CONDUIT PAYMENTS TO THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 9, 1997

Serial No. 105–51

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

44–833 CC WASHINGTON : 1997

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
J. DENNIS HASTERT, Illinois
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
STEVEN SCHIFF, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER COX, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
DAVID M. MCINTOSH, Indiana
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
JOHN B. SHADEGG, Arizona
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire
PETE SESSIONS, Texas
MICHAEL PAPPAS, New Jersey
VINCE SNOWBARGER, Kansas
BOB BARR, Georgia
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
GARY A. CONDIT, California
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
THOMAS M. BARRETT, Wisconsin
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
JIM TURNER, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
HAROLD E. FORD, Tennessee

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*
RICHARD D. BENNETT, *Chief Counsel*
JUDITH MCCOY, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on October 9, 1997	1
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Barr, Hon. Bob, a Representative in Congress from the State of Georgia:	
Exhibits 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, and 78	151
Exhibits 115, 119, 60, 61, 53, and 67	158
Bennett, Richard, chief counsel, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight:	
Exhibit 68	96
Exhibit 69	98
Exhibits 70, 71, and 72	100
Exhibit 73	104
Exhibits 75 and 76	106
Exhibit 77	109
Exhibit 78	111
Exhibit 93	115
Exhibit 94	117
Exhibit 96	119
Exhibit 97	121
Exhibit C–28	123
Exhibit 99	254
Exhibit 100	260
Exhibit 101	262
Exhibits 102 and 103	264
Exhibit 106	267
Exhibits 104 and 105	269
Burton, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana:	
Letters referring to House Rule XI 3.(f)(2)	4
Pertinent supplementary material	306
Prepared statement of	9
Foung, Manlin:	
Deposition of	16
Exhibits from deposition	59
Horn, Hon. Stephen, a Representative in Congress from the State of California:	
Exhibit 113	288
Information concerning John Huang's whereabouts	359
Kanjorski, Hon. Paul E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, photograph of John Huang	290
Landon, Joseph Raymond, Jr.:	
Depostion of	76
Exhibits from deposition	89
Lantos, Hon. Tom, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, letter dated October 8, 1997	134
Mica, Hon. John L., a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, exhibit 110	181
Wang, David:	
Deposition of	186
Exhibits from deposition	217
Waxman, Hon. Henry A., a Representative in Congress from the State of California:	
Bank of China annual report	367
Chart referring to John Huang as Charlie Trie's DNC contact	13
Minority staff report	306

CONDUIT PAYMENTS TO THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dan Burton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Burton, Hastert, Morella, Shays, Cox, McHugh, Horn, Mica, McIntosh, Souder, Shadegg, Sununu, Sessions, Pappas, Snowbarger, Barr, Portman, Waxman, Lantos, Owens, Kanjorski, Condit, Maloney, Barrett, Norton, Fattah, Cummings, Kucinich, Blagojevich, Davis of Illinois, Tierney, Turner, Allen, and Ford.

Staff present: Kevin Binger, staff director; Richard Bennett, chief counsel; William Moschella, deputy counsel and parliamentarian; Butch Hodgson, chief investigator; Daniel R. Moll, deputy staff director; Judith McCoy, chief clerk; Teresa Austin, assistant clerk/calendar clerk; Robin Butler, office manager; Will Dwyer, director of communications; Ashley Williams, deputy director of communications; Barbara Comstock, chief investigative counsel; Robert Rohrbaugh, James C. Wilson, Tim Griffin, and Uttam Dhillon, senior investigative counsels; Dave Bossie, oversight coordinator; Kristi Remington, Alicemary Leach, Bill Hanka, and David Kass, investigative counsels; Jim Schumann, John Irving, and Jason Foster, investigators; Phil Larsen, investigative consultant; Carolyn Pritts, administrative investigative assistant; David Jones and John Mastranadi, investigative staff assistants; Phil Schiliro, minority staff director; Phil Barnett, minority chief counsel; Kenneth Ballen, minority chief investigative counsel; Agnieszka Fryszman, Christopher Lu, Matthew Joseph, Andrew McLaughlin, David Sadkin, Michael Yang, Michael Yeager, minority counsels; Harry Gossett and Mark Stephenson, minority professional staff members; Ellen Rayner, minority chief clerk; Becky Claster, Jean Gosa, Andrew Su, and Amy Wendt, minority staff assistants; and Sheridan Pauker, minority research assistant.

Mr. BURTON. The committee will come to order.

Would the television cameras recede a little bit? And when we get through with our opening statements, at the request of the counsel for the witnesses, we will ask the television cameras to leave the room.

Good morning. A quorum being present, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight will come to order. Before the dis-

tinguished ranking member and I deliver our opening statements, the committee must first dispose of some procedural issues.

I ask unanimous consent that Members be able to use the depositions of Manlin Foung, Joseph Landon and David Wang at today's hearing and ask further unanimous consent that they be made a part of the record.

Mr. WAXMAN. Reserving the right to object, those depositions, Mr. Chairman, will be, in their entirety, part of the record?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. We have no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection, so ordered.

I also ask unanimous consent that questioning in the matter under consideration proceed under clause 2(j)(2) of House rule XI and committee rule 14 in which the chairman and ranking minority member allocate time to committee counsel as they deem appropriate for extended questioning, not to exceed 60 minutes, equally divided by the majority and the minority.

And without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LANTOS. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman reserves the right to object.

Mr. LANTOS. Does this mean, Mr. Chairman, that committee counsel, with his questioning, will precede members of the committee?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, sir. For the first hour, we will have committee counsel on each side question for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I'll be glad to yield.

Mr. WAXMAN. The rules have recently been changed in the House of Representatives to provide for an interrogation of a half-hour, first by the majority and then a half-hour by the minority. That time can be allocated to staff or to Members as the chairman sees fit on his side or we see fit on our side.

Mr. BURTON. That is correct.

Mr. WAXMAN. Under the rules, this must be agreed to either by consent of the ranking member with the chairman or vote of the committee.

I don't see an objection to what the chairman is requesting. I think this is going to be the first time that the House of Representatives has used this new format for a more extended period of time for interrogation. We'll try it out.

Mr. LANTOS. Continuing my right to reserve, I will not object. However, I think it is a very bad procedure. It is analogous in political campaigns to having a battle of advertising agencies rather than candidates themselves.

I think members of this committee should conduct their own questioning. That is why we have been sent here by our respective constituencies. And to turn this very important function over to our staff, I think is less than ideal procedure. But I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection, so ordered.

I further ask unanimous consent that the questioning in the matter under consideration proceed under clause 2(j)(2) of House rule XI and committee rule 14 in which the chairman and ranking minority member allocate time to members of the committee as they

deem appropriate for extended questioning, not to exceed 60 minutes for the first panel, equally divided between the majority and the minority.

And there has been agreement reached between myself and the ranking member, Mr. Waxman, that we will proceed under an equation or situation where there will be 10 minutes given to the majority side and 10 minutes to the minority and so on until the 60 minutes is exhausted.

Is there objection?

Hearing none, so ordered.

On October 1, 1997, the committee received a letter addressed from Charles J. Stephens requesting, on behalf of his clients, Manlin Foung and Joseph Landon, that the cameras be turned off pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of House rule XI. Similarly, David Wang's attorney, Michael A. Carvin, sent a similar letter on October 8, 1997.

Without objection, those letters will be entered into the record.

[The letters referred to follow:]

STEVENS & O'CONNELL
ATTORNEYS
400 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 1450
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

TELEPHONE: (916) 329-9111
FACSIMILE: (916) 329-9110

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

OUR FILE NUMBER
1039.0001

October 1, 1997

VIA FAX – 202/225-3974

The Honorable Dan Burton
Chairman
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
United States House of Representatives
2157 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6143

Dear Mr. Burton:

Special Counsel Richard Bennett has advised me that our clients, Manlin Foung and Joseph Landon, will testify before the Committee pursuant to subpoena on or about October 8, 1997.

Pursuant to House Rule XI(3), Ms. Foung and Mr. Landon hereby request that during their appearances before the Committee, "all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off."

By copy of this letter, I am respectfully requesting that Special Counsel Bennett advise whether the Committee would like any additional documentation of this request. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Charles J. Stevens

CJS/slc

cc: Richard D. Bennett, Esq. (VIA FAX – 202/225-3974)
Kenneth M. Ballen, Esq. (VIA FAX – 202/226-6511)

Cooper & Carvin

Lawyers
A Professional Limited Liability Company
Suite 401
2000 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Michael A. Carvin
(202) 822-8952

(202) 822-8950
Fax (202) 822-8966

October 8, 1997

VIA FACSIMILE AND FIRST-CLASS MAIL

The Honorable Dan Burton
Chairman
House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
2157 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6143

Dear Representative Burton:

This letter is to inform you that my client Mr. David Wang, subpoenaed to appear before the Committee on Thursday, October 9, 1997, is invoking his right under House Rule XI(3)(f)(2) to have radio, television, and still photography coverage excluded during his testimony. Thank you for your assistance in this regard.

