us from your experience with him over this five-year period anything about what Mr. Huang's duties were? What was he doing during that period of time? UTOMO: I guess he works also for the bank. LIEBERMAN: He did some work for the bank. UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: Did he do anything regarding HipHing itself? UTOMO: If I need approval from him, I just came to him. That's it. LIEBERMAN: If you need what? UTOMO: Approval-- for... LIEBERMAN: Approval, yes. UTOMO: ...for irregular expense. LIEBERMAN: But as far as you can remember, most of his time was spent on bank work? UTOMO: I don't know. , ", LIEBERMAN: You don't know. UTOMO: No. LIEBERMAN: Even though you were there with him for that four or five years. But... UTOMO: I don't see him every day. LIEBERMAN: Yes. OK. Did anyone-- obviously, we're interested here in political contributions from HipHing-- did anyone ever discuss with you why HipHing was making political contributions? UTOMO: No. LIEBERMAN: Did-- when you signed the \$50,000 check to the DNC Victory Fund, did anybody explain to you what it was? UTOMO: No. LIEBERMAN: So they just asked you to sign it? UTOMO: Right. LIEBERMAN: And without knowledge, you signed it. Without knowledge of what the purpose was is what I meant to say. UTOMO: Yes, that's correct. LIEBERMAN: OK. All right, I don't have any other questions, Mr. Chairman. It does seem to me that through this witness we have-- although I suppose questions could be made about the income and loss statements-- there's a pretty clear document there requesting reimbursement for a \$50,000 donation to the DNC Victory Fund, which certainly looks like the movement of foreign money into an American campaign in 1992. I thank the chair and I thank you, Miss Utomo, for your testimony. UTOMO: If I may add-- actually the DNC exact (OFF-MIKE). I didn't know until recently. , ", LIEBERMAN: Could you say that again? The DNC... I didn't hear the second word. WEXLER (ph): She didn't know what the DNC stood for until recently. LIEBERMAN: Oh, didn't know what it was. So this was literally a blank check that you-- that you signed. I mean, who asked you to sign the check? UTOMO: I cannot remember. LIEBERMAN: You don't know whether-- well, whom might it have... UTOMO: But usually Mr. Augustode Awan (ph) or Mr. Huang. LIEBERMAN

AN: Or Mr. Huang. One or the other... UTOMO: Yes. LIEBERMAN: ...would have asked you to sign. OK. Thank you. THOMPSON: Mr. Torricelli. TORRICELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Utomo, did there appear to be anything unusual in your mind about the organization of any of these three corporations-- Toy Center, San Jose or HipHing-- in how they were organized or operated as corporations established for the purpose of holding real estate? UTOMO: No. TORRICELLI: In fact, aren't they actually, in the real estate industry, fairly standard enterprises organized for the largely or exclusive purposes of holding real estate for development? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: During the course of the operations from 1991 to '93, by my records, HipHing Holdings made 16 political contributions; the Toy Center Holdings 10; San Jose Holdings, six. But in each and every one of those instances, there was sufficient revenue in the " ", account from income of the properties with the sole exception of the contribution to the Democratic National Committee, which apparently was illegally reimbursed. Is that your own impression? UTOMO: I don't know, because before March '94, I didn't handle all the bookkeeping. And actually, I just learned a little bit by little bit regarding the financial statements after March '94, because my background was not in the... TORRICELLI: Well, as you've reviewed the records of each of these three corporations, is it not accurate that from what you can decipher, in each and every instance where there was a political contribution, there was a domestic source of revenue equal to or greater to the level of the political contribution, with the exception of the DNC contribution issue? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: So it would appear-- although you do not have direct knowledge on all of these, because you were not handling the books at all times-- we have a total of 32 contributions by these three corporations, and in only one instance does it appear that there was not a local source of revenue in excess of the amount of the contributions? UTOMO: It appears so. TORRICELLI: That would appear that for those who believe that anyone or all of these companies were established solely for the purposes of being an illegal conduit of funds, that it would-- the facts would not seem to support that contention? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: Do you recognize, Miss Utomo, that it is the belief of some that these corporations may have been established for the purposes of putting foreign money into the domestic political process in this country. But it would be your contention, based on your own limited experience, that that was not the function, the intention or even the purpose of anyone of these companies? Isn't that your testimony? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: It is also the belief of some that these companies " ", or individuals associated with them may have been representing foreign governments intending to contribute to the American political process. But it is your testimony that that, to your knowledge, was not the instance in these circumstances? UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: It is the belief of some that Mr. Huang may have in fact been representing a foreign government in a conduit of contributions. But to your knowledge, having worked with Mr. Huang and these companies, in fact having had an office next to his, having been associated and responsible for some of the bookkeeping and the paper work of these companies, is it your testimony that you have no knowledge at those were the circumstances either? UTOMO: Yes. I don't know. TORRICELLI: The property a question owned by HipHing was worth at various times several million to \$7 million? UTOMO: That's correct. It's, I guess, at that time more than \$10 million. TORRICELLI: But you were unsuccessful in finding the means because of market conditions to develop it? UTOMO: Yes, the market was (OFF-MIKE) down (ph). TORRICELLI: I've noted in your contributions, considerable contributions, to state parties or California political figures that were through one of the three corporations, is that accurate? UTOMO: I'm sorry? TORRICELLI: Well, I've noticed that you contributed through one or many of these companies to various political figures in California. UTOMO: Yes. TORRICELLI: The company obviously was losing considerable money. It held real estate, but it continued to pay taxes, pay bills, and meet its obligations in holding real estate that was generating no profit and in fact losing capital. Isn't that accurate? UTOMO: It appears so. " ", TORRICELLI: It definitely appears so. Do you have any knowledge whether, as a result of all these political contributions through each of these companies over all these years to all these California political figures, there was ever any effort or intention or any evidence that any time effort was expended to either assist in the development of the property or change its zoning or change its circumstances that would have made it more profitable? UTOMO: No. TORRICELLI: So, in fact, despite these political contributions, whatever relation

ships were established or advantages were regained, none appear to have been used for any direct economic benefit of the company? UTOMO: No. TORRICELLI: Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. MADIGAN: Just very briefly, Miss Utomo, when you summarize the documents that have been placed in front of you, and you look not only at revenue, but you look at the expenses per year, starting in 1992 with Hip Hing Holdings and moving to 1993 with Hip Hing Holdings, San Jose and the Toy Center, the documents show that every single year for each of those companies they lost money, right? UTOMO: Yes. THOMPSON: All right. Senator Akaka. AKAKA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Miss Utomo, did you ever discuss political contributions with Mr. Huang? UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Or with Mrs. Sathiwan (ph)? UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Did you ever hear them discuss political contributions? UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Did you ever make a political contribution yourself? , ", UTOMO: No. AKAKA: Well, I want to thank you so much for coming. I want to add my welcome to you. And may we apologize for dragging you all the way from California here to this hearing? And I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank you for coming from California. UTOMO: Thank you. AKAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Anything further? Thank you very much, Ms. Utomo. We appreciate your being here with us. And you're excused. And we will take a 10-minute recess. Let's try to start back promptly after 10 minutes. (RECESS) THOMPSON: Let's come to order please. Then next witness will be Mr. Thomas R. Hampson. Mr. Hampson will be able to explain a little bit more about the organization of the Lippo Group. Mr. Hampson, would you please stand and raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the testimony you're about to give? HAMPSON: I do. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. Senator Bennett. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Mr. Hampson, let's lay out your background and your qualifications. I understand you're president of Search International, a research and investigations firm. Will you tell us what that firm does? HAMPSON: Well, we're based out of Chicago, and it's a firm that I founded 14 years ago. We conduct research and investigations worldwide, and we specialize in qualifying prospective business, ", partners or acquisition targets on behalf of four corporate clients. We also provide competitive assessment and business intelligence services. BENNETT: Do you specialize in American companies that need information about foreign companies? HAMPSON: Yes, sir. BENNETT: So we can look to you as an expert to understand how foreign commerce works and how foreign companies are organized? HAMPSON: Yes. BENNETT: Mr. Hampson, did you hear the testimony of the previous witness? HAMPSON: No, I didn't. BENNETT: Well, let me characterize it because I'd like your comment on it. As I saw it, coming from a business background myself, we have here a series of small firms--by small, I mean none of them is doing more than a quarter of a million dollars a year in total revenue, and some of them are doing substantially less, one of them doing less than \$50,000 a year in revenue. But we have a series of them--half a dozen or so--none of which has ever made any money. All of them have expenses that are in excess of their income, in some cases substantially in excess of income. And yet they continue, from year to year to year to year, with no action on the part of management to try to solve their financial difficulties. The executive whose name seems to be connected with all of these firms earns \$90,000 a year, receives an annual bonus of \$230,000, and upon leaving, is given a severance pay approaching half a million dollars. In your research, have you come across any circumstances like that? Do you consider that a normal activity on the part of a foreign company trying to do business in the United States? HAMPSON: I haven't seen anything like that before. , ", BENNETT: This is not standard real estate operations, in your opinion? HAMPSON: No. BENNETT: Would you like to apply for a job where you would get salary and bonus of that kind, presiding over companies that continually lose money? HAMPSON: I don't know that I would. BENNETT: Well, I think that's a pretty good job, Mr. Chairman, to get that kind of income and be presiding over companies that never ever produce any kind of revenue. Well, let's go on to the area that we want to go through with you. THOMPSON: Could you pull your microphone a little closer. BENNETT: There's been a lot of conversation about the Lippo Group, and we'd like you to explain to us what the Lippo Group is. Based on your background and your investigation of this, you're in a position to tell us. What is the Lippo Group? HAMPSON: It's a multi-billion dollar confederation of companies controlled by the Riady family of Indonesia. It's a conglomerate very much like AT&T, although it's not as large--or ITT. Also, there's no central company that manages and directs the various units. In fact, there's no real entity known as the Lippo Group. Although the

e's no central structure, the group of companies is controlled by an interlocking network of family relationships. Mochtar Riady started the company more than 30 years ago by piecing together a group of different firms. He started with a retail banking base in Indonesia, but the Lippo Group has expanded to encompass banking, finance, insurance, property development, communications and manufacturing interests. The financial side of the business was intentionally developed and structured to facilitate international trade, initially in the Asia area, and later, it was expanded into the West. Although the principal figure in the Lippo Group is Dr. Mochtar Riady, an Indonesian of Chinese descent, today his two sons--Stephen and James--manage the entire Lippo empire. Stephen Riady is responsible for most of the Hong Kong operations of the Lippo Limited--Lippo Group, such as Lippo Limited and the Hong Kong Chinese Bank. HAMPSON: His activities are primarily focused on banking and property development in Hong Kong and mainland China. James Riady is responsible for the Lippo Bank, flagship Lippo Bank of Indonesia, and also Lippo Land (ph), which is headquartered in the Indonesian area and is developing property in Indonesia as a subsidiary--or a suburb of Jakarta. BENNETT: What are they doing in the United States? Is it real estate development? Is it banking? Is it insurance? What are they doing... HAMPSON: The primary operation in the United States is the Lippo Bank. It has headquarters in Los Angeles. And then--but it has also several branches--one in San Francisco; San Jose; and Westminster, California. BENNETT: Do they make money? HAMPSON: It doesn't seem that they make that much. I don't have access to their financial records. BENNETT: Do you know of any American entity of Lippo that does make money, based on public documents? HAMPSON: No, I don't personally. BENNETT: So they're in the United States, but there's no evidence that they're making any money in the United States? Their money is all made elsewhere in the world? HAMPSON: Well, no, I--what I did was evaluate the public record documents that are available through a variety of online databases. And a lot of those specific financial records are not available. BENNETT: I see. HAMPSON: They have, you know--they are--most of them are privately held corporations that don't produce any public documents, that show their financial statement. BENNETT: So it would be unfair for me to conclude that they are not making money on their American operations? HAMPSON: Yes, that would be unfair, I think. BENNETT: I see. I don't want to be unfair. HAMPSON: At least from what I know. BENNETT: OK. Well, what is the connection between Lippo and the People's Republic of China? HAMPSON: Well, over the past few years, the record is very clear that the Lippo Group has shifted its strategic center from Indonesia to the People's Republic of China. Lippo currently is involved in dozens of large TL joint ventures on the mainland, including construction and development of apartment complexes, office buildings, highways, ports and other infrastructure. Lippo's principal partner on the mainland is China Resources, a company wholly owned by the government of the People's Republic of China. The interrelationship of the Lippo and the government-sponsored companies such as China Resources has grown markedly since 1993. Lippo's first known business connection with a PRC-controlled company was in late 1991, when the Hong Kong Chinese Bank attempted to involve China Resources in acquiring the Hong Kong branch of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International, better known as BCCI. The deal fell through when China Resources backed out. However, in late 1992, China Resources purchased 15 percent of Hong Kong Chinese Bank. Subsequently, at a critical time, when the Indonesian interests were under great financial strain, and indeed, there was a brief run on the Lippo Bank, China Resources injected tens of millions of dollars into the cash-starved Lippo Land. Finally, in mid-1993, China Resources increased its stake in the Hong Kong Chinese Bank to 50 percent. Press reports indicate that China Resources paid 50 percent over the market price of the stock, more than a \$125 million premium. Since 1993, the Lippo Group and China Resources have grown closer and closer, with dozens of shared development projects throughout mainland China. Just two weeks ago, Stephen Riady announced that the name of Lippo's Hong Kong Chinese Bank would be changed to Lippo China Resources to reflect that China Resources is now an equal partner. By way of illustrating the change, I prepared several charts. There's a 1992 chart over here on my right. I can't see it, but... BENNETT: I can see it, but I can't read it. HAMPSON: Well, both the 1992 chart and the 1997 chart are analytical charts. They are intended to evaluate the relationship that exists between the various entities. I've provided--put the information in a very large database. And establish connections between the various groups, wh

ich show how the entities are related to each other and what direction ownership interest is involved. HAMPSON: They are not intended to be flowcharts. What I'd like to do is refer you to several exhibits. Exhibit Number 17, if you could put that on the screen, is a chart that shows the Lippo Group in 1997. And it greatly simplifies and makes more clear the relationships that existed or that existed at this time. As you can see on the right of the chart, Lippo Limited, headed by Stephen Riady, and a subsidiary is a Hong Kong, China, bank. They're relocated on the mainland and involved in a number of different development projects in mainland China together. These are only a small list of those that are available. On the left-hand side of the chart, you'll see the extreme left--you'll see the financial activities, centered in Indonesia, that provide the Indonesians side of their financial network that they've set up. In the middle is Lippo Land (ph), and the various--or the two different development projects in Indonesia that Lippo has started back in about the mid-'90s. All of these entities have connections to the People's Republic of China, and essentially, that's what this chart over here shows in a very much--in a very complicated way. However, that type of representation is extremely important to evaluate the detail of the relationships, because it's from the detail that we get the general relationships that exist. ", These second chart that you can see is Lippo Group in early 1992, Exhibit 118. You can see all of the major entities on these charts. But at that time, there was no known business connection between the Lippo Group and China Resources, which is essentially the People's Republic of China. BENNETT: So your point is that in the five-year period, Lippo went from a family-owned entity headquartered in Indonesia to a joint venture, in effect, with the Chinese government, with the primary source of activity headquartered in the People's Republic of China. Is that a fair characterization of what you're saying? HAMPSON: Yes. BENNETT: Tell us a little more about China Resources and what they can bring to the table as a joint venture partner. HAMPSON: Well, China Resources is a huge trading company. It's a hundred percent owned by the government of the People's Republic of China. It's involved in everything from peanut stop property development, and from mineral to machinery. It has hundreds of subsidiaries. It's a huge sized warf seven the Lippo Group. It's purpose is to foster trade and to promote development of the mainland's economy. Through business ties it has established, the group seeks out technology that the country needs and buys it. China Resources also has a more geopolitical purpose. It is well-established in the public record that the government of the People's Republic of China uses China Resources as an agent of espionage, economic, military and political. If its agents can't buy the technology, they obtain it by other means. They acquire interest in companies in order to use them as surrogates, as well as to provide cover for covert operatives. The company is kind of like a smiling tiger--it might look friendly, but it's very dangerous. BENNETT: Well, now, let's talk about the Lippo activities in the United States currently, because your implication is that the China Resources, by virtue of its relatively new association with Lippo, can come through Lippo entities into the United States. I don't want to lead you. But is that a fair characterization of what you're leading to? ", HAMPSON: It's possible. Right now, if I'd refer you to Exhibit Number 19--119, this is another chart that was prepared. This largely is developed from a document produced by Hip Hing Holdings Company. As I mentioned earlier, most of the operations of the Lippo Group in the United States are very closely held and private. There's not a great deal of information about them. And we don't know very much about their activities, at least I don't. I mean, there's not that much in the public record that's available. But you can see... BENNETT: We now know that at least San Jose Holdings, Toy Center and Hip Hing Holdings don't make any money, and never have, based on the testimony we've had before. HAMPSON: OK. BENNETT: All right. Go ahead. I didn't mean... HAMPSON: I was just going to point out that you can see that the Lippo Bank in California is the primary--really the primary active operation of the Lippo Group that I'm aware of, at least from the public record documents that are available. The rest of it are privately held companies that all have ties back into the Lippo Group operations internationally. BENNETT: Do you have any information on the public record that would indicate there was any activity on the part of the Chinese government through China Resources, through Lippo, in the United States in any of these organizations? HAMPSON: I have no knowledge of that. BENNETT: Do you have any knowledge that it has not happened? HAMPSON: No. BENNETT: So, that's something we'll have to pursue other than through public documents. HAMPSON:

N: Yes. BENNETT: Aside from the fact that your charts give us terrible eye strain, I want to thank you for coming to help us get a better understanding of exactly what it is we're dealing with. Thank you. , ", Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further. THOMPSON: Senator Glenn. GLENN: Mr. Baron. BARON: Thank you, Senator. Good afternoon, Mr. Hampson. We just made it by two minutes. You described earlier that you are the president of Search International, and you described what Search International is. How many employees does Search International itself have? HAMPSON: Five. BARON: And you're based in Chicago? HAMPSON: In Chicago, yes. BARON: And are all five investigators? Or does that include clerical people? HAMPSON: Well, I don't have any clerical people. I do have an administrative assistant. BARON: OK. So you have four investigators and an administrative assistant? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Now, in gathering information on a foreign company, am I correct that you would typically use many databases that are public? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And is it fair to say that in putting together your analysis that much of the material you've relied on today is available in the public domain? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: This would include Lexis-Nexis, Dun & Bradstreet--databases of that sort? , ", HAMPSON: Yes, sir. BARON: OK. Now, in your gathering of information concerning the Lippo Group, did you have access to anything done by the Harvard Business School in 1993? HAMPSON: Yes, I did. BARON: And do you recall that at the Harvard Business School profile describes the Lippo Group, based in Indonesia, as a unified consolidated federation of companies with a multi-billion dollar asset base, a second major base in Hong Kong, and activities throughout the Pacific Rim which enjoyed remarkable success. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Do you agree with that? HAMPSON: Yes, I do. BARON: Does that confirm your own analysis? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And am I correct that you learned in your analysis and research with regard to the Lippo Group that it is a profit-driven entity. I mean, it is what we would think of as a capitalist venture. HAMPSON: Oh, yes. BARON: All right. And do you recall also, according to the Harvard Business School profile that the Lippo Group was able to attract and hire experienced, well-regarded executives? Do you recall that? HAMPSON: Yes. Yes, I do. BARON: High-caliber professionals, I think, is one of the phrases. Now, the population of China has in excess of a billion people. Am I correct? , ", HAMPSON: Yes, it does. BARON: And it certainly is also one of the largest markets in the world. Is it not? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And, of course, as a nation, it and through its various arms, it has money that it wishes to invest. Does it not? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And much of that investment is outside of China. Is it not? HAMPSON: Yes, it is. BARON: And there's nothing unusual about that inherently. Is there? HAMPSON: No. BARON: Am I correct that in China, doing business--and we're talking about the PRC--if you're doing business in China, doing business with Chinese companies means doing business with companies owned by the Chinese government, such as China Resources. HAMPSON: Not always. BARON: I don't mean always, but if you--if one wishes to do business in China, very often one ends up dealing with an entity such as China Resources, which is owned by the government. HAMPSON: Right. BARON: Now, am I correct that the Lippo Group also has relationships with countries other than China? And by China, I'm talking about mainland China. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Countries like Taiwan? HAMPSON: Yes. , ", BARON: Japan? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: France? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: England? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Now, the charts that you have provided don't say anything about the percentage of Chinese government money in any of Lippo's American entities, do they? You're not in a position to say that, are you? HAMPSON: No, I'm not. BARON: So they don't show any Chinese money in Lippo/USA or in Hip Hing Holdings or in Toy Center Holdings. You don't know that, do you? HAMPSON: No, I don't. BARON: San Jose Investments? HAMPSON: I don't know. BARON: But as far as you know, there's no Chinese government money in any of Lippo/USA's entities? HAMPSON: I wouldn't know one way or the other. BARON: Right. If you had seen evidence of it, you would have brought it forward, would you not? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Now, you indicated that Lippo has business ventures jointly with China Resources, a company that is either partially or entirely owned by the Chinese government. Is that correct? , ", HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: And one of those ventures is the Hong Kong Chinese Bank, I believe? HAMPSON: Yes, it is. BARON: All right. Now, I believe you've also testified that the Lippo Group is a huge international conglomerate. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: At our best count, it has about 143 subsidiaries all over the globe. Does that sound right? HAMPSON: I think there's more than that. BARON: Give or take a couple? HAMPSON: No, there's quite a bit more than that. BARON: OK. HAMPSON: This is only a small representation of the companies that

atare available. In fact, this is just the core relationships that exist. The chart would be much, much bigger if we had all of the additional companies listed on it. BARON: All right. I'd like to have the chart over on the easel. Please put it in a position so the witness can see it. Maybeyou ought to take down the... (UNKNOWN): You can't take that... BARON: ...there we go. Now, do you recognize those as Lippo joint ventures that a part of them make up of the various investments that the company has? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Am I correct--I'm sorry. HAMPSON: I don't recognize a couple of them off the top of my head. But I do--I see several of them that I remember. BARON: Right. And the fact that you don't remember may be because they have so many, and you just don't remember them. HAMPSON: That's right. BARON: OK. And indeed, am I correct--did you come across the fact that even Pat Robertson does business with Lippo? HAMPSON: No, I didn't come across that. BARON: Well... (LAUGHTER) HAMPSON: I wasn't looking for him. BARON: Well, there he is. You recognize the face? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: OK. And we assume that Pat Robertson's investment in Lippo was not part of some grand scheme to permit the Chinese government to infiltrate our political system? HAMPSON: I wouldn't know. (LAUGHTER) BARON: OK. Mr. Hampson, are you aware that Boeing has business ventures involving companies in which the Chinese government has a stake? HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: General Motors has the same kind of relationship with Chinese companies in which the Chinese government has a stake. HAMPSON: Yes. BARON: Eastman Kodak has business ventures of that type. Do they not? HAMPSON: I don't know. BARON: It wouldn't shock you to find out that they did? HAMPSON: No. BARON: It's a great place to sell film, would it not? Over a billion in population. HAMPSON: I would think so. BARON: Are you aware that Microsoft has business ventures involving companies in which the Chinese government has a stake? You're aware of that? HAMPSON: No. BARON: It wouldn't shock you to find out that that was the case, though, would it? HAMPSON: No. BARON: Coca Cola, all-American company like that, has business ventures with the Chinese government, with companies in which the Chinese government has a stake. Do you know--are you aware of that? HAMPSON: No, I wasn't. BARON: Does it shock you? HAMPSON: No. BARON: I have nothing further. THOMPSON: Why don't we let the senator go ahead. LEVIN: Just a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman. Shall I proceed? THOMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: Did you read the Harvard study, by the way, on Lippo? HAMPSON: Yes, I did. LEVIN: Did anything you found in the public record conflict with the Harvard study that you read? HAMPSON: No. Not that I recall. LEVIN: When you looked at the public record on Lippo and you saw that one of the holding companies was HipHing, is that correct? (OFF-MIKE) a chart? HAMPSON: HipHing. LEVIN: HipHing, I mean. HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: You have Hip Hong? HAMPSON: Well, I didn't put it in there. LEVIN: All right. Well... HAMPSON: I see. I know it's HipHing. LEVIN: It's HipHing. And when you looked at the public record on HipHing, did you--we're you able to determine what their income was in 1992? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: Were you able to determine what their gross or net income was in '92? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: That wasn't in the public record? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: Do you know whether or not, for instance, they grossed even \$100,000 in '92? HAMPSON: I have no idea. LEVIN: Did you do a thorough examination of the public record? HAMPSON: I did a very complete database research on a number of different records. I wouldn't consider it exhaustive. LEVIN: But you did a reasonably thorough database search? HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: And that did not disclose whatever their net or gross income was in '92? HAMPSON: No. LEVIN: This gets into the question of how, then, does a political party receiving a contribution check out whether or not there was a adequate either gross or net income to cover that contribution. LEVIN: Now, you're not able to answer that. I'm not asking you the question. But that's what your testimony raises here. A check comes in for \$50,000. If it's not from a foreign source, it is clearly legal. People can argue as to whether or not if it is from a foreign source it's legal or not. But it shouldn't be received in any event. As far as I'm concerned, it shouldn't be legal. But the check comes in in 1992, and they hire somebody like you. How many weeks have you been working on this? HAMPSON: A couple. LEVIN: A couple of weeks. So they hire somebody like you for a couple of weeks, say, here's this check for \$50,000 and check the database and see what the sources are. But in any event, it does raise the question as to how when dozens or hundreds of checks come in, what is the vetting procedure which is reasonably expectable of a party or a campaign, because even your reasonably thorough public search of the public record doesn't disclose this kind of a figure or what that gross or net figure could--was in that particular year. My next question is this: You've indicated that there's a greater focus now on

n China on the part of the Lippo Group, is that correct? HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: In the last five years. Is that fairly typical of a lot of companies, that there's been a shift of focus in the last few years to China as an opportunity for profit? Is that happening with a lot of entities? Borneo, others have been mentioned. Is that... HAMPSON: A lot of companies are making investments in China. I haven't seen a lot of companies becoming partners with a company like China Resources, however. LEVIN: You indicated China Resources, I thought-- didn't you say had hundreds of subsidiaries or hundreds of... HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: And do you know approximately how many of those-- do you call them subsidiaries or joint ventures? HAMPSON: Yes. LEVIN: Do you know-- have you tracked the growth of those subsidiaries and joint ventures in the China ventures? HAMPSON: No. I only tracked those entities that I could tie into the Lippo Group. LEVIN: So that you're not able to tell us, for instance, whether or not there's twice as many, five times as many, 10 times as many subsidiaries now that joint-- that China ventures is involved in as there were in 1992? HAMPSON: No, I wouldn't know. LEVIN: Do you know, in terms of the Lippo Group's income, do you know what percentage of the income or the assets of Lippo Group are now in China compared to five years ago? HAMPSON: It's very difficult to tell. I couldn't even begin to speculate. LEVIN: OK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Senator Lieberman, we may have-- we have a vote on, but we may have time for you if you want to... LIEBERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to do this quickly. Mr. Hampson, going back to that Harvard study, very briefly, on one of the exhibits in it, they list country representatives for the Lippo Group. They have five countries in it. Next to the United States-- this is as of 1992-- John Huang is listed. On the basis of the review you did, do you have any understanding of what it would mean for John Huang to be the country representative for the Lippo Group here in the United States? Was he-- is he chief officer or a sales rep? Or... HAMPSON: I don't know. LIEBERMAN: You can't tell. OK. Second, the Lippo Group and the individuals associated with it contributed substantial amounts of money to American political campaigns over the last several years, amounts of money that are questionable or raise questions because the company wasn't doing-- the Lippo Group wasn't doing that much business here in the United States. But one of the theories raised does not go to China, but goes to Jakarta and Indonesia. And the question I want to ask you is, in your review, did you-- on the basis of your review, can you tell us anything about the relationship between the Lippo Group and the Indonesian government? HAMPSON: I didn't look at that. LIEBERMAN: OK. Final question. China Resources Holding Company. I believe you indicated that that holding company, which bought a 15 percent interest in Lippo Group in '92, and now, I believe, holds a 50-- in the Lippo Hong Kong Bank... HAMPSON: Yes. LIEBERMAN: ...now holds a 50 percent interest, had been used for espionage purposes by the Chinese government. What is the basis of that conclusion that you've made? HAMPSON: There's a number of published reports in the media about this. There was a BBC broadcast a few years ago where it quoted an-- intelligence agents on that particular subject. There were a couple of other references, too, that I can't-- I have it in my materials, but I can't recall the exact source. LIEBERMAN: OK. So, again, these were from public sources, not, from classified information? HAMPSON: No. LIEBERMAN: Thank you. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: All right. No. I thought we'd bring him back if you-- we have a vote on. Let's recess for lunch. And let's reconvene at 2:15? 2:15. (RECESS) THOMPSON: Senator Glenn, did you have further question of this witness? GLENN: Mr. Chairman, just one minute worth. I was going to ask before we went out for the break whether, you know, the title of your company would indicate that you do search abroad and I was just wondering if you do actual personnel searches in a foreign country, and the obvious followup question would be we got a couple of dozen people out some place out there that we'd like to find. Do you think you could find them? (LAUGHTER) HAMPSON: We might. GLENN: That's not the right answer. Do you think you can or cannot or is your the wrong company to do that? HAMPSON: Well, we could find them if we're given enough time. GLENN: Well time is of the essence in this case. I'm reasonably serious about this too. I'd like to have a bipartisan effort. Let's find some of these people and if we find them see if we can talk to them. Do you do that kind of work, or are you mainly involved with corporate and business connections as your, as the writeup of your background indicates? HAMPSON: Most of it is corporate work that we do. GLENN: OK, you've never done work like that, like I'm talking about? HAMPSON: The only thing-- we've tracked down many people for, witnesses or whatever purpose it might be. GLENN: Well this might be some

