

seek our shores. If it is so that the best way to deal with a country that spills over with souls is to invade it, *que viva Mexico?* Should the U.K. invade Pakistan; France, Algeria, and Hong Kong, Vietnam? For that matter why have you not hastened forward to Havana? In fact, the history of great-power interventions shows that conquest does not prevent but, rather, facilitates population transfers.

Your desire to wipe out the expenditure of \$14 million a month to maintain the leaky embargo that you put in place was not consonant with your robust urge to spend elsewhere, and was a rather dainty pretext. Fourteen million dollars is what we in this country spend on "sausages and other prepared meats" every seven hours, if you truly believe, Mr. President, that "restoring Haiti's democratic government will help lead to more stability and prosperity in our region," then you, sir, have more Voo doo than they do. The entire Haitian gross national product is worth but three hours of our own. Were it to grow after intervention by 10% and were the U.S. to reap fully one half the benefit, we would surge ahead another nine minutes' worth of GNP. This is not exactly high-stakes geopolitics.

Why, then, Haiti? Why are your subordinates suddenly so Churchillian? Clearly, in a real crisis they would be so worked up that all their bulbs would burst. The nations towed along for the ride (Poles? Jordanians?) seemed not to know whether to be embarrassed by the stupidity of the task or amused by the peculiarity of their bedfellows. This the secretary of state described as "a glowing coalition." Never in the history of the English language has such an inept phrase been launched with such forced enthusiasm to miss so little a target. Granted, the vice president's "modalities of departure" did much to inspire the nation to a frenzy of war.

Why Haiti? Because, like the father in Joyce's story, "Counterparts," who bullies his son because he cannot fight his bullying boss, what you do in Haiti says less about Haiti than about North Korea, Europe, and the Middle East, where the real challenges lie, and where you cannot act because you do not have a lamp to go by and you have forced your own military to its knees.

Why Haiti? Because you have been unable to say no to the Black Caucus as it stands like the candlestick on the seesaw of your grandiose legislation, and because you are a liberal and in race you see wisdom, or lack of wisdom; qualification, or lack of qualification; virtue, or lack of virtue. And because the Black Caucus is way too tight with Father Aristide.

Why Haiti? Because you have no more sense of what to do or where to turn in a foreign policy crisis than a moth in Las Vegas at 2 a.m. You should not have singled out Haiti in the first place, but once you did you should not have spent so much time and so much capital on it, blowing it out of all proportion, so that this, this Gulf Light, this No-Fat Desert Storm, is your Stalingrad. Six weeks and it should have been over, even including an invasion, about which the world would have learned only after it had begun. All communications with the Haitian regime should have been in private, leaving them the flexibility to capitulate without your having to distract Jimmy Carter from his other good works.

Though you and your supporters made a marriage of convenience with the principles of presidential war powers, your new position is miraculously correct, while that of the Republicans who also switched sides in the question is not. You did have the legal authority to invade Haiti. What you did not have was the moral authority. Despite what

you have maintained during the first 46/48ths of your life, the decision was yours, but your power was merely mechanical

#### DRY BONES

Like your false-ringing speech, the dry bones of your authority had none of the moral flesh and blood that might otherwise have invigorated even a senseless policy. The animation that you have failed to lend to this enterprise was left to the soldiers in the field, who with the greatest discipline and selflessness would have taken on the task that, generations ago, you refused. I wonder if your view of them has really changed. In your philosophy they must have been pawns then, and they must be pawns now. The only thing that has been altered is your position.

Though it is fair to say that I differ with your policy, if our soldiers had gone into combat I would have been behind them 100%, and I hope that, despite the orders in Somalia, you would have been too. This is a lesson that you might have learned earlier but did not, the truth of which you now embrace only because you have become president of the United States. You are the man who will march only if he is commander in chief. Yours, Mr. President, has been a very expensive education. And, unfortunately, every man, woman, and child in this country is destined to pay the bill for your training not because it is so costly but because it is so achingly incomplete.

#### IMPORTANT DETAILS IN GATT LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the reason I am here today is to plead my case to my fellow colleagues to please pay attention to the details that are within the GATT implementation legislation. As somebody once said, "The devil is in the details," but what 90 percent of us in this body do not realize is what is contained in the massive GATT implementation legislation, and in that legislation are provisions that will dramatically reduce the patent protection now enjoyed by Americans.