Sincerely,

Michael Carvin

Michael A. Carvin

Mr. BURTON. Clause 3(f)(2) of House rule XI allows a subpoenaed witness to have the cameras turned off and the microphones used for broadcast turned off. The rules provide that,

> No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing by radio or television is being conducted.
>
> At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered, and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

While I'm disappointed that this hearing will not be televised because we believe the American people have the right to know what these witnesses have to say. However, Manlin Foung, Joseph Landon, and David Wang have asserted their rights under the rule, and the committee is obliged to honor their request. Therefore, at the appropriate time, I will instruct our friends in the media to observe the rule and cover all lenses and shut off all microphones used for coverage.

I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, marks the first day of hearings into illegal foreign fundraising and other violations of law during recent campaigns. We have three witnesses today. These individuals have admitted to making conduit contributions to the Democratic National Committee.

Testifying on our first panel will be Manlin Foung, the sister of Charlie Trie. Joining her will be her companion, Joseph Landon. Testifying on our second panel will be David Wang, a businessman from Los Angeles. Our witnesses today are not villains; they are victims. They are ordinary people who are put on the spot by someone they trusted, and they got burned.

Ms. Foung, Mr. Landon, and Mr. Wang have given their full cooperation to this committee, and we really appreciate that. They have talked to us voluntarily. Their testimony will help us as we slowly but surely try to put the pieces of this puzzle together. We owe them our thanks for their cooperation.

It stands in marked contrast to the cooperation we have received from the White House and the Democratic National Committee. The difficulty this committee has faced with the White House has been deplorable. It is an outrage that the White House has withheld knowledge of the White House coffee videotapes until now.

This committee's March 4th subpoena specifically required the production of videotapes 7 months ago. At least a half a dozen senior White House aides and the President himself were taped. It is obvious that the President and most of his senior staff knew that these tapes existed for a long time. After all, the President was in the tapes.

The fact that they have been withheld this entire year borders on obstruction. There are reportedly another 150 tapes of Democratic National Committee events that we still have not received. The record shows more and more that this White House and this President are not eager for the American people to know the whole truth, and the American people have a right to know the facts.

Fortunately, today, we have witnesses who have been cooperative and are willing to tell the truth. Ms. Foung and Mr. Landon contributed $35,000 to the DNC in 1996 at Charlie Trie's request.

They were promptly reimbursed for each contribution. Our investigators have traced $10,000 of this amount directly back to the Bank of China in Macao. This money was wired to the United States in August 1996. Within 10 days, it was in the hands of the Democratic National Committee. The other $25,000 was repaid in sequentially numbered money orders from a bank in New York City.

Mr. Wang contributed $5,000 to the Democratic National Committee in August of last year. His friend, Daniel Wu, also contributed $5,000. Daniel Wu lives in Taiwan. Both contributions were made at the request of John Huang. Both men were paid back with envelopes full of cash given to them by Antonio Pan.

We have granted these witnesses immunity from prosecution. This is an extra layer of protection to make sure that these three people can come forward and tell the American people what happened without any fear. It is well known that the Justice Department, as a matter of policy, does not seek to prosecute straw donors. I will quote from a 1994 memo from the director of the Justice Department's Election Crimes branch, quote, The Justice Department has a long-standing, nonprosecution policy for persons who are used as conduits or straws to disguise another person's illegal contributions, provided that allowing their names to be used by another is the extent of their participation in the scheme, end quote.

The testimony we are about to receive cannot be dismissed lightly. John Huang and Charlie Trie are both close friends and appointees of the President. John Huang was in the White House over 90 times during the President Clinton's first term. He had numerous meetings with the President. The President personally intervened to help move him from the Commerce Department to the Democratic National Committee.

This is the first time in my memory that we have seen evidence of such blatantly illegal activity by a senior national party official. John Huang's title at the Democratic National Committee was vice chairman for finance.

Likewise, Charlie Trie was a close personal friend of the President. Charlie Trie visited the White House nearly 40 times that we know of. In early 1996, the President signed an Executive order enlarging a Presidential commission on trade, so he could appoint Mr. Trie to that commission. It should be disturbing to all of us to receive testimony about illegal and unethical conduct by such close associates to the President of the United States.

An important figure that is going to emerge during this hearing is a man named Antonio Pan. Mr. Pan is a rather mysterious figure who had ties to Charlie Trie, the Lippo Group, and John Huang. He was in the White House eight times in 1995 and 1996. He was apparently the bag man in both the transactions involving Manlin Foung and David Wang. It will become clear through documents and testimony that he was handling large amounts of cash.

Antonio Pan's involvement here raises a number of questions. Whose bidding was he doing? Charlie Trie's? John Huang's? The Lippo Group's? Were they all collaborating? Where did the cash come from? A number of the transactions we are going to talk about today involve large amounts of cash. If we are going to trace

the origins of this money, we are going to have to talk to the people who handled that cash.

Charlie Trie has left the country. I don't think he's planning on coming back. The last we heard, he was in Shanghai. John Huang has taken the fifth. Antonio Pan has left the country. According to our most recent information, we believe that he's either in Hong Kong or New Zealand. This is a perfect case study in the obstacles that this committee has faced in trying to root out the truth about the illegal foreign money that was flowing to the DNC.

The obstacles have been many. More than 60 people have either taken the fifth amendment or fled the country to avoid revealing their role in this scandal. Next week, the President will be meeting with President Jiang Zemin of the People's Republic of China. If he wants to get all of the facts laid out on the table, he should insist that the Chinese Government send Charlie Trie back to the United States so we can question him. The American people have an absolute right to know what Charlie Trie did and what senior Government officials asked him to do.

Finally, today's hearing is going to focus much-needed attention on the DNC's program of identifying and returning illegal contributions. It appears that the DNC's highly touted audit by Ernst & Young was error prone and is completely unreliable. This is a subject that we are likely to return to in future hearings.

I once again want to thank our witnesses for their cooperation. This has been a tense and nervous couple of weeks for them, and we understand that. This hearing room is probably the last place that they want to be today, but we are going to try to make this as easy as possible for all of them.

I now recognize our ranking member, Mr. Waxman, for his comments.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Dan Burton follows:]

DAN BURTON, INDIANA
CHAIRMAN

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, NEW YORK
J. DENNIS HASTERT, ILLINOIS
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, CONNECTICUT
STEVEN SCHIFF, NEW MEXICO
CHRISTOPHER COX, CALIFORNIA
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, FLORIDA
JOHN M. McHUGH, NEW YORK
STEPHEN HORN, CALIFORNIA
JOHN L. MICA, FLORIDA
THOMAS M. DAVIS III, VIRGINIA
DAVID M. McINTOSH, INDIANA
MARK E. SOUDER, INDIANA
JOE SCARBOROUGH, FLORIDA
JOHN SHADEGG, ARIZONA
STEVE C. LaTOURRETTE, OHIO
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, SOUTH CAROLINA
JOHN E. SUNUNU, NEW HAMPSHIRE
PETE SESSIONS, TEXAS
MIKE PAPPAS, NEW JERSEY
VINCE SNOWBARGER, KANSAS
BOB BARR, GEORGIA
ROB PORTMAN, OHIO

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6143

MAJORITY (202) 225–5074
MINORITY (202) 225–5051
TTY (202) 225–6852

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

TOM LANTOS, CALIFORNIA
BOB WISE, WEST VIRGINIA
MAJOR R. OWENS, NEW YORK
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, NEW YORK
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, PENNSYLVANIA
GARY A. CONDIT, CALIFORNIA
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, NEW YORK
THOMAS M. BARRETT, WISCONSIN
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHAKA FATTAH, PENNSYLVANIA
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND
DENNIS KUCINICH, OHIO
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, ILLINOIS
DANNY K. DAVIS, ILLINOIS
JOHN F. TIERNEY, MASSACHUSETTS
JIM TURNER, TEXAS
THOMAS H. ALLEN, MAINE
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., TENNESSEE

BERNARD SANDERS, VERMONT
INDEPENDENT

Statement of Chairman Dan Burton
Government Reform and Oversight Committee
October 9, 1997

Today, marks our first day of hearings into illegal foreign fundraising and other violations of law during recent campaigns.

We have three witnesses today. These individuals have admitted to making conduit contributions to the Democratic National Committee.

Testifying on our first panel will be Manlin Foung, the sister of Charlie Trie. Joining her will be her companion, Joseph Landon. Testifying on our second panel will be David Wang, a businessman from Los Angeles.

Our witnesses today are not villains. They are victims. They are ordinary people who were put on the spot by someone they trusted -- and they got burned.

Ms. Foung, Mr. Landon and Mr. Wang have given their full cooperation to this Committee. They have talked to us voluntarily. Their testimony will help us as we slowly but surely try to put the pieces of this puzzle together. We owe them our thanks for their cooperation. It stands in marked contrast to the cooperation we have received from the White House and the DNC.

The difficulty this committee has faced with the White House has been deplorable. It is an outrage that the White House has withheld knowledge of the White House coffee videotapes until now. This Committee's March 4th subpoena specifically required the production of videotapes. At least a half-a-dozen senior White House aides and the President himself were taped. It is

obvious that the President himself and most of his senior staff knew that those tapes existed a long time ago. The fact that they have been withheld this entire year borders on obstruction. There are reportedly another 150 tapes of DNC events that we still have not received.

The record shows more and more that this White House and this President are not eager for the American people to know the whole truth.

Fortunately, today we have witnesses who have been cooperative and are willing to tell the truth. Ms. Foung and Mr. Landon contributed $35,000 to the DNC in 1996 at Charlie Trie's request. They were promptly reimbursed for each contribution. Our investigators have traced $10,000 of this amount directly back to the Bank of China in Macau. This money was wired to the United States in August 1996. Within 10 days, it was in the hands of the DNC. The other $25,000 was repaid in sequentially numbered money orders from a bank in New York City.

Mr. Wang contributed $5,000 to the Democratic National Committee in August of last year. His friend Daniel Wu also contributed $5,000. Daniel Wu lives in Taiwan. Both contributions were made at the request of John Huang. Both men were paid back with envelopes full of cash by Antonio Pan.

We have granted these witnesses immunity from prosecution. This is an extra layer of protection to make sure that these three people can come forward and tell the American people what happened without any fear. It is well known that the Justice Department, as a matter of policy, does not seek to prosecute straw donors. I will quote from a 1994 memo from the Director of the Justice Department's Election Crimes Branch:

> ***"The Justice Department has a longstanding nonprosecution policy for persons who are used as conduits, or straws, to disguise another person's illegal contributions, provided that allowing their names to be used by another is the extent of their participation in the scheme."***

The testimony we are about to receive cannot be dismissed lightly. John Huang and Charlie Trie are both close friends and appointees of the President. John Huang was in the White House over 90 times during President Clinton's first term. He had numerous meetings with the President. The President personally intervened to help move him from the Commerce Department to the DNC. This is the first time in my memory that we have seen evidence of such blatantly illegal activity by a senior national party official. John Huang's title at the Democratic National Committee was Vice-Chairman for Finance.

Likewise, Charlie Trie was a close friend of the President. Charlie Trie visited the White House nearly 40 times that we know of. In early 1996, the President signed an executive order enlarging a Presidential commission on trade so he could appoint Mr. Trie to it.

It should be disturbing to all of us to receive testimony about illegal and unethical conduct by such close associates of the President.

An important figure that is going to emerge during this hearing is Antonio Pan. Mr. Pan is a rather mysterious figure who had ties to Charlie Trie, the Lippo Group, and John Huang. He was in the White House eight times in 1995 and 1996. He was apparently the bagman in both the transactions involving Manlin Foung and David Wang. It will become clear -- through documents and testimony -- that he was handling large amounts of cash.

Antonio Pan's involvement here raises a number of questions: Who's bidding was he doing? Charlie Trie's? John Huang's? The Lippo Group? Were they all collaborating? Where did the cash come from?

A number of the transactions we are going to talk about today involved cash -- large amounts of cash. If we are going to trace the origins of this money, we are going to have to talk to the people who handled the cash. Charlie Trie has left the country. I don't think he's planning on coming back. John Huang has taken the Fifth. Antonio Pan has left the country. According to our most recent information, we believe that he is in either Hong Kong or New Zealand. This is a perfect case study in the obstacles that this Committee has faced in trying to root out the truth about the illegal foreign money that was flowing into the DNC.

The obstacles have been many. More than 60 people have either taken the fifth or fled the country to avoid revealing their role in this scandal. Next week, the President will be meeting with the President Jiang Zemin of the People's Republic of China. If he wants to get all of the facts laid out on the table, he should insist that the Chinese government send Charlie Trie back to the United States. The American people have an absolute right to know what Charlie Trie did, and what senior government officials asked him to do.

Finally, today's hearing is going to focus much-needed attention on the DNC's program of identifying and returning illegal contributions. It appears that the DNC's highly-touted audit by Ernst and Young was error-prone and is completely unreliable. This is a subject that we are likely to return to in future hearings.

I want to thank our witnesses once again for their cooperation. This has been a tense and nervous couple of weeks for them. This hearing room is probably the last place they want to be today, but we are going to try to make this as easy as possible for them.

I now recognize our Ranking Member, Mr. Waxman, for his comments.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing today. After nearly a year of investigating and $3 million spent, we're hearing from our first witnesses about the 1996 elections. The focus of this hearing is on conduit payments. Conduit payments are, of course, illegal; unfortunately, they've also become much too common. In Senator Dole's campaign, for instance, both Simon Fireman and Empire Landfill have admitted to pervasive conduit schemes and directed $149,000 in illegal donations to the Dole campaign. In fact, today's Washington Post has the headline "Firm to Pay $8 million Fine for Illegal Campaign Gifts."

Moreover, as the chart on the screen indicates, the Federal Elections Commission is currently investigating 27 conduit payments involving 214 individuals. The FEC has closed 21 cases involving 108 individuals and levied $335,000 in fines. The FEC also closed, without action, 20 cases involving 246 respondents under their enforcement priority system. All these cases are for the 1992, 1994 and 1996 election cycles.

Our hearings have value if they at least add to the knowledge gained already in Senator Thompson's hearings. So it is useful to review briefly the July 29 Senate hearing that focused on Charlie Trie.

[Video shown.]

Senator THOMPSON. "There was a Presidential appointment in April 1996. So the committee will hear today from Mr. Jerry Campane, an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And it will later hear from two witnesses to whom it has granted immunity for the—from the use of their testimony and any criminal prosecutions against them.

"Senator Glenn, do you have an opening statement?"

Senator GLENN. "I don't have an opening statement."

Senator THOMPSON. "All right.

"Mr. Campane, will you please stand and raise your right hand."

Mr. WAXMAN. That was an excerpt from Senator Thompson's hearing and part of his opening statement. At that hearing, he had three witnesses testifying. The first, Jerry Campane, was an FBI agent detailed to the Senate. He led the Senate conduit investigation and used the chart now on the screen—if we could have that chart put on the screen—to show how Charlie Trie and Ng Lap Seng, also known as Mr. Wu, arranged conduit payments. And I want to point out that these conduit payments were for a February 1996 fund-raiser at the Hay-Adams Hotel, which is the same fund-raiser that Manlin Foung and Joseph Landon contributed to.

[The chart referred to follows:]


San Kin Yip Holding Co. Ltd.
Bank of China -- Hong Kong
$150,000 Wire Transfer
2/14/96
Yah Lin
"Charlie" Trie
Ng Lap Seng
"Mr. Wu"
Riggs Bank -- Washington, D.C.
$5,000 Check
2/19/96
$7,500 Check
2/19/96
$12,500 Check
2/19/96
Xiping Wang/
Zhengwei Cheng
Yue Chu/
Ming Chen
$5,000 Check
Bank-Fund Staff
Federal Credit Union
2/19/96
$7,500 Check
Chevy Chase Bank
2/19/96
$12,500 Check
Bank-Fund Staff
Federal Credit Union
2/19/96
Democratic National Committee
John Huang, Trie's DNC Contact

Mr. WAXMAN. Also testifying at the Senate hearing were Yue Chu and Xi Ping Wang, whose names are on the charts. They received immunity from the Senate and testified that they made contributions and were subsequently reimbursed by Charlie Trie and Ng Lap Seng.

In my view, the Senate hearing conclusively demonstrated that Mr. Trie and Ng Lap Seng asked Yue Chu and Xi Ping Wang to make conduit contributions. The depositions of Manlin Foung and Joseph Landon seem to indicate that they had an identical experience. But there is nothing in their deposition that adds to the knowledge to what Senator Thompson uncovered in his July 29 hearing. Instead of bringing them here from California, we could have achieved the same result simply by replaying not just that opening from Senator Thompson's hearing, but the whole hearing itself.

Now we have a third witness today, but before addressing his testimony, I want to make a brief comment to my Democratic colleagues. As the senior Democrat on this committee, I have a special responsibility to make sure our side has all the necessary information in making decisions. In retrospect, I believe I made a serious mistake in not adequately questioning the information Chairman Burton gave to us regarding David Wang and in agreeing to his recommendation to approve immunity.

When the matter was before us, I was influenced most by the fact that Mr. Wang seemed to be an innocent victim in a conduit scheme and that he made statements to committee investigators without an attorney present, and with no understanding of the legal consequences that he faced. But I was also perhaps too sensitive to the fact that if the Democrats opposed immunity, we would be accused of being partisan. I will not make that mistake again.

It is now clear that David Wang never should have received immunity. He has repeatedly misled this committee and Chairman Burton and his staff and our staff, and we have failed to ensure that his representations were truthful. The essence of his testimony—the part the chairman, the Republican chief counsel and other committee members have been citing, and the press has been reporting—appears to be a fiction.

I personally questioned Mr. Wang during his deposition on Monday, and he testified that John Huang called him on the morning of August 16th. According to Mr. Wang's testimony, 1 hour later, John Huang then arrived in Mr. Wang's Los Angeles office. Mr. Wang also testified that at that time, John Huang asked for and immediately received Mr. Wang's contribution to the Clinton campaign. The truth, however, is that this never happened.

John Huang did not meet with David Wang on August 16. In the last 3 days, the Democratic staff has thoroughly investigated this matter. Later this morning, I will enter into the record hotel bills, receipts, photographs, news stories and sworn affidavits that prove that John Huang was in New York on August 16th. It was impossible for him to have met with Mr. Wang.

Now, it's bad enough that we have approved immunity for false testimony. But even worse is that in the course of his deposition, Mr. Wang disclosed other criminal acts or potential criminal acts

that are far more serious than his conduit contribution. But because he provided that information in response to a question Republican Counsel Dick Bennett asked, he now has immunity for those crimes as well. We have blundered into giving Mr. Wang immunity for immigration and tax fraud and received only false statements in return.

At the outset, I said our hearings will only have value if we add to what Senator Thompson has learned. But that presupposes that we do no harm. Today we do harm. We have made a careless and irresponsible decision on immunity. We cannot take the representations Chairman Burton gives us at face value. And I regret that we didn't initiate our own Democratic investigation of Mr. Wang earlier. That is another mistake we won't make again.

In a year of embarrassments, this is the most damaging one to our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. I would just like to say to the ranking member that while immunity was granted, there is no immunity for perjury before this committee, and all witnesses will be sworn, as the ranking member knows.

With that, in accordance with what I previously stated in the rule, we will ask the cameras to be shut off, to be covered, and the microphones to be covered so that we can proceed with the——

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. In light of the fact that the most serious witness before us is Mr. Wang, I would ask that we put him on first.

Mr. BURTON. We already have the schedule. And the Chair has——

Mr. WAXMAN. There's no reason why that schedule couldn't be changed. He is the witness from whom we are going to learn something today. And we may have learned that, to our regret, we're out giving immunity inappropriately. Let's put him on first.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Waxman, the gentleman is not even here yet. He was scheduled to come this afternoon. He won't be around until at least noon. And we will proceed as we have scheduled.

The cameras will be shut off at this time. They will be covered. The microphones will be covered in accordance with the request of the witnesses.

[Pause.]

Mr. BURTON. If you're going to leave that camera there, could you cover that lens, please, just to make sure that the witnesses feel comfortable. I know you have it shut off, but I want to make sure it's covered, so we don't have to worry about it.

Thank you, sir. I appreciate that very much. That is an unusual cover you have there. Could you find some kind of cover or turn that camera around on the right, please, or whatever you want to do to cover it up?

Are we about set? Would the officer out there shut that door as soon as the door is cleared, please?

Manlin Foung and Joseph Landon, with your counsel, would you approach the witness table, please? Would you stand and raise your right hands, please?

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. BURTON. Be seated.

Once again, we want to thank you for your cooperation in being here today. And like I said to both of you before we started, we're going to try to make this as easy and as painless as possible. So just relax. And if you need some water or anything, take your time.

I now recognize the committee's chief counsel, Mr. Bennett, to start the questioning. He will be recognized for 30 minutes, and then we'll yield to the ranking minority member for whomever he chooses for the remaining 30 minutes of the first hour.

[The depositions of Manlin Foung and Joseph Landon follow:]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEPOSITION OF: MANLIN FOUNG

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1997

The deposition in the above matter was held in the Office of Charles J. Stevens, Esq., 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1450, Sacramento, California, commencing at 9:00 a.m.

Appearances:

Staff Present for the Government Reform and Oversight Committee: Richard D. Bennett, special counsel; James C. Wilson, senior investigative counsel; Charles F. Little, investigator; Kenneth Ballen, minority chief investigator; Phil Barnett, minority chief counsel; and Christopher Lu, minority counsel.

For MANLIN FOUNG:

CHARLES J. STEVENS, ESQ.
Stevens & O'Connell
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1450
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. BENNETT. Good morning, Ms. Foung. I am Dick Bennett, Special Counsel to the United States House of Representatives, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I want to thank you for coming.

In an abundance of caution, I want to read a preamble and some ground rules prior to having the oath be administered. If for any reason you don't understand any questions that we have here today, don't hesitate to indicate that you don't understand.

On behalf of the members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, I want to thank you for appearing. The record should reflect that we are here in Sacramento, California, taking your deposition. This proceeding is known as a deposition. The person transcribing the proceeding is a House reporter and notary public, and I would now request that he place you under oath.

THEREUPON, MANLIN FOUNG, a witness, was called for examination by counsel, and after having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung, I would like to note for the record those who are present at the beginning of this deposition. Your attorney, Chuck Stevens, is here with you. And again the record should reflect we are here in Mr. Stevens' office.

I am Dick Bennett, special counsel to the committee. With me and accompanying me is Mr. Jim Wilson, who is also Majority counsel for the House committee. Also, Mr. Charles Little, an investigator for the committee.

Here for the Minority today are Messrs. Ken Ballen, Phil Barnett, and Charles Lu.

Mr. LU. Chris Lu.

Mr. BENNETT. Chris Lu. I'm sorry.

Although this proceeding is being held in a somewhat informal atmosphere, because you have been placed under oath, your testimony here today has the same force and effect as if you were testifying before the committee, before the Congress, or in a courtroom. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes, I do.

Mr. BENNETT. If I ask you about conversations you have had in the past and if you are unable to recall the exact words used in a conversation, you may state that you are unable to recall those exact words and you may then give the gist or substance of any conversation to the best of your recollection. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Oh, yes, I do.

Mr. BENNETT. The court reporter cannot pick up a nod of your head.

If you recall only part of a conversation or only part of an event, please give us your best recollection of these events or parts of conversations that you recall. If I ask you whether you have any information about a particular subject and you have overheard other persons conversing with each other regarding that subject, or have seen correspondence or documentation about that subject, please tell me that you do have such information and indicate the source from which you derived such knowledge. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Including newspaper?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, general information that you have, yes.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. BENNETT. Before we begin the questioning, I want to, pursuant to the procedures normally followed, give you some background about the investigation and your appearance here.

Pursuant to its authority under House rules 10 and 11 of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is engaged in a wide-ranging review of political fund-raising improprieties and possible violations of law.

Pages 2 through 4 of House Report 105–139 summarizes the investigation as of June 19, 1997, and describes new matters which have arisen in the course of the investigation. Also, pages 4 through 11 of the report explain the background of the investigation.

All questions related either directly or indirectly to these issues, or questions which have the tendency to make the existence of any pertinent fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence, are proper.

The committee has been granted specific authorization to conduct this deposition pursuant to House Resolution 167, which passed the full House of Representatives of the United States Congress on June 20th of this year. Committee Rule 20 outlines the ground rules for the deposition.

The Majority and Minority committee counsels will ask you questions regarding the subject matter of the investigation. Minority counsel will ask questions after Majority counsel has finished.

After the Minority counsel has completed questioning you, a new round of questioning may begin. If there were any Members of Congress who were here today and wanted to ask you questions, they would be afforded an immediate opportunity to ask you any questions.

Pursuant to the committee's rules, you are allowed to have an attorney present to advise you of your rights here at this deposition, and Mr. Stevens is here. Any objection raised during the course of the deposition shall be stated for the record. You are represented by Mr. Stevens, not by Minority counsel, and you follow the instructions of Mr. Stevens with respect to responding to questions.

If you are instructed by Mr. Stevens to not answer a question or otherwise refuse to answer a question, we will then, either Majority and Minority counsel, will confer to determine whether the objection is proper. If the counsels agree that the question is proper, you will be asked to answer the question. If the objection is not withdrawn, the Chairman or member designated by the Chairman may decide whether the objection was proper.

This deposition is considered as taken in executive session of the committee, which means it may not be made public without the consent of the committee, pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of House Rule 11. You are asked to abide by the rules of the House and not discuss with anyone other than your attorney this deposition and the issues and questions raised during this proceeding.

No one is going to take this deposition, Ms. Foung, and give it to a newspaper reporter in terms of your responses. You ultimately will be called as a witness before the committee to publicly testify and at that time people can ask you questions after you publicly testify. But no one is going to have a copy of this deposition prior to that. Do you understand that?

Again, you have to answer.

The WITNESS. I do.

Mr. BENNETT. Finally, no later than 5 days after your testimony is transcribed and you have been notified that your transcript is available, you may submit suggested changes to the Chairman. That would give you the opportunity if you think that Mr. Strickland, the court reporter, had made an error with respect to tran-

scribing something, you would be given an opportunity to correct any error that you felt was in the transcript, and we will see that that is sent immediately to Mr. Stevens so you can have an opportunity to review it.

The transcript will be available for review by committee staff in terms of any errors anyone thinks has been made. That would be available to both Majority and Minority.

Substantive changes, modifications, clarifications or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by you must be accompanied by a letter requesting the changes and a statement of your reasons for the requested changes. A letter requesting any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications or amendments must be signed by you. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications or amendments shall be included as an appendix to the transcript conditioned upon your signing the transcript.

Do you understand everything we have gone over so far?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. If you don't, tell them and ask questions.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you understand generally what I have advised you thus far?

The WITNESS. I'm sorry?

Mr. BENNETT. Do you understand the matters about which I have advised you thus far?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Okay. I am starting to understand why these depositions are taking forever, if this preamble was read to every witness.

If you have any reasons to break, to talk to Mr. Stevens, you may.

In terms of ground rules, I will be asking you questions concerning the subject matter of the investigation. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Would you repeat that, please?

Mr. BENNETT. I will be asking you questions concerning the subject matter of this investigation. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes, I do.

Mr. BENNETT. Okay. If you don't understand a question, please say so and I will repeat it or rephrase it so that you understand the question.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you understand that you should tell me if you do not understand my question?

The WITNESS. Yes, I do.

Mr. BENNETT. Okay. The reporter will be taking down everything we say and will make a written record of the deposition. You must give verbal, audible answers because the court reporter cannot record a nod of the head or other gesture.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. BENNETT. If you cannot hear me, say so—I doubt that will be a problem—and I will repeat the question or have the court reporter read the question to you. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes, I do.

Mr. BENNETT. Please wait until I finish each question before answering, and I will wait until you finish your answer before I ask the next question. Do you understand that this will help the reporter make a clear record, because he cannot take down what we are both saying at the same time? Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Your testimony is being taken under oath as if we were in court, and if you answer a question it will be assumed that you understood the question and the answer was intended to be responsive to it. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Are you here voluntarily or here as a result of the subpoena? I believe the record should reflect that you have not been subpoenaed. I believe we filed a Notice of Deposition. So you are here pursuant to your understanding with your attorney, Mr. Stevens, correct?

The WITNESS. Say that again.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Stevens, we actually didn't subpoena your client. You have agreed to make your client available to us to answer questions; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. I think that is accurate. We certainly anticipated that if we said no, that there would be a subpoena. But you're right, we agreed to do this voluntarily, and we appreciate everyone coming here to this office to accommodate the witness.

Mr. BENNETT. And I am sure that we were all glad to come here to Sacramento on such a beautiful day to be here. I speak for the Majority and I suspect I might speak for the Minority on that.

If you have any questions before we get started, please ask, Ms. Foung. Or you can talk to Mr. Stevens. Do you have any questions.

The WITNESS. Not at this time.

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me, Mr. Bennett. I do have some opening comments I would like to make.

Mr. BENNETT. That might be a good time, if you would like. Go ahead.

Mr. BALLEN. Ms. Foung, good morning.

The WITNESS. Good morning.

Mr. BALLEN. I represent the Democratic members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. As you may know, there are two parties in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Republican Party that controls the House and the Democratic Party which does not.

On our committee, every committee has representatives of both parties. The Majority is represented by the Republicans. Their Chairman is Dan Burton who is Mr. Bennett's boss. I represent the Minority on the committee, the Democrats. My boss is Representative Henry Waxman from Los Angeles, and the other committee Democrats. If you are familiar, some are from this area. Gary Condit is one of our Members. Tom Lantos from California. You may know some of them.

I want to emphasize to you that we represent the Democratic Members of Congress who sit on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. I do now.

Mr. BALLEN. Okay. We don't represent the Democratic National Committee. We don't represent the White House. We simply represent the Members of the House of Representatives who are the Democratic members on the House committee.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. BALLEN. You look somewhat perplexed, so I wanted to ask you.

The WITNESS. It is something more complicated than I can understand, but I basically understand what you are trying to say, yes.

Mr. BALLEN. I want to let you know our view of this proceeding so that you do understand it, and start by apologizing because we feel you have given the statement and that should be sufficient for this committee. We do not feel this deposition today is necessary. And so we apologize for the inconvenience it has caused you, in advance.

And we also want to tell you, and Mr. Bennett is going to perhaps have to tell you that better, why we think you are being called today, because we are not sure. Mr. Dan Burton, who is the Chairman of the committee and who is Mr. Bennett's boss, has stated on the floor of the House of Representatives that he believes there to be a conspiracy possibly involving the Chinese Government to corrupt the American political system. And he also believes and he has stated that your brother, Charlie Trie, may be a part of this conspiracy.

In April of this year, Mr. Burton took to the floor of the House of Representatives and talked about your brother. He said your brother was part of a cast of characters who may have corrupted the American political system.

The WITNESS. What does that mean, "cast of characters"?

Mr. BALLEN. Well, can I read it to you?

Mr. STEVENS. Ken, I don't think she understands the idiom "cast of characters." It means one of a group of people, a group of individuals involved in something.

The WITNESS. Oh, okay. That was my only question.

Mr. BALLEN. Let me just read you the exact quotes, not to take anything out of context.

Mr. Burton, Mr. Bennett's boss, said on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington, "Did foreign governments funnel foreign funds in the 1996 campaign? The American people have a right to know. How did a cast of characters"—individuals—"such as John Huang, Charlie Trie, Chinese arms dealer Wang Jun, purported Russian mob figure Gregori Loutchansky and convicted drug dealer Jorge Cabrera gain access to the highest levels of our government?"

The WITNESS. So in another word, they do not necessarily mean—I am just still trying to understand the "cast of characters."

Mr. BALLEN. Uh-huh.

The WITNESS. Does that mean they are just comparing my brother with the other characters, or is my brother part of all the characters that conspired something? Is that what that means?

Mr. BALLEN. Well, it's hard for me to answer that. I think the answer is both. Comparing your brother to the other characters——

The WITNESS. As well as he's a part of it?

Mr. BALLEN. Yes, correct. I mean, I think that's the theory. I think the statement reflects that theory and those are serious allegations.

The WITNESS. This is news to me, yes.

Mr. BALLEN. That's why I wanted to tell you, so that you know the context of why you are being called here and what this is about.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. STEVENS. Let me be clear that he is not saying that there is necessarily evidence of that. He is saying that that is one potential theory that will be reviewed. It may be that there is no evidence of it. He is outlining one thing that might be the subject of the investigation.

The WITNESS. Right.

Mr. BALLEN. Right. And I think what your lawyer told you is correct. It is just a theory, but it is a theory that Mr. Bennett's boss has said repeatedly over the past 9 months. So it is a theory that some people may want to try to prove.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. BALLEN. I think it is also fair to inform you just what is meant—why you have to be coming back to Washington, what will happen to you in Washington. That there will be a hearing. There may be—there will be a large room with many Congressmen, over 44 Congressmen sitting there. You will be at a table in front of them. There may be television cameras. There may be news reporters. It is a public open hearing.

And we just want you to know where this thing is going and our point of view on it, which is different from their point of view. And we will do our best to make this as simple for you and as painless as we possibly can.

The WITNESS. I hope so. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. Are there any further comments, Mr. Ballen?

Mr. BALLEN. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung, are you now terrified to testify, or are you still willing to testify here today?

The WITNESS. I will tell you what I know. That is all I can do.

Mr. BENNETT. I am certainly not here to try to frighten you here, Ms. Foung. The effort here is not to scare a witness or frighten a witness. It is merely to get facts.

We as lawyers are here—I am here representing the Majority. I don't just work for one individual. I'm with the Republican Majority and report to the Republican Majority. And we are here just to ask you questions of facts. No one has made an allegation against you, and the lawyers here at the table as lawyers are bound by canons of ethics in which we are to seek the truth as best we can.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. BENNETT. And that ultimately is or should be the calling of lawyers. So no one is here to frighten you. I don't know what is going to happen when you come to Washington. There will be a hearing and there will be, hopefully, 44 Congressmen sitting in a room, although I suspect many of them will be going in and out of the room, from what I have observed, and you will be asked questions. We thought it was fair to see you first to understand the types of questions that will be asked of you. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to ask.

Also, in the room here, along with the two lawyers for the Majority and the three lawyers for the Minority and your lawyer, is Mr. Charles Little, I mentioned earlier. I believe you met Mr. Little before; is that correct.

The WITNESS. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And Mr. Little as well as two other individuals at one point in time asked you basic questions and tried to get information as best they could from you; isn't that correct?

The WITNESS. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And you were very cooperative and answered their questions; is that correct?

The WITNESS. I believe so.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. And I want to compliment you on your level of cooperation and your candor in answering those questions.

Do you believe that Mr. Little or any of the other visitors were unfair to you in any way?

The WITNESS. I believe they were doing—probably doing their best job they can.

Mr. BENNETT. And do you think that they in any way abused you or treated you unfairly or unkindly in any way?

The WITNESS. They were very polite and very friendly.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Stevens, I believe you indicated to me previously that you don't believe your client's constitutional rights were violated in any way.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, I'm not having my deposition taken. But do you want me to state my full position on the record?

Mr. BENNETT. Just generally, if you will, on behalf of your clients.

Mr. STEVENS. Based on my review of the situation, including numerous discussions with my client, I think it is fair to say at this point that she is not alleging that any of her constitutional rights were violated nor is she alleging that she was in any way abused or mistreated in the normal sense of those words by the attorneys or investigators who contacted her.

I will say, however, though, that she is concerned there were some statements made that in her mind were designed to cause her to believe that it was not necessary for her to consult counsel in order to protect her interests. She's not claiming that she was told unequivocally not to obtain counsel. And I know, based on my own experience, that statements of an ambiguous nature like this are frequently made and they are not necessarily improper. However, given her background, her cultural background, to a certain extent inability to comprehend all of the idioms of the English language, in an ideal world there would have been no statements about counsel at all.

For example, when she asked whether she should consult with counsel, one thing that she recalls being stated in response was, "Why would you need counsel?" Now, we all as lawyers might know that that is not technically an improper question, but when that question is posed to a person in Ms. Foung's position, it could have the effect of causing her to misunderstand the situation. Again in an ideal world, certain statements perhaps shouldn't have been made. But that expression of concern on her part about her treatment is a far cry from some of the things, frankly, I've heard and read about violating constitutional rights or abusing her or mistreating her or lying to her.

But I did think it appropriate to put on the record that one area of concern, because it is one Ms. Foung has consistently expressed to me, although she understands the system and she does agree that all the lawyers and investigators on both sides in this situation are honorable people doing their best and no one at any time has tried to induce her to make things up or to implicate people unfairly or inappropriately.

Let me just make sure that what I said is an accurate summary of Ms. Foung's position.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Ms. Foung, and Mr. Stevens.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. With respect to your personal background, Ms. Foung, when were you born?

Answer. February 9th, 1952.

Question. And what is your social security number?

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me; is this necessary to put her social security number on the record? Something maybe she—because we——

Mr. BENNETT. I don't really care. You don't have to put your social security number on the record. That's fine.

Mr. BALLEN. This might be publicly released, this deposition.

The WITNESS. Could I have a piece of paper and pen?

Mr. BENNETT. Sure.

Mr. BALLEN. It is my understanding that your deposition could be publicly released and so, therefore, I don't see why we need to put the social security number on the record.

Mr. STEVENS. Can we go off the record for a second?

[Discussion off the record.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Let me just ask you this, you are a naturalized American citizen?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. What is the date of your citizenship?

Answer. I couldn't remember. I believe sometime around 1980.

Question. When did you first come to this country?

Answer. 1973.

Question. And what is your educational background?

Answer. I graduated from high school in Taiwan. I had 52 units completed in the United States, major in business.

Question. At what university?

Answer. Solano College.

Question. Here in California?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And in terms of your background, I'll get into your family background, I'll ask more detailed questions on some matters perhaps later, but you have a brother and a sister; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And are your mother and father both still living?

Answer. No. My father was dead.

Question. And your mother, her name is?

Answer. Do E-Fong.

Question. And where does she reside?

Answer. Little Rock.

Question. Arkansas?

Answer. Arkansas.

Question. And your two siblings, a brother and a sister, your sister's name is?

Answer. Why do we—Dai Lin.

Question. And does she have a last name in addition—I know that Lin is a family name. Is there a last name?

Answer. Outlaw.

Question. And she lives in Virginia; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And then you have a brother who has previously been indicated as Mr. Charlie Trie?

Answer. Yah Lin Trie.

Question. And he goes by the name Charlie Trie; is that correct?

Answer. I call him Charlie—we call him Charlie.

Question. Okay. And are your brother and sister both naturalized American citizens?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And your mother is a naturalized American citizen?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. Now, have you been politically active yourself, Ms. Foung?

Answer. No.

Question. And I would imagine after this experience you don't intend to be; is that correct? You have to answer. You are not politically active, are you, ma'am?

Answer. No.

Question. And prior to the matters about which we are going to have you testify in 1996, had you ever worked on any political campaigns?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. Had you—and I want to go over the matter—the States in which you have resided, but have you been particularly active in contributing money to any political campaigns over the years?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. In terms of your residence, you have lived here in California for how long?

Answer. Since 1990.

Question. Prior to 1990, where did you live? You don't need to name the specific address, but the State.

Answer. Texas.

Question. How long did you live in Texas?

Answer. Approximately 6 years.

Question. From approximately 1983 or 1984 until 1990?

Answer. I'm sorry?

Question. Just take your time. From——

Answer. From 1992 to—I mean '82 or '83—I couldn't remember.

Question. Let me go back. Maybe it would be easier as opposed to moving back, I will take you back to a date and let you move forward. Where did you first reside when you came here to the United States?

Answer. San Francisco.

Question. For how many years?

Mr. STEVENS. Just give approximate, two or three? Four to five?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. You don't need to be with any great specificity.

Answer. '73 to '7—'73 to '77. Approximately 4 years.

Question. You lived in the San Francisco area of California?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And then in 1977, where did you move?

Answer. Little Rock, Arkansas.

Question. And you went to Little Rock, Arkansas, approximately in 1977?
Answer. That's correct.
Question. How old were you at that time, approximately?
Answer. If I was born——
Question. 25?
Answer [continuing]. In '52? Twenty-five.
Question. And what caused you to move to Little Rock, Arkansas?
Answer. A job transfer.
Question. And for whom were you working at the time?
Answer. USF&G, an insurance company. United States Fidelity and Guaranty.
Question. And you went to work there in 1977 in Little Rock, and how long did you stay in Arkansas?
Answer. Approximately 5, 6 years.
Question. From let us say 1977 until perhaps '83?
Answer. '82, '83.
Question. Were any other members of the family with you when you moved to Little Rock, Arkansas?
Answer. What do you mean by that?
Question. I mean, did you move to Little Rock, Arkansas—my question is, did any other members of your family live in Little Rock, Arkansas, in addition to you?
Answer. Yes, my brother and my sister, both.
Question. Were they already living there or did they go with you to Little Rock, Arkansas?
Answer. They were already there.
Question. And how long had Dai Lin been living in Little Rock, Arkansas?
Answer. I don't remember. I don't know.
Question. Several years?
Answer. Yes.
Question. She had an existing business there; is that correct?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And her business, she owned a restaurant?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And your brother, Yah Lin Trie, Charlie Trie, how long had he been in Arkansas when you arrived there in 1977?
Answer. I don't really remember.
Question. He was working for your sister at the time; wasn't he?
Answer. At first, yes.
Question. And in what capacity did he work for your sister?
Mr. STEVENS. What did he do?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. What did he do? I'm sorry; what did he do for your sister? She owned a restaurant. Dai Lin owned a restaurant in Little Rock, Arkansas; is that correct?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And your brother worked for Dai Lin in her restaurant; is that correct?
Answer. That's correct.
Question. And what did he do for her?
Answer. I don't really know. I believe everything related to whatever the restaurant needs.
Question. She owned the restaurant, though, and he worked for her; is that correct?
Mr. BALLEN. If you know.
The WITNESS. I believe so. I don't really know. I was in the insurance business, different than the restaurant business, so I didn't really know what they were doing.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I understand.
At some point in time during this 6 years that you were there in Little Rock, Arkansas, from '77 to '83, did there come a point in time when your brother established his own business?
Answer. I believe so.
Question. And what was the nature of that business? What was the business?
Answer. Restaurant.
Question. He opened up a restaurant separate from your sister's restaurant?
Answer. I don't really know. Seems like they were working together for a long time, and then I moved to Texas.

Question. I understand.

Answer. And then I didn't keep up with it.

Question. You moved to Texas around 1983?

Answer. '83, yes.

Question. I guess my question is——

Answer. End of '83, uh-huh.

Question [continuing]. During this time from '77 to '83, do you know whether your brother took over your sister's restaurant or do you know whether he established a separate restaurant?

Answer. I really can't remember.

Question. At some point in time, though, he went into the restaurant business?

Answer. That's correct. That's correct.

Question. And up until the time you left Arkansas to move to Texas in 1983, he was operating a restaurant; is that correct?

Answer. He was working in a restaurant business. How was—what capacity, I don't know.

Question. Okay. But basically, then, that was his—you don't know what the nature of the ownership of the restaurant was or the details but——

Answer. No——

Question [continuing]. But he was in the restaurant, running a restaurant?

Answer. That's right.

Question. That was what he did for a living was run a restaurant?

Answer. Yes.

Question. During that period of time, did you have occasion to meet Governor Clinton of Arkansas?

Answer. No.

Question. I'll ask you this later, but at some point in time your brother during that time period met Governor Clinton; is that correct, in Arkansas?

Answer. I personally don't know. I did find out later, yes, they were friends.

Question. And how did you find that out later?

Answer. The newspaper. It was on the newspaper all over.

Question. I will get into more detail later but you at one time in March of last year actually had occasion to meet President Clinton; didn't you?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And you met him here at a fund-raising function here in California; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And at that point in time President Clinton made reference to your brother; isn't that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And exactly what did President Clinton say to you about his relationship with your brother back in the Little Rock, Arkansas, days?

Answer. He say my brother, Charlie Trie, is a close friend of his in two decades.

Question. A close friend for two decades?

Answer. Yes.

Question. But during the time that you lived in Arkansas, you yourself did not meet Governor Clinton?

Answer. Never. Was he the Governor at that time?

Question. At some point in time. I believe he was the Attorney General and then was the Governor.

Answer. I wasn't familiar with him at all.

Question. And I gather that you yourself did not meet any members of the Clinton family during your 6 years in Arkansas?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. Then chronologically moving forward, around 1983 you moved to Texas; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And you maintained contact with your mother who remained in Arkansas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And maintained contact with your brother who remained in Arkansas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And with respect to your sister, she, Dai Lin, had had a restaurant in Arkansas, you said, when you arrived in 1977; is that right?

Answer. I think so.

Question. When did your sister move from Arkansas to Virginia?

Answer. I couldn't remember. It seems like '84 or '85. Something like that.

Question. At some point in time while you were still in Texas, your sister then moved from Arkansas to Virginia?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And your brother and mother remained in Arkansas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And your mother remains in Arkansas to this day?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And she lives in a home which is owned by your brother; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you have any ownership of that house in which she lives, you personally?

Answer. I don't believe so. We originally applied a loan together.

Question. "We" meaning your mother and you?

Answer. Me and my brother. But somewhere along the line, I think that the house was sold and then the person that bought it—I don't know exactly what happened, either default or something, and he has to buy back without my name, I believe.

Question. Who is "he" who bought it back?

Answer. My brother, Charlie—Yah Lin.

Question. So Yah Lin Trie at some time became the total owner of the house in which your mother now resides?

Answer. I think so. I never did go into it to find out.

Question. When do you believe this approximately would have occurred when your name was taken off the title?

Answer. I couldn't remember.

Question. Okay. It was while you were in Texas or when you had moved back to California?

Answer. It was when I was in Texas.

Question. Sometime during the 1983–1990 time period?

Answer. Yes, but I don't remember—I don't know the details. I don't know what happened.

Question. I understand. Did you have any conversations with your brother where he explained to you what happened?

Answer. I don't think so—I don't remember.

Question. Directing your attention up until the time period of February of 1996, do you have any recollection of making any political contributions to any Federal political candidates, meaning candidates for Congress or the United States Senate or candidates for President, for President Clinton? Up until February of 1996, do you recall making any political contributions?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. And what contributions would they have been, ma'am?

Answer. I believe there was a check written to DNC.

Question. The Democratic National Committee?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. And when would that check have been written? Approximately?

Answer. February.

Question. February of 1996?

Answer. February 1996.

Question. I'm going to get to that ma'am, we are going to do that in a second. I'm sorry if you didn't understand my question. That is the $12,500 check.

Mr. BALLEN. Before.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I am trying to get before that, prior to the $12,500 check to the Democratic National Committee in February of 1996, before that, before that date, do you recall making any political contributions to President Clinton or the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. I cannot remember.

Question. Do you recall making any contributions to any Federal political candidates for the U.S. Senate or for Congress in Texas or in Arkansas or in any other State?

Answer. I can't—I can't recall.

Question. Now, then, directing your attention to February of 1996, I will show you what has been previously marked as MF–1, your initials, dash, 1.

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–1 was marked for identification.]

[Note.—All exhibits referred to may be found at end of deposition on p. 59.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Looking at that exhibit drawn on your bank account, which is the Travis Federal Credit Union; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And do you recognize—I know that that is a faded copy—your signature on that check and do you recognize the copy of that check?

Answer. Yes, that's my signature.

Question. And in fact—and that is, in fact, a copy of a check which you prepared on February 18, 1996, to the Democratic National Committee, or as you have noted on the check, paid to the order of the DNC; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. Now, with respect to that check, what were the circumstances leading up to your preparation of that check? As a matter of fact, why don't we—in order to have everything in front of you, let me have, if I can, two more exhibits, please.

I'm going to show you—place in front of you and Mr. Stevens, your attorney, MF–2.

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–2 was marked for identification.]

Mr. STEVENS. Is it all right if I mark exhibit numbers on these copies?

Mr. BENNETT. Go right ahead. And MF–3.

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–3 was marked for identification.]

Mr. BALLEN. Dick, ours are not marked, so if you could indicate which is going to be which.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, Ken, the check, the $12,500 check is MF–1. The packet of material from the Amerasia Bank and the $5,000 cashier's check payable back to Ms. Foung is MF–2. And then the deposited cashier's checks, the second packet you just got, is MF–3.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. If you want to look at those, take your time, I want to go through the scenario with those exhibits in front of you in terms of the circumstances of your first contribution to the Democratic National Committee.

You have indicated that to your knowledge—and if I'm not stating this correctly, please correct me—from what I gather this is the very first time you had ever prepared a check to the Democratic National Committee; is that correct? To your knowledge?

Answer. To my knowledge, yes.

Question. And what were the circumstances giving rise and causing you to prepare this check? Why did you write this check?

Answer. Because my brother called me.

Question. Your brother, Charlie Trie?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Approximately when did he call you and where was he when he called you?

Answer. I couldn't remember—I don't know exactly the time. I will have to guess somewhere around the check written time.

Question. Somewhere around the date of the check, February 18, 1996?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Was he overseas at that time?

Answer. I believe so. I was under the impression he was.

Question. And what caused you to believe that he was overseas?

Answer. Because he said he couldn't make it to meet a deadline of a contribution.

Question. He—I'm sorry, if I misunderstood what you said, correct me. But your brother, Charlie Trie, said to you that he could not make a deadline for a contribution?

Answer. Something like that.

Question. And where was the contribution to be sent, this $25,500 to the DNC?

Answer. That I don't remember. I must jot down the address.

Question. Do you know what the deadline was he was referring to?

Answer. No, I didn't ask.

Question. Did you have any knowledge of a dinner right around that time period that was to be held at the Hay-Adams Hotel in Washington, D.C.?

Answer. No, I don't.

Question. Did he talk to you about that?

Answer. No, he didn't.

Question. And basically you prepared this check at his request?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did he indicate to you how—did he indicate to you that you were to be reimbursed for writing this check?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And did he indicate to you how he was going to reimburse you?

Answer. I don't remember. I don't remember.

Question. But again we'll go through the exhibits, looking at the exhibits before you, you were reimbursed almost immediately for your check; isn't that correct?

Answer. According to the date, yes.

Question. Within a matter of a few days, you got the money back from your brother?

Answer. Four or five days, yes.

Question. Now, do you recall whether you mailed this check or what happened to this $12,500 check made payable to the DNC once you prepared it? Where did it go? My question is, did someone come by and pick the check up at your home?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you put it in the mail?

Answer. No.

Question. Where did you send it?

Answer. I sent it to Washington, D.C., somewhere by—I couldn't remember if it was by Federal Express or regular mail or Federal express mail, I couldn't remember.

Question. But you sent it to whatever address your brother gave you; I gather?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And do you recall what the address was?

Answer. No, I don't.

Question. Do you recall whether or not it was the address of the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. I don't even know what their address.

Question. So you don't know the mechanics of how this came into the possession and was cashed by the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No.

Question. You just know that you sent it to an address designated by your brother?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. Now, did you know an individual named Antonio Pan?

Answer. No, I don't.

Question. Have you ever met an individual named Antonio Pan?

Answer. I don't believe so.

Question. Do you have any personal knowledge of the involvement of Mr. Antonio Pan in forwarding money to you in covering this check?

Answer. No, I don't.

Question. And we'll go into the matter of Mr. Landon—you have a close personal friend, Mr. Joseph Landon; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And you and Mr. Landon reside together; is that correct? I don't need to get into your personal life. Strike that question.

He is a close personal friend of yours; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And, again, I don't want to get into your personal life, and I apologize for that. Mr. Landon at some point in time this same day also wrote out a $12,500 check; is that right?

Answer. I believe so.

Question. Did you have discussions with Mr. Landon concerning the preparation of a $12,500 check?

Answer. I might have. Must be very brief because I couldn't remember what was said.

Question. Do you know if your brother spoke to Joe Landon about a $12,500 check?

Answer. No.

Question. You don't remember or you don't know that he spoke with him?

Answer. I know he didn't spoke to him.

Question. So it could be correct, would it not, that if Mr. Landon prepared a similar $12,500 check, as did you, to the Democratic National Committee, it would have been at your request pursuant to the discussion you had with your brother?

Answer. Must be.

Question. Okay. Let me show you that check.

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–4 was marked for identification.]

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–5 was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Looking at now Exhibits MF–4 and MF–5, you see there is Mr. Landon's check I think a day later than your check.

Mr. BALLEN. I'm sorry, Dick, I just missed what you said.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sorry, excuse me.

Mr. BALLEN. I'm sorry.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Showing you Exhibits MF–4 and MF–5, you will see that Mr. Landon's check is also made out to the Democratic National Committee for $12,500. Do you see that?

Answer. Yes, do I.

Question. And, in fact, that was a result of a conversation that you had with him, based on your conversation with your brother; isn't that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And, in fact, Mr. Landon—you advised Mr. Landon that both you and he were going to be reimbursed for these checks and you were doing this as a favor for your brother; isn't that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And in fact, then looking at MF–2 and MF–5, they are copies of cashier's checks which came back to you and Mr. Landon 3 days later, isn't that correct? From the Amerasia Bank in New York?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And if I'm wrong correct me, but three of the five—there are five $5,000 cashier's checks; isn't that correct? If you want to take a minute, look at Exhibits MF–2 and MF–5. Just take your time.

Answer. Okay. MF–2, we have three and MF–5 we have two.

Question. Meaning that MF–2, there are three cashier's checks to you each for $5,000, totaling $15,000; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And MF–5, there are two $5,000 cashier's checks made payable to Mr. Landon; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And, in fact, that represents a total of $25,000 totally reimbursing both of you for the checks you had written out to the Democratic National Committee a few days earlier; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Now, how did it turn out? Did Mr. Landon get his entire $12,500 back?

Answer. I believe so.

Question. And how do you believe that he got his money back?

Answer. I must gave him $2,500.

Question. Actually, to help you here, Ms. Foung, let me show what you has been marked as MF–1A, which is a supplement to Exhibit 1 which I think will be of some assistance to you.

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–1A was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. If you look at MF–1A, you will note there in terms of a $2,500 withdrawal—again, correct me if I am wrong, Ms. Foung, but it appears that of the $15,000 you received back after depositing those checks, you took $2,500 out to give to Mr. Landon, in addition to his $10,000 in cashier's checks; is that correct?

Answer. It appears to be.

Question. As you testify now, that is your recollection, looking at these documents in terms of what happened; is that right?

Answer. Exactly, because I couldn't remember what happened.

Question. I understand. I understand. I understand.

Did you have any contacts with any officials of the Democratic National Committee at the time that you wrote these checks——

Answer. No.

Question [continuing]. You wrote the check?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. To your knowledge, did Mr. Landon have any contact with any representatives of the Democratic National Committee at the time he wrote the check?

Answer. I really cannot speak for him, but to the best of my knowledge, no.

Question. I understand. Okay. And do you know the particular fund-raising event for which these checks were prepared?

Answer. No.

Question. And you did not attend any events in connection with these checks; is that correct?

Answer. No.

Question. It was purely at the request of your brother that these checks were prepared?

Answer. Yes.

Question. To your knowledge, had Mr. Landon ever made any contributions himself to the Democratic National Committee prior to this check, reflected by exhibit MF–4?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Does Mr. Landon know your brother, Charlie Trie?

Answer. He met my brother a couple of times briefly.

Question. How long have you and Mr. Landon known each other?

Answer. Possibly 4 years.

Question. And during those 4 years, how many times do you believe Mr. Landon has met your brother?

Answer. Two times for sure. Maybe three.

Question. To your knowledge, does Mr. Landon know the individual, Antonio Pan?

Answer. Not as I know of.

Question. Let me ask you this, Ms. Foung, have you ever heard of a group in Arkansas called the Lippo Group?

Answer. Never heard of it.

Question. Prior——

Answer. I do now.

Question. I think a lot of people have heard of the Lippo Group now, but prior to the matters in the newspaper did you have any knowledge of the individuals at the Lippo Group in Arkansas?

Answer. No.

Question. And as we speak, you have never met Antonio Pan?

Answer. Not as I know of.

Mr. BALLEN. Just to clarify your question was, "Do you have any knowledge of the Lippo Group in Arkansas?" Do you have any knowledge of the Lippo Group at all anywhere?

The WITNESS. No, sir.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. We don't have a process of rotating questions here, but I thank counsel for the clarification on that. I should have followed up.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. You don't have any knowledge of Antonio Pan anywhere up until today other than perhaps having seen his name in the newspaper; is that correct?

Answer. Until his name was brought up to me.

Question. Did your brother explain to you where the $25,000 came from that reimbursed you and Mr. Landon?

Answer. I believe—he never explained, but I believe it was his money.

Question. In fact, there are documents—just so you understand, because I want to make sure that you have the benefit of as many facts as we can give you so you understand, the committee has documents before it showing that the $25,000, in fact, came from an individual named Antonio Pan, and an account in New York.

Would you have any explanation for why Mr. Pan would have been giving you and Mr. Landon the $25,000 back?

Answer. I really never thought about that.

Question. Did your brother, Charlie Trie, ever represent to you that he, Charlie Trie, had repaid the $25,000 to you and Mr. Landon?

Answer. Would you please repeat that question?

Question. Did your brother, Charlie Trie, ever indicate to you that the repayment of the $25,000 came from him, Charlie Trie?

Answer. I couldn't remember exact conversations, but I was under the impression, yes.

Question. That he, Charlie Trie, your brother, had in fact paid you the $25,000?

Mr. STEVENS. When you say "paid," are you talking about physically being the conduit of the money or being the source of the money?

Mr. BENNETT. Being the source of the money.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. To your knowledge, your impression was that your brother had repaid the $25,000?

Answer. Yes, yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Just one second.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Directing your attention to approximately a month later, I think it is in March of 1996, do you recall attending—we talked about this a little bit earlier in the morning—a political fund-raising event here in California attended by President Clinton?

Answer. Would you be more specific?

Question. Sure.

Answer. Are we talking about the one that I mentioned earlier?

Question. Yes, yes, in fact, specifically you attended a political fund-raising event in Hillsborough, California. Do you recall that?

Answer. I recall, but at the time I didn't know it was fund-raising.

Question. I want to direct your attention to that event, if I can. With respect to the—an event in March of 1996, directing your attention to that event, first, you attended an event in Hillsborough, California, in March of 1996 at which Mayor Willie Brown of San Francisco and President Clinton were in attendance; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And, in fact, you met President Clinton at that time; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And that's the very first time you'd ever met President Clinton?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. When you went to that event, did you know that it was a political fund-raiser?

Answer. I didn't.

Question. What were the circumstances surrounding your attendance at that event?

Answer. Because my brother called me, said——

Question. Again, do you know where your brother was when he called you?

Answer. I don't.

Question. Do you believe it was overseas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. If I can just step back for a second, Ms. Foung, I gather that