something we'd want to take and make a bipartisan effort to see if you could go out there and find some of these folks. If you could, I'd be all for it. Don't know whether we could get them to talk on camera, but we might try it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Madigan, did you have a couple of brief questions? MADIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just briefly. Mr. Hampson, if you would look back for us at the chart on the right, which has understood your testimony is the configuration of the Lippo Group today as we sit here. Is that right? HAMPSON: Yes. MADIGAN: Now what does the chart on the right reflect as to the present interest today of China Resource in any Lippo entity? HAMPSON: The chart shows that most of the Lippo entities represented on this display have at least some ownership interest by China Resources Holding. MADIGAN: And so I can follow this--actually can't see it all that well from here--with the different colored lines, is the present interest that China Resources has in any Lippo entity reflected on this chart reflected on this chart by a particular color line? HAMPSON: Yes, the purple line shows ownership interest by both China Resources and the Lippo Group. MADIGAN: So it's the purple line on this chart that would reflect that. Is that right? HAMPSON: Yes. MADIGAN: Now to your knowledge, does China Resources have any ownership interest in Coca-Cola, Microsoft, General Motors, or any of the other companies being asked about by Mr. Baron? HAMPSON: No, sir. MADIGAN: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: That's all that we have, Mr. Hampson. I will point out that I was handed at the intermission the advisory opinion of the Federal Election Commission, 1992-16. Says, "contributions by domestic subsidiaries of foreign nationals." Apparently, in order to be legal, a domestic subsidiary must make a political contribution out of net profits and not revenues. And so with that we will excuse you, Mr. Hampson, and thank you very much. HAMPSON: Thank you. THOMPSON: We're going to call Harold Arthur as our next witness. THOMPSON: Mr. Arthur, I'm sorry. I'm not going to ask you to stand again. Would you please raise your right hand, please? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? ARTHUR: I do. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Arthur. I'll call on Senator Collins. COLLINS: Good afternoon, Mr. Arthur. I know that you have a lengthy opening statement, which I can assure you with the chairman's concurrence will be submitted for the record, and which has been provided to all members of this committee. So, unless you'd like to make a few opening remarks, we'll proceed to questions. ARTHUR: Proceed. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Arthur. Mr. Arthur, I understand that you are a long-time officer and director of Lippo Bank, and that you currently serve as chairman of the board of directors, is that correct? ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: Mr. Arthur, who owns Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: Mr. James Riady. COLLINS: And is it accurate that some 98 percent or 99 percent of the stock is owned by Mr. Riady. ARTHUR: That's my understanding. COLLINS: OK. Is Lippo Bank part of the Lippo Group that we've heard discussed earlier today? ARTHUR: The Lippo Group consists of a consortium. It consists of a group of small or large different types of entities, all with the commonalities of being related in some respect to the Riady family. COLLINS: I'm going to take that as yes and as consistent with your deposition in which you are asked was there anyway in which the bank was not part of the Lippo Group, and you responded that there was no way. Do you still stand by that statement in your deposition? ARTHUR: Of course. COLLINS: Thank you. As part of your duties during the period that you occupied the position of CEO of Lippo Bank, you attended Lippo Group conferences in Jakarta, where senior executives throughout the group were brought together, is that correct? ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: And what was the purpose of those conferences? ARTHUR: To introduce the various entities which were considered to be part of the group to one another for the purpose of knowing what the business relationships could be developed, and what marketing functions we could share. COLLINS: OK. Were Mr. James Riady and Mochtar Riady in attendance at those meetings? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: During your tenure at Lippo Bank, you worked with an individual named John Huang. Could you tell us what position or positions Mr. Huang held at Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: Mr. Huang was the president and chief operating officer of the bank in 1986 to 1988, I believe. I was the CEO at that time, until--let me start over again. I was the CEO from '84 until '87, John joined the bank as president and COO in '86, and he held that position until '88. COLLINS: Thank you. Beyond his director's duties at the bank which he subsequently went to after he was no longer COO, did Mr. Huang also serve as the United States representative of the Riady family? ARTHUR: That was my understanding. COLLINS: Are you aware, M

r. Arthur, that in 1992, the Lippo Group attempted to purchase the Hong Kong branch of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International, which is known as BCCI? ARTHUR: I understand that is correct. COLLINS: OK. Do you happen to be aware of the fact that the Riady sent Mr. Huang to Beijing to negotiate aspects of that transaction with the Chinese government? ARTHUR: I do not know. COLLINS: OK. Mr. Huang maintained an office at Lippo Bank, didn't he? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: I'd like to direct your attention to an exhibit. It's exhibit 109, that's in your book. And it'll also be brought up on the screen. ARTHUR: OK. COLLINS: The first page of this exhibit is a little bit hard to see on the screen. Maybe we can go to the second page, which labels the various rooms. What we're looking at is the layout of the Lippo Bank executives' suite during the period that we're discussing. Could we have page two of the exhibit put up? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: This may make it easier to follow. Would it be fair to say that this is a small office suite and that you sat in close proximity to Mr. Huang's office for the better part of the four years day in and day out? ARTHUR: That's correct. But the names are wrong. COLLINS: The names are wrong? OK. But it is correct that you were in close proximity to his office. Is that correct? ARTHUR: My office was (OFF-MIKE)--it is labeled James Per Lee. COLLINS: OK. So it's right directly next to it. ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: Thank you for that clarification. Mr. Arthur, would it be fair to say that during this four-year period, that you developed a close business relationship with Mr. Huang? ARTHUR: I developed a relationship with Mr. Huang. Not a close business relationship, no. COLLINS: I just want to direct your attention to your deposition, if I could, just on that point, just for clarity. On page 17 of your deposition, you were asked, did you come to have a personal relationship with Mr. Huang? And your response was that--quote--"I have had a close business relationship with John for many years." ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: OK. Based on your connections with Mr. Huang during this four-year period, what were your observations about what Mr. Huang did in his office day in and day out? ARTHUR: In the--in his office? COLLINS: Yes. ARTHUR: I really have no--I have no--I really don't know what he did in his office. He was not in the bank. COLLINS: But... ARTHUR: The office was a space that was leased. And he occupied the office. COLLINS: But you did sit in the next office for a period of years. You shared a secretary at some point. Is that correct? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: And you travelled with him occasionally to--is that correct--to Jakarta? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: No. Did you ever travel with him? ARTHUR: I don't think I've ever travelled with John. COLLINS: OK. You shared a secretary. You sat next door. By your deposition, you said that you developed a close business relationship. ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: But you don't have a sense of what he did, day today? ARTHUR: I do not. COLLINS: Is that because he held very closely to him his activities for other subsidiaries of the Lippo Group? ARTHUR: No, not necessarily. We never discussed his relationship with the Lippo Group. COLLINS: And you never discussed what he was doing? What his duties were? ARTHUR: No. I presumed it was business relations and customer development. COLLINS: Mr. Arthur, are you aware of the news reports that surfaced last fall stating that Mr. Huang had made numerous phone calls to Lippo Bank from his office at the U.S. Department of Commerce? ARTHUR: I am aware of the news paper reports. COLLINS: Would it be fair to say that you and the CEO, Per Lee, and your fellow board members at the bank were concerned when you read, in the press accounts that John Huang had made numerous phone calls to the bank while in the employ of the U.S. Department of Commerce? ARTHUR: I was not concerned. Mr. Per Lee cannot answer for. He's not there. COLLINS: OK. In response to those press reports, however, it's my understanding that Mr. Per Lee performed an investigation into the phone calls. Is that correct? ARTHUR: I understand that he did. COLLINS: And his preliminary investigation revealed, from his perspective, that there had been 60 contacts between Mr. Huang and the bank after he left Lippo Bank. Is that correct? ARTHUR: I'm not--I do not know. COLLINS: OK. That is our understanding based on Mr. Per Lee's deposition. Now, I'd like to direct your attention to another exhibit. It's exhibit number 114. What I'm showing you here is a phone bill and it indicates that Mr. Huang's Lippo Bank calling card was in use making calls from Mr. Huang's Commerce Department phone, as well as his home phone in Silver Spring well after he left the bank in July of 1994. And I'd like you to take a look at this particular exhibit. This particular exhibit shows that there were 41 phone calls in 23 days--41 phone calls in 23 days--that were charged to the Lippo Bank calling card between July 18th and August 9th, 1994. This raises a question in my mind. After he left the bank, was Mr. Huang authorized to continue to

use his Lippo Bank calling card? ARTHUR: I am sorry. I cannot answer your question. If Mr. Per Lee were here, he could. COLLINS: Would it be typical for an employee who has left the employ of the bank, a former employee, to continue to have access to a Lippo Bank calling card? ARTHUR: I can't answer that question. COLLINS: Well, in your experience of being the CEO of the bank, can you recall any cases where an individual who was leaving the employ of the bank was given permission to continue to use the bank's calling card? ARTHUR: We would not have given permission. COLLINS: You would not have given permission. As I mentioned, Mr. Per Lee's preliminary investigation indicated that there was some 60 calls that--or 60 telephone contacts that he could document. Would you be--you said you weren't really that concerned about that. Would you be more concerned if you were to learn that the staff of the committee has documented more than 230 telephone contacts between Mr. Huang and Lippo Bank after he left the bank? Would that heighten your concern? To go from 60 to 230? ARTHUR: Mr. Per Lee told me he had made the survey, that no--none of those calls were directed to any of the senior officers of the bank. I would not have been concerned. COLLINS: Well, let me ask you another question. You're not concerned at 60 calls. You're not concerned at 230 calls. Would you be concerned if I told you that the staff has documented that there were more than 400 telephone contacts between Mr. Huang, while he's working at the United States Department of Commerce, and various Lippo entities or people working for various Lippo entities? That just to put that in context, that amount to more than a call per business day during John Huang's entire tenure at the U.S. Department of Commerce. ARTHUR: I am not aware of any of those phone calls. I really have no knowledge of what you're talking about. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Arthur... ARTHUR: I'm sorry, but that's... COLLINS: No, I understand what you're saying. COLLINS: I guess that I'll say, as one member of this committee, that to have 400 telephone contacts between John Huang while he is an employee of the United States Department of Commerce and people working for various Lippo entities makes me wonder who Mr. Huang was really working for during his time at the Department of Commerce. That seems to be an extraordinary amount of contact. But let me turn to a different issue. I'd like you next to look at what is labeled "special exhibit number 1" and I don't know whether you have a copy of that. We'll wait for a moment to make sure that copies are provided to you, and to all members of the committee. I'm sorry--it has been labeled. I'm mistaken in calling its special exhibit number 1. It is exhibit 125. ARTHUR: Haven't I seen this, have we? COLLINS: Do you have that now in front of you? ARTHUR: I do. I do. COLLINS: OK. This is a letter written by John Huang while he is a director of the Lippo Bank. It's on Lippo Group stationery. It's dated October 7th, 1993. And it's to Jack Quinn at the White House. In this letter, Mr. Huang is thanking Mr. Quinn for a September 24th meeting with Mr. Huang and Mr. Shen Jueren, who is the chairman of China Resources. We've heard a lot about China Resources from the previous expert witness. In addition, in the letter, Mr. Huang refers to a previous meeting that occurred in Los Angeles on September 27th, and in the letter he states, quote, "that Vice President Gore was just super." We heard this morning from our--this morning and then also a little bit this afternoon--from our expert witness, Mr. Hampson, that China Resources is, in fact, owned and operated by the government of China and that numerous press reports state that it's well-known that China Resources is at times used as an intelligence gathering front for the Chinese government. Were you aware that Mr. Huang had taken the chairman of China Resources to the White House for a meeting? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: Were you at all aware that Mr. Huang was having communications with the White House? ARTHUR: I'm sorry. Would you repeat? COLLINS: Were you aware that Mr. Huang was in contact with the White House on any issues or to arrange any meetings? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: Let me go to some additional exhibits. It's exhibit number 115. This is a letter, again, from Mr. Huang dated February 18th, 1993, again on Lippo Bank stationery and it's signed John Huang, vice chairman of the board of Lippo Bank. And it's to President Clinton and it is--it is thanking him for a meeting that he has attended at the White House. And he talks about--he praises the president's speech, etcetera. It's followed up by a February 22nd letter referring to that same meeting, in which Mr. Huang asks for the photograph taken by the White House photographers of himself, Mr. Mochtar Riady and James Riady. Were you aware of any of these contacts between Mr. Huang and the White House on behalf of the Riady family? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: OK. I'd like to go to another exhibit. It's a June 1st letter, again from Mr. Huang, again on Lippo Bank stationery, again he identifies himself as vice chairman. It's a Ju

nel 1st, 1993, letter and he's thanking a White House official for having the president meet with James Riady and himself in April. Were you aware of this? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: OK. Do you know anyone else whom Mr. Huang introduced the chairman of China Resources to while he was here in Washington, whether at the White House or elsewhere? ARTHUR: No. COLLINS: OK. Mr. Arthur, in 1996, was Mr. Huang still a director of Lippo Bank? This would be--he would be employed by the ,", Democratic National Committee at this point. ARTHUR: I can't remember. COLLINS: Do you want to take a few minutes? Would you be able to... ARTHUR: In 1996? COLLINS: Right. In 1996. ARTHUR: No. He was not a director. COLLINS: No, he was not a director? Did he have any affiliation with Lippo that you are aware of in 1996? ARTHUR: He has had no affiliation with Lippo Banks since he resigned his directorship and joined the Department of Commerce. COLLINS: So Mr. Huang had left Lippo. He then went to work at the Department of Commerce, and by 1996, he was working for the DNC. And he had no affiliation with Lippo at all at that point to your knowledge, is that correct? ARTHUR: Not in an official capacity of any kind. COLLINS: Mr. Arthur, let me show you a document that I want to ask you about. This is Exhibit Number 126. Do you have that document in front of you now, Mr. Arthur? I don't want to proceed until you do. ARTHUR: I do. COLLINS: This essentially is a registration sheet or a sign-up sheet that Mr. Huang submitted to the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation Conference that was held in April of 1996. Do you see where it says name, and John Huang has, or someone on his behalf at the Lippo Group, has filled in John Huang? ARTHUR: I see John Huang and Lippo Group. COLLINS: I'm sorry? ARTHUR: And Lippo Group. ,", COLLINS: And under the company, Mr. Huang has indicated that he's affiliated with the Lippo Group? ARTHUR: That's correct. COLLINS: And then there's an address that is indicated that is 711 West College Street in Los Angeles. Is that the address of the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: That is the address of the Lippo Bank. COLLINS: OK. Do you also see that Mr. Huang lists his title as an adviser to the Lippo Group? ARTHUR: I see that. That's not the Lippo Bank, you understand. COLLINS: I do understand that. But do you have any idea why in 1996 Mr. Huang would be listing the Lippo Bank as his address, as his work address? ARTHUR: The Lippo Group address was formerly the bank address. I don't know what the current address should be. COLLINS: Do you have any idea of why at this point, when Mr. Huang, remember now, has left? He's gone to work at the Department of Commerce for a little less than a year and a half. He's then gone to work for the DNC, and he's still listing the Lippo Group as the company for which he works. ARTHUR: I'm sorry. I have no knowledge. COLLINS: Does it surprise you to learn today that Mr. Huang was holding himself out in 1996 as an adviser to the Lippo Group while he was employed by the Democratic National Committee? ARTHUR: I can't answer your question. I don't have any knowledge. COLLINS: I know you don't have personal knowledge that this was done. But does it surprise you to learn that? ARTHUR: A little. (LAUGHTER) ,", COLLINS: You're a hard man to surprise, Mr. Arthur. (LAUGHTER) Again, this incident, like the 400 phone calls that were between Mr. Huang and various Lippo Group entities while he was employed by the United States Department of Commerce, again raises the question, in my mind, for whom is Mr. Huang really working. I'd like to return to another issue. COLLINS: I'd like to now talk about Mr. Riady. And I'm talking about Mr. James Riady. ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: Was Mr. Riady active politically when you knew him? Well, I know you still know him. But when--in your tenure at the bank? ARTHUR: He has always supported political action committees, that type of thing. COLLINS: Was he... ARTHUR: But I have no knowledge--no direct knowledge. COLLINS: Do you know whether he was a big contributor to political campaigns? ARTHUR: I know nothing about it, his contributions. COLLINS: OK. Well, let me show you a series of exhibits. We'll start with exhibit number 124 that we're going to put up on the screen. Now recall--or I don't know whether you heard this morning, but we had a witness who testified that James Riady subsequently moved back to Jakarta in 1990. Is that your understanding, that he returned to Jakarta in 1990? ARTHUR: I believe it was before that. COLLINS: It may have been even before that? ARTHUR: (OFF-MIKE). ,", COLLINS: But in any event, by 1990, Mr. James Riady is living in Indonesia. Is that correct, to your knowledge? ARTHUR: Mr. James Riady was living between Indonesia and the United States. COLLINS: OK. Let me just direct your attention to the first page of this exhibit. And this is a check in the amount of \$15,000 drawn on James Riady's account at Lippo Bank. And it's made out to the DNC Victory Fund. It's dated August 13, 1992. Have I correctly represented the check that's in front of you? ARTHUR: Yes. COLLINS: OK. And let's go on to the series of other checks that are on the next

tpageoftheexhibit. Thetopcheckisfor\$75,000. Again, it'sdrawnonMr. Riady'saccountatLippoBank. Andit'smadepayabletotheLouisianaStateDemocraticParty. Isthatcorrect? ART HUR: That'scorrect. COLLINS: Andifwelookatthesecondcheckfromthetop, thisone'sdrawno ntheaccountofEileenRiady. Couldyoutelluswhothatis? ARTHUR: ThatisJamesRiady'swife. COLLINS: AnddoesMrs. RiadyalsoliveinJakarta? ARTHUR: SheliveswithJames, whereverheli ves. (LAUGHTER) COLLINS: Goodanswer. Isit--toyourknowledgein1992, aretheylivinginJak arta? ARTHUR: Tomyknowledge, Icannotrespondtothat. COLLINS: OK. Let'sproceeddownthesh eet. Therearetwomorechecks, bothdrawnonEileenRiady'saccountatLippoBank. (BELL) , " , Oneisfor\$50,000, andoneisfor\$5,000. ARTHUR: Yes. I'msurprisedtheonefortheArkansas StateDemocraticwasonly\$5,000. But(OFF-MIKE). (LAUGHTER) COLLINS: Well, theremayhaveb eenothers. Thisisjust--ifyouturnthenextpage, Ithinkyou'llbereassuredthatArkansas h asnotbeenslighted. ThenexttwochecksthatI'mgoingtodirectyourattentiontowillbeinde edreassuringonthatpoint. Atthetopofthepage, thereisanOctober'92checktotheArkansas StateDemocraticPartyfor5,000. Andthenaverylargecheckfor75,000totheArkansasStateD emocraticParty, againdrawnonMr. Riady'saccount. Mr. Chairman, I'lljustaskfortheremai nderofthecheckstobeenteredintotherecord. ItincludesachecktotheMichiganStateDemoc raticPartyfor75,000, drawnonMr. Riady'saccount; onetotheOhioStateDemocraticPartyfo r75,000; andonefortheDNCVictoryfundonMrs. Riady'saccountfor15,000. Therearefurther checksalsototheDemocratic--theCaliforniaDemocraticPartyVictoryFund, theDNCVictor yFund. Again, CaliforniaDemocraticPartyandtheDNCVictoryFund. Allthesechecksaredraw noneitherJamesRiadyorEileenRiady'saccountsattheLippoBank. THOMPSON: Allright, than kyou, SenatorCollins. SenatorGlenn. (UNKNOWN): Mr. Chairman, ifIcanmake... COLLINS: Tha nkyou, sir. (UNKNOWN): ...onequickcorrection. They'realldrawnonthesameaccount. Presu mablyit'sajointcheckingaccount. Butthey'realldrawnonthesameaccount, justdifferent names. Thesenatorwasindicatingtheyweretwoseparateaccounts. COLLINS: TheSenatorisco rrect. (UNKNOWN): They'rethesameaccount., ", THOMPSON: Yes, thankyou. GLENN: Mr. Baro n. BARON: Thankyou, SenatorGlenn. GLENN: Mr. Baron. BARON: Thankyou, SenatorGlenn. Goodaf ternoon, Mr. Arthur. ARTHUR: Goodafternoon. BARON: Mr. Arthur, therewassomecolloquybetw eenyouandSenatorCollinsregardingwhenMr. andMrs. JamesRiadmighthavemovedtoJakarta , toIndonesia. AndIbelieveyouindicatedinyourtestimonythattheymaintainedhomesinbot hIndonesiaandtheUnitedStatesintheearly1990s, isthatcorrect? ARTHUR: They'vemaintai nedahomeinthisLosAngelesareaofCaliforniaIbelieve since1987. BARON: Right. AndIdon't knowifyoudoknowthis, butI'mgoingtoaskyou. AmIcorrectthattheRiadysdidn'tmovebackto IndonesiafromCaliforniauntilaround1994? Doesthatsquarewithyourrecollection? ARTHU R: I'msorry. I donotrecallwhenthey movedback. BARON: OK. Thankyou. Now, we'vehadtestimon ythattherecameatimewhenMr. JohnHuangassumedthepositionattheDepartmentofCommerce. ARTHUR: Yes. BARON: DidyouplayanyroleinhelpingMr. Huangreceivethatappointment? ARTHU R: Absolutelynot. BARON: WhendidyoufindoutthatMr. HuangwasgoingtobemovingtoWashingt ontoassumethatposition? ARTHUR: InJanuaryof'94. BARON: Andhowdidyoucometolearnofit? , ", ARTHUR: IvisitedwithMr. JamesRiadyathishomeinBrentwoodwiththepurposeofinfor minghimthatIthoughtit wastimeIhunguptheglovesandretired. AndItoldhimIthoughtIhadb eenthere longenough, andweneedednewblood. HeaskedifIwouldstayonasadirector, andIsai dIhadn'tthoughtaboutit. HesaidheunderstoodthatperhapsMr. Huangwouldhaveanappointm entwiththegovernment, andifso, hewouldbeleavingthedirectorship. BARON: Andthat'swhe nyoufirstlearnedaboutit? ARTHUR: That'swhenIfirstlearnedaboutit. BARON: And, bythewa y, Mr. Arthur, Ithinkwemayhaveslightedyourverydistinguishedcareerinbanking. You'ves pentabout45yearsinthebankingindustry, haveyounot? ARTHUR: Alittlemorethanthat, buty ou'reclose. BARON: Giveortake. AndamInotcorrectthatwhenyoufirstcameaboard, thebankt hathadbeenacquiredbyMr. Riadywasinalotofdifficultyandthatindeed, asIunderstandit, theonlyreasonthebankwas, thattheyletthebankstayopenwasbecausetheybroughtyou, Mr. R iadybroughtyoutotakecharge, isthatcorrect? ARTHUR: Ibelieve that'swhattheexaminer stoldme. BARON: DoyouknowwhetherMr. RiadyoranyoneelseconnectedwiththeLippoBankorLi ppinterestsplayedanyroleinMr. HuangobtainingapositionatCommerce? Doyouhaveanykno wledgeofthat? ARTHUR: Ihavenoknowledge. BARON: Howoftendidyou talktoMr. Huangwhenhewa

satCommerce?Werethereoccasionswhenhewouldcallyouoryouwouldcallhim?ARTHUR:Ihaven'evertalkedwithMr.Huangsince--well,I'lltakeitback.IwasatafundraiserforPresidentClintoninAugust, April, whenever. I've forgotten. And I saw John. At that time he was not in the Department of Commerce, however. I believe he was at DNC. BARON: This was after he'd left Commerce? ARTHUR: I think so. ", BARON: Right. And with regard to any telephone contacts, these alleged 400 telephone contacts, were you privy to any of those? ARTHUR: I haven't been involved in any conversation with Mr. Huang except casually over cocktails at that meeting. BARON: It's a key--have you ever acted as a conduit for information from Mr. Huang to Mr. Riady or any other member of the Lippo Group in Asia in any capacity? ARTHUR: No, sir. BARON: Now, you knew Mr. Huang for about how long a period of time? ARTHUR: I met Mr. John Huang in 1984. That was shortly after I had joined the bank. I joined the bank on June 15th, 1984. I met Mr. Huang on a visit to Hong Kong in November, and he had just joined the group, I understand. That's my understanding. BARON: OK. And you then knew him as a colleague thereafter? ARTHUR: I knew him as a person who had been introduced as a new member of the so-called group. BARON: Now, did you become familiar with Mr. Huang's activities in the Asian-American community? ARTHUR: I was comfortable with his activities in the Asian-American communities. BARON: Indeed, did you understand that perhaps that was part of his function was community outreach into that community on behalf of the bank and the interests? ARTHUR: When he joined Lippo Bank, he was one of several candidates. We filled the position of president and chief operating officer, and he joined the bank, I believe it was October of '86, and was in that capacity until July of '88. ARTHUR: At that point, his duties were community outreach, public relations, business development in the Asian-American community, because that's the job we were in. ", BARON: And it's true that the Lippo Bank--in particular, its constituency for its business--was focused on the Chinese-American community in the area. ARTHUR: Absolutely. BARON: Were you aware that Mr. Huang was selected to leadership positions in such institutions as the California-Taiwan Trade & Investment Council? ARTHUR: I'm sorry. BARON: I'm sorry. Are you aware or were you aware that Mr. Huang had been elected to leadership positions in such organizations as the California-Taiwan Trade & Investment Council? Does that ring a bell? ARTHUR: That rings a bell, and there were several others. BARON: Well, I let's try some of the others. Do you recall that he was a director of the Chinatown Service Center in Los Angeles? ARTHUR: No. BARON: How about co-chair of the United Way Chinese Business Initiative? ARTHUR: No. (LAUGHTER) BARON: How about co-chair of the Pacific Leadership Council? ARTHUR: No. BARON: Was he--do you recall that he was a member of the California State World Trade Commission? ARTHUR: No. BARON: I'm striking out. I say, when you say you're not familiar with it, you're not saying it didn't occur, but that you just don't have the knowledge. ARTHUR: I don't have knowledge. ", BARON: OK. Are you familiar with the Committee of 100, which is a by invitation only group of Asian-Pacific-American leaders, which is headed by I.M. Pei, the distinguished architect, and Yo-Yo Ma, the very famous cellist? ARTHUR: I am not familiar with that at all. BARON: OK. When Mr. Huang left the Lippo Bank in 1994, I take it you had known him for close to 10 years. Is that about right? ARTHUR: That's correct. BARON: Can you tell us your personal opinion of Mr. Huang based on your personal interaction with him during that decade. ARTHUR: I've always considered him to be a very fine, honest--I can't even think of the right word--he was very personable. He was very, very gentle. My wife used to describe John as the most gentlemanly man she had ever known. Except for my wife, that's not bad. (LAUGHTER) BARON: Did you have any reason in that decade of interaction with him to doubt his veracity? ARTHUR: None whatsoever. BARON: Did you ever accompany Mr. Huang to Washington, D.C.? ARTHUR: No. BARON: Do you recall giving a deposition to the committee in which you told the committee that John Huang and others knew better than to solicit you for a contribution to the DNC because they knew you were a good Republican? ARTHUR: I'm a good Republican. BARON: Have you ever discussed political contributions with Mr. John Huang? ARTHUR: No, I haven't. BARON: With Mr. James Riady? ", ARTHUR: No, I haven't. I'll take that back. I did discuss a political contribution with Mr. James Riady in 1985, I think it was. March Fong Yu (ph) was running for secretary of state. And James said, "Wouldn't I like to contribute to her campaign." I said, "She's a Democrat." He said, "I know, but you know her." I did contribute. That's my contribution. BARON: One more thing, Mr. Arthur. Were you aware of whether Mr. or Mrs. James Riady during 1992 were green card holders? ARTHUR: As far as

I know, they were green card holders. BARON: And I know you're not an election law expert. But do you know whether that had any effect on the legality of them making political contributions in 1992? ARTHUR: I really have no knowledge. BARON: Thank you very much. THOMPSON: OK. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if I could just make one quick comment for the record. THOMPSON: Senator Collins. COLLINS: I just want to make clear that the Riady checks that I introduced for the record were produced pursuant to a subpoena out of the custody of Hip Hing Holdings, the Lippo entity that we heard about this morning that was managed by Mr. Huang. COLLINS: and I also wanted to just thank Mr. Arthur for responding to my questions. ARTHUR: Thank you. GLENN?: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Senator Lieberman. LEVIN: Senator Levin has... THOMPSON: Senator Levin. LIEBERMAN: Thank you. LEVIN: I think you indicated in response to Mr. Baron's question that you had a history in banking and that were indeed perhaps brought into the Lippo Bank because of your record in banking. Is that correct? ARTHUR: That's absolutely correct. LEVIN: And they were having some problems when you came there in the mid-'80s, a number of problem loans apparently, particularly to recent immigrants. Is that correct? ARTHUR: No. LEVIN: Pardon? ARTHUR: No, sir. That's not correct. They had problems with the former president of the bank. LEVIN: The former president of the bank. ARTHUR: Who disappeared one day. LEVIN: Oh. Sure he wasn't a recent immigrant, huh? (LAUGHTER) ARTHUR: No, he wasn't. LEVIN: During some of the time that you were connected to the bank as an officer/director, the bank was being supervised by the FDIC, you've testified. Is that correct? ARTHUR: The bank was and is supervised by the California State Department of Banking. It's insured by the FDIC. LEVIN: It was--did the bank make any attempt at any time that you know of to take advantage of the Riady's family with President Clinton in any of its regulatory problems? ARTHUR: Never at all. LEVIN: Did you ever see the bank try to win any favors or special treatment? ARTHUR: No, sir. LEVIN: Did you ever, to your knowledge see Mr. Huang seek such favored or special treatment? ARTHUR: No. LEVIN: I think you indicated that one of Mr. Huang's duties was outreach, including political outreach. Is that... ARTHUR: No, sir. I said community outreach. LEVIN: Community outreach, all right. You were asked questions about by Senator Collins about the meetings between--at the White House, where Mr. Huang was sending (OFF-MIKE). ARTHUR: Yes. LEVIN: Was that surprising to you, those meetings? That he would go to the White House? ARTHUR: Not particularly. LEVIN: You were asked about a number of checks in 1992. And I want to ask you about another incident in 1992 and see what, if any, recollection you have about it. And that was a check which a man named Michael Kojima... (LAUGHTER) Does that name strike a bell? ARTHUR: I thought it was funny. (LAUGHTER) LEVIN: Huh? ARTHUR: I thought it was rather funny. The pronunciation is absolutely right. LEVIN: Does the name strike a bell? ARTHUR: It does. LEVIN: Did your bank--was your bank owed money by Mr. Kojima? ARTHUR: Mr. Kojima was a guarantor on two or three loans with the bank. LEVIN: And did you end up being owed a lot of money by Mr. Kojima? ARTHUR: We sued, and we got a judgment. LEVIN: Did you see an article that Mr. Kojima made a major contribution in the same year, 1992, to the Bush dinner? ARTHUR: Is that... LEVIN: Did you see an article about that? ARTHUR: The answer is yes. It was brought to my attention by our attorneys who were the ones who got the judgment against Mr. Kojima. LEVIN: In what year did they bring that to your attention? ARTHUR: Whenever the picture was published. LEVIN: Would that have been about 1992? ARTHUR: If that was about 1992. LEVIN: And did it surprise you that he had any assets to make that kind of a contribution to the Bush dinner? ARTHUR: Yes. As a matter of fact, I think your question was, how did he get the money and why haven't we got it? LEVIN: Thank you. That's all my questions. THOMPSON: Senator Lieberman. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Arthur, thanks very much for your cooperation this afternoon. Do I understand correctly, that you were the CEO of the bank that the Lippo Group bought and changed to the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: No. I was the--James Riady bought Bank of Trade, San Francisco. LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: He bought it. He gained a majority interest in the Bank of Trade, San Francisco, on June 14th, 1984. LIEBERMAN: And then... ARTHUR: And I was employed by the bank to take care of the problems they had. LIEBERMAN: And that's how you first came to know Mr. James Riady? ARTHUR: That's the day I met him. LIEBERMAN: Right. Right. And then, did that become the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: The name was changed. LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: In 1990, I believe it was... LIEBERMAN: OK. ARTHUR: ...from Bank of Trade to Lippo Bank of California. LIEBERMAN: Right. Generally speaking, how--we know that the Lippo Group and their various holdings internationally are quite

substantially--but how would you describe the size of the Lippo Bank in California? ARTHUR: Very small. LIEBERMAN: Very small. Are the assets public information? ARTHUR: Yes. When I joined the bank, there was \$30 million in --, --, total assets. LIEBERMAN: Right. And now? ARTHUR: Currently, it is \$90--about \$93 million. LIEBERMAN: OK. So by most accounts, that's a pretty small bank these days? ARTHUR: It's a very small bank. LIEBERMAN: OK. Is it a profitable bank? ARTHUR: It has been since the first of January. LIEBERMAN: Of this year? ARTHUR: This year. LIEBERMAN: Previous to that? ARTHUR: We've had some fairly heavy losses relating to the economic conditions that existed. The first five years that I was involved with the bank, it was profitable. LIEBERMAN: Understood. Let me ask you now--because you testified earlier about the room arrangement and your office was right next to Mr. John Huang's--can you tell us how often Mr. Huang was at his office at the bank? Did he tend to be there every working day? Or... ARTHUR: He was there a lot. I have no idea. LIEBERMAN: Really? Even though you were right next--your office... ARTHUR: I didn't pay attention to Mr. Huang. LIEBERMAN: Yes. ARTHUR: I had my own problems. LIEBERMAN: Understood. But generally speaking, would you say that he was there most of the average working week? --, --, ARTHUR: Generally speaking, yes. LIEBERMAN: And did he work a normal day on those days when he would just--you know, what I'm saying--nine to five or eight to whatever... ARTHUR: His hours were like mine. LIEBERMAN: Yes. Which were atypical working day. What were your hours? ARTHUR: Depending upon the situation that existed that I knew I'd walk into, it was either 6 o'clock in the morning... LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: ...or 9 o'clock in the morning... LIEBERMAN: Right. ARTHUR: ...and I would leave when the work day was over. LIEBERMAN: Sure. It is that we all understand that most of the time that Mr. Huang was there, he was not working on bank business but working for the Hip Hing Holding Company. ARTHUR: That's my presumption. LIEBERMAN: Right. And you've testified earlier that you don't know exactly what he was doing for Hip Hing. ARTHUR: I do not. LIEBERMAN: OK. Let me go now to the Riadys. James Riady we have talked about. Am I correct that Stephen Riady is his brother? ARTHUR: Stephen Riady is his brother. LIEBERMAN: And Mochtar Riady is the father. --, --, ARTHUR: That's correct. LIEBERMAN: OK. Do you know all three of the Riadys? ARTHUR: I have met all three. LIEBERMAN: Right. But the closer relationship you had, I presume, was with James because... ARTHUR: With James. He's the owner of the bank. LIEBERMAN: He was the owner of the bank. Do you have a basis for knowing about any of their relationships, of the three Riadys with John Huang? ARTHUR: I do not. LIEBERMAN: Let me ask you this. Did you see Mr. James Riady and John Huang together at any point? ARTHUR: I have. LIEBERMAN: And how would you describe that relationship? ARTHUR: I hadn't thought about it. I don't know how I would describe it. LIEBERMAN: Yes. Did they appear to be very close? Trusting relationship? I don't want... ARTHUR: I think it was a trusting relationship, but I do not know what they were talking about. I don't know what the relationship consisted of. LIEBERMAN: Right. Right. OK. Let me go on to the political activities which you've answered some questions on. Just to clarify--did you ever discuss the making of political contributions beyond what you've testified with either John Huang or James Riady? ARTHUR: No. --, --, LIEBERMAN: Did you know at the time that the Lippo companies were making political contributions? That is the holding companies? ARTHUR: No. LIEBERMAN: OK. Let me ask this general question, last, second to last. LIEBERMAN: It is a matter of record that the three Lippo holding companies and, as has been indicated here earlier, the Riadys themselves, made substantial contributions to American political entities in the '91, '92, '93 period. I've tied up--and it looks to me that between all of them, the total comes to more than \$800,000 in that three-year period. And we have heard all sorts of theories floated about about why they might have made such large contributions in a country in which their business interests were relatively small compared to the overall size of the Lippo Group activities. The bank was small. It lost money in all years except the one you've just described this year. The three holding companies were losing propositions. Mr. Arthur, you were part of the organization, attended some meetings in Jakarta in which the Lippo Group's plans, I presume, and ideas were discussed. I don't mean necessarily political. Bottomline--you know a lot more about the Lippo Group and Mr. Riady and Mr. Huang than we do, certainly than I do. What is your view about why they may have made these substantial contributions to American political entities during that period of time? ARTHUR: Friendship. LIEBERMAN: Friendship. With whom? ARTHUR: I know that James Riady because closely acquainted with the then-Governor Clinton, and

hey developed a--I believe they developed a personal friendship. LIEBERMAN: But as far as you know, again based on your associations with the Lippo Group, the contributions were not the basis--or were they the basis?--for asking for any special favors from the government? ", A RTHUR: I do not believe so. LIEBERMAN: To the best of your knowledge. ARTHUR: To the best of my knowledge, no. LIEBERMAN: Final question. And this is--well, I'll just ask it. Some have charged, as you know, that John Huang was a spy for either the Lippo Group or the Chinese government. And you knew him. You've told us what you thought about him. You worked right next door to him. I'm interested in hearing your reaction to those charges. And I suppose more specifically, in your experience with Mr. Huang, did you see anything that would support those claims? ARTHUR: I think the answer, if I may... LIEBERMAN: Please. ARTHUR:...to the claims is hogwash. And the answer to your other specific question is--no, I never saw anything that would indicate that. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Arthur. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. Senator, I think you point out something that is very relevant and very interesting and that is the fact that we would consider it odd that the heavy political contributions was not necessarily proportionate with the business interest involved. We assume nowadays that the money flowing into campaigns is proportionate with the interest involved, and the question raised to what extent those who are receiving the money can help those who are giving them the money. And that's part of what we're very much about here, the fact that that question is so readily raised and is so--is so relevant to our current process. But I will call the next senator who wants to question. And Senator Torricelli? Senator, excuse me. Senator Smith, did you... TORRICELLI: Go ahead. I'll follow. ", THOMPSON: We'll take it in order. Senator Smith, if you're ready. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of follow-ups. I was not here when you responded originally, early, to Senator Collins' questions regarding your relationship with Mr. Huang. But I know you did say that, although your offices were close to each other, you really didn't have a lot of knowledge about what he was doing. How well did you know him? Would you consider him a social friend? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: You indicated, though, that you had no reason to doubt his veracity. SMITH: I think that's the term you used a moment ago. How could you draw that conclusion if you don't know him very well? ARTHUR: A business associate, I think I knew him very well. I knew him for 13 years. I have known him for 13 years. SMITH: All right. And I would agree with you if you knew a person as a business associate for 13 years and you said to this committee or anyone, I worked with him for 13 years. I know him pretty well. I know what he was doing. But you're saying you worked with him all these years and you didn't know what he was doing. I mean, that's still your testimony, isn't it? You didn't really have direct knowledge about what Mr. Huang was doing in that office with you. ARTHUR: That's correct. I knew he was there representative--I think his official capacity was the U.S. representative of the Lippo Group, now what that representative, what it's occupation is, I presumed, and I still presume, that it had a lot to do with image building, with--I think that is my presumption. SMITH: But outside of the office, and you did mention one, a political event where you saw him, but outside the office, are you saying that you did not socialize with Mr. Huang? ARTHUR: Only at bank functions like Christmas parties and soon (OFF-MIKE) meetings, but not as a social event. ", SMITH: You did say, however, in your deposition that you, and I guess you did qualify that somewhat, but you did say that you felt that you had a close business relationship with him. ARTHUR: I do. SMITH: But yet you didn't, again, didn't know what he was doing in that office next to you, correct? ARTHUR: I had no desire to know. My close business relationship with him related to his activities with, as a member of the bank's board of directors in connection with the bank. I knew him when he was the president and COO and I was the CEO, and I had very direct relationships with him at that time. SMITH: In a response to a question I believe from Senator Lieberman, I may be incorrect on that, you indicated that, quote, you were not particularly surprised that Mr. Huang had visited the White House and met with Mr. Riady and the president. Why were you not surprised? ARTHUR: I understood that they were friends. SMITH: Pardon me? ARTHUR: I understood that they were friends. From Arkansas days. SMITH: That Mr. Huang and the president were friends? ARTHUR: And the president. Yes. SMITH: What kind of a person, how did Mr. Huang conduct himself when he came into the office in the morning? Was he outgoing? Was he withdrawn? Did he speak about what he did the day before, the night before, or did he say...? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Just walked into his office and said nothing? ARTHUR: He said hello, good morning. And so did I. SMITH:

H: If you and I were business associates and we had an office next to each other, and you had a visit with the president of the United States, and you came back into the office the next morning, would you think I would be somewhat surprised if you didn't tell me you visited with the president of the United States? ARTHUR: That is a tough question for me. And the reason is, that I would, I was not surprised to learn that he had visited the president. SMITH: Would it surprise you to know that during the course of the time that Mr. Huang was working with you at the Lippo Bank that he visited the White House 52 times in a period from 1993 through June of 1994? ARTHUR: When I read that in the newspapers, I was surprised. SMITH: Why would you be surprised? ARTHUR: I didn't know it was that often. SMITH: And during the time that he made those 52 visits to the White House, and that we have, and I would just enter into the record Exhibit 70, and you should have a copy of it there, put it on the monitor, which is a Secret Service log from the executive office of the president which we got by subpoena, which has a list of the number of visits that Mr. Huang had with the president of the United States or the White House. And I would just point out for the record and ask for your response here, I've known some presidents in my time. I've been invited once to the White House residence by President Bush. SMITH: I'm sure many of us, as United States senators, have had an opportunity to visit. Mr. Huang, if you look here, when now has no government relationship--he now works for a private company--if you look on here, you'll see on the March 15th, at 8 o'clock, almost 9 o'clock in the morning, he had a visit with the president of the United States in the White House, in the residence of the White House. On May 5, 1993, a visit with the president of the United States in the residence of the White House. On the 21st of 1993, president of the United States in the residence of the White House. On August 2, 1993, with the president of the United States in the residence of the White House. And then if you go on to--I believe there are four or five references to meeting with the president of the United States in the residence. Does that surprise you at all? ARTHUR: I'm sorry, this is the first I've seen this. SMITH: Well, I mean the issue--assuming this document is correct and the Secret Service is accurate here, which I don't think anybody would challenge, would it surprise you to know that a colleague that you worked with every day had five visits in the residence, not in the Oval Office, in the residence of the White House with the president of the United States and he didn't tell you about it? Does that seem strange. ARTHUR: There would be no reason for him to tell me about it. SMITH: Why? ARTHUR: Because I am in the bank, a completely separate entity. We did not discuss business between us, other than relate to the bank where he was a director. SMITH: Well, Mr. Arthur, I mean, I don't know you, and I don't mean to challenge your veracity, and I'm not trying to challenge your veracity. But I am trying to challenge your recollections a bit. (LAUGHTER) You mentioned that your wife had said that she found Mr. Huang to be one of the kindest and gentlest people that she'd ever met. ARTHUR: That's correct. SMITH: Well, you don't form that kind of conclusions about people that you don't know, that you don't socialize with and you don't have some interaction with. Isn't that fair? ARTHUR: The interaction that we had was at bank meetings--I'm talking about bank parties, Christmas parties--perhaps twice a year. SMITH: Again, let me just recap one final point, Mr. Chairman. Your testimony is that you worked with John Huang in the same office for two years, shared a secretary, and that he visited the residence of the White House, met with the president of the United States--we assume--five times in the course of a year-and-a-half, and he never told you about it? ARTHUR: That's correct. SMITH: Never said a word about it to you? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: How about to your wife? ARTHUR: No. He would not have talked to my wife. SMITH: So he never ever said: Hey, I saw it. It was really great. I went up. And I, you know, we went into the residence and looked out the window off the Truman balcony? Never, never, not a word about it ever, nothing? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Do you have any idea why he would meet with the president of the United States? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Do you have any idea why he would go to the White House 52 times in the course of a year and a half? ARTHUR: No. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. I might point out to--Exhibit 70, I say, was not subpoenaed. That was turned over pursuant to our request, was given to us by the White House. But it was not subpoenaed. (UNKNOWN): I apologize for that. THOMPSON: Not subpoenaed. Senator Torricelli. TORRICELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much. Mr. Arthur, good afternoon. ARTHUR: Good afternoon. TORRICELLI: I was going to begin, Mr. Arthur, by thanking you for being here. But, in fact, your attendance, I take it, was involuntary. You were subpoenaed. But

t's every kind of you to be with us nevertheless. ARTHUR: Thank you. TORRICELLI: Even kinder, Mr. Arthur, because I understand, in recent years, actually you haven't been well, and at times, have been ill. ARTHUR: I've had one or two problems. TORRICELLI: How many years has it been since you were the chief executive of the bank at issue, Mr. Arthur? ARTHUR: I retired from the bank as the CEO. I believe it was February 28, 1994. TORRICELLI: I see. So it's been more than three years since you were the chief executive of this bank, and in the interim, unfortunately, you have been ill. But I take it, you needed to be called here today because you are far and away the most knowledgeable person on the current operation of the bank. ARTHUR: I'm sorry. If Mr. Per Lee were here, he would argue with you. TORRICELLI: So, Mr. Arthur, you're here today testifying before the committee, although you haven't worked in the bank for three years. You haven't been well. And you do not believe you are the most knowledgeable person on the operation of the Lippo Bank? ARTHUR: Not since 1994. TORRICELLI: And who is Mr. Per Lee? ARTHUR: Mr. Per Lee is the now president and chief executive officer of the bank. TORRICELLI: Would he be the most knowledgeable person about the --, " , operations of the bank in recent years? ARTHUR: Yes. TORRICELLI: Wasn't Mr. Per Lee questioned by the committee and scheduled to be here today, too? ARTHUR: I understood he was. I received a call Saturday afternoon which -- where they indicated that his testimony was not required and he did not need to be here. TORRICELLI: Was no longer required? ARTHUR: That's correct. TORRICELLI: Didn't that strike you as unusual that you would be asked to come before the committee as an expert on the operation of the Lippo Bank, but Mr. Per Lee, despite the fact that you've been retired these years, and Mr. Per Lee, who not only is the chief executive, but in fact conducted an internal review of the very issues being questioned by this committee, was disinvited to attend? ARTHUR: I was surprised. TORRICELLI: So am I, Mr. Arthur. It is, however, a fact that Mr. Per Lee did conduct an internal review of the communications between Mr. Huang and the bank. Do you have knowledge that that, indeed, occurred? ARTHUR: I think that I have already testified that -- yes, I had knowledge because he told me he had made the survey as a result of the newspaper articles. TORRICELLI: I apologize for referring to it again. You understand in the workings of both this committee and this Congress, referring to something once or testifying on one or even a number of occasions is sometimes not sufficient. So excuse me if I return to it. ARTHUR: I understand. No, I understand. , " , TORRICELLI: Mr. Per Lee actually, when he was questioned, in his deposition, if I could refer to it -- on page 97, starting at line 22 -- let me walk through this briefly. And the question: "As I recall from our previous conversation and also from a cursory review of these documents, it is apparent that the bulk of these phone calls from the bank to Mr. Huang's office at the Department of Commerce were coming from Judith Hester's (ph) line. Did you reach the same conclusion?" Answer, Mr. Per Lee: Yes. "Question: Did you make some effort to ascertain why she was making so many phone calls?" Answer: Yes. "How did you go about that?" Answer: I called her line. "Question: What did she say?" I called her twice with a matter of months in between the calls, and each time she told me essentially the same thing. It was that when John left -- that is left as the director of the bank and went to the Commerce Department -- he had a lot of associations with people in Los Angeles and people were calling and looking for him. "I mean, they knew he was in the Commerce Department because the press said all that, but didn't necessarily know how to get a hold of him. And they would call the bank." Judith (ph) would talk to these people and relay messages to him at the Commerce Department -- that so-and-so was calling and looking for you. "Again, on page 99, line 9: "Question: Did you discuss with Mr. Segeda (ph) the circumstances which led him to place a half dozen phone calls to Mr. Huang? , " , " Answer: Yes. "Question: What does Mr. Segeda (ph) say?" Answer: The calls were basically related to that period of time when Mr. Ning (ph) was here in D.C. He was ill. He had a serious heart problem. There was a flurry of calls during that period while he was convalescing here in Washington. "I would assume, Mr. Arthur, if Mr. Per Lee had not been disinvited today, it was probably his intention to refer to his deposition and give an explanation and end the mystery of what these calls were about. Would you make that same assumption? ARTHUR: I would presume so. TORRICELLI: Indeed, it's my information from the committee staff that there were probably about approximately 70 calls made by Mr. Huang to the Lippo Bank and probably 100 of those were returned. An analysis of those calls, as done by Mr. Per Lee, is that in 24 of them were from his secretary of the approximately 70. And of those 24 of the 70 calls that were made, they averaged 3.5 min

utes. On the question of communications directly with the management of the bank, to Mr. Perlman, there was only one phone call and it lasted for 21 minutes. You've worked for a variety of banks through the years, Mr. Arthur, during your long and distinguished banking career. TORRICELLI: After you have left employment in one institution and gone to another, did you find occasions to call your previous employer or have phone calls referred from your previous employer to your current employer? ARTHUR: Many times. TORRICELLI: Would it be unusual during the course of the year that your former secretary would call once every several days and convey a message that someone had called looking for you and you would answer that phone call? ARTHUR: Quite possible. TORRICELLI: Indeed, if you were in fact in the Commerce Department and still representing the interests of the Lippo Bank and deal in serious business matters, wouldn't be unusual if the average phone call was two or three minutes? Could you conduct serious business on behalf of the Lippo Bank at the Commerce Department in phone calls that averaged two or three minutes? ARTHUR: I wouldn't think so. TORRICELLI: I wouldn't, either. Mr. Arthur, before your very able management was able to deal with the problems of the Lippo Bank and re-establish it on a sound financial footing, Senator Levin referred to the fact and asked the question about whether there had been any involvement by Mr. Huang or other officials of the Democratic, Republican parties, the state of California or the United States government. There were three cease-and-desist orders issued by the FDIC. Did you receive any assistance politically from anyone in dealing with those cease and desist orders? ARTHUR: Absolutely not. TORRICELLI: There were some communications and issues, as in any banking institution with a federal reserve bank. Any one call or make inquiries for you over at the Federal Reserve system? ARTHUR: We're not a member of the Federal Reserve system, but the answer is no. TORRICELLI: And how about with the California state bank regulators? I noticed there were considerable contributions to California political figures. Did anyone help you with the California state banking regulators? ARTHUR: No, sir. TORRICELLI: Mr. Arthur, there was a quote--Speaker Gingrich made a considerable accusation against the institution when he said the bank engaged in money laundering, there were violations of money laundering statutes. You were quoted as saying Speaker Gingrich's comments were inaccurate, irresponsible and without foundation. As a good Republican, is that an accurate quote on your behalf to these accusations? ARTHUR: It is indeed. TORRICELLI: You regret making that comment about Speaker Gingrich, calling him "irresponsible, inaccurate and without foundation"? ARTHUR: No, as a matter of fact, I think it was a little gentle. (LAUGHTER) TORRICELLI: Could you for us, Mr. Arthur--you now serve as the chairman of the board of the bank? ARTHUR: Yes, sir. TORRICELLI: Could you list for this committee--during the difficult times of the bank, you certainly were in need of references of considerably new depositors. It is never without need to get new loan business. Mr. Huang, obviously, was someone who knew people with considerable financial resources in the country and people with considerable commercial interests. Senator Glenn, could you just... GLENN: You can have part of my time. TORRICELLI: Thank you very much. Could you list for the committee of these references that Mr. Huang made that were of considerable assistance in these years to the Lippo Bank of customers or loan businesses that you think made an appreciable difference in the economic recovery of the bank? ARTHUR: No, I do not have those records. TORRICELLI: Well, you're chairman of the board. Does anything come to mind of a major reference of a depositor or loan business that was so considerable that you, as chairman of the board, noticed this? ARTHUR: If they were so considerable, the chief executive officer would have reported to the board. He has reported nothing to the board to my knowledge. TORRICELLI: So, in fact, as chairman of the board of the bank, in spite of the fact that Mr. Huang obviously had some considerable access to both loan and deposits, you as chairman of the board have no knowledge of any considerable references that were financially helpful to the institution? ARTHUR: That's correct. TORRICELLI: Finally, Mr. Arthur, you recognize that the work of this committee in ensuring that a foreign government did not interfere in the political process of this country... ARTHUR: Of course. TORRICELLI: ...compromise our security or gain access to classified information is of extraordinary importance as the primary focus of this committee. ARTHUR: I understand. TORRICELLI: I know, Mr. Arthur, you've given your life to the banking industry and have loyalty to the institution that you have served. Should we all be reassured that you recognize the relative importance of the work of this committee

tee? TORRICELLI: And if you believe for one moment that a foreign government was getting access to political institutions of this country, getting access to proper information, you would not for a moment, because of your loyalty to these individuals or to any of these institutions, for one moment hesitate to bring before this committee that information and ensure that the interests of the country were protected? ARTHUR: I would not hesitate for one minute. TORRICELLI: Mr. Arthur, as a-- you have been very helpful to this committee. You recognize the minority is unable to call witnesses of our own at this stage of the proceedings. Fortunately, the majority has been good enough to call witnesses that seem almost routinely to be helpful to the points we want to make. (LAUGHTER) And you have been no exception, and I thank you very much. THOMPSON: Mr. Madigan. MADIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of questions, --, Mr. Arthur. Did you become aware that Mr. Per Lee's study that found only 60 calls was, in fact, wrong? ARTHUR: I have done not know anything about the details of Mr. Per Lee's study. MADIGAN: Did you know that it didn't check any calls from the bank to Mr. Huang's home in California? ARTHUR: I'm sorry. I repeat, I did not-- I know of none of the details. MADIGAN: Then you didn't know then that it didn't check any calls from the bank to the home in the Washington, D.C., area or to the office he used at Stevens, is that right? ARTHUR: No. MADIGAN: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: All right. So Mr. Arthur, thank you very much. This will conclude our Lippow witnesses. I know that so many would like to stay around here another hour or two and hear other Lippow witnesses, but we are assured that Senators Torricelli and the minority will have an opportunity from time to time between now and November to call any Lippow witnesses that they want to call. But we appreciate your being here with us today. And Senator Glenn unless you have objection, I'm going to recess for the evening. GLENN: No objection. THOMPSON: We reconvene at 10:00 in the morning. FDCH Transcript Service July 15, 1997 9:59:29 There are no more items to read. 9:59:29 XLXXX### mXXL#9:59:29 U.

S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS HOLDS HEARING (ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE) JULY 8, 1997 SPEAKERS: U.S. SENATOR FRED THOMPSON (R-TN), CHAIRMAN U.S. SENATOR WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR. (R-DE) U.S. SENATOR TED STEVENS (R-AK) U.S. SENATORS SUSAN M. COLLINS (R-ME) U.S. SENATORS SAM BROWNBACK (R-KS) U.S. SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI (R-NM) U.S. SENATOR THAD COCHRAN (R-MS) U.S. SENATOR DON NICKLES (R-OK) U.S. SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER (R-PA) U.S. SENATOR JOHN GLENN (D-OH), RANKING U.S. SENATOR CARL LEVIN (D-MI) U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN (D-CT) U.S. SENATOR DANIEL K. AKAKA (D-HI) U.S. SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN (D-IL) U.S. SENATOR ROBERT G. TORRICELLI (D-NJ) U.S. SENATOR MAX CLELAND (D-GA) [*] THOMPSON: Come to order, please. Senator Glenn and I both have-- we each have matters to bring up this morning that are a renewal. I'd like to lead off even before opening statements and read a separate statement. Our ability to relate this information in a public forum just came about. And it's important that it be placed on the public record, I believe, as soon as possible and in a careful and accurate manner. So I would like to turn our attention to one of the most troublesome areas of this investigation. I speak of allegations concerning a plan hatched during the last election cycle by the Chinese government and designed to pour illegal money into American political campaigns. The plan had a goal-- to buy access and influence in furtherance of Chinese government interests. By the very nature of the topic, I must keep my remarks brief. However, I will relate what I can. The committee is investigating the existence of an alleged --, Chinese plan, to the fullest extent possible. Although we have encountered limitation on the information available, including those attendant to a pending criminal investigation, the committee has uncovered significant amount of documentary and other relevant information. Our work in this area will continue. For now, the committee is able to report some of its basic findings, which are as follows: A story about the existence of a Chinese plan to subvert our election process is intertwined with the state of America's relation with China and Taiwan in recent years. Let me provide some context up front about those relations. Although the United States maintains no official ties with the government of Taiwan or diplomatic relations with the government of China, they have long been influenced by our ties to Taiwan. This is largely because the government of China considers Taiwan a rogue province and suspects it of seeking independence from the mainland. In 1994, Beijing lodged an official protest over an administration proposal to modestly increase contacts with Taiwan. This precedes difficulties of U.S.-China relations that would arise

he following year. In May of 1995, Taiwanese President Li Tung-hui was granted a visit to--avi-
sato visit the United States. President Li's trip, which included stops in Alaska, California
and New York, was highlighted by a visit to his alma mater, Cornell University. The visa, gran-
ted after a political struggle between Congress and the White House, represented a shift in ad-
ministration policy. President Clinton initially opposed the visa, but eventually agreed to
the visit. The move caught the government of China off guard. It had apparently underestimat-
ed Congress' influence over the process. Though caught off guard, Beijing was quick to voice its
outrage and to engage in a series of overt retaliatory measures. China suspected arms--sus-
pended arms control talks with Washington; postponed cross-strait talks with Taiwan; can-
celed official visits to and from the United States; amassed troops along the coast facing Taiwa-
n; and recalled its ambassador to the United States. ,", THOMPSON: But not all of China's re-
actions were overt. Secretly, Beijing worked to prevent similar diplomatic surprises from oc-
curring in the future. The committee believes that high-level Chinese government officials
crafted a plan to increase China's influence over the U.S. political process. The committee
has identified specific steps taken in furtherance of the plan. Implementation of the plan has
been handled by Chinese government officials and individuals enlisted to assist in the effort.
Activities in furtherance of the plan have occurred both inside and outside of the United States.
Our investigation suggests that the plan continues today. In general terms, the plan un-
dertakes a series of activities as the officials rise through the ranks to higher offices. These efforts
are typical appropriate steps for foreign governments to take to communicate their views on Uni-
ted States' policy. They include retaining lobbying firms, inviting more congresspersons to
visit China, and attempting to communicate Beijing's views through media channels in the Uni-
ted States. However, other parts of the plan are direct actions that are illegal under U.S. law. Al-
though most discussion of the plan focuses on Congress, our investigation suggests it affected
the 1996 presidential race and state elections as well. The government of China is believ-
ed to have allocated substantial sums of money to achieve its objectives. Another aspect of the
plan is remarkable, because it shows that the PRC is interested in developing long-term rela-
tionships with persons it has identified as up-and-coming officials at state and local levels.
The intent is to establish relations that can be cultivated as the officials rise through the
ranks to higher office. When the FBI learned of these matters, it opened a foreign counterint-
elligence investigation and has developed and gathered a large volume of detailed information
on the plan's implementation. In May and June of 1996, having determined that the gravity of
the situation warranted specific action, the FBI briefed the Intelligence Oversight Commit-
tees in the House and Senate, as well as six members of Congress. The FBI determined might be tar-
geted of the Chinese effort. The Bureau later briefed a seventh member in October of 1996. The FBI
continues to investigate possible illegal activities ,", connected to the plan. Importan-
tly, the FBI also told the White House about the Chinese plan in June of 1996, when FBI agents
briefed two representatives of the National Security Council. The FBI placed no limitations on
sharing the information, much of which the White House had independent access to through other
means. This raises questions about who in the White House should have known or actually knew of
the Chinese plan, and how it came to be implemented. My comments provide only a broad outline of
the Chinese plan. The great majority of information about this matter cannot be discussed fu-
rther in open session. The committee expects to hold closed executive sessions sometime soon
to consider this matter more closely. That concludes my initial statement. Now I would like to
proceed with my opening statement for these hearings. On March 1 of last year, the United States
Senate voted unanimously, 99 to nothing, to authorize an investigation into improper or il-
legal campaign activities involving the '96 federal election cycles. Now Article I of the Con-
stitution grants Congress its legislative powers. Implied in those legislative powers is the
power to investigate. So from time to time throughout our history, when matters of grave conc-
ern to this country and this body have arisen, Congress has exercised its legislative power
through hearings, congressional hearings such as the one that we begin today. Now these hear-
ings serve two purposes. THOMPSON: One is a legislative function--in other words, taking a lo-
ok at our laws, seeing whether or not they need to be changed, amended, deleted, added to; an exam-
ination that also involves the question of whether or not our problem is with our laws, our sys-

em, or those who are implementing our laws. A second function--and some consider this to be a even more important function--is the one of disclosure to the public. It's an opportunity for the Congress and this committee in this setting to disclose to the American people, to see how the government is operating, to pull back the curtain and give the American people an unfiltered view as to exactly how their system is working. Now within this broad outline, I think it's important for us to --, remember what these hearings are and what they are not. They are not trials where people are prosecuted. They are not soap operas that are designed to titillate. And they are not athletic events where we keep a running score. Rather, these hearings are serious looks at how our government is working, how our government is operating, and it's designed at the end toward seeing if we can't make our system, make our government work even better. Now a lot of facts are already out on the public record. In fact, there's been an outpouring of information and allegations and stories over the last several months in the media. And I'm sure that there's been so much troubling information out there that the average citizen has great difficulty in keeping from getting lost in a lot of it and putting it all together. And I think that sometimes the temptation under those circumstances is to just throw your hands up and maybe look for one key witness or one piece of evidence, one document, or maybe even a tape that would explain it all. But the truth seldom emerges in that way. But the truth often emerges in various other ways. That's the obligation of this committee, to find the truth. Our obligation is to take this virtual blizzard of information, add to it facts which we have discovered in our investigation, add depth, add perspective and context, and pull it all together and try to present it to the American people in a way that's understandable. And I believe that we can do that. And if we do that, at the end of the day, I am confident that the true picture will emerge. Now the allegations before us are extremely serious. They include illegal foreign contributions and other illegal foreign involvement in our political process. Money laundering. Influence peddling. Violations of the Hatch Act, which prevents fundraising on government time and government property. Violations of the Ethics in Government Act. Violations of the conflict of interest laws. Improper use of the White House in fundraising activities, and questions of whether our domestic and foreign policy was affected by political contributions. Now these matters go to the basic integrity of our government and our electoral process, and these matters will constitute the first --, phase of four hearings. There apparently was a systematic influx of illegal money in our presidential race last year. We will be wanting to know who knew about it, who should have known about it, and whether or not there was an attempt to cover it up. Now it has been pointed out that certain witnesses have fled the country or that certain witnesses will take the Fifth Amendment and refuse to testify, as is their right. It's also been noted that this committee has a cut-off date. Some people have expressed concern that all this will allow people to somehow thwart the purposes of this investigation to find the facts and to establish the truth. THOMPSON: However, it should be remembered that much evidence is available to us. Many witnesses are available to us who will give truthful statements about what they know. And if anyone should unlawfully impede or misinform this committee, there are criminal sanctions available. Now valuable information can be obtained in various ways. It seems that due to the facts that these hearings were about to start, that the White House has decided to release certain information before the committee had a chance to, in other words to pre-empt. Since this is information that the American people, I believe, have been entitled to for a long, long time, I welcome this preemption. And I can only assume that this investigation goes forward, they will have the opportunity to pre-empt many times in the future. Now when the first phase of these hearings are complete, we will begin the second phase, which will address the broader issues concerning our electoral process, including the role of soft money and the role of independent groups. Now while most of the activities in the second phase are presumably legal, I believe that, frankly, that the common practices in these areas by both parties are a far cry from the original intent of the framework of four current campaign finance laws that were passed right after Watergate. I personally believe that we can do much better than the campaign finance system--the campaign finance system that we have today. However, we cannot move forward unless we have accountability for the past. And we cannot allow calls for campaign finance reform to act as a shield to keep from thoroughly examining those whomay have broken our existing laws. Otherwise, calls for reform will be viewed as

imply as partisan, and the cause of campaign finance reform will be hurt and, ", not enhance d. Now these hearings come at a time in this nation of economic prosperity. But they also come at a time when the American people are increasingly cynical about their government. We have less than half of our people voting now. I believe that part of this is due to what has happened to our political process, as evidenced by the matter that this committee will be considering. The American people see their leaders go to greater and greater extremes to raise unprecedented amounts of money to fund their political campaigns. Power is at stake, and the ends justify the means. And I believe that this thirst for increasing amounts of political money and what people are willing to do to get it lie at the heart of this investigation. Now while these hearings are clearly necessary, we must realize that this process does not come without a price. Some say that the revealing of unpleasant information about our government and about our system itself further fuels the cynicism that I referred to. However, we decided over 200 years ago that we could stand the truth, that we could be trusted with it, and that we could conduct from time to time this kind of self-examination and come out the stronger for it. It's also pointed out as a downside of these kinds of hearings that congressional investigations offer the opportunity for rank partisanship, which further debases our system. It seems to be true that the American people often expect the worst out of us in Congress, and we seldom disappoint them. But it doesn't have to be that way. We as Democrats and Republicans have much more in common than the things that divide us. We all have our primary allegiance to this nation. We all believe in the rule of law. THOMPSON: And anything that attacks the fundamental things that we hold precious as a country are things that are going to be of grave concern to all of us. So this committee is presented with a unique opportunity. We can conduct a good, thorough investigation, assess responsibilities where appropriate, and make recommendations as to how we can improve our system in the future. ", We can conduct these hearings without a lot of partisan bickering. A lot of people say let the chips fall where they may. We can say it and actually mean it. This committee demonstrated dearly its commitment to fairness, something I'm very proud of. This committee unanimously voted to have a scope that would allow us to look at Democrat and Republican activities alike, where appropriate. Now if the American people see us honestly trying to get the facts in a professional manner, treating each other and treating our witnesses with dignity and courtesy, I believe that it will enhance the status of this institution. More importantly, I think it will enhance our government in the eyes of the American people at a time when our government sorely needs it. That's our opportunity, and that's our obligation. Senator Glenn. GLENN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our democracy--this representative form of government of the people, by the people and for the people--is based on that greatest of all political documents, the Constitution. And it promises for our people the greatest freedom, the greatest protections and the greatest framework to pursue individual opportunities, along with the greatest hope for the future of any nation on earth. But a written constitution does not form the government. People form a government and lead our country to its future under the Constitution. Throughout most of American history, that role has been filled by our political parties. They have put forward their concept and ideas about where the country should go and what our stature should be in the world community. And after the push and pull of public debate and political campaigns, the American people make their choice, and we move on. For the most part, our political system has served us well. It has worked to implement our constitutional government. But within the ongoing constitutional political experiment in democratic self-government, this unique work in progress, there is one linchpin, without which such an intricate, complex system cannot continue to ", function as intended. Our democratic framework system of freedoms, protections and opportunities, and our whole political system function only to the degree that they have the faith, the trust and the confidence of the American people. Poll after poll and election after election have shown an increasingly dangerous and growing skepticism of our system. In the eyes of most people, the timbers of our political structure have developed a rot that must be dealt with. Or it can spread to dangerous proportions, adding to distrust and cynicism and doubt of those who won't participate, who drop out or they join protest groups with varying motivations. And that is the pernicious effect of huge amounts of money in today's political spectrum, both Republican and Democratic. The abuses have been bipartisan, and our investigations must be bipartisan

is an if the results of these long and expensive efforts are to have sufficient credibility to be used as a base for meaningful campaign finance reform. GLENN: With the committee's expertise and long investigative history, we've not only been assigned a major responsibility, but also a great opportunity to start restoring faith that our government and political systems represent all the people, all the time, not special interests, and all the people part time. But that will be accomplished only if the investigation is done right. And what do I mean by that? Well, I mean that we must show the American people the truth about our campaign finance system--that your chances of winning are dependent on how much money you raise, that fundraising has become so all-consuming it has pushed both parties to seek to get as close to the edge of the federal election laws as possible, and that in their zeal in seeking the edge of the law, both parties have, at times, stepped over the edge. In exposing this system it is not so much that we expect to surprise the American people. Unfortunately sleazy fundraising practices are just what the American people have come to expect, and this expectation preceded the 1996 federal elections. If we wish to surprise the American people, we will do so by showing them that we in the Congress recognize that the system is broken, needs to be fixed, in fact must be fixed, and that we, "recognize that the lack of trust the American people have in their government stems, at least in part, from the perception that the Congress has been bought by big-money contributions, by corporations, others special interests giving contributions in return for legislative or other political favors. I'm in favor of rooting out and exposing all the information on fundraising abuses without fear or favor, whether on the Democratic or Republican side, wherever the trail leads us. We should examine any illegalities involving foreign or domestic money. We should examine whether federal election laws have been broken or have been abused by individuals and organizations, and willful violators should be severely punished. But if that is all we do, we will have failed in this investigation and failed miserably, because even if it is not explicitly stated in the Senate resolution that launched this investigation, the measure of success for this investigation will be whether it produces congressional action for campaign finance reform, substantial reform, not the little bit of reform some in the Congress might advocate to reduce public pressure. What will we need to produce this success? Well, first the investigation and these hearings must be seen as fair, bipartisan, focused on the activities of both parties. Unfortunately for the past six months we've had problems in this respect, and I hope that this is behind us. Another factor in the success of this investigation is whether we will examine thoroughly, with respect to fundraising by both parties, the following issues: one, foreign money. What evidence is there that foreign money was actively solicited in the 1996 federal elections? We do know that some foreign money came to the Republican Party, and I'll explain that in more detail later. Did it happen in Democratic fundraising circles as well? Let's find out. GLENN: I'm all for finding out. Also, is there any real evidence that the Chinese government or any other foreign government actually infiltrated the American government via campaign contributions? If there was Chinese government money illegally entering the American political system, is there any evidence that such money went to candidates of only one political party? ", Now beginning in February of this year, there have been stories in The Washington Post, The New York Times and The L.A. Times about Chinese government plans to influence the American political system. This past April, The Los Angeles Times reported that in 1995, the Chinese government formulated a plan to use about \$2 million to influence legislative branch elections, both Republican and Democratic, in 1996. The article reported that the plan was formulated because the Chinese government was upset at the recent visit of Taiwan Prime Minister Lien. As a result, the Chinese government apparently recognized that it needed to conduct more lobbying on its behalf. Part of the plan, therefore, apparently called for Chinese officials to meet to influence people with a focus on legislators. As the article noted, the type of lobbying activity is legitimate, is done by many foreign countries and domestic interests. Well, that's mainly what we know for sure about the Chinese plan at the moment. According to the press, the Chinese government intended to use a relatively modest amount of money to gain influence in the Washington lobbying game, and it intended to do this by focusing on the legislative branch of government. Now, I mention these reports here because I am greatly concerned about how the reports are sometimes discussed by individuals in this body and in the press. I've heard

language like infiltration, foreign spies, foreigners, as we're jeopardizing our national security. Well, on this issue, the committee should go just as far as the fact stake, recognizing that it's the FBI that's in a much better position to-- than a congressional committee to do espionage investigation. We must be careful, however, not to jump to conclusions that treason has been committed based on a partial story with ambiguous information. But wherever the trail leads, let's look at it. And we want to do it fairly. This committee, if we go back in our records, we have a very unhappy history in that respect, as far as ambiguous information goes. During the 1950s, we can all recall what happened on this committee, and I doubt anyone here wants to return to those dark days. Now, the second issue that we-- other issues we must examine during these hearings, the second one is the misuse of tax-exempt and non-profit organizations. There are numerous and credible allegations, that such organizations were illegally employed, perhaps on both sides, but we know of some on the Republican side in 1996. We have those documented. Did the Democrats receive similar illegal help? Let's find out. Number three, contributions given in the name of another person-- did both parties violate that?-- because that is an illegal practice under our campaign finance laws. Well, the vice chairman of Bob Dole's campaign was fined \$1.6 million and put under house arrest for this practice. GLENN: This committee will also investigate similar allegations regarding a Democratic fundraising event at a Buddhist temple in California. Are there other cases we should look at? We should find them if they're there. Number four, the use of soft-money contributions. This is a most important issue that the chairman has indicated will be examined in phase II of the hearings. If there's some element of the campaign fundraising system crying for reform, it's soft money. Unlimited funds-- unlimited funds-- being given to the political parties, which have resulted in not only continually raising the ante in political campaigns, but have resulted in distorting the political agenda of both parties. Now all these issues have fueled the cynicism I spoke of earlier that currently infects the American body politic. Who can blame them when they see what campaign contributions given by special interests have produced in terms of favors to those interests? We've heard a great deal-- a great deal these past months-- about Democrats and perks and access. And Americans have every right to be concerned about special favors for campaign contributions. Mr. Chairman, in my full statement, I give a number of examples of Republican favors also back and forth, as well as some Democratic. And as I see it, it sort of comes out as a match on both here, as far as transgressions of the past. And I would ask my-- I don't want to read all of those-- I'd ask my entire be included in the record. THOMPSON: Made part of the record. GLENN: Yes, thank you. Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to one specific case, however, that the committee has been investigating. And it is a very clear case of foreign money channeled through a Florida corporation to the National Policy Forum, and ultimately, to the Republican National Committee. On one level, this is an extremely complex story. It's a story of a multimillionaire and his Hong Kong corporation, a desperate, cash-strapped Republican Party, and how they combined to finance the Contract With America in 1994, and then two years later, to infuse the Republican Party with three-quarters of a million dollars in foreign money. At its core, this is also a simple story. It's a story of greed and trust betrayed, as I see it, of a national chairman who betrayed the trust of a wealthy foreign donor, his own party and the American people when he tried to circumvent the campaign finance laws of this country. This summer, you will hear many examples of foreign money being funneled to the Democrats and to the Republicans. But this story, as far as I know right now, is the only one so far where the head of a national political party knowingly and successfully solicited foreign money, infused it into the election process and intentionally tried to cover it up. We'll be holding hearings on the National Policy Forum and Young Brothers later in this summer, perhaps later this month. And I want to give you just a short preview of what we have learned. The National Policy Forum was established in 1993 as a think tank to develop Republican ideas and policies. Republican officials claimed that it was independent of the party, and thus would not be subject to the laws and regulations that apply to the Republican National Committee and other political organizations. In fact, the National Policy Forum was an arm of the Republican National Committee. It was a subsidiary, in the words of a top Republican official. One way the Republicans used their subsidiary was for what can only be described as the laundering of illegal foreign money. GLENN: Now I have a few slides that tell this story

here, and I think--I hope the audience can see these. They're on the monitors, our monitors up here, and I think the larger monitors back there. , ". The first document's a memorandum titled NPF Action. It's from Scott Reed, the executive director of the RNC, to officials at the NPF, including the chairman, Haley Barbour. This document was created in anticipation of the formation of the NPF. And under the heading of fundraising, the sixth item, as you can read, is for foreign, which strongly suggests that Mr. Reed contemplated tapping foreign sources for funding the NPF. The document's also interesting because it reveals that at its inception, the NPF was a little more than a front for the RNC. Here's a high-ranking RNC official recommending the structure, the personnel and the mission for the NPF. A few weeks later, the National Policy Forum is officially launched, and Haley Barbour, the RNC chairman, as well as the chairman of the NPF as well, declares that this organization will be separate from the Republican National Committee. Barbour also announces the selection of Michael E. Baroody as NPF's president. The next document is a memorandum from Mr. Baroody providing Mr. Barbour with some reasons for resignation. By this time, Mr. Baroody has been at the NPF for a little over a year, has had a chance to see how the organization works. He is dissatisfied to the point of resigning, and he writes to Mr. Barbour, quote: "We also discussed your belief that considerable money could be raised for this effort from foreign sources. I told you again, even before starting at NPF, I thought you were right about the possibility foreign money could be raised, but I thought it would be wrong to do so." The idea, nonetheless, seemed to hold some fascination and continued to be discussed until well after Denning came on the scene." End of quote. This seems to jibe with what RNC Executive Director Scott Reed wrote to Barbour in the earlier memo. The Baroody letter is an extraordinary document. Here's the president of the NPF stating quite clearly that the organization is no thing more than a Republican front group, describing the so-called separation between the RNC and the NPF, in his words, "a fiction." In an effort to learn more from Mr. Baroody (ph), this committee served him with a subpoena, and a few weeks ago, we asked him a series of questions under oath. Mr. Baroody refused to say anything about the letter. In fact, on more than 100 occasions, his attorney instructed him not to answer the questions posed to him by this committee, even questions directly asking him about foreign money at NPF. , ". I should note, Mr. Chairman, that we do appreciate very much the order you recently issued instructing Mr. Baroody to answer the questions we believe to be within the scope of this investigation. It was a tough statement. We appreciate it. You were right to put it out. Other former officials of the NPF and the Republican Party have also withheld information from this committee, seriously undermining our effort to uncover the complete story. And we hope they'll be more forthcoming in the weeks ahead. However, even without the cooperation of those Republican witnesses, we have this letter and other documents that speak for themselves. There are references to foreign money and "the fiction," as they say it, in quotes, the fiction of separation between the NPF and RNC, are right there in black and white. Mr. Baroody's worst fears are realized shortly after he resigns when, at the request of Chairman Barbour of the RNC, foreign money is used to guarantee a loan to NPF to the ultimate benefit of the RNC. GLENN: Young Brothers Development Corporation, a foreign owned company based in Hong Kong, directs a \$2.1 million loan through its Florida-based shell corporation, Young Brothers, USA. The Florida company's only assets come straight from Hong Kong. The shell organization provides the loan guarantee to the National Policy Forum, an organization which is an arm of the Republican National Committee. The National Policy Forum and its chairman, Haley Barbour, immediately funnels \$1.6 million to the Republican National Committee and its chairman, Haley Barbour. As you can see here, corporate money that started in Hong Kong is spread out all over the country by the RNC to help pay for elections in 1994. This slide shows that foreign money helps make a major difference in November when the Republicans do capture the Congress for the first time in 40 years. In states where the money flowed right before the election, Republicans won congressional races. Now that, of course, could be a happy ending, at least for Haley Barbour and the RNC, but the story doesn't end there. In fact, some ways it's just beginning. After using the Young Brothers money to fund the Republican victory, Mr. Barbour decides that the NPF should just keep the money. He asked Young for forgiveness (ph). Young says, , ", no. NPF fail to make the next payment on the loan guaranteed by Young Brothers, perhaps to test Mr. Young's resolve. Young says, pay up. In '95, Barbour travels to Hong Kong to visit Am

brose Young on his yacht and again plead for forgiveness, and Young says no. A few more months pass. Haley Barbour and Ambrose Young travel to China together and meet with the Chinese foreign minister--Barbour still pressing for forgiveness; Young is holding firm. Spring of '96 when the Dole campaign is strapped for cash, the RNC desperately needs money, and the Republicans look like they might lose Congress if they--that they have held for only two years, and the NPF defaults. They just won't pay. Needless to say, the RNC won't pay either, despite Haley Barbour's early assurance to Ambrose Young. Angry letters are exchanged between lawyers. Richard Richards, the former chairman of the RNC, tries 10 times to call the current chairman, Haley Barbour. Mr. Barbour won't talk to him. On September 17th, Dick Richards writes to Chairman Barbour a letter which recounts the history of the loan. He says, quote, "I have recently heard from Mr. Young in Hong Kong, and needless to say, he's somewhat distressed about the non-payment by the forum." Just prior to the election of 1994, I was asked by Fred Volcanzik (ph) to help facilitate a loan in excess of \$2 million to assist to help pick up 60 targeted House seats. Funds were transferred from Hong Kong to Young Brothers, USA, a Florida corporation of which I am the president. Shortly after the loan was made, you journeyed to Hong Kong and approached Mr. Young for the first time about the question of forgiveness of the loan. "There cannot be any dispute that this was a loan. Mr. Young made iting good faith to assist you in capturing some targeted congressional seats." That's in the letter. Indeed, the RNC had \$1.6 million to fund the Contract With America in '94. GLENN: Two years later, it saved \$750,000 to fund the election in '96, all thanks to the efforts of a wealthy man from Hong Kong and the concerted effort by Haley Barbour and the NPF to privately exploit this generosity while publicly hiding it. ,", Now that's an encapsulation of the story. As always, the devil's in the details. There are more details to flesh out. We will be able to, as I indicated earlier, we'll tell the complete story later this month, we hope this month, and the American people will learn exactly what happened. I began my remarks by referring to the cynicism that the American people feel for so much of what we do. High among the reasons they give for their cynicism is the way that money influences campaigns. Indeed, according to a recent Wall Street Journal poll, almost two-thirds of all Americans favor banning soft-money contributions from our elections system because they realize that it predictably, invariably, inevitably cheapens our democracy. Another reason for their cynicism is a partisanship that is increasingly seem to distort our work in the Congress. Just as surely as cash cheapens the work that we do, partisanship does so as well, and the American people know it. Indeed, some 70 percent of all Americans believe that both parties believe that both parties are equally guilty of campaign fundraising abuses. So, Mr. Chairman, let's honor this body--and the American people who have given us the great privilege of serving in it--with an investigation that is serious, it's balanced and it's fair. And let us then act to rectify the campaign finance problem afflicting both parties in a way that restores a measure of faith in our system to the American people whose daily lives are affected by that system. Mr. Chairman, I have one other issue. And this is a very important one to discuss before concluding. One of the most disturbing, and most focused-on by the press, allegations in this investigation has been the suggestion that an individual placed in a position of trust in our government may have been engaged in espionage, or at least, economic espionage, passing classified information to persons unauthorized to receive this information. If true, charges of spying or of being an unregistered foreign agent could follow. I'm referring of course to Mr. John Huang, who was hired at the Department of Commerce and given a security clearance. It's been suggested that Mr. Huang leaked classified information while at Commerce to his former employer and possibly to a foreign government. Few charges could be more serious. ,", Sometime ago, minority counsel Alan Baron approached Mr. Huang's attorney to explore the possibility of Mr. Huang appearing to testify before this committee. Those discussions have continued and come to fruition in not only the last few days, but the last few hours, over the weekend and indeed in some respects just this morning. And I wish to report that counsel for Mr. Huang has stated that Mr. Huang is willing to come before the committee and not exercise his Fifth Amendment rights. He will respond to any questions the committee may ask on any aspect of our investigation. He will ask for limited immunity only. GLENN: Limited immunity, because of certain FEC and Hatch Act allegations against him. Now, let me explain. One thing that has been clear from the beginning of any discussion with Mr. Huang's attorney

ney, under no circumstances would Mr. Huang be immunized from prosecution for any act of espionage or for any offense prosecutable for the disclosure of classified information or for acting as an agent for any foreign government. Moreover, Mr. Huang would be subject to prosecution for perjury or for giving a false statement to investigators if he did not tell the truth. I can now report that Mr. Huang has agreed through his counsel to testify with a limited immunity relating to any criminal charges that could result. Now, limited immunity would not apply to the criminal charges. To testify without immunity relating to criminal charges that could result in the committed espionage, or even economic espionage, if he disclosed classified information to anyone not authorized to receive it; if he acted as an agent for any foreign government; if he commits perjury; if he makes any false statement under oath. While Mr. Huang will answer questions on any subject, his testimony can be used against him in a prosecution for any of these charges. It's my view that upon completion of the opening statements today, the committee should go into executive session to consider such a proffer. I further believe that the committee should solicit and receive the views of the Department of Justice before it makes a final determination as to whether it believes the limited grant of immunity sought by Mr. Huang should be afforded. Well, as you yourself stated, we are not bound by the views of, " , the Department of Justice, it is appropriate for us to obtain the department's input. I've been advised that Mr. Huang's attorney, Mr. Cobb, who is a highly respected defense attorney, is prepared to proceed immediately to make a presentation and proffer to the Department of Justice on behalf of his client. Mr. Chairman, I make this clear: I'm not entirely prepared today to take a position on the issue of immunity, limited immunity, for Mr. Huang at this point, because I wish to know what the Department of Justice has to say also, even though it is not the controlling factor, as you pointed out. Given the fact, however, that Mr. Huang would not be immune from prosecution for espionage or the unauthorized transfer of classified information, and would also be subject to prosecution for perjury, I believe this may be a very unique and inexpensive opportunity to inform ourselves and the American people about an issue that has been of serious concern to all of us. Of course, it is also true that Mr. Huang would still be wide open to questions in those areas for which he has received immunity. He could still be questioned in those areas. And this would include all aspects of his fundraising, which has been the subject of such intense scrutiny. Now, one issue which concerned me, and I'm sure many others here today, is why Mr. Huang would be motivated to come forward on the basis that I have described. Now, I do not know Mr. Huang. GLENN: I don't know that I have ever met him. But he's been described to me as a man proud of his heritage, proud to be an American citizen. I've been advised that a guiding principle in his life has been to promote the interests of the Asian-American community. He believes the interests of that community have been harmed by the allegations surrounding him. And I am told that is why he wants to come forward and address the allegations and speculations before this committee. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from counsel, Mr. Cobb, that I gave you a little earlier today. I would ask that that be included in the record. I believe a copy has been distributed to all the members at the desks. " , " , THOMPSON: Without objection, it will be made a part of the record. GLENN: As I said, as far as I know, neither I nor any of my staff have ever met Mr. Huang, and I am in no position to assess his reputation or motives beyond what I have been told. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my efforts to bring Mr. Huang before this committee serve to underscore my full commitment that all the facts be presented to the American people on a bipartisan basis. The issues surrounding national security and the issues surrounding campaign finance reform override partisan concerns. We have arrived at a point where we can reshape the political landscape, and we can redefine the political process. I hope that all of us will have the strength to rise to that occasion and do what is best for our country. Thank you. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Glenn. I propose that we go on with opening statements. We certainly do want to discuss this new information. I think it's very important. And I think it's encouraging. There are some serious questions that have to be asked about it, however, and I know that other members of the committee will want to discuss that to exactly how we move forward. But I welcome very much these developments. Senator Collins. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today we embark on a difficult task. We have been asked to judge conduct in which all of us who are involved in partisan political activity will be seen to have an interest, an undeniable self-interest. In discharging this responsibility, we on the

committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, must demonstrate that we are guided by one goal and one goal only: the pursuit of truth on behalf of the American people. We can do no less, as matters we will be scrutinizing affect the process by which we choose our leaders, a process that defines the very essence of a free society. ", It has already been widely reported that we will be examining very troubling allegations about the involvement of the Democratic National Committee and the White House with foreign money. As we do so, the challenge for the Republic is on this committee will be to remain objective and fair-minded in the face of mounting evidence of potentially very serious wrongdoing. For their part, my Democratic colleagues must show a willingness to go where the evidence leads and not restrict the committee's ability to gather information. They must also resist the temptation to make dissimilar conduct look similar in an effort to dismiss serious legal and ethical breaches with the time-worn excuse that everybody does it. The White House and others under scrutiny must be much more forthcoming. The president cannot credibly preach the gospel of campaign finance reform unless his aides and supporters are prepared to let the light of day shine on their activities during the 1996 campaign. The public, too, has a role to play in making these hearings successful. The American people, understandably weary of scandals and skeptical about the prospects for change, must ultimately become engaged in this matter. I disagree with those who view the jaded attitude of the public toward campaign finance abuses as good news. For me, it sends a stronger message than the loudest shout of protest. Silence does not mean approval. To the contrary, it means not only disapproval, but a complete lack of faith that we are capable of improving the system. We must attempt to use these hearings to persuade the public that this is not a hopeless quagmire. During the next several months, we can be certain that we will witness some conflicting versions of events, some of which may never be resolved. COLLINS: But what already seems clear, based on the allegations that have appeared in the press, is that we are here today largely because of an ethical indifference which some at the Democratic National Committee and the White House displayed toward fundraising in the 1996 presidential campaign. Indeed, as important as it is to uncover abuses, it is probably more important to understand causes. Toward that end, let me suggest ", three components of the ethically lax atmosphere which gave rise to the events that bring us here today. The first was a mania for money. This is certainly not new in the political life of our country. But driven by the high cost of television ads, it has reached epic proportions. Indeed, the television ad race has become the political counterpart of the nuclear arms race, characterized by the same insecure feeling that one can never have enough. Even the limits placed on spending in presidential campaigns did not stop the escalation, as candidate ads were replaced by party ads, funded in part by soft money raised from questionable sources. The second component was a failure to distinguish between the ethically right and the technically legal. Instead, there was a willingness to cut every corner, bend every rule, and invoke every technicality. When the argument is that moving from one room in the White House to another makes the solicitation of funds legal, we have at best compliance with the letter and not the spirit of the law. Until it becomes part of our political ethos to honor the purposes underlying our campaign finance laws rather than trying to subvert them through legalistic loopholes, there may be merit to the contention that our laws will never be tight enough to withstand the mania for money. The third component was an utter lack of concern for the source of contributions. Accepting money from a Buddhist temple flies in the face of a prohibition against political contributions from religious groups. Accepting money from an impoverished Indian tribe exploits those who are dependent on the federal government. And accepting money from suspected criminals suggests that money talks regardless of what it has to say. For some, it seems that the contributors tent can never be too big, with the only requirement imposed on those seeking entry being, "Show me the money." It is this third component which has raised one of the major concerns to emerge from the 1996 presidential campaign and which must be most closely examined in these hearings. Specifically, it is imperative that we get to the bottom of the allegations involving foreign money. COLLINS: Let me take just a moment to explain why these allegations are so serious. Much of the solicitation of foreign money ", was allegedly done by an individual who recently had been receiving classified information of potential interest to the would-be contributors. This combination of possessing government secrets and soliciting political contributions

rom overseas donors, possibly even foreign governments, should make even the most hard-boiled political veteran nervous. This is particularly true when the individual in question has been unwilling to disclose his activities without a grant of immunity for fear of incriminating himself. Moreover, the world must have confidence that our foreign policy decisions are based on American interests. Even the appearance that they are tainted by contributions from persons connected with foreign governments undermines our national credibility. It is ironic, Mr. Chairman, that after China regained control of Hong Kong, one of the first acts of the newly created Hong Kong legislative body was to ban foreign contributions. We proudly hold our country out as the nation's--as the world's--greatest democracy, the model for countries emerging from totalitarian rule. The spectacle of huge amounts of money from wealthy foreign contributors pouring into our presidential races sends a message to emerging nations that democracy in America is not about carrying out the will of the many, but about catering to the interests of the few. Mr. Chairman, campaign finance practices have become the source of great confusion in this country. This committee has the perhaps unenviable task of creating clarity out of chaos by exposing illegal and unethical practices and by leading the national debate on the rules that govern the electoral process. I commend you for assuming this responsibility, for your leadership in this regard, and I look forward to working with you and the other members of the committee in the coming months.

THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Collins. Senator Levin. LEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What this committee and the American people are going to hear about in the next few weeks and months are the symptoms of a disease of the American body politic, a disease we can call the money chase, and from which no party and few candidates are immune. ,", To inoculate our democratic system against this disease, we passed a series of laws in the 1970s to limit the role of money in federal elections. It was our intent, at that time, to protect our democratic form of government, which relies so heavily on the interchange of ideas and actions between the government and the private sector. LEVIN: To protect our form of government from the corrosive influence of the unlimited and undisclosed contributions, we wanted to ensure that our elected officials were neither in reality nor in perception beholden to special interests or able to contribute large sums of money to candidates and their campaigns. These laws were designed to protect the public's confidence in our democratically elected officials. And for many years, those laws worked fairly well. The limits that they set are impressive, and those limits are still on the books today. Individuals are not supposed to give more than \$1,000 to a candidate per election or \$5,000 to a political action committee or more than \$20,000 a year to a national party committee or \$25,000 total in any one year. Corporations and unions are prohibited from contributing to any campaign. Contributions from foreign countries, foreign citizens and foreign corporations are prohibited. And presidential campaigns are supposed to be financed with public funds. That's the law that's on the books today. Yet in this series of hearings, we're going to hear about contributions of hundreds of thousands of dollars from individuals, corporations and unions. We're going to hear about contributions from foreign sources, and we're going to hear about presidents and presidential candidates spending long hours on fundraising tasks. Now how is that possible, we ask? Well, what has happened is that a pretty good law setting limits on size and source of contributions has some soft spots, which over the years both parties took advantage of. Both parties pushed up against those soft spots and created holes in the law--big loopholes--that allowed the big money to pour in, so that now there are no effective limits at all. Now we face the daunting task of trying to close those loopholes, to make ,", the law whole again, and in making it whole, to make it effective. Some of what we're going to hear about in the next few weeks and months involves possible illegal conduct. But the vast majority of what we're going to hear about, and the bulk of the activity that creates concern and has the largest effect on the campaign process right now is what's legal. It's what's allowed by those loopholes. And most of it involves the so-called soft money or unregulated money. Look at the data on this first chart--on just what the Democratic National Committee did. Only 172,000 over 2 1/2 million total contributions received by the DNC in the 1994-96 election cycle had to be reported. That's six thousandths of 1 percent. And only a limited number of those were returned because they may not satisfy applicable legal and regulatory requirements. And the other part of that chart shows that just a tiny percentage of the contributions which were received

, the dollar that were received, were returned. The real problem, the real big problem with the way we finance campaign today, is what's legal. LEVIN: Because the way both parties in the Federal Election Commission have gotten around the law of the 1970s is by establishing a whole separate world of campaign finance. And that's the world of so-called "soft money"--contributions not technically covered by the limits under current law. In the 1996 election, as you can see from this chart, the Republican Party raised more than \$140 million in soft money; the Democrats raised over \$120 million. That's the real problem, and that's how we get to these enormous sums of money in the last campaign, like the \$1.3 million that the RNC received from one company in 1996 and the \$450,000 that just one couple gave to the Democratic National Committee in the same year. Once that soft money loophole was opened, once the loophole was viewed as legitimate, the money chase was on by both parties. Couple that with the high cost of television advertising and you have the money chase involving just about all candidates. The chase for money has led most of us in public office or seeking public office to push the envelope, to take the law to the limit to get the necessary contributions. The money chase led President Clinton to invite contributors to stay in the Lincoln Bedroom overnight. It led President Bush in 1992, to use White House stationery to announce a briefing by Cabinet members and the president himself for three Republican contributor groups at the Old Executive Office Building, with a reception to follow in the Indian Room. That's what this invitation is all about--White House stationery, when President Bush was in the White House announcing the briefing for the major contributors and fundraiser to the Republican Party. And at the bottom, it says, "The president and Mrs. Bush thank you for coming to the White House." The money chase led the Democratic National Committee to use coffees and other perks involving the White House and President Clinton for top contributors in 1996. And that's what this memo is all about, from Martha Phipps, who worked with the Democratic National Committee chairman and suggested various perks, like a seat on Air Force One and overnight stays at the White House in order to help raise money. And it led--the money chase led--the Republican National Committee to hold a private reception at the White House and a private lunch at the vice president's house for top fundraisers for President Bush when he was in office in 1992. The offer gave the benefits it listed, including a private reception hosted by President and Mrs. Bush at the White House, including a luncheon at the vice president's residence. And then it said that the benefits to be received by the table buyers and the fundraisers--and here I quote this 1992 invitation--"the benefits were based on receipts." The money chase led the Republican National Committee to overlook the debtor status of a man, Michael Kojima, who was identified by the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office as America's worst deadbeat dad, "but who contributed a half million dollars to sit next to President Bush at the 1992 President's Dinner. It was reported just on the news last night that Japanese citizens provided some or all of the money to Michael Kojima for that contribution. But the money chase also led the Democratic National Committee to accept a third of a million dollars from Yogesh Gandhi, who also turned out to be heavily in debt. The money chase led the head of the Republican National Committee, Haley Barbour, to use as a subsidiary of the Republican, National Committee--the National Policy Forum--to obtain some \$750,000 in a foreign contribution from the Young Brothers of Hong Kong. LEVIN: This document, which has been referred to also by Senator Glenn, a memo outlining the NPF fundraising, is a memo from Scott Reed, executive director of the Republican National Committee, to Haley Barbour and Mike Baroody, Republican chairman and NPF president, respectively. And it's the most dramatic document that I've seen. Indeed, it's the only document that I've seen where there is evidence that party leaders intentionally went after foreign dollars. The money chase also pressures political supporters to cross lines that they shouldn't in order to help their candidates get needed funds. It led an national finance chair of Senator Dole's campaign to engage in a five-year laundering scheme, which funneled \$120,000 through a secret Hong Kong trust to his employees who contributed to the candidates he supported. It led members of a family--father, mother and daughter--to funnel \$50,000 through company employees and stockholders to Democratic candidates that they supported. Both of those incidents that I've just described have led to convictions. The money chase is also leading foreign governments to think that U.S. politics is an arena in which they have to compete. We saw just last week that one paper featured a story that foreign governments spent \$86 million

olobby the U.S. government in the first six months of 1996. Japan alone spent \$17 million in six months. The Chinese expenditure, which has been referred to this morning, was a small fraction of the \$86 million. It was aimed at lobbying and influencing the Congress. China's target in 1995 and '96 was not the White House. It was the Congress. It's the money chase, the money chase which is driving the illegal and improper conduct that is the subject of these hearings. The money chase in political campaigns is a serious disease which has become chronic. Most of us have been affected by it. Most of us have spent too much time fundraising, and in the process, pushing the fundraising rules to the limits. We know in our hearts that the money chase is a bipartisan problem, and that a bipartisan investigation into a number of aspects of it is the right way to go. Experience surely tells us that the only reform that we will achieve is a bipartisan reform. If these hearings get to illegal practices that would otherwise go unpunished, that would be useful indeed. If these hearings get to activities that, ", are currently allowed but which should not be, and if that arouses public opinion so that Congress will end the money hunt, that would be a major contribution to restoring health to the body politic. But if we just blow it out of town, rough up a few low-level rustlers and hustlers, point fingers at the other guy but never at ourselves, produce a summer spectacle for the country and the world but leave no solid record of legislative reform behind, we will be doing something far worse than missing an opportunity. We will be deepening public pessimism and thickening the public gloom about this democracy's ability to restore public confidence in the financing of our campaigns and our elections. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Levin. Senator Brownback. BROWNBACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I certainly want to start my comments by commending you for your tremendous leadership in bringing hearings on this very serious matter to the point where we are today. I think you've demonstrated extraordinary resolve and skill in your determination to make these hearings bipartisan, and to make them fair and thoughtful, as all of these have as much as possibly can. Mr. Chairman, today your committee undertakes a solemn constitutional responsibility of the Congress. BROWNBACK: This committee has been charged by the Congress and by the Senate with investigating illegal and improper activities in the 1996 election cycle, the most troubling of these being allegations against the current administration as relating to the conduct of foreign policy, the safeguarding of state secrets, and possible breaches of national security. Congress has a legitimate and appropriate role protecting the integrity of elections and in assuring a foreign policy conducted in the national interest. The most important questions before us deal with a convergence of these concerns. Therefore the fundamental question of these hearings is whether this administration faithfully executed its responsibility to protect the American national interest, or if that function was infiltrated and compromised. This issue overwhelms all others. ", Mr. Chairman, oversight is a critical part of any congressional work, but only rarely does it focus on issues of this magnitude. During this Congress, we will do what the American people sent us here to do. We'll work together to provide pro-job, pro-family tax relief, preserve and protect Medicare, and take common sense steps to make our streets safer, our schools better and our families stronger, and, yes as well, we will balance the budget. The current dispute regarding the matters under this committee's jurisdiction cannot be allowed to impede that agenda for American renewal. Similarly, Mr. Chairman, every senator has constructive ideas for how we can improve the political process through legislation. Hopefully, these hearings will provide the necessary impetus for enacting some of those improvements. They are certainly needed. However, our central focus must be the transgressions which may have compromised the interest of the United States, and even endangered American lives. The issue is American integrity. Politics is just the wrapping paper. More pointedly, was John Huang, or others, highly placed industrial spies? I'm delighted to hear the possibility of his testifying, and I look forward to reviewing that. I'm most concerned about allegations that certain campaign activities were not merely illegal or improper, but may have put political or personal gain ahead of the economic interest, foreign policy or national security of the United States. To me, these are without question the most serious allegations before us, and they deserve our intense focus. It is my hope that in these hearings we will find answers to the following questions: Were existing U.S. laws broken? Did foreign governments or foreign conglomerates infiltrate our political process with a scheme to influence

election for their own ends? What was the nature of this scheme? What were the foreign ties after? Were their efforts successful in whole or in part? Did high-ranking officials of the executive branch of our government give classified information to foreign governments or foreign corporations directly or indirectly? Was the foreign policy of the United States altered due to influence by illegal foreign campaign contributions? Were the lives of national security officers put in jeopardy by the leaking of classified government information? Was the integrity of the United States government compromised by the influence of illegal foreign campaign contributions? The confidence of the American people in our federal government has been shaken by these allegations. Only through a full and fair investigation of these charges can we restore the American people's confidence in our constitutional system. Mr. Chairman, the American people are watching. And we owe it to them to conduct ourselves in a non-partisan manner with the highest degree of civility, objectivity and integrity. BROWNBACK: That I hope will be the legacy of these hearings, Mr. Chairman. The American people are watching. Thank you very much, and I yield back the remaining portion of my time. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Brownback. Senator Lieberman. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, our committee has traveled a long road full of bumps and distractions to reach this hearing room today, and now we face an extraordinary challenge, opportunity and responsibility. The way here was not smooth because the subject of our investigation is not ordinary. We are here to investigate the political system in which we all live and to investigate as well many people who live there with us. There will be political consequences, some serious, from what we do and say and find here, and that naturally has caused anxiety, pressure, defensiveness and partisan bickering. The time for all that is over now. The chairman's gavel has fallen, and the nation is watching. More to the point, history is watching. Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn, fellow members of the committee, the challenge we face here is critically important to our country, and we must rise to it, because the way in which money is given and spent for political campaigns in America has gone so far out of control that it threatens the integrity and legitimacy of our government. We, members of this committee, may never in our lives have a better opportunity to strengthen our democracy than we have in this investigation and its concluding report. Our opportunity is to expose, what money has done to America's democracy. Our responsibility is to do so without regard to partisan loyalties or political consequences. Mr. Chairman, as we listen to the testimony of the witnesses that will come before us and as we question them, it is important to remember that we are neither prosecutors nor defense attorneys. It would be grossly inappropriate for us to act at these hearings as if we were. There are plenty of prosecutors at work and plenty of defense attorneys who have been hired. We must be what we are, senators selected by the people of four respective states, sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and to protect it from all enemies foreign and domestic. In these hearings, I am afraid, we will find evidence that you don't have to carry a military weapon to be a foreign or domestic enemy of the United States and its Constitution. All you need is a checkbook. We must be finders of fact and searchers for truth. And when we learn the truth, we must tell it to all who will listen so that the prosecutors will be better enabled to pursue past wrongdoers and the people will be emboldened to demand better protection in campaign laws from future wrongs. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we must be careful not to be overzealous, lest we risk allowing these to degenerate into a partisan witch hunt or a bipartisan headline hunt. With each witness we question, we must seek only the truth, no more and no less, and we must accept that truth and not try to force it improperly into any preconceived construct that any of us may bring to the table. Fact is that serious charges have been made against individuals, groups and even foreign governments. We must make sure that at the end of the day, we judge the truth of those charges on the content of the hard evidence offered during these hearings, not on mere inferences and innuendoes. LIEBERMAN: Time and the testimony will tell what crimes have been committed, but there is one thing I'm convinced will be clear from the evidence that will be presented in the two phases of our investigations. Our current campaign finance system, borne of misdeeds, exposed in similar hearings almost 25 years ago, as a system progressively in need of repair and reform in the years since then, finally broke down in 1996. The evidence will reveal that people in both of our major political parties were driven by an apparently unquenchable thirst for cash in a frantic race to exploit and

de in factor in spirit the very campaign laws that had been passed after Watergate to put a limit on political contributions and to clearly reveal the source of all those contributions. In the search for soft money, for example, political operatives of both parties pushed up the limits of what was acceptable for individuals or groups to give to campaigns--from thousands of dollars to tens of thousands of dollars to hundreds of thousands of dollars, as if they were bidding at Christie's auction of Princess Diana's clothing, except that what was for sale here was nothing less than the fabric of American democracy. What was compromised here was the fundamental promise of equality that our democracy makes--in this case, the equality of opportunity to influence our government that each one of us as Americans is promised by the Constitution. On one person, one vote. Surely, those who give hundreds of thousands have greater access and influence than the great majority of average Americans, who do not. And that majority of average Americans see this. They understand it. They're not fooled. It makes millions of them angry at their government, and millions more returned off by and to their government. Either response is a serious threat to the legitimacy and credibility of our democracy. Mr. Chairman, the harder and faster the parties and candidates ran after money in 1996, the less vigilant they became in protecting the process from those who sought to use political contributions for illegal or unethical ends. As fewer were asked of contributors, naturally the influence peddlers and the courtiers saw their opportunity, and they worked the system for their own gain. Too many people, domestic and foreign, sought and gained access to candidates and elected officials by the vice of their improper contributions rather than the virtue of their ideas. When standards slide and laws are not enforced, people's worst nature is always encouraged. Of course, not everyone involved in the 1996 federal elections went down the wrong road. In fact, most did not. But enough did to create the crisis we face and result in the hearings we begin today. ,`", In the first phase of these hearings, we will focus quite appropriately on the extent to which so-called foreign money from either governments or private hustlers or both may have entered the 1996 American federal elections. These are serious and consequential charges that may send people to jail and alter the course of America's relations with other countries. Those who have done wrong ought to be exposed and ought to be punished. LIEBERMAN: But Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not overlook the larger fact that these foreign corrupters, who thought they could purchase influence in American government, would not have been emboldened to try to buy if they did not believe there were those who were ready and willing to sell, if they did not think there was effectively a "For Sale" sign hung out on America's government. For that, it is Americans, not foreigners, who are profoundly guilty. Mr. Chairman, I know that this committee has gone to the four corners of the globe to find evidence of foreign infiltration of American politics. That is right, and it is proper. But in another sense, we already know where and who the enemy is. It is domestic. And it is us. It is a campaign finance law that we have allowed to atrophy and to be evaded, a law that no longer works, that no longer protects our government, its leaders or its people, its people whose apathy, anger and mistrust have been dangerously deepened by the misdeeds that will be described in these hearings. Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn, fellow members, if we carry out our responsibilities here honorably and well, these hearings will not only shed light on the truth of what happened in the 1996 federal elections, they will light a fire in the belly of the American people and in us, their elected representatives on Capitol Hill, and give us the courage and the capacity to set right what we know is wrong. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Lieberman. Senator Domenici. DOMENICI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Glenn and fellow senators. As I see it, history seldom marks its moments with precision. ,`", Yet these hearings are one of those moments. The issues we will address touch upon our nation's basic sovereignty. Our democratic system is, by the division of powers intrinsic to its structure, a public spectacle. That is by design. Walter Lippmann once said, "The great virtue of democracy, in fact, its supreme virtue, is that it supplies a method for dragging realities into the light, of summoning our ruler to declare themselves and submit to judgment." Supreme Court Justice Brandeis put it another way. "Sunlight is the best disinfectant," he said. If leaders are to instill public confidence in their decisions, they must have the trust of the people. And when questions emerge regarding the conduct of public officials awarded a public trust, the American people have a right to answers. That is why, as difficult as it may be, in the legi

slative branch, we have a constitutional duty to conduct this investigation. We are here to perform that duty and to engage in that responsibility. And I believe we must examine the events which took place during the last election and attempt to give the American people some answers to some very unsettling questions. Some would suggest the answers are simple, and we don't really need these hearings. We only need to reform the campaign laws of our land. And some, who have already talked with the American people here today on the other side of the aisle, would talk as if reform is what these hearings are all about. Well, reform may be needed. But reforming the law will not solve the problem if officials are already ignoring or violating those already on the books. And I'd like to take a moment to reference just a few existing laws on the books, because as this drama unfolds, I think we will continue to hearken back, at least in the first phase, what are the existing laws and who has violated them. DOMENICI: Let me cite one: Two U.S. Code, Section 441 -- and I quote -- "It's unlawful for a foreign national directly or through any other person to make a political contribution in a federal election." Also, it makes it illegal for a person to solicit, accept or receive a contribution from a foreign national. One other section, 441(f), the same part of the code, prohibits making a contribution in the name of another. That is, it prohibits money laundering and makes it illegal to knowingly accept such a contribution, laundering contribution. As part of the inquiry, we must seek to find out whether these laws were violated and if there are attempts made to purposely skirt these laws. Did the Democratic National Committee or the White House violate the prohibition against taking campaign money from foreign nationals and the prohibition against laundering foreign contributions through U.S. citizens and companies. The American people have a right to know and deserve answers regarding the mysterious activities of John Huang, Charlie Trie, Pauline Kanchanalak and Johnny Chung. Also, one further section, Section 18 USC, Section 607, makes it a crime for any person to solicit or receive a campaign contribution -- and I quote -- "in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by an officer or an employee of the United States." Seem to me a very clear and forthright statute. To me, we need explanations. Are we to excuse the executive branch fundraising activities that seem to fall in these categories? I am troubled that by what happened to have been a conscious effort to evade these statutes. As always I keep an open mind and listen with interest to the facts presented during this inquiry. But I will be looking for answers to some questions about our nation's security, the role of foreign corporations, foreign agents and foreign money in our electoral process and in the executive branch and its minions. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I'm the longest serving senator participating in these hearings. I came to Washington 25 years ago, and as soon as I arrived, the Watergate investigation of the executive branch was the issue before this brand new senator who had never been a legislator in his life. I was awed by the enormity and the importance of the issue raised by those hearings. But I was also impressed, Mr. Chairman and fellow senators, by the sense of constitutional duty and bipartisanism displayed by members of both sides of the aisle in those hearings. I raise this issue not to draw factual parallels between the hearings. Each congressional investigation is different. Whether this particular investigation will be of significance will depend upon the facts and how those facts are presented to the American people. But I hope we conduct this inquiry with the same sense of bipartisanism and constitutional duty that was present in the '70s hearings I just referred to. The American people have a right to know, and Congress has a constitutional responsibility to investigate whether the executive branch and the national parties and their committees were willing to place the pursuit of campaign money ahead of other concerns, including sovereignty and national security. The people of our country have the right to know and Congress has a constitutional responsibility to investigate whether the executive branch appointees, otherwise unqualified, but well-connected with rich and powerful interests, were placed in positions in government with access to classified information based solely on the amount of cash they could accumulate for the 1996 presidential election campaign. The people have a right to know and we have an obligation to investigate whether vital classified information was improperly obtained and leaked to foreign corporations and governments by these individuals. DOMENICI: The American people have a right to know and we have a responsibility to examine whether foreign nationals, some of them known criminals, were given access to the president of the United States at the White House and at fundraising events in exchange

for questionable campaign contributions. And the American people have a right to know and we have the highest duty to determine whether there was a concerted plan by foreign governmentsto infiltrate our electoral process. These are important issues, Mr. Chairman, and we need to make them clear. Some may want to change the focus of these hearings, but we are here to follow the facts wherever they lead, not to engage in an exercise in partisanship. The Watergate hearing showed us that a serious issue can be handled in a dignified impartial way. Collectively we should follow that example. Mr. Chairman, you have been steadfast in your willingness to look into the activities of both parties. You and your staff have done an tremendous amount of work in a short period of time to get us to the point where we can begin these hearings. Your job has not been an easy one, Mr. Chairman, and I commend you for the way you've conducted the business of the committee so far and look forward to the month to come when I'm sure you will continue to do the same. We have a constitutional duty to carry out during the next ,", several months. We should get on with our work in a fair and even-handed way, and let the facts speak for themselves. I start with the premise that senators on both sides of the aisle share this commitment. If we do, we will get our job done. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Domenici. Senator Akaka. AKA: Chairman Thompson, Senator Glenn, members of this committee, we have overcome tremendous odds to arrive at this moment. There are many issues for this committee to investigate: allegations of foreign money influencing federal campaigns, the use of federal facilities to raise money, dramatic increases in soft-money donations, unregulated independent expenditures and issue advocacy, and improper use of tax-exempt organizations. Initially, I feared that the aisle separating our two parties had engulfed our good judgment and clouded our vision. Recently, I was discouraged by the lack of cooperation, which was blocking my hope of a bipartisan investigation. I felt the cynicism held by the American people for the elected officials would only deepen without a full and open hearing. This committee was on its way to undermining the investigation and confirming the belief that Congress doesn't get it when it comes to reforming our campaign financial system. I sincerely hope that the expressions of goodwill and desire to conduct open and bipartisan hearings are not 20-second sound bites. The allegations of illegal and improper activities relating to the 1996 election cycle are serious. They touch Democrats and Republicans alike. And they threaten to undermine the integrity of our elections system. Mr. Chairman, I am, however, confident that we will conduct our inquiry in a bipartisan and fair manner which has been a hallmark of the Governmental Affairs Committee. Last Friday, our nation celebrated its Independence Day, marking America's break with England and its beginning as the world's greatest democracy. AKA: Our forefathers built this country on the premise of free and open elections. We do not need to be reminded that, although our ,", citizens are free to vote for whomever they wish, running for public office in the United States demands great financial resources. I am astonished that given the tremendous explosion in campaign expenditures, that anyone would oppose reforming our nation's campaign financial laws. And yet throughout the initial process of putting together this investigation, we had to contend with colleagues opposed to revising campaign financial laws. Although we are told that the only wrongdoing was on the part of the White House, let us not forget the Republicans, who raised far more money during the 1995-96 election cycle than the Democrats. There will be issues discussed, testimonies received and documents reviewed that will make the members of this committee uncomfortable, because we are investigating the system under which we were elected. We have a responsibility to closely review all allegations brought before this committee no matter how unimportant they may seem. It is our responsibility to scrutinize all allegations brought before this committee. However, without also reviewing the way we run our national elections and revamping our campaign financial laws, we will fail the American people. This investigation must make a good case for laying a foundation to improve our campaign financial laws. With less than 50 percent of voting age Americans going to the polls in the last election, so much is at stake. The public is cynical. And who can blame them? The deep distrust of this nation's elected officials by the voters will continue if the only thing that comes from these hearings is political rhetoric. We must set our goal, the enactment of substantive campaign financial reform legislation. And conversely, only when the American voters demand a change in the way we run elections, will those who oppose reform drop their objections. The strength of campaign fina

ncereformrests with the American people. And I am hopeful that these hearings will generate a quickened movement to enact legislation to stop some of the practices we are about to investigate. My expectations are high. And my belief in the American people is strong. We have an extraordinary opportunity to do our campaign, "Finance Law on a Bipartisan Basis." I also wish to affirm my belief that if this committee is seriously committed to investigating the breadth of allegations into abuses of federal election laws, we cannot be caught up in partisan posturing and name calling. Let us not tolerate assumptions made on the basis of an individual's race or ethnic background. I ask my colleagues to remember that the United States is a nation of immigrants. Let us take to heart the lessons of history when waves of Irish, Italian, German, Jewish and other immigrants were negatively stereotyped. We are not here to conduct a witch hunt. We must ignore the temptation to assign guilt by association, especially ethnic association. Other than indigenous peoples, American Indians, Alaskan natives, native Hawaiians, American Samoans and Chamorros from Guam and Northern Mariana Islands, the proud people who make up this country came from somewhere else. AKA: While I am three-quarters native Hawaiian, my great grandfather immigrated to the kingdom of Hawaii from China, which classifies me as a native Hawaiian-Chinese-American. But foremost, I am an American, like some of the individuals of non-European heritage who have come before us as witnesses. Mr. Chairman, I am seriously concerned with the negative impact of the allegations of fundraising abuses we have had on the Asian-Pacific American community. I do not have to remind my colleagues of the contributions Asian-Pacific Americans have made to our society. And yet, despite well-known contributions, Asian-Pacific Americans have been targeted and misrepresented from the moment the press saw a good story in the allegations of foreign contributions to the 1996 elections. When the news of possible fundraising abuses first broke last fall, the media was quick to toss around references -- Asian connections, Asian funds network, people with tenuous connections to this country -- phrases applied equally to people who are American citizens and non-citizens alike. Fortunately, the press has become more attuned to the distinctions between a U.S. citizen, a legal permanent resident and an "alien," Asian from another country, although one news magazine this week used the expression Asian-American network in a story on these investigations. It is this lack of distinction by both the media, members of Congress and the public that threaten to cast doubt on the integrity of Asian-Pacific Americans. Our country has a deep history of racial discrimination against U.S. citizens of Asian descent, naturalized citizens and their foreign-born relatives. And it would be a disservice to our democracy to fall prey to the evils of prejudice again. Asian-Pacific Americans have been singled out for joining together to support candidates of their choice during the last election cycle. Contributions made by persons with Asian or ethnic surnames have been scrutinized, and donors asked for bank records and verification of citizenship. We should be gravely concerned if foreign companies or countries have influenced our electoral process. I strongly condemn illegal fundraising activities. But I do not hold all Asian-Pacific Americans responsible for the alleged actions of a few. Asian-Pacific Americans should not be held to a higher standard than other citizens, nor should we believe that all Asian-Pacific American political contributions are suspect. We must not be guilty of selective harassment of those with Asian surnames. Such actions only underscore the Asian-Pacific American community's fear that they are being held responsible for the alleged transgressions of some individuals who happen to be of Asian heritage. With the majority of Americans choosing not to vote, let us not discourage Asian-Americans from participating in the development of public policy because they believe the system is against them. As we investigate the allegations of fundraising abuses, let us remember that bigotry, prejudice and discrimination are unacceptable to this committee. Let us also remember that the Asian-Pacific American community supports Republicans, Democrats and independents. There are allegations that the only reason why Asian-Pacific Americans participated in the last election was to influence U.S. immigration policies. Let me remind everyone that an unlikely alliance of high-tech companies, the Christian Coalition, Americans for Tax Reform, business groups, religious organizations and immigration rights groups joined forces to fight cuts in legal immigration. AKA: During last year's debate over the immigration bill, the elimination of most provisions dealing with legal immigration was not the result of a concerted effort by the Asian

-Pacific American community. It was the effort of a diverse coalition that included the most conservative and most liberal groups in this country. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I think that it is appropriate that I highlight the motto of our state, which was first pronounced in Kawaiaha'o Church, the Coral Church of Hawaii, by Kamehameha the Third. And he said, "Uamauke'ea, oka'a inaikapono," which means, the life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness. As we conduct these hearings, I think it behooves us to keep this in mind, particularly the concept of pono or righteousness. If we do this, I believe that the end of the day--at the end of the day, we shall have done what is right for our nation. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving me this time, and I look forward to these hearings and anticipate as spirited, informative time. Thank you. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Akaka. All very valid comments. We will be in recess for 10 minutes. (RECESS) THOMPSON: Senator Cochran. COCHRAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time you have set for these hearings in your opening statement. It was a commitment to fairness, thoroughness, common courtesy and respect for others. I hope we will all respond in a positive way to this challenge you have given our committee. We do have to acknowledge first that this investigation is a work in progress. Our efforts to learn the truth are ongoing. There are still documents to be reviewed, witnesses to be interviewed, depositions to be taken. So what the public will see and hear at this beginning point of the hearings is just a sampling of what we have learned so far. We also should acknowledge that we've had some disappointments. Some witnesses have disappeared; some documents have probably disappeared. Some witnesses have indicated that they'll take the Fifth Amendment. President Clinton has not called on his White House staff, the Democratic National Committee to cooperate in the search for the facts. This is also disappointing. It may contribute to an atmosphere that suggests it is OK to avoid discussing what really happened. One thing that we know happened in advance of the campaign last year was the development of a unique relationship between the purposes of these hearings and to help the Senate decide if the law should be changed to make it crystal clear to all what is legal and what is not. There also will be evidence produced at these hearings of a deliberate pattern of fraud with the Democratic National Committee about budgets, fundraising targets, personnel and methods to achieve political and campaign goals by using federal government resources. The line that usually is drawn between governing and party building was not only blurred by this administration, it was erased. Another finding that I believe these hearings will disclose is that there developed at the Clinton White House an aggressive plan to use the office of the president to raise an unprecedented amount of money, rewarding large donors with travel aboard Air Force One, overnight stays at the White House, and special briefings on administration policy plans. Some have suggested that these activities were not illegal. One of the purposes of these hearings is to help the Senate decide if the law should be changed to make it crystal clear to all what is legal and what is not. There also will be evidence produced at these hearings of a deliberate pattern of fundraising by a vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, John Huang, that involved contributions from persons and corporations that are prohibited by current law from making such contributions. Our first witness will be Richard Sullivan, who was the finance director at the Democratic National Committee. I expect he will help us understand how the fundraising operation was organized and how White House officials were involved in these activities. He will be able to confirm, for example, that Harold Ickes presided over the so-called weekly money meetings, most of which were held at the White House. He will also help us understand how John Huang came to be vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. After all the evidence is in, I hope the final result will be more sensitivity to and respect for the laws we have that govern our elections and a clearer understanding by the Senate of the need to improve and strengthen these laws to protect the electoral process, from abuse in the future. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Senator Cochran. Senator Durbin. DURBIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn. The specter of the Watergate hearing looms in the hall of Capitol Hill like Banquo's ghost, reminding us of that historic moment in the Senate's history, at times inflaming political memories, challenging us to equal its work. And I think it is a fact that every investigation since Watergate has been held to its standard. We have gathered an historic array of resources for this investigation. More taxpayer dollars will be spent on this 1997 committee investigation than any investigation in the history of the Senate. DURBIN: Four-point-three mi-

l lion this year, and clearly, as much or more next year or beyond. This committee has hired 70 staff, 50 attorneys. To put that in perspective, there are 30 attorneys working full time in the public integrity section of the U.S. Department of Justice. We have nine full-time FBI agents detailed to this committee. We have issued almost 200 subpoenas, and we have authorized extensive travel overseas in pursuit of our investigation. The men and women serving on this committee bring a wealth of personal and political experience to the assignment. Whether our ranks include another Sam Ervin or Howard Baker, we don't know. But there's every reason to believe that the wisdom of our political process will be vindicated again during the course of this investigation. But unfortunately, all of these resources notwithstanding, this committee investigation was launched under a dark cloud. Since our first organizational meeting (OFF-MIKE) for fairness and impartiality. In preparation for today's hearing, I took a look at the opening testimony of the first day of the Watergate hearings, May 17, 1973, and a quote from Senator Howard Baker that perhaps the chairman may be familiar with. He said he was skeptical about whether or not it could be a fair hearing. And then he said: "But any doubt that I might have had, about the fairness and impartiality of this investigation have been swept away during the last few weeks. Virtually every action taken by this committee since its inception has been taken with complete unanimity of purpose and procedure." The integrity and fairness of each member of this committee and its fine professional staff had been made manifest to me. And I know that it will be made manifest to the American people during the course of this proceeding. "This is not in any way a partisan undertaking," Senator Baker said. "But rather, it is a bipartisan search for the unvarnished truth." I regret that neither this senator nor many on this side of the aisle can make the same statement today. But I hope, even though we have been denied the opportunity to issue subpoenas that we think will bring about a fair presentation of the evidence, there is still hope. Even though subpoenas which we have issued against Republican sources have not been enforced, there is still hope. Even though the procedure of this committee still seems to be somewhat secretive as to where we are headed and who will be called as witnesses, there is still hope. And what was probably resolved between the chairman and Sam Dash over a cup of coffee 24 years ago has now been relegated to an avalanche of contentious e-mail between our staff attorneys. But there is still hope. It remains to be seen whether this sad state of affairs can or will be changed today or in the near future. We've missed an opportunity to date, but we can still rectify it. Mr. Chairman, I think it is curious, as we embark on this investigation, that we consider for a moment the subject of the investigation. If we asked American families nationwide the most important issues facing Congress, it is not likely that they would include in any list, five or 10, this issue of campaign finance reform and the integrity of campaign fundraising. And yet if we ask the same American people their opinion of us, members of the Senate, members of the House and Congress, we know that over the past 30 years it has disintegrated. It is very low, and, unfortunately, going lower. There are several facts that are before us that should give us pause. As we dream up more ingenious ways to raise money for our political campaigns, and more ingenious ways and scientific ways to spend it--through our polling and focus groups and our television, radio and direct mail, e-mail, you name it--there's a curious fact. The more money we spend on each election cycle, the fewer Americans vote. They are telling us--they are voting with their feet, and they are leaving the polling places. They are telling us they have no confidence in this process. At that same opening statement in the Watergate hearing 24 years ago, Senator Sam Ervin said at that hearing: "Our citizens do not know whom to believe. And many of them have concluded that all the processes of government have become so compromised that honest governance has been rendered impossible." I think we have an opportunity at this hearing to not only investigate wrongdoing--whether it's by Democrats, Republicans, foreigners or Americans--but also to initiate a real, true and honest reform of our campaign finance system. DURBIN: Someone on the other side has called this issue, quote, "a diversion," close quote. I don't think it's a diversion. I don't think it's inconsistent or impossible to consider both wrongdoing and reform. And Watergate taught us the lesson that out of the wrongdoing of that episode, we did initiate campaign finance reform. I hope that we can be inspired to do the same here. Let me speak for a moment about the Chinacard that has been played today and in preparation for this hearing. It's been described in a variety of ways in opening statements. I've heard the terms industri-

alspies. I heard from a colleague over the weekend the term foreign espionage, foreign infiltration of our political process. If this has occurred, it should be dealt with seriously. But I am troubled as much by what we are not investigating as what we are. Every press account of foreign effort to involve itself in our political process points to that involvement primarily at the congressional level. And yet this committee will not touch that issue. We will not even address this infiltration or alleged infiltration of foreign sources and foreign money into our own elections. , ", There have also been allegations of foreign money in state and local races. That is beyond our jurisdiction, not the sort of thing that we want to get into. And when you go to the matter of foreign involvement at the presidential level, it is sad to report that most of the activity, the discovery activity and investigation of this committee, has been directed primarily at the Democratic Party and President Clinton. I can assure you that all of the accounts that I have read, classified and unclassified, indicate that this foreign involvement was truly bipartisan. As critically important as the influence of foreign money is in our electoral process, I fear we will find politicians and monied interests playing this China card to avoid real reform. If China played no role in the last campaign, we would still have a serious national scandal in our campaign finances system. The problem is not just foreign money; it's good old American money. It's hard money, soft money and mystery money. When fundraising fever is raging, parties and candidates rationalize ways to raise money which they're embarrassed to admit after the election. And as we gingerly step through this political minefield, trying to pick and choose appropriate outrages, we ignore the big picture, which unfortunately includes the accusers as well as the accused. Real reform, comprehensive reform, is the only answer. And I must say quite honestly, despite all the lip service paid to this issue, there is no evidence in this session of Congress of any will by the majority to move the issue of campaign finance reform. The president challenged Congress in his State of the Union address to present a bill to him by the 4th of July, and it did not occur. To my knowledge, no bill has been set for here. So while we invest great amounts of time and money in the investigation of wrongdoing in campaigns, we put precious little, if anything, into the question of how to change the system and restore public confidence. I'm proud to be a member of the Senate. I am proud to represent the state of Illinois. Like every member of this panel, though, I will tell you that I am not proud of the political processes that we all had to endure to come here. If it is not corrupt, it is corrupting. , ", And it must be changed. And if this committee loses sight of that as its ultimate goal, I believe that we will only add to the cynicism of the American people. I hope, in the final analysis, these hearings will be constructive, not destructive. I hope they will help restore public confidence and reassure the American people that our system has integrity, and that any breaches of law, rules or national security interests, if they in fact occurred, are dealt with justly. Further, I hope we'll seek comprehensive campaign finance reform to reduce this endless chase for campaign funds. Only then can we honestly say that the awesome responsibility we have accepted as members of this important committee at this time in history has been fulfilled. DURBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Durbin. Senator Nickles. NICKLES: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I'll try and be fairly brief. Let me just make a couple of comments. One, I really hope that this hearing will be bipartisan. We are fulfilling one of our constitutional responsibilities by having oversight to find out whether or not the laws have been adhered to by Congress, by the administration. We have checks and balances in this government where actually we do have oversight over the law, and we are supposed to find out whether or not the laws have been broken. My colleagues have said--several colleagues have said, well, we need to really move this forward so we can change the laws and reform campaign laws. That may well be, but we have laws on the books, and we need to determine whether or not those laws have been complied with. And something's really wrong, Mr. Chairman, when we find out existing laws as interpreted not just by Republicans but also by Democrats. I looked at a memo that was given by Ab Mikva, counsel to the president, talking about what's legal and what's not legal in the White House. It's an excellent memo. It was very closely tailored to one that Boyden Gray had given during the Bush administration. I'm looking at the comments, what he says as far as what is legal, he says government buildings including the White House offices and meeting rooms should not be used for meetings or events organized , ", by campaign or political committee. It also says no fundraising

phone calls or mail may emanate from the White House or any other federal building. That's from the Democratic general counsel. Now I might mention this administration's had five general counsels, and maybe that's part of the problem. But this memo was written in April of '95. And it wasn't adhered to. And some colleagues have said, or kind of implied, well, both parties have kind of pushed the envelope. Maybe that's true, but I think in this case this administration in many, many cases, and some individuals leading to the highest individuals in the White House, have moved beyond pushing the envelope. Just give you an example. I think something's really wrong when you have an official, John Huang, who receives a top security clearance without a background investigation five months before he begins work at Commerce Department. I also find it really wrong when he keeps that security clearance for a year after he goes to the DNC. That's more than unusual. It's more than unusual to find that at this level of an employee would have, reportedly by one account, 146 classified briefings. At least over 100. That's a lot. It's more than unusual to find out that this individual had meetings in the White House at least 94 times, frequent access to the president of the United States. That's very unusual. That's more than pushing the envelope. It's more than pushing the envelope when you have the vice president attending a fundraiser at a tax-exempt Buddhist temple, and then not calling it a fundraiser, but clearly it was a fundraiser, and then when Buddhist monks and nuns who've taken a vow of poverty are given thousands of dollars to donate to the DNC following the fundraiser. In cases where someone doesn't realize it, the law covers this. The law prohibits any person from making a political contribution in the name of another person, section 441.f, or a foreign national make a political contribution, section 441.e. When President Clinton offers the White House Lincoln Bedroom for overnighters to 938 people who collectively contributed over \$10,000, million, many of which \$50 or \$100 thousand for those sleepovers, that's more than pushing the envelope. When he's asked how to energize major fundraisers, President Clinton wrote a memo--this is President Clinton's writing--"Ready to start the overnights right away. Give me the top-10 list back along with the \$100 thousand and the \$50 thousand list." Again, read the statute. Read Ab Mikva's memo. It is unlawful, quote, "for any person to solicit or receive any contribution in any room or building occupied by discharge of official duties." That's the statute. I think the statute is very clear. Some of our colleagues are talking about let's change the law. NICKLES: The law, as interpreted by White House general counsel and a clear interpretation of the statute, I look like more than the envelope has been pushed. It looks like the law has been violated. And I could go on and on. When DNC donors, former White House staff, coffee attendees and top fundraisers flee the country or they take the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination when asked about the source of donation or fundraising activity--a lot of the major players are fleeing. That's not cooperation. That's a mass exodus, in hope that maybe this hearing will blow over at the end of the year. Mr. Chairman, when you said originally that you didn't want to have a time limit, I see why. Now, I will tell my colleagues I was one that wanted a time limit. I wanted to divide it into this thing, do our work and be done with it. Get the facts out. Let the facts fall where they may be, Democrat or Republican. Let's find out who violated the law. Let's lay it out. Let's have the exposure and find out what happened. Let the chips fall where they might. But if several of the major players are either going to take the Fifth or they're going to flee the country, then that really brings into question the cooperation or maybe the interest of some people just to prolong it and hope that they'll be successful in installing this thing out. On the coffees--when you have 1,510 people attend 103 coffees at the White House, raising more than \$27 million, that's more than pushing the envelope, and again, seem to be directly contradictory to the memo and also to the statute. ,", When the coffee attendees come as representatives of groups that receive approximately \$30 billion in federal government contracts and over \$825 million in grants and loans from government entities, that looks to me like it may well be a violation of the law. Quote--"It's unlawful for any person to solicit any contribution from an entity with contracts with any federal government agency." That's Section 441.c. And Mr. Chairman, I could go on. When Pauline Kanchanalak visits the White House over 26 times with 10 meetings with President Clinton and is allowed to bring in three foreign business clients who invest heavily into China into the White House for coffee with the president in exchange for \$85,000 that was not even her own money--Ms. Kanchanalak apparently left the country after congressional subpoena

were issued. Federal law prohibits any person from making political contribution in the name of another person. That's laundering money. And again, have we had any cooperation concerning where abouts or participation in submitting information or testifying before this committee? And I could go on. When a convicted drug dealer, Mr. Cabrera, contributes \$20,000 to the DNC and gets invited to the White House Christmas party with the Clintons and attends a dinner in Miami with Vice President Gore--and I could go on and on. Mr. Chairman, we talk about security briefings; and you talk about the lack of security; or you talk about drug dealers; or you talk about Mr. Tamraz, who had an outstanding international arrest warrant for allegedly embezzling \$200 million from a Lebanese bank--and he's advised by the National Security Council not to meet with President Clinton, but yet he has that meeting--he has access to the White House, and he donates \$50,000 and then \$100,000 to the DNC, you said what went wrong. How could that happen? And then you find out that there's an ex-barbouncer, Craig Livingstone, who is placed in charge of White House security. And then you find out that he has access to over 900 confidential FBI files, almost all on Republicans, you say what went wrong. That's against the law. How could that be? How could that happen? When you have the FBI agents who are working with the White House, Mr. Aldrich and Mr. Sculimbrene, who were basically forced out, forced out of service with the FBI, the Secret Service is curtailed. It leaves the administration without any security procedures to prevent, felons and international arms dealers from attending White House events. It shows you there's a real breakdown. A real breakdown. When you have the associate attorney general, Webb Hubbell, who's convicted of bilking his clients out of thousands of dollars, and then you find out that he received \$100,000 from Lippo Group, after he leaves the administration. NICKLES: So there's a lot of interconnecting here, Mr. Chairman. I think we need to get the facts out. And we need to get the facts out in a fair and impartial manner, and in an informative way not to crucify or not to prosecute, but just to get the facts out. Just to let people find out what happened. And I'm all for changing the law. I've heard some colleagues say well, maybe we need to move to the second phase and go into campaign reform. This is not actually the committee that does campaign reform. That happens to fall on the Rules committee and some of us serve on both committees. But we're happy to work on campaign reform. But I think first we have to find out existing law--has it been broken? And I've heard several people say well, no laws have been broken. It looks to me--and I've looked at several. I quoted a half a dozen, I could quote many more, laws that look very clear, look very plain, look to be broken. I hope this committee will dwell into that, examine what happened, try and find out what's wrong and then move to work to make sure that it doesn't happen again. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Nickles. Senator Torricelli. TORRICELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, not wanting to be the first person to speak before this committee and mislead in any way, I will not promise to be brief. I do, however, choose to begin my own participation, as many other members of the committee have, by citing that first day in what is still the standard for this institution and the hearing process, when Senator Sam Ervin brought down the gavel in the Watergate hearings. I do so because I believe his words are instructive as a standard, a warning and an admonition. He said, and I quote: "The Congressional investigation can be an instrument of freedom, or it can be freedom's scourge. A legislative enquiry can serve as a tool to pry open the barriers that hide government corruption. It can be a catalyst that spurs Congress and the public to support vital reforms in our nation's laws. Or it can debase our principles, invade the privacy of our citizens, and provide a platform for demagogues and the rankest partisans." Mr. Chairman, Senator Ervin on that day, and later Senator Inouye in the Iran-Contra hearings, set a standard that should be remembered by every member of this committee. They were fair, they were bipartisan, they were substantive and they remained true to their objective. The Senate has also had moments that do not provide opportunity for equal pride. Senator McCarthy's investigation into the Army and the State Department and later, indeed, Whitewater itself. Investigations that proved unnecessary distractions, more forums for personal ambition than meeting the legitimate goals of the institution or the country. These are the historic extremes that represent the choice before this committee. I, like other members of this committee, have had our moments of discouragement as we prepared for this day. Perhaps there's reason for some new optimism. Promise that at long last Republican-affiliated organizations will receive subpoenas; promise that

hat when these initial hearings conclude in a few weeks the National Policy Forum will at last be held to answer for its own foreign connections and sources of contributions. We'll see. Mr. Chairman, if it is, however, established that a suspect by you and other members of the committee that the Chinese government contributed funds to the Democratic or Republican National Parties, if the policy influence of this country and our interests were compromised, I begin this hearing by simply suggesting to my colleagues this is a problem that we Americans in some measure brought upon ourselves. The American campaign finance system has been an accident waiting to happen. TORRICELLI: Our system of campaign finance is an invitation to any interest with a desire to compromise the policy of the United States, and to use money as a lever of power. We are not the first generation of Americans to face a declining public confidence in our system of government and the abuse of the electoral process. From the abuse of the patronage system in the 19th century to the secret accumulation of contributions in Watergate, " " , United States history has been a cycle of reform and abuse, as the political system adjusts to change in the political culture. Now that burden of change arises again. And the responsibility rests with this Congress. No less than in the 19th century, from Andrew through to the reforms of Teddy Roosevelt and Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, we have a new problem of changing the culture of how American finances its campaigns. There is simply one startling difference. One stark contrast. Each and every other generation of Americans recognizes the problems, and their Congress convenes to legislate a solution. The silence in this Congress to this new problem of campaign finance has been deafening. As the committee meets, President Clinton's goal of a July 4th deadline for the Congress to consider and pass campaign finance reform has passed. It is not unusual for congressional deadlines not to be met in passing legislation. But what is more extraordinary is not simply that the date passed without enactment of reform, but no bill has been considered. No date has been established. Indeed, there is no realistic prospect of campaign finance reform this year. We may, indeed, in the coming days and weeks learn much about the campaign finance system that requires change. I have no doubt we will. But which member of the Senate today could not offer their own testimony about problems that we already know to exist and their prescription for change? My worst fear, as this committee convenes, to begin its own hearings, is that our work, no matter how well-intentioned by some, becomes nothing more than another excuse by many to delay consideration of fundamental reform of the system. Mr. Chairman, a century ago, Speaker Reed noted that there is no intellectual argument so persuasive as the possession of a majority of votes on a committee. The majority of this committee has voted to subpoena the AFL-CIO because of concerns of the coordination of soft money expenditures, but shielded the Christian Coalition, the National Rifle Association and a variety of other organizations suspected of the same activities from subpoena or any scrutiny. The majority has voted to subpoena the Democratic National Committee and allowed the Republican National Committee to respond " , " , with utter contempt to attempts by this Senate and this committee to inquire into its own activities, and to those of the National Policy Forum. And there appears to be no intention and little willingness to explore what, in my judgment, was the single greatest change in the political culture of the 1996 elections. Which was the use of non-profit, tax-free organizations, a model of which was created by Speaker Gingrich, but duplicated by presidential campaigns and , indeed, by many members of Congress. TORRICELLI: It appears to be receiving no interest nor scrutiny in this committee's activities. We have, Mr. Chairman, left the impression that there is a partisan problem financing campaigns in the United States. Despite the fact that it is now established that the National Policy Forum and the Republican National Committee are the largest established recipients of foreign contributions. There is, Mr. Chairman, no partisan problem with campaign finance in the United States. There is an American problem. And it is an overwhelming problem. We have as well, Mr. Chairman, convinced the American people that this is principally a problem of the executive branch of government with its relationships with foreign governments. Although as hearing follows hearings and month follows month, I believe it will be established that the principal problems of foreign money may more properly reside with the Congress and the objectives of certain foreign governments to influence this government may be more centered on the operation of this Congress. And indeed now we are told today that the Clinton administration, facing the prospect of these hearings, has not been cooperative,

testimony has been withheld. Although the record could not be further from the truth. The president's principal aides have all been subjected to hours if not days of testimony and a quarter of a million pages of documents have been provided to the committee. Mr. Chairman, I hold no bribe for anyone. There are no heroes and many victims of this system. The need is to follow the truth wherever the truth might lead. I do however, finally, want to assume my responsibility that I know other members of the committee rightfully feel as well. Forty years ago, another chairman of a congressional committee, a senator also from the state of Tennessee, convened a inquiry into wrongdoing in our country. It is among the first memories I have of government in the United States, and probably the first hearing of the United States Senate I ever witnessed. It was only on a flickering television screen, but I will never forget it, and even if I tried, my family would never allow me. It was Estes Kefauver. He left the American people with the unmistakable impression that because of the misdeeds of a few individuals, there was a general problem of the role of Italian Americans in the commerce of this country. The pain, Mr. Chairman, that many Americans felt on that day must not and will not be allowed to be visited upon Asian Americans in the coming weeks. There is a rising prosperity, awareness, and interest of Asian Americans in the political prospects of this country. It is in the best tradition of the United States that Asian Americans of long ancestry or recent arrival in the United States are taking their rightful place in participating in the governance of this country. If there was a problem with a few, it is not the problem of the many. The fact that a few individuals can be provided for testimony cannot be allowed to become an excuse to victimize the role of Asian Americans generally in this society. TORRICELLI: I trust all of us will begin this hearing with that in mind. Finally, Mr. Chairman, while there is much to discourage the American people as they listen to this testimony in the coming days about our political process, there's also something that we need to remind ourselves. In only a few years, when the 20th century ends, there will only be two nations that continue under the same basic system of laws and governance with which they began the 20th century. The United States is one of them. Our capacity for both self-criticism and change is a reason for our enduring system of government. There is much wrong with the political system of the United States. There is also much that is right. And it is the principal reason why our system of free government endures. We may discover many problems with the Clinton campaign and how Bill Clinton sought re-election. But this fact also remains. Bill Clinton is the first president in American history who received the contribution of over one million Americans who believed in his campaign, his promise and his governance. He also received the volunteers support of millions of Americans, who have also believed in him and his campaign. Those few individuals who, unfortunately and even tragically, participated in this system, much to the embarrassment of that campaign and our country, and when no doubt also did the same in congressional campaigns, the Dole campaign and other political operations, cannot be seen to detract in any way compromise those millions of Americans who believed in their country, their president and followed their belief into an active involvement. Good people are still inspired to serve and participate in the greatest participatory democracy in history. In that, through all the days to follow, we should all take great pride. We are neither the first nor the last Congress of the United States that will deal with the problem of money and political campaigns. Every generation has had this responsibility to ensure the integrity of our system of government, while also encouraging participation and dealing with the reality of the need to finance the national political debate. I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to participation in these hearings. I trust they will be fair and informative and instructive. But mostly, a prelude to this Congress meeting our generational responsibility to legislate reform and change in this system that will ensure its highest integrity and the confidence of the American people. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Torricelli. Senator Specter. SPECTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Opening statements are always difficult. And I think today has been no exception. And we're anxious, in the words of the Olympians, to let the games begin. But I do believe that there has been a foundation laid from which this committee can move very usefully. My sense is that the contentions have been worked out about the subpoenas. And there will be full opportunity for Democrats as well as Republicans to have subpoenas issued. And that the various groups will be treated evenly. And that if you take the groups mentioned, that there will be fair treatment

on all sides. And to the extent that that has not been accomplished, I think it can be accomplished in fairly short order. I do believe also that where there is concern about congressional matters not being heard, that this committee will, in due course, take those matters up. They are within our purview. And where we talk about some state and local matters, the Congress has authority to deal there, and perhaps we will. SPECTER: We'd have to broaden our mandate, but that is possible. And I think it is highly significant that some of those who spoke in terms of shortening this committee's work are now talking in terms of elongating this committee's work, whereas others have left the jurisdiction or have taken their privilege against self-incrimination so that we have our work cut out for us. And as I hear the statements today, I am personally optimistic that this committee will follow the Teapot Dome hearings of the '20s and the Truman procurement hearings and the McClellan hearings and other hearings and do a real job. And I believe that we will not have campaign finance reform in America until the American people demand it. And there is the potential in this committee to create that demand, and that is the job which we have before us. I had planned to take most of my time, and still will to some extent, to discuss a couple of the factual matters. And at the outset, I think it is important to note that there are important investigations on soft money for Republicans as well as Democrats. And the National Policy Forum has been mentioned repeatedly heretoday, and I concur with the Democrats that that has to be gotten into. And I think it is important to note that the chairman rejected an effort by the National Policy Forum to limit the scope away from 1994 and issued an order, as it is his prerogative, to include that. ", When we talk about the problems, I think it is understandable that there would be more on the Democrats' side because the Democrats have controlled the White House. I have a chart which had been presented for putting on the screen, and when it was put on the screen, it was virtually unintelligible. So I've had a blow-up of it made. And this chart is a depiction of a series of financial transactions on the Kanchanalak family, whose leader was Pauline Kanchanalak, Mrs. Pauline Kanchanalak, who has evaded process and is now in--well, you couldn't hear me. It didn't matter if I didn't know where she is now. (LAUGHTER) Where is she, Michael? In Thailand. And this chart shows a--this chart shows a tracing of some \$457,500 with money starting from Chong Poon (ph) Kanchanalak, who is Pauline Kanchanalak's husband, going through mothers-in-laws and sister-in-laws and ending up in the Democratic National Committee or in a goodly number of state committees. SPECTER: In the course of the hearings, this will be analyzed in some greater detail. But it is illustrative of a complex jigsaw puzzle that we have to work with there. The participation of Mr. John Huang is a very important participation. And we had a number of discussions about how the committees should treat Mr. Huang. And today's hearing has been interesting, because in the last 24 hours, we found some important matters. As the chairman, Senator Thompson, has outlined--and this was only concluded late yesterday--that we were able to make a presentation of the involvement by the government of China at the highest levels in seeking to influence the American political process. And in the spirit of healthy competition, we had an interesting disclosure by Senator Glenn, the ranking member, about the possibility of having immunity for Mr. Huang. Nothing like a little good, healthy competition between the parties here. And I think if we keep it in ", the right spirit, we can move ahead. And the proposed immunity grant to Mr. Huang is really fascinating, for many reasons. He had at least 37 briefings by the CIA. And he saw a number of documents which they can't even tell us, which raises a real question about our super spies--don't even know what they have done. And they can tell us only as to 15 documents where he made comments. And I reviewed those. And they are highly sensitive. They deal in sources and methods. They are matters we would not tell the Brits, who are our closest allies; and yet the CIA made those available to Mr. John Huang. And shortly after he saw those, he went to an outside office and made faxes and made telephone calls and visited the Chinese Embassy, with all the earmarks of disclosure of highly sensitive governmental information, which is espionage. And it carries a life sentence, and in some cases, it could carry the death penalty. I don't know if that's applicable here. We'd have to see. When Mr. Huang talks about immunity only as to a couple of charges, it is a fascinating proposal, because the history has been that once there is immunity even to a limited extent, it works out to be complete immunity. US immunity is supposed to be only for the testimony given. But it frequently turns out, without being unduly complicated, a transactional immunity. And from the cases involving Admiral Po

indexer and Colonel North, we know that once the immunity starts, the criminal cases are gone. But my own personal view is that it is worth immunizing Mr. Huang, providing he tells us the truth and the whole truth. It has not been said today, but it ought to be emphasized, that a congressional committee takes priority over criminal prosecutions, because the public policy is that what we do as a congressional committee is more important than an individual criminal prosecution, because we change the laws for the future, so that when we deal with immunity, it has to be granted by the court, and the attorney general can raise an objection. But I, for one, would be willing to give Mr. Huang immunity, "because he is a very central figure. He brought Mrs. Pauline Kanchanalak to the White House. He brought many people to the White House. And only one of the specific matters--and that involves Wang Jun, which is worth noting, a major dealer in Chinese arms--AK-47s smuggled into the United States, sale of arms to Iran and Iraq, admitted to the White House as a coffee for a campaign contribution of \$50,000, the president himself flatly conceding that it was totally inappropriate. There is a great deal more to be said, but I'm about to the end of the 10 minutes, which, I think, is as long as any opening statement ought to be. But I approach these hearings with optimism that we can work out the issues on a fair and bipartisan basis, and that we can use a head into the soft money. One other item I do want to mention, and that is, it is phase II, but just for a moment. The kind of fads which were put again by both parties, and the issue is clear that if you have an advocacy ad which is coordinated, it violates the federal election law--and that is language taken as a whole that can have no other reasonable meaning than to urge the election or defeat of a clearly identified federal candidate. SPECTER: There is a great deal more to be said, but I'm about to the end of the 10 minutes, which I think, is as long as any opening statement ought to be. But I approach these hearings with optimism that we can work out the issues on a fair, bipartisan basis, and that we can use a head into the soft money. One other item I do want to mention, and that is, it is phase II, but just for a moment--the kind of fads which were put again by both parties. And the issue is clear that if you have an advocacy ad which is coordinated, it violates the federal election law--and that is language taken as a whole that can have no other reasonable meaning than to urge the election or defeat of a clearly identified federal candidate. And this is one which is illustrative of the Democrats. But there are Republicans similar. And this is an ad which, according not only to Dick Morris, but also Leon Panetta, but type of an ad which was edited personally by the president. Quote--"Sixty-thousand furlongs and fugitives tried to buy " , " , hand guns, but couldn't, because President Clinton passed the Brady Bill. Five-day waits, background checks." But Dole and Gingrich said no. One hundred thousand new police, because President Clinton delivered. Dole and Gingrich voted no, want to repeal them. Strengthen anti-drug programs. President Clinton did it. Dole and Gingrich, no way. "The old ways don't work. President Clinton's plan, the new way, meeting our challenges, protecting our values." Hard to see how any interpretation of that television commercial could be construed to be anything but an advocacy of the election of President Clinton--re-election--and the defeat of Senator Dole. And that is the second part of four challenges on soft money. And I believe this committee will rise to the occasion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Specter. Senator Cleland. CLELAND: Mr. Chairman, Senator Glenn, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I guess it's a bad time to quote Confucius... (LAUGHTER)...but Confucius 2,500 years ago had an interesting saying that I think bears on our business as we conduct these hearings. Confucius said that a great nation needed three things: first of all, a strong defense; secondly, a vigorous economy; and third, faith of people in their government. He said you could probably have a great nation, maybe without a strong defense. You could maybe even have one without a vigorous economy. But you cannot have a great nation without faith of people in their government. I think that's the ultimate goal of four hearings. It's not just to examine the people and situations through this investigation, or even pass campaign finance reform--laws of which I am a co-sponsor--but to restore some confidence and some faith of people in their government to make sure that we continue as a great nation. I believe in this system. I've served this government. I'd " , " , serve it again. My first act as United States senator was actually to take an oath that said I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose

se of evasion; that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I'm about to enter, so help me God. That was my act as a member of the Senate. One of the reasons I wanted to be on this committee, though, was what happened before I became a member of the Senate, in the campaign, where I was outspent two-to-three-to-one. And I realized I was up against the odds. In the days and weeks ahead, in our conduct of this serious investigation into alleged improper and illegal activities connected with the 1996 campaigns for federal office, the faithfulness of members of this committee to the oath I've just stated will be sorely tested. For in addition to the individuals and organizations we'll be examining, we, too, are on trial before the American people. As a new member of the Senate, I've become impressed with the seriousness of purpose and the competence of my colleagues on this committee and our staffs. The challenges for us are indeed serious and severe, because we sit, in essence, as prosecution, defense, judge and jury. We're all interested parties. And all a part of the very system which we're now investigating. The entire web of alleged abuses, which are the subject of this investigation grow out of one, and only one, prime factor--the relentless, unrelenting, unending, unforgiving pursuit of campaign dollars. Back in Georgia, we had a governor, Governor Marvin Griffin (ph), he used to say about raising political money, the only thing tainted about money is it's tainted mine and it's tainted enough. (LAUGHTER) Unfortunately, that attitude predominates all too often. To be sure, there are numerous variations in terms of sources and uses of money in politics, including the very serious matter of foreign influence. But the campaign chase for dollars is at the heart of these allegations. It's one of the most serious problems we face as a country in conducting this American experiment in democracy. I suggest to my colleagues that this is the central issue with which this investigation and this committee must come to grips. The distinguished chairman and the senator from Maine have joined with me and other members of the Senate as co-sponsors of the bipartisan McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. CLEVELAND: I truly believe that had that bill or something like it been in place in 1996, we wouldn't be sitting here today. And I say to all the members of this committee that, if we don't help through our actions here, build a fire to enact such reforms in this Congress, regardless of what we're able to uncover here, we will have failed in our larger mission of ensuring the American public that such abuses will not occur again. Part of this reform effort must be an examination of issues related to certain tax-exempt and non-profit organizations. These entities will not be part of the initial round of our investigation, but will be a focal point of phase II, which is to begin later. Nonetheless, I believe it's important that we note in the beginning of our work that the scope of our inquiry into campaign finance issues we must confront goes well beyond the matter of foreign money and influence. For example, a February 22nd report in Congressional Quarterly stated--and I quote--"Tax-exempt organizations are emerging as a potent weapon in the political arms race to amass an arsenal of campaign donations. While the vast majority of tax-exempt organizations promote causes such as sheltering the homeless or assisting the disabled, some money-hungry campaigns have used them to skirt campaign finance laws. When abused, tax-exempt organizations become little more than a shell or conduit for money to flow in and out of a politician's campaign." Unquote. The article goes on and continues, and puts the question of soft money and potential tax-exempt non-profit abuses into perspective. Quote--"The latest figures filed at the FEC show that party committees raised a combined total of \$264 million in soft money in 1996. That's three times as much as was raised by them in 1992 and 13 times what they raised in 1980, the first election to allow soft money. But at least that money can be tallied. No one knows how much money was raised by the over 600,000 tax-exempt groups in the 501(c)(3) category, and the almost 140,000 tax-exempt groups in the 501(c)(4) class, because the FEC does not track it and the IRS does not disclose it." Unquote. Let me make very clear the vast, vast majority of these--hundreds of thousands of groups--are not implicated in any way in these charges. And indeed, the tax-exempt and non-profit world plays a vital and positive role in our country. But for a small portion, there is at least some reason to believe that they may have engaged in improper or even illegal campaign-related activity. Among the questions which must be answered are the following: "Did the organization in question engage in partisan activity in violation of laws prohibiting both 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations from conferring any private benefits, including benefits for a single political party? Did the orga-

nization exceed legal limits on non-partisan campaign activity, which is the case in the case of 501(c)(3) organizations prohibiting participating directly or indirectly in any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate"--end of quote--"for federal, state or local office, and in the case of 501(c)(4) groups, prohibit these entities from engaging in non-partisan campaign activity as their primary activity?" Another question--did the organization make any false statements or omit material information in its application to obtain tax-exempt status? Did the organization receive and spend money in the amount of \$1,000 or more to influence a federal election while failing to register as a political committee? Did any of the organization's advertisements, voter guides, direct mail or telephone calls in excess of \$1,000 contain express advocacy, which under the law must be reported to the FEC and raise in accordance with so-called hard-money requirements? Another question--did any of the organization's advertisements contain candidate advocacy which violated the spirit, if not the letter, of federal election law pertaining to issue advocacy? ", Did the organization use foreign money to finance campaign activities, which would be illegal? These are important questions, because as our oath of office indicates, danger to our republic and its system may emanate from domestic, as well as foreign, sources. I look forward to a full airing of these matters as we continue. There have been many fine words spoken today about our commitment to fairness, to bipartisanship, to pursuit of the truth. There have been some serious charges made about abuses which may have compromised our national security. Words are important in setting out our preconceptions, goals and intentions. But the public and history will judge us primarily on our deeds over the next coming months. CLELAND: And they will judge us not only over how well we pursue and expose individual cases of wrongdoing, but also, I would suggest, they'll judge us even more on whether or not we help lead the way in fixing a campaign finances system which has gotten out of control, as these hearings will so clearly demonstrate. In the words of W.C. Fields, "It's time to take the bull by the tail and face the situation." (LAUGHTER) It is time to face the situation that our system is broken and must be fixed. It's time to face the situation that our democracy is becoming an auction rather than an election. It's time to face the situation that those who spend the most money win over 90 percent of the time. It's time to face the situation that at we place a "For Sale" sign on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. It's time to face the situation that more often than not, special interests, particularly on the Hill, predominate over public interest. We have the best government money can buy. But that is not what Jefferson and Franklin and Adams and Madison and the other founding fathers intended when they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in creating this country. Let us renew that pledge today. Let us pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor toward improving this democratic system for which so many young Americans have given their lives. ", Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Cleland. Senator Smith. SMITH: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm the 15th of 16 senators to give the opening statement here. It reminds me of the gentle man whom I married a woman who had eight previous husbands. I know what I need to do, but I've got to figure out how to make it interesting. But I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership in this matter to get us to where we are today. You've been subjected to some personal attacks, and you've held up under some pretty intense fire, kept your composure, and I commend you for your leadership. The matters before this committee are very, very serious. Never before in the 211-year-old history of our nation have allegations this serious about the role of foreign influence on an American election been raised. Did a foreign government deliberately scheme to manipulate large sums of its money into a U.S. presidential campaign and some congressional campaign in order to influence the outcome of those campaigns? Did foreign contributions to U.S. political campaigns result in policy changes favoring the giver? Was foreign policy compromised? Did an agent of a foreign government and/or a foreign multinational corporate conglomerate use campaign fundraising connections to infiltrate the executive branch of our government, gain access to our government's most sensitive secrets, and then conduct espionage for its foreign bosses? Did such a foreign agent infiltrate the highest levels of our nation's two principal political parties in order to help funnel one of the two of our top political parties in order to funnel his foreign boss' money into our political system? If these things happened--and we don't know that they have--then how and why did the responsible officials of our government

fail to prevent them from happening? Who are those responsible? Or perhaps it might be better aid, who are those that were irresponsible? Are they guilty of benign neglect? Or are they guilty of conspiracy to undermine our national security? These are dark questions, Mr. Chairman, and they demand clear answers. It's the urgent priority of these hearings to get those answers. As this committee begins what I hope will be bipartisan hearings, our investigation faces a number of very serious obstacles--many have been alluded to here in previous statements--obstacles that are going to make the truth very, very difficult to attain. We have key witnesses who have notified the committee that they will assert their Fifth Amendment privileges against self-incrimination and refuse to testify or perhaps place limits or conditions on how they testify regarding what they know about the truth of the allegations before us. SMITH: We have key witnesses who have fled the country and are hiding out overseas, ironically some of them in China, because they do not want to come before us and tell the truth. Mr. Chairman, I couldn't help but think of President Harry Truman as I prepared for these hearings today. He had this insight that everybody new about on his desk, "The Buck Stops Here." And I'm hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that we'll see some of President Truman's spirit, dignity, grit and personal responsibility in the current White House's approach to these hearings. President Clinton knows John Huang. He knows him personally. He knows that Huang is asserting his Fifth Amendment rights in refusing to testify. President Clinton has known Charlie Trie of Little Rock as a friend for 20 years. Trie is hiding out in China so that he too can avoid testifying. I wonder what President Truman would have to say about all this were he to be here under these circumstances. It's only subject to conjecture, but frankly I believe he'd get on the phone and I think he'd say to John Huang whoseerved in the administration and who worked as a senior level Democrat National Committee adviser, I think Truman would say get you rear end before this committee, Mr. Huang, and tell the American people the truth. I believe that President Truman would tell Charlie Trie, come out of hiding. Come home. Step up to the plate. Tell the truth. You're an American citizen. And your country deserves to know the truth. You have brought embarrassment to the presidency, to the country, and to me personally. I would like to think, Mr. Chairman, that President Clinton, in fact, has done or will be doing these very things. If he has, then I hope that he will tell this committee about it so that we can be satisfied that everything possible is being done to secure the testimony of Mr. Huang, Mr. Trie, and anyone else that we need to talk to to learn the truth. Of course, you cannot force people to testify. You can't do that, Mr. President, but you can make the attempt. To do less, anything less, is to further exacerbate the blight on the presidency, on our presidency, that now exists. Mr. Huang, Mr. Trie, and many of the others mentioned here worked for you. They embarrassed you. They let you down. Harry Truman would say, give 'em hell. In order to get these answers, Mr. Chairman, we must leave our partisan hats at the door. The cynics, the Congress-bashers, and many in the media will play up all the partisan bickering--every word of it. Yes, the Congress happens to be controlled by Republicans. And yes, the executive branch happens to be controlled by Democrats. And yes, the Republican-controlled Congress is investigating allegations of wrongdoing in a Democrat administration. But if these allegations are proven correct, the perpetrators bring discredit upon our nation, our presidency, and a major political party. They violated a trust that was given to them, and they're not worthy of defense by honorable people in their party. The people who did these things are not Democrats. They're a disgrace. Now some in the media on this committee have said that everybody does this. A pox on all of your houses. We should look equally at both parties. In fact, the media and some in the other party scurried around frantically trying to find some scandal, some similar scandal that might in some way deflect the criticism of this administration. And they found one with the National Policy Forum and we'll have to see if the facts support the contention that it is equally as serious. And we're willing to look at it, and I am willing to look at it, and I will look at it. But that's not what this investigation is about, Mr. Chairman. And it's ludicrous to imply that it is. When Sam Ervin, who's been mentioned here today, led the Watergate investigation, Howard Baker didn't try to go find a Democrat scandal so that he could force equal attention. He joined the investigation, Senator Baker did, and the truth about a Republican president was the result. I'm currently the chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee--a different perspective that I bring to this committee. If we receive allegations of wrongdoing by a Repu-

blican senator in that committee, we don't put off investigating those charges until we find a Democrat senator with similar problems. The ethics committee of three Republicans and three Democrats looks into the matter and on a bipartisan basis, and reaches its conclusions based on the facts of the case and that particular senator. Mr. Chairman, it's true that the scope of this investigation includes not only the allegations of illegal foreign contributions to the DNC, and possible economic espionage, but also possible foreign contribution entering the Republican Party, and how soft-money contributions are impacting U.S. elections. SMITH: But to place soft-money reforms on the same plane as the very serious allegation of foreign contributions and influence that has been discussed here today is an insult to the intelligence of the American people, and those people who put it on that same plane know it. Mr. Chairman, I want to add one final personal reflection. I used to be a civic teacher in the public schools of New Hampshire. I used to teach my students about how the framers designed our constitutional system and how our modern day government is intended to work. I taught them that things will go wrong from time to time, but it's not the system that's at fault. People make mistakes. They make mistakes of judgment, and sometimes they engage in deliberate wrongdoing. But I tried to instill in my students a faith in our system and a desire to participate in it as honest and patriotic young men and women. And when things do go wrong, don't turn off. This is a time that we need you more than ever. What particularly saddens me, Mr. Chairman, about the obstacles that this committee faces is that those obstacles are sending exactly the wrong signal to those young people, and indeed, all of the , " , American people. When the most serious allegations are made and the people who know the truth flee, hide or take the Fifth to avoid telling the truth, that just feeds the cynicism that is so evident in this country. It especially saddens me that is also turning off those very young people that I taught. All Americans have a right to expect that people who serve in positions of trust in this government should tell the truth. The obstacles that this committee is facing--the flight overseas, the Fifth Amendment--are there because these individuals believe themselves to be more important than the truth, more important than their country, more important than the embarrassment to their president, to their Congress. Truth, after all, ought to be the highest ideal. Aristotle once said, "Plato is dear to me, but dearer still is truth." I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the major witnesses to whom I have referred will put aside their narrow self-interest, recognize as Aristotle did that truth is dearer still, and tell the committee and the American people the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Wouldn't it be refreshing if all parties here accused would voluntarily step up to the plate, come before the committee, tell the truth, so that we didn't have to have an investigation? In the darkest days of the revolution, Thomas Paine said: "These are the times that try men's souls, and sunshine patriots and summer soldiers will shrink in this crisis from the service of their country. But those that stand it now deserve the love and thanks of man and woman." This isn't the American Revolution, and it's not on the same plane. But in this particular crisis, the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will cry partisanship, will whine, will equate the need for soft-money reforms with illegal foreign contributions, and will say, everybody does it, let's just reform the process. But Mr. Chairman, those who stand it now--and I include you in that category--those who stay focused on getting the truth, those who try to rid this terrible pollution of foreign contributions and economic espionage from our government will deserve the thanks of their countrymen. And history, Mr. Chairman, will be our judges. We can prove the cynics wrong and give my former students and their children proof that in spite of the flaws, we can conduct our , " , oversight responsibilities with bipartisanship and dignity and that our system does work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Smith. Senator Bennett. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am grateful that a number of members of the press have stayed. I know the members of the Senate feel some compulsion to stay. The horse is smelling the water. We're moving toward the barn. This is the last one. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to stand before the easel. I, being at the end of the stream, wasn't aware of the high-tech circumstances available to us, and my charts are very definitely low-tech. But I would appreciate the opportunity of presenting them. Mr. Chairman, there's an old statement about the very best place to hide a leaf. And the answer is, on the floor of the forest, surrounded by all the other leaves. BENNETT: We've had a number of leaves thrown at us in this debate. And I want to pick up one particular leaf

off the floor of the forest and spends some time on it, because I think it is the key of what we're talking about. It will come as no surprise that we're talking about John Huang. John Huang has three pressures on him, as I see it--the first one coming from the Lippo Group; the second one from the Chinese government; and the third from President Clinton. And I'm going to talk about all three, in that order. Let's talk first about the Lippo Group. I will not resurrect the spirit of Sam Ervin, but I do go to another dead official, in this case Alan Dulles, whom some consider the founder of the modern CIA. He made this comment in his memoirs. He says: "One of the great intelligence services of the 19th century was maintained not by a government, but by a private firm--the banking house of Rothschild. They benefited the clients as well as themselves by their superior intelligence-gathering duties." I quote Mr. Dulles to indicate that it is not unusual, "...", unprecedented or unhistorical for a bank to be concerned about significant intelligence-gathering activities. And Mr. Huang worked for an international bank. He worked for them for a long period of time. The deposition that we have read indicates that no one's quite sure what he did for them. But they do know he handled a great deal of money. Now, Mr. Riady, the head of Lippo Group, referred to Mr. Huang while he was at the Commerce Department as "my man in the American government," in this tradition of a bank having an intelligence officer well-placed. Mr. Huang may have felt he was Mr. Riady's man as well. I show you this facsimile of a check, perfectly legitimate, perfectly legal campaign contribution by Mr. Huang. But not two things, Mr. Chairman. First, the date--December of 1995. Mr. Huang, at the time, was an employee of the United States government, at the Commerce Department. But what did he put on his FEC report, telling the FEC his employment? He said he was vice president and chairman--vice president of the Lippo Bank, chairman of the Lippo Group. He apparently considered himself Mr. Riady's man in the government, if at the time he made a campaign contribution, he did not report himself as a government employee, which he was. Instead, he reported himself still working for Lippo. Now, that's Lippo's interest--intelligence information in the spirit of international bankers throughout the years. Let's talk about the Chinese government and their interest. The chairman has read a statement this morning about the Chinese government and their interest in this campaign, starting with Taiwan in 1995. In fact, the Chinese government has been interested in this kind of thing for much longer than that. This is a statement taken from the testimony of a Chinese intelligence recruit. His name is Bim Wu (ph). He was recruited in 1989 in China by the Ministry of State Security, the Chinese equivalent of the CIA. They said Bim Wu (ph) would become a successful businessman. You would patiently, steadily work your way up into the U.S. power structure. You would come to know congressmen and senators, and perhaps one day, even be able to report information from the White House. Now, Mr. Wu (ph) got as far as the first sentence. With Chinese money, he became a successful businessman. Unfortunately for him, he was arrested for violating U.S. export laws. He was given his choice of being deported to China or standing trial in the United States. He chose to stand trial in the United States, and he's now currently a guest of the U.S. taxpayers at a federal penitentiary in Pennsylvania. He prefers that to returning to China, because he got no farther than this. But the Chinese clearly were making an effort to find people who would patiently, steadily work their way up into the U.S. power structure. BENNETT: What kind of people are they looking for who will do this? William Colby, a former head of the CIA said, "The perfect operator in such operations is the traditional gray man, so inconspicuous that he can never catch the waiter's eye in a restaurant." This is the kind of person that we are looking for in the American apparatus to meet the Chinese pressures on Mr. Huang. We know the Chinese officials working through Lippo made contact with Mr. Huang prior to his entering the Commerce Department and coming to work for the U.S. government, that the Chinese were aware of him and aware of his upward mobility in the government. Now, when Mr. Huang came to the Commerce Department from the Lippo Group, the undersecretary of the department, Mr. Garton (ph), dictated a policy in writing in a memo to Mr. Huang's direct superior, the assistant secretary, Mr. Meissner, stating that "because of Mr. Huang's background at Lippo in the banking business dealing with Asia, Mr. Huang was to be walled off from anything dealing with Asia and the Pacific." Understand Mr. Huang was one of six deputy assistant secretaries reporting to Mr. Meissner, but he was the principal deputy assistant secretary. That means the other deputy assistant secretaries, one for each of these areas--Europe and the Americas, Africa, Japan and Asia and the

Pacific--each of these five reported to Mr. Huang as the principal deputy assistant secretary, and he acted as the assistant secretary when Mr. Meissner was out of town. ", Mr. Meissner was a notorious traveler. He was out of town a great deal of time, which meant that a lot of the intelligence information available to Mr. Meissner became available to Mr. Huang while Mr. Meissner was out of town. Of course, information was available to Mr. Huang when Mr. Meissner was in town as well, but the specific requirement from Mr. Garton (ph) was that Mr. Huang was to be wall ed off from dealings with Asia and the Pacific. In April of this year, in federal court, John Dickerson (ph), the briefer from the CIA who briefed Mr. Huang, reported in the court that Mr. Huang's primary interest was China with subsidiary interest in Vietnam, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Indonesia and Malaysia. In other words, Mr. Huang--instead of staying away from this area as he was ordered to do in writing--spent the majority of his time in this area. It is interesting that in his briefings--and you see these are the areas he's supposed to be concerned about--Mr. Huang seldom, if ever, raised any issue about Japan. If we're going to talk about America's trading activities and you are the principal deputy assistant secretary dealing with U.S. trade policy, you want to know what's going on with Japan. Mr. Huang seemed to have no interest in Japan whatsoever. It may be just coincidence, but Lippo has no activities in Japan compared to the activities they have in these other countries where Mr. Huang had regular, continuing briefings in violation of Commerce's own directive. Now, one other thing that is very interesting is that Mr. Huang, in addition to his briefings and his continued contacts with Lippo, had serious continuing contacts with the Chinese Embassy. BENNETT: Again, a man who by written instructions from the under secretary is not supposed to be in this area, is not only in this area regularly in his briefings and his intelligence, but also in this area regularly with his contacts. Thus, the possibility of the pressure from the Chinese. Finally, pressure from the Clinton on Mr. Huang. Here is a list with which we're all familiar, but I decided to put it up again, of Bill Clinton's career after leaving college. Immediately after leaving Yale Law School in 1974, he ran for the U.S. House of ", Representatives. Two years later, he ran for attorney general. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for governor. Two years later, he ran for president. And of course, two years later, he ran for president again. All of us in this room who have run state wide campaigns can have an appreciation for how much money it takes to run a state wide campaign again and again and again. Mr. Huang and the Lippo Group met Mr. Clinton, then attorney general, roughly at this point on the chart, and participated in helping finance every campaign for the next 16 to 20 years. Pressure on Mr. Huang, pressure from Lippo, pressure from the Chinese, pressure from Mr. Clinton. Each one wanted something different from Mr. Huang. Some wanted only information. Some wanted campaign contributions. When Mr. Huang left the Commerce Department, I believe that the folks who put pressure here became the recipient of the pressure here. That is, the pressure for more campaign contributions, pressure that had been put on Mr. Huang and responded to for a 20-year period, turned into pressure back to people with whom he had previously had contact, and there we have the problem. Mr. Chairman, this leaf is worth examining. It is a very serious one, and it goes beyond some of the other leaves that have been strewn around in this circumstance. It raises for me one overwhelming question, which I will pursue throughout his first phase of the hearings. That question is this: Who was John Huang's patron? We are talking about patronage jobs here--a patronage job at the Department of Commerce, a patronage job at the Democratic National Committee. These are not merit jobs. These are not career jobs. They are patronage jobs, and they are achieved under the pressure of a patron. I want to know who is John Huang's patron. Who put him in the Commerce Department and saw that he stayed there even though he was operating in a way violative of the written directions of that department? Who put him at the national committee and saw that he stayed there even though the contributions that he raised eventually were sufficiently tainted that a majority of them had to be returned? ", He didn't get to the place that he got by virtue of his personality. He got there because he had a patron, and I think as well if this leaf off the floor of the forest, we should ask ourselves who was that. Thank you. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Bennett. As Senator Glenn suggested, let's discuss as a committee now for a few minutes as to how we want to proceed as far as Mr. Huang and his

attorneys are concerned. As Senator Glenn said, we just received this letter from Mr. Huang's attorney in one of the leading and most prestigious law firms in Washington, D.C., as well as elsewhere. THOMPSON: And basically, as I read the letter, he is offering to testify for what he calls "limited immunity," and that is that he would have immunity for everything except two basic categories. One would be the classification or the disclosure of classification information. He would not have immunity for that. And he would not have immunity for matters relating to espionage. For all other things, such as campaign money laundering and things of that nature or anything else, he would have immunity for. Clearly, anything that is going to make it so that Mr. Huang can come before us and give us truthful and complete information is something that we are very, very much interested in, in this committee. Clearly, we will pursue that. Clearly, we're being offered an arrangement that we're going to have to seriously consider once we find out exactly what it is. But let's step back a moment and put it in perspective and remember where we are. Mr. Huang recently was quoted as being in New York and making a speech when he said, sure, he'd be glad to testify before the committee. Mr. Madigan called his counsel at that time--I think that was about three weeks ago--and asked him about that. His counsel said he was misquoted, that he was not. He was going to take the Fifth Amendment. Mr. Madigan has had three separate contacts--I believe in addition to that--over the last few months with his counsel, at which time in every case, no proffer was offered, and a statement was made that he was going to take the Fifth Amendment. Now, as I understand it--and I congratulate Mr. Baron for being ,", the bearer of this--he's made us an offer here for what he calls limited immunity. The only problem with that is that he is asking us for something that we probably legally cannot give him. I've not had a chance to research the law on this, but my feeling is that there's no such thing as limited immunity, that you can have immunity for one set of flaws and not immunity for another set of flaws, that you either have immunity or you don't. Now it might be that we might, under some circumstances, want to give him complete immunity. But of course, in order for that, as Senator Glenn and I have discussed, he would need to come in and make a proffer. In other words, you don't buy a pig in a poke. You don't give anybody immunity unless you know that their testimony will be helpful and you know it won't be held against them if the immunity deal falls apart. But you have to have through counsel or otherwise some indication of what they're going to be testifying to under any circumstances. And I certainly think we need to proceed on that basis. But let's proceed with a certain amount of caution and understanding. Ironically, I said in my opening statement, which I prepared a little while ago, that our tendency is to want, in all this jumble, to want to have one key witness or one document to come in and explain it all. That's sad. There's no quick fix to this process, and there is no easy solution. Usually, the way you get to Mr. Huang is you work up to it, toward a Mr. Huang with people such as the Buddhist monks, and we still have immunity questions lying out there for them. So this is in a little bit of inverse order. So as we go to the top, so as we speak, of the evidence chain is something that we ought to proceed with a certain amount of caution. I'm delighted at the prospect, but you know, I've been down to many trails to be totally convinced of what we're dealing with. I hope we're not dealing with a situation where Mr. Huang's counsel is proposing something to us that we know we cannot deliver legally. And then after we deal with it for a few days and a few witnesses who, I think, are going to provide very interesting testimony, by the way, starting tomorrow, that all the talk and all the concentration is what's Mr. Huang going to do, and by the time we find out he's not ,", going to do anything, we are a long way down the road and some valuable testimony has been overlooked. THOMPSON: Those are my concerns, Senator Glenn. I applaud you for bringing this to our attention. And I otherwise think we need to move forward on it expeditiously, just to see what they have to say and what they have to offer. GLENN: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Yes, Senator Glenn. GLENN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with much of what you've said. And I--the definitions of what is limited immunity, what those limitations would be, is something that yet is to be worked out. We have the indication of what the intentions are from the counsel for Mr. Huang. And that's what this was this morning was basically a letter of intent. It did not try and spell out all the details of what an actual proffer would put forward to us. I think it's incumbent on us to get to that proffer just as fast as we possibly can, get it in at the earliest possible time, have counsel, both counsels, chief counsels, work with Mr. Cobbin and see if we can't get an agreement there on exactly how the proffer would work and what the imm

unity would be. And I would say that if the immunization is as limited, perhaps, as you indicated, then I'm not sure where that leaves us with the Buddhist monks and everyone else who would follow under those same interpretations and the other that might be granted immunity later. But that's beside the point. One witness and one quick fix, as you referred to it, might be able to short-circuit a lot of the rest, save us a lot of time and get to the basis of this, without having to work up layer by layer by layer by layer to try and build a case against someone. If that particular person that the case is being built toward is willing to come in in the first instance and answer all the questions you're retrying to build to, it would seem to me the first thing we should do is get that proffer in here and look at it. I see nothing wrong with that. I certainly can't believe that our best interests would be served by turning down the offer that has been made. Your last statement, that we should proceed with caution, I agree with that. I agree with that with every one of our witnesses, including this one. ", And as I stated in my statement, I have not decided which way I would vote on immunity myself without having the proffer and without knowing what the Justice Department opinion of this was, albeit we are the final authority on whether we wish to issue some kind of immunity or not. So I would just propose that we go ahead with this and that we authorize--we not authorize--that we direct our counsels jointly to talk to Mr. Cobb and try to work this out, work out a proffer to bring before the committee at the very earliest time. T

HOMPSON: Well, I would join in that. And if there's no objection, that's the way we will proceed. Is there anyone who has any further comment? Senator Lieberman. LIEBERMAN: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the possibility that Mr. Huang would come and testify before us is something that we had not expected, and in that sense, presents us with an option that we did not know we had. But I want to second what you've said and what Senator Glenn has said. We ought to be very cautious before we rush to exercise this option. In one sense, this is the star witness that the committee has been looking for. On the other hand, the immunity that's being requested is immunity from prosecution for election law violations which, while not as significant as espionage, nonetheless are at the heart of what's--what we're all concerned about here. And I think we've got to tread very cautiously here, and we've got to ask ourselves, as our counsels begin to work with attorney for Mr. Huang, as to whether Mr. Huang will offer testimony that will advance the focus of this investigation and to weigh that against the compromising of the possible prosecution of Mr. Huang and others with whom he has been associated on election law violations. LIEBERMAN: Finally, I'm going to personally apply the same standard to this as I have to the other requests for immunity that the committee has made, which is to ask the Justice Department first what they think about it. There--and if they have no objection, that would certainly make the road a lot easier for me, and I presume, the whole committee. If they do have objections, it's still possible we might decide on our own good judgment to grant immunity. But I think that's the--", a

so our counsels gather, we ought to also try in a speedy way, Mr. Chairman, to sit with the Justice Department to find out what they have to say about this. DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Senator Domenici. DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman, first, I think the opening session bodes well for a successful hearing. But there will be many bumps. Some may even be even big mountains that we have to get over. Frankly, the letter that comes from Mr. Ty Cobb, signed by somebody other than he, in his behalf... GLENN: We since have the original signed letters sent out this morning. That was faxed over this morning to us about 8:50 this morning. We do now have a letter that's been signed by... DOMENICI: Thanks, Senator. But my point--that was just kind of a parenthetical, which I shouldn't have thrown in. Let me just suggest--this letter makes me put my guard up about this immunity. First of all, I heard my distinguished friend from Alaska raise the issue of Asian bashing. And this lawyer raises it there in his letter. I don't believe there's any Asian bashing even on this committee, on the United States Senate, that even reaches the proportion of being minuscule. So you know, to raise that issue in this letter causes me to wonder about what they're up to. Secondly, we had a difficult time in this committee getting the attorney general to tell us we can have immunity, my recollection is, on 12 or 15 Buddhist monks and nuns. The extent of their involvement was a \$5,000 contribution, which they were probably the vehicle for laundering. We don't have any evidence that they would be prosecuted for anything. As a matter of fact, so my indication from the attorney general that they wouldn't, because they're too far down the bottom pole. Now I believe that that process of trying to get them immunized took us an inordinate

amount of time because the other side wasn't willing to let us have immunity. They have since, with reference to two, three or three or four, said let's immunize them. ", Now my point is that this fellow, from everything we know about him, really needs immunity. Well, that's the way I see it. Totally the truth, if I were he, I would come here running trying to get immunity. But the point of it is, we have to be very judicious, because this man must--and we must find a mechanism to be sure that he is going to tell us what he knows. You grant immunity on some weak proffer that says I'll talk about this and that, you have no assurance when it comes time to answer the question that he'll tell you anything. Now I think you can direct your counsel. Whether I'm going to vote on what they recommend--I mean, to me, we've got to make sure that they are saying to us what he'll tell us what he knows, and it will relate to these issues. He will not be evasive. He will not regularly claim he can't remember. We've got documents to refresh his recollection about this guy. So while it is a nice gesture, it is suspicious. After three months of negotiating with him, it wasn't available. Told our counsel that he wasn't going to be there. And all of a sudden, it shows up today. And I noticed, for some reason, the spinning was wonderful here today. I mean, that's why that little line--there is the spinners who stay on this side and the press on that side. And the spinning of this document was enormous. I didn't see any of us down there spinning. So I guess we know who's spinning it. But the truth of the matter is--the truth of the matter is we have to find out a lot more about what he's going to tell us before we grant this kind of immunity. DOMENIC: And in the meantime, fellow senators, we ought to get on with immunizing these little nuns and monks so we aren't worried about discriminating against them. We won't give them immunity, and we give this kind of guy immunity. I mean, that doesn't strike me very--as being very, very right. I have to leave. But I stayed around here to make that little statement and to congratulate you on the hearing. GLENN: Mr. Chairman? THOMPSON: Thank you very much. Senator Glenn. ", GLENN: Mr. Chairman, let me answer--and this--the answer to this is we get the proffer in. If it's weak, well, it's weak, and we don't accept it, because a proffer is supposed to spell out what the person is going to testify to in response for what immunity you're going to give, and that's the basic reason for it. We don't have that yet. We have a letter of intent. And so to characterize it in some way as being weak at this point, it may come in as a very strong proffer for all I know. As far as--and I would not--I would caution that we note that this with what's happened over at the Justice Department, because you know, we know what the delays were there. We had some lawyer problems with other commitments and soon. There was a delay there. The attorney general, Janet Reno, has guaranteed us that if at all possible, she will turn these things around where possible within 24 hours. Now whether she can meet that goal or not, I don't know. The difficulty in immunizing the Buddhist group from out there that was sent, that was given to us in a bloc, was the fact that they are working through these--and we already have four of them through and approved now--and they're reworking as rapidly as they can to get the other three through also, as I understand it. I think to try and go without them running through this would take--would run the risk of seeing us maybe get into, get ourselves in the middle of immunizing someone that they may behave real, substantial case built up against, and that they're prepared to take to a grand jury. And we'd be immunizing without knowing that. And whether they're Buddhist monks or nuns or whatever, they might very well have charges like that against them for all I know. So all we've asked is a sign-off over there that no such--or it's left up to us for our consideration. If there are considerations like that over there, then we want to know about it. And then, as the chairman has pointed out several times, we are the final judge. And we have asked that that decision over there, that there be given a maximum of 10 days for the Justice Department to act on these. And if they have not acted at that time, the chairman has indicated--and I think properly so--that we then would go ahead if we wanted to. We would make that judgment at that time. I just don't see any problem here with getting a proffer, because that's the next step. All we have now is a letter of intent. We ", can't say whether it's a weak proffer, a strong proffer, a middle proffer or whatever. We won't know until we get it. And all I've asked for this morning is the opportunity to have our staffs be directed to go, and that's what we voted a moment ago with the unanimous consent request that the chairman made. I would repeat something I said a while ago. I don't know how I would vote on immunity at this point. I, too, want to see the proffer. I, too, want to know what comes out of the negotiations with the attorney general. And at that time, I'll be satisfied to make my own

n judgment. But I do think this is a great opportunity, and I'm glad I understand that there was no objection before. And so the committee has voted to authorize our staff to go ahead, and that's obviously the logical next step, and I'm glad to see you take it. Thank you. THOMPSON: Sure. Thank you, Senator Glenn. I think we're all basically saying the same thing. And we will just let the lawyers do what lawyers are supposed to do at this stage, and that is to--and it's happened before, and it'll happen again. When these matters come up, you talk to the other lawyer and see what they've got to offer. And then we'll get back together and see the nature of the proffer that we would expect and start narrowing the difference if we can. So, Mr. Madigan and Mr. Baron will do that. I'd like to announce that we will start in the morning at 9 o'clock and go straight through until 1 o'clock. There were some schedule problems with some of our people we've asked to be here with us tomorrow. And so we're trying to accommodate them. So we will adjourn until 9 o'clock in the morning. FDCH Transcript Service July 08, 1997 55 There are no more items to read. 58#p#

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D48]MAIL42029369C.116 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
HEARINGS ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE WITNESSES/TRANSCRIPT INDEX

<u>DATE</u>	<u>WITNESS (ES)</u>
7/8/97	Opening Statements
7/9/97	Richard Sullivan
7/10/97	Richard Sullivan
7/15/97	Juliana Utomo, Thomas Hampson

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sherman A. Williams (CN=Sherman A. Williams/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 17:17:59.00

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have no documents relating to this request.

----- Forwarded by Sherman A. Williams/WHO/EOP on
09/21/99 05:16 PM -----

PostMaster 09/21/99 05:04:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: All EOP Users, All USTR Users

cc:

Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

MEMORANDUM TO: All EOP Staff

FROM: Beth Nolan

Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

M. Dennis Sculimbrene has filed a lawsuit alleging in part that the White House maintains files on him in violation of the Privacy Act. To allow us to respond to these allegations, please conduct a thorough and complete search of all your records -- whether in hard copy, computer form, or any other form -- for any of the following material:

Any and all documents relating or pertaining to M. Dennis Sculimbrene. To the extent that you have responsive documents, please provide a copy of the file folders or file jackets that the documents were contained in as well as the documents.

Every employee is responsible for searching his or her own files and records to ensure a comprehensive search. Each office head or Assistant to the President must certify that his or her staff has done a complete and thorough search.

In addition, if you believe that files from your office that have been sent to the Office of Records Management may contain responsive information, please advise us so that we may ensure that all responsive documents have been located.

All materials must be provided to Shelli Peterson (OEOP Room 482) by noon on Thursday, September 30, 1999. If you have any questions, Shelli can be reached at 456-7804.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Linda L. Moore (CN=Linda L. Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 17:09:54.00

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: Jocelyn A. Bucaro (CN=Jocelyn A. Bucaro/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
never heard of the guy.

----- Forwarded by Linda L. Moore/WHO/EOP on 09/21/99
05:09 PM -----

PostMaster 09/21/99 05:04:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: All EOP Users, All USTR Users
cc:
Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

MEMORANDUM TO: All EOP Staff

FROM: Beth Nolan
Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

M. Dennis Sculimbrene has filed a lawsuit alleging in part that the White House maintains files on him in violation of the Privacy Act. To allow us to respond to these allegations, please conduct a thorough and complete search of all your records -- whether in hard copy, computer form, or any other form -- for any of the following material:

Any and all documents relating or pertaining to M. Dennis Sculimbrene. To the extent that you have responsive documents, please provide a copy of the file folders or file jackets that the documents were contained in as well as the documents.

Every employee is responsible for searching his or her own files and records to ensure a comprehensive search. Each office head or Assistant to the President must certify that his or her staff has done a complete and thorough search.

In addition, if you believe that files from your office that have been sent to the Office of Records Management may contain responsive information, please advise us so that we may ensure that all responsive

documents have been located.

All materials must be provided to Shelli Peterson (OEOB Room 482) by noon on Thursday, September 30, 1999. If you have any questions, Shelli can be reached at 456-7804.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 17:11:18.00

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Samir Afridi (CN=Samir Afridi/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastris (CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP on
09/21/99 05:11 PM -----

PostMaster 09/21/99 05:04:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: All EOP Users, All USTR Users

cc:

Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

MEMORANDUM TO: All EOP Staff

FROM: Beth Nolan

Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

M. Dennis Sculimbrene has filed a lawsuit alleging in part that the White House maintains files on him in violation of the Privacy Act. To allow us to respond to these allegations, please conduct a thorough and complete search of all your records -- whether in hard copy, computer form, or any other form -- for any of the following material:

Any and all documents relating or pertaining to M. Dennis Sculimbrene. To the extent that you have responsive documents, please provide a copy of the file folders or file jackets that the documents were contained in

as well as the documents.

Every employee is responsible for searching his or her own files and records to ensure a comprehensive search. Each office head or Assistant to the President must certify that his or her staff has done a complete and thorough search.

In addition, if you believe that files from your office that have been sent to the Office of Records Management may contain responsive information, please advise us so that we may ensure that all responsive documents have been located.

All materials must be provided to Shelli Peterson (OEOB Room 482) by noon on Thursday, September 30, 1999. If you have any questions, Shelli can be reached at 456-7804.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christina Stacey (CN=Christina Stacey/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 17:49:47.00

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: Sang W. Lee (CN=Sang W. Lee/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorothy Henry (CN=Dorothy Henry/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy B. Kletnick (CN=Amy B. Kletnick/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eileen P. McCaughey (CN=Eileen P. McCaughey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John H. Corcoran III (CN=John H. Corcoran III/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Wertman (CN=John A. Wertman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael R. Cherba (CN=Michael R. Cherba/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Helen S. Castleman (CN=Helen S. Castleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Manuel A. Mendoza (CN=Manuel A. Mendoza/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Sharp (CN=Michael A. Sharp/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gregory T. Trainor (CN=Gregory T. Trainor/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth M. Schilling (CN=Elisabeth M. Schilling/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald R. Goodwin (CN=Donald R. Goodwin/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharon R. Lewis (CN=Sharon R. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George H. Bohrer (CN=George H. Bohrer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gertrude A. Roddick (CN=Gertrude A. Roddick/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary U. Binns (CN=Mary U. Binns/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jody J. Kaplan (CN=Jody J. Kaplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dana C. Strand (CN=Dana C. Strand/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lana Dickey (CN=Lana Dickey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bernice W. Smith (CN=Bernice W. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Earlene F. Rick (CN=Earlene F. Rick/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine K. Baer (CN=Christine K. Baer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eileen M. Upperman (CN=Eileen M. Upperman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (CN=Tracy F. Sisser/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie S. Hankins (CN=Marjorie S. Hankins/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christina Stacey (CN=Christina Stacey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James P. Mulvehill (CN=James P. Mulvehill/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shivaun A. Cooney (CN=Shivaun A. Cooney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen E. Undlin (CN=Maureen E. Undlin/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert J. Zanolungo Jr (CN=Robert J. Zanolungo Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey H. Oakman (CN=Jeffrey H. Oakman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Renee Sagiv (CN=Renee Sagiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Alexander (CN=Debra D. Alexander/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kelley A. Van Auken (CN=Kelley A. Van Auken/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia F. Shumaker (CN=Patricia F. Shumaker/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Reagan (CN=James M. Reagan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cyril Jones (CN=Cyril Jones/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip L. Weintraub (CN=Philip L. Weintraub/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Annie Stewart (CN=Annie Stewart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ami M. Lynch (CN=Ami M. Lynch/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara J. Garner (CN=Barbara J. Garner/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Agustin A. Labrador (CN=Agustin A. Labrador/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Belsky (CN=David Belsky/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert C. Houser (CN=Robert C. Houser/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen K. Horn (CN=Stephen K. Horn/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice J. Pushkar (CN=Alice J. Pushkar/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori K. Krause (CN=Lori K. Krause/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shannon M. Hinderliter (CN=Shannon M. Hinderliter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia Williams (CN=Patricia Williams/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy W. Showers (CN=Wendy W. Showers/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Danilo DeGuzman Jr. (CN=Danilo DeGuzman Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lynn A. Crable (CN=Lynn A. Crable/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (CN=Woyneab M. Wondwossen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew W. Pitcher (CN=Matthew W. Pitcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (CN=Maureen A. Hudson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janice H. Vranich (CN=Janice H. Vranich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Bird (CN=Debra D. Bird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

All staff should begin working to comply with the document request from
Beth Nolan, Counsel to the President, dated September 21, 1999. All
responsive documents must be coordinated through the Director's Office by
noon on Tuesday, September 28, 1999.

----- Forwarded by Christina Stacey/WHO/EOP on 09/21/99
05:44 PM -----

PostMaster 09/21/99 05:04:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: All EOP Users, All USTR Users
cc:
Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

MEMORANDUM TO: All EOP Staff

FROM: Beth Nolan
Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

M. Dennis Sculimbrene has filed a lawsuit alleging in part that the White House maintains files on him in violation of the Privacy Act. To allow us to respond to these allegations, please conduct a thorough and complete search of all your records -- whether in hard copy, computer form, or any other form -- for any of the following material:

Any and all documents relating or pertaining to M. Dennis Sculimbrene. To the extent that you have responsive documents, please provide a copy of the file folders or file jackets that the documents were contained in as well as the documents.

Every employee is responsible for searching his or her own files and records to ensure a comprehensive search. Each office head or Assistant to the President must certify that his or her staff has done a complete and thorough search.

In addition, if you believe that files from your office that have been sent to the Office of Records Management may contain responsive information, please advise us so that we may ensure that all responsive documents have been located.

All materials must be provided to Shelli Peterson (OEOB Room 482) by noon on Thursday, September 30, 1999. If you have any questions, Shelli can be reached at 456-7804.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 17:09:10.00

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich (CN=Nancy V. Hernreich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I do not have any documents pertaining to the request below.

----- Forwarded by June G. Turner/WHO/EOP on 09/21/99

05:08 PM -----

PostMaster 09/21/99 05:04:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: All EOP Users, All USTR Users

cc:

Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

MEMORANDUM TO: All EOP Staff

FROM: Beth Nolan
Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

M. Dennis Sculimbrene has filed a lawsuit alleging in part that the White House maintains files on him in violation of the Privacy Act. To allow us to respond to these allegations, please conduct a thorough and complete search of all your records -- whether in hard copy, computer form, or any other form -- for any of the following material:

Any and all documents relating or pertaining to M. Dennis Sculimbrene. To the extent that you have responsive documents, please provide a copy of the file folders or file jackets that the documents were contained in as well as the documents.

Every employee is responsible for searching his or her own files and records to ensure a comprehensive search. Each office head or Assistant to the President must certify that his or her staff has done a complete and thorough search.

In addition, if you believe that files from your office that have been sent to the Office of Records Management may contain responsive information, please advise us so that we may ensure that all responsive documents have been located.

All materials must be provided to Shelli Peterson (OEOP Room 482) by noon on Thursday, September 30, 1999. If you have any questions, Shelli can be reached at 456-7804.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 17:53:56.00

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: Christina Stacey (CN=Christina Stacey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We have nothing.

----- Forwarded by Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP on 09/21/99

05:53 PM -----

Christina Stacey

09/21/99 05:53:07 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

Directors,

Please let me know via Lotus Notes if your offices have any responsive documents pursuant to the document request from Beth Nolan dated 9/21/99.

Thanks!

----- Forwarded by Christina Stacey/WHO/EOP on 09/21/99

05:49 PM -----

PostMaster 09/21/99 05:04:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: All EOP Users, All USTR Users

cc:

Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

MEMORANDUM TO: All EOP Staff

FROM: Beth Nolan

Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

M. Dennis Sculimbrene has filed a lawsuit alleging in part that the White House maintains files on him in violation of the Privacy Act. To allow us to respond to these allegations, please conduct a thorough and complete search of all your records -- whether in hard copy, computer form, or any other form -- for any of the following material:

Any and all documents relating or pertaining to M. Dennis Sculimbrene. To the extent that you have responsive documents, please provide a copy of the file folders or file jackets that the documents were contained in as well as the documents.

Every employee is responsible for searching his or her own files and records to ensure a comprehensive search. Each office head or Assistant to the President must certify that his or her staff has done a complete and thorough search.

In addition, if you believe that files from your office that have been sent to the Office of Records Management may contain responsive information, please advise us so that we may ensure that all responsive documents have been located.

All materials must be provided to Shelli Peterson (OEOP Room 482) by noon on Thursday, September 30, 1999. If you have any questions, Shelli can be reached at 456-7804.

Message Sent

To:

Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen K. Horn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eileen M. Upperman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lynn A. Crable/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lori K. Krause/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alice J. Pushkar/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert C. Houser/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gertrude A. Roddick/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Sharp/WHO/EOP@EOP
Manuel A. Mendoza/WHO/EOP@EOP
James M. Reagan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Shivaun A. Cooney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Alexander/WHO/EOP@EOP
Cyril Jones/WHO/EOP@EOP

Kelley A. Van Auken/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lori K. Krause (CN=Lori K. Krause/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 17:59:02.00

SUBJECT: Re: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: Christina Stacey (CN=Christina Stacey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
The Gift Office has no records for Dennis Sculimbrene.

Christina Stacey

09/21/99 05:53:07 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

Directors,

Please let me know via Lotus Notes if your offices have any responsive documents pursuant to the document request from Beth Nolan dated 9/21/99.

Thanks!

----- Forwarded by Christina Stacey/WHO/EOP on 09/21/99
05:49 PM -----

PostMaster 09/21/99 05:04:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: All EOP Users, All USTR Users
cc:
Subject: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

MEMORANDUM TO: All EOP Staff

FROM: Beth Nolan
Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

M. Dennis Sculimbrene has filed a lawsuit alleging in part that the White House maintains files on him in violation of the Privacy Act. To allow us to respond to these allegations, please conduct a thorough and complete search of all your records -- whether in hard copy, computer form, or any other form -- for any of the following material:

Any and all documents relating or pertaining to M. Dennis Sculimbrene. To the extent that you have responsive documents, please provide a copy of the file folders or file jackets that the documents were contained in as well as the documents.

Every employee is responsible for searching his or her own files and records to ensure a comprehensive search. Each office head or Assistant to the President must certify that his or her staff has done a complete and thorough search.

In addition, if you believe that files from your office that have been sent to the Office of Records Management may contain responsive information, please advise us so that we may ensure that all responsive documents have been located.

All materials must be provided to Shelli Peterson (OEOP Room 482) by noon on Thursday, September 30, 1999. If you have any questions, Shelli can be reached at 456-7804.

Message Sent

To: _____

Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen K. Horn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eileen M. Upperman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lynn A. Crable/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lori K. Krause/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alice J. Pushkar/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert C. Houser/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gertrude A. Roddick/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Sharp/WHO/EOP@EOP
Manuel A. Mendoza/WHO/EOP@EOP
James M. Reagan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Shivaun A. Cooney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Alexander/WHO/EOP@EOP
Cyril Jones/WHO/EOP@EOP

Kelley A. Van Auken/WHO/EOP@EOP