□ 1740

Proponents of this devastating provision have dressed it up by calling it patent harmonization. It is one of the most malicious attacks on the ownership rights of Americans to be put forth before this body in decades. The people who have slipped this GATT ripoff, this ripoff of GATT legislation, the ripoff of patent rights, into the legislation, are counting on the ignorance of the Members of this body. In 1968, and in subsequent years, the proponents, that is, the Japanese and other multinational interests have sought to use separate legislation for this very same patent harmonization. Wisely, the Congress has defeated it every time it has seen the full light of day. These powerful interests now realize they cannot get their way in a direct battle, so they are seeking to achieve their ends through subterfuge, by using a major trade bill as a vehicle to fundamentally

alter our patent system and in the process grab billions of dollars of royalties that should be going to creative and innovative Americans.

Understand that this attack on our patent rights is coming from technological users, not creators. Americans who create the technology that makes our lives better are now under attack by the big guys, huge Japanese and multinational corporations that will be making bigger profits and will be paying dramatically less in patent royalties to do so.

There are several big lies that have permitted this proposal, this ripoff, to get as far as it has.

Lie No. 1. The changes are hidden in the GATT implementation legislation and that legislation was kept from us until the very last minute. One of the reasons very few Members of this Congress realize there was a dramatic reduction in the patent protection Americans now enjoy in the GATT implementation legislation is we were not even permitted to see the legislation until just a few weeks ago, and many Members still have not been permitted to see the legislation. That is the No. 1 big lie, it is just keeping us in the dark.

Big lie No. 2. It is claimed that the massive changes in our patent laws that are part of the GATT implementation legislation are necessary because they are part of the GATT Treaty. This is big lie No. 2. What we have in the GATT implementation legislation that affects the length of the term of patent protection for Americans is not mandated by the GATT Treaty itself. What we have here is a special interest who has snuck this provision into the GATT implementation legislation trying to fool us, lie to us, and tell us that, well, we have to do this or the whole world trading system is going to break down. That is a lie, it is not mandated by GATT.

No. 3, the third big lie. It is the most arrogant lie of all. That the patent term as suggested by this change in the GATT implementation language is longer for 95 percent of all the patents that go through the system, 95 percent of the inventors are actually going to have their term lengthened. It all comes down to this, ladies and gentlemen. What is being proposed is a change in the language that says that a person who files for a patent today in the United States, he is granted 17 years of protection from the time his patent is issued, no matter how long it takes during the process time from the time he files. What they are proposing in the GATT implementation legislation is changing that to say he has 20 years of protection from the time he files. But the clock starts ticking.

Almost every major invention that has changed the way we live for the better has taken years, up to 10 to 15 years to get through the patent process, and under the current law, the inventors have had 17 years' worth of protection. Under what they are trying

to do through GATT, it would reduce it to 5 years, to 3 years and sometimes eliminate it altogether. This third lie, this idea that they are actually extending the patent protection, is the worst lie of all.

The fact is that if we permit the patent protection time to be diminished by the GATT implementation legislation going through as it is, we will find that research and development money for private development in this country will dry up. It will destroy America's edge. It will cause billions of dollars that should be going to American inventors as royalties to be left in the hands of Japanese corporations who will use it to destroy us economically.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in demanding that this be taken out of the GATT Treaty.

#### CALL FOR INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the whole 60 minutes, but we will go into some very interesting issues tonight. Everybody in the country has heard about Whitewater and they have heard about some of the mysterious things that have happened in the investigation into Vince Foster's death, but there is a lot of other interesting things that have happened involving the Rose Law Firm in Little Rock, AR and Hillary Rodham Clinton and the former Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton.

Tonight I would like to talk about two cases involving the failure of two savings and loans and the involvement of the Rose Law Firm and some possible conflicts of interest that should be investigated by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, as well as the Special Counsel, Mr. Starr.

First American Savings and Loan of Oak Brook, IL was seized by the Federal authorities for the Federal Government in 1986. First American Savings and Loan of Oak Brook was headed by former Illinois Gov. Dan Walker.

Dan Lasater, a friend of Bill Clinton, had a brokerage business, United Capital Corp., and it traded Treasury bond futures for First Federal Savings and Loan of Illinois and others. Dan Lasater ran a brokerage firm in Little Rock, AR. He was a big contributor to Bill Clinton's gubernatorial campaigns, he was a friend of Bill Clinton and he flew Clinton around in his private jet. Lasater gave Roger Clinton, Bill Clinton's brother, a job and loaned him \$8,000 to pay off a drug debt.

Lasater's brokerage firm received a lucrative contract from the government of Arkansas worth \$750,000 to sell

State bonds for a new Arkansas State Police communications network. He also received millions of dollars in bonds for the Arkansas Development Financial Authority.

In 1986, Lasater was convicted on drug charges. This is Bill Clinton's good friend. He served only part of his sentence and he was pardoned after serving a small part of his sentence by then Gov. Bill Clinton.

In 1985, Dan Walker, the former Governor of Illinois, discovered that First American Savings and Loan was losing money big time on its Treasury bond future trades with Dan Lasater. According to court records, Mr. Walker lost approximately \$361,000. Walker claims that Lasater made unauthorized trades with First Federal's money and, Walker told the Chicago Tribune they, Lasater & Co., had general authority to trade, but they were supposed to call the First American operating officer at the time they made the trade and they did not do that.

Walker sued Lasater for \$3.3 million for mail, wire, and securities fraud. The suit charged that one of Lasater's employees used First Federal's money to carry out what were in effect personal Treasury bill trades.

Does this sound familiar? Members heard me on the floor not long ago talking about a gentleman named Dennis Patrick from Kentucky. He had a similar story. According to Mr. Patrick in published accounts, between \$60 million and \$107 million was traded in an account in his name at Lasater & Co. without Mr. Patrick's knowledge. They traded \$60 million to \$107 million in bond trades in his account and he did not even know about it. On 1 day, \$23 million was traded on his account without his knowledge. Now when Federal regulators, the FSLIC, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, seized First American of Illinois, they continued to pursue the lawsuit against Lasater. They wanted to recover as much money as they possibly could.

Dan Walker, the former Governor of Illinois, was accused of lending himself \$1.4 million in federally insured depositors' money and later ended up being convicted of bank fraud and perjury.

Hopkins & Sutter, I know this is very complicated, but Hopkins & Sutter, a Chicago law firm, was the primary contractor or law firm for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Hopkins & Sutter hired or subcontracted with a law firm in Little Rock, AR, called the Rose Law Firm to handle the suit against Lasater.

I hope everybody will think about this, my colleagues. Lasater & Co., Mr. Lasater was a very close friend of Bill Clinton. He flew around in his private jet. They went on parties together. Lasater was convicted along with Bill Clinton's brother of drug dealing. Lasater paid one of Bill Clinton's brother's drug loans of \$8,000. And after Lasater was convicted, he was pardoned by then Gov. Bill Clinton. Rose

Law Firm is hired as a subcontractor for the purpose of the suit against Lasater. They are going to go after Lasater. And Hillary Rodham Clinton and Vince Foster were the two lawyers from the law firm, the Rose Law Firm, to go after Mr. Lasater.

□ 1750

Think about that for a minute. They are going after Lasater for the Federal Government at the same time that he is a very good friend of Gov. Bill Clinton and has been pardoned for drug trafficking by the Governor. Dan Lasater was convicted of drug charges in 1986, as I said, and served only a small part of his sentence, and was later pardoned by the Governor, now President Clinton.

Now enter Hillary Rodham Clinton, Rose Law Firm's powerhouse lawyer, and Vince Foster. They handled the Government's suit against Lasater. It is hard to believe this conflict of interest could occur, but they are handling the case against Lasater, Bill Clinton's friend.

Because of the close ties between Lasater and Bill and Hillary Clinton, she never should have been involved in this matter in any way. That is a big conflict of interest.

In late 1987 a confidential settlement was reached between the Government and Lasater. He ended up paying \$200,000 of the \$3.3 million suit. That is all, just \$200,000.

The Chicago Tribune learned of the amount of the settlement from a February 1989 letter that Foster wrote to the FDIC. The letter was not part of the court filings. Court records show that Hillary Rodham Clinton and Vince Foster negotiated this settlement from \$3.3 million down to \$200,000. It started on May 8, 1987, when Hillary Rodham Clinton signed an amended complaint on this case that reduced the damages sought by the FSLIC against Lasater from \$3.3 million down to \$1.3 million. She negotiated the reduction of this down from \$3.3 million down to \$1.3 million for the FDIC at a time when the guy, Lasater, she was supposed to be nailing to the wall was a good friend of she and Bill Clinton, the Governor of Arkansas. The FDIC said Hillary's involvement was not extensive enough to constitute a conflict of interest. This sounds like a whitewash by the FDIC, and to cover their tails the FDIC said under Federal rules existing at the time she did not have to inform the Federal Government about her close relationship with Lasater and Lasater's company. The FDIC said Hillary worked only 3 hours on the case. They said she was not involved in the final decision to settle at \$200,000. The FDIC says Vince Foster did most of the work on this case. He was her partner at Rose. The FSLIC that hired Hillary and Vince Foster and the Rose Law Firm could not remember details of the case. The FDIC's earlier inquiry was primarily a review of court records and records submitted by the Rose Law