

HEINONLINE

Citation: 4 Bernard D. Reams Jr. Law of E-SIGN A Legislative
of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National
Act Public Law No. 106-229 2000 S1930 2002

Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Sun Apr 21 21:24:59 2013

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance
of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license
agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from
uncorrected OCR text.

sentenced for theft and tax offenses a white back. He was at the White House for coffee two days after a company partially controlled by him gave \$25,000 to the Democratic National Committee. At the time Mr. Wynn hooked up with the president, he bore the distinction of having been a twice-convicted felon. But that was only the beginning. Mr. Wynn—who was seeking a presidential pardon for himself—turned up last year at four other DNC fund-raisers involving the president including one in which he, his attorney (a close presidential friend from Arkansas) and Mr. Clinton reportedly had a brief private chat. Whatever about? The president, said White House press secretary Michael McCurry, "recalls no substantive private meeting with Mr. Wynn and is certain he never entertained any discussion of Mr. Wynn's legal situation."

Jorge Cabrera of Miami, DNC donor who was jailed on drug charges in the 1980s. Mr. Cabrera turned up at a White House Christmas party, only to get caught a short time later with more than 6,000 pounds of cocaine, for which he is now serving 10 years in jail.

Chong Lo. Convicted of tax evasion in the 1980s under the name of Esther Chu. Chong Lo was another visitor for coffee with Mr. Clinton. She has since been arrested again on 14 charges of falsifying mortgage applications—to which she has pled not guilty.

Roger Tamraz. White Interpol was looking for Mr. Tamraz all over the world under a 1989 international arrest warrant on conspiracy and embezzlement charges, the fugitive from Lebanon was here in Washington at the White House sipping coffee with the president.

Here in another indicator. In our view, that something being a new screening mchsp befell the White House in these fundraising transactions. It is the sheer number of times that some of the fund-raisers visited the White House. We desarray there are department bigwigs in the administration who haven't been there nearly as often.

So what was actually going on during these recurrent White House sessions? At this stage, little is known about the purposes of their visits, who the visitors saw each time, what they did when they got there, or who authorized their entry to the White House. More should be known. Fonder just a few of the numbers we find so startling: Mr. Huang visited the White House 78 times in 15 months (most of the money he raised in 1995 was returned, having been deemed inappropriate or from unlawful foreign sources). That businessman and major Democratic party donor Pauline Kanchanalak has been at the White House at least 28 times since the president took office; businessman and contributor Johnny Chung reportedly visited the White House at least 49 times. This wasn't a question of screening or failing to screen. These were people apparently well known to their White House hosts, people who had business to do at 1800 Pennsylvania Avenue and went right in.

Then there are the sleepovers. The White House has disclosed that 300-plus individuals have spent a night at the White House since the Clintons moved in. The acknowledgment of this fact and the publication of the list rather sharply change the impression the White House earlier gave a more casual, friendly and family kind of hospitality. More than a third of the sleepovers were financial benefactors of Mr. Clinton or the DNC.

"They were my friends and I was proud to have them here," the president explained, but as the White House deputy communications director delicately corrected him, some weren't friends yet—but were people the president and the first lady wanted to spend more time with." As Charles Krauthammer observed on the opposite page the other day,

the word for people who aren't friends yet is usually "strangers."

Much more needs to be known about these sojourns—especially the number of visits and their dates in relation to events that preceded and followed. This is especially relevant where the visitors weren't strangers at all, as a matter of fact, but persons involved in the other, related legal matters concerning the Clinton administration.

Our conclusion about all this is threefold. It is that first, a great deal more needs to be disclosed about all these transactions; second, it will be disclosed, as it has been to date, reluctantly and in response to various events and pressures; and third, (see below) the odds are not great for a good and fair-minded congressional inquiry into the subject. For the moment that leaves Janet Reno in charge.■

PROPOSED ENCRYPTION LEGISLATION

● Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise to express my concern over bills introduced last Thursday, February 27, 1997 by the Senators from Vermont and Montana. These bills, the Encrypted Communications Privacy Act of 1997 and the Promotion of Commerce On-Line in the Digital Era Act of 1997, deal with the complex and controversial issue of encryption and the export of encryption products. I too am concerned over our Nation's policy regarding encryption, but I believe rash action on this issue at this time by Congress would be inappropriate.

I agree with both Senator BURNS and LEAHY that digital communications, the internet, and the global information infrastructure are already revolutionizing the way we live and work. I also believe there is a need to ensure the security of private, commercial, and Government messages and information sent over global communication links and stored in computer databases. The information revolution is underway and technology is progressing at exponential rates.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, our Nation still has needs that must be addressed. The same digital information, communication links, and computer memory that allows for great advances in personal convenience and entertainment, in commercial productivity and competitiveness, and in Government services and efficiencies can also be abused by individuals with other designs and intentions. Our society has entrusted its elected leaders and public servants to protect its citizens from such activities. Therefore, I think it is imperative that we study thoroughly how this proposed legislation will affect our Government's ability to fulfill its responsibilities. The National security and the ability to effectively enforce our extraterritorial laws is at stake.

The executive branch is the part of our Government responsible for implementing and enforcing the laws of this Nation. For the past several years the administration has been involved in a dialog with industry leaders in an attempt to promote the use of encryption

and expand exports while also protecting the legitimate needs of our Government to gain access with properly executed search warrants to communications. This is not done for nefarious intentions, as some have claimed. The negotiations took place because our Government is charged with fulfilling its responsibility to protect the lives and livelihood of all its citizens.

But our concern for access to encrypted data extends beyond our shores. Our Nation faces threats from nations, groups, and individuals overseas. The United States' ability to counter and thwart these threats will likely be hampered if encryption products are allowed to be exported worldwide with unlimited strength or without key recovery provisions.

Mr. President, the administration has also been negotiating with other OECD nations regarding encryption policy. We are not the only nation which realizes the benefits and possible abuses of encryption products. Other nations are also considering how to ensure that their government needs and responsibilities are addressed in their encryption export and import policies. I do not believe our relations with other nations will be furthered if the administration's negotiations are undercut by unnecessary and potentially damaging congressional action. Further, the interests of our Nation's technology industry will not be advanced if other nations shut their borders to American encryption products.

Today, many established software and hardware firms are successfully marketing encryption products with key recovery features here and abroad. The President has put forward a plan which in good faith attempts to balance our Nation's interests in commerce, security, and law enforcement. While other firms say the administration policy is untenable, these American companies are producing and selling advanced encryption products worldwide which meet both the needs of private commerce and industry, and the requirements of our Government. This suggests to me that the administration's policy not only can work, it is working. I believe Congress should let the administration's negotiations and policies on encryption go forward, to succeed or fail on their own merits. Mr. President, caution and careful study are in order.■

TRIBUTE TO THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PEARL HARBOR SURVIVORS ASSOCIATION ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the New Hampshire Pearl Harbor Survivors Association. Those brave men stood tall in perhaps one of the most tragic moments in American history. Against overwhelming odds, these great Americans fought to defend the United States. Their heroic actions were an inspiration to the people of the

Document No. 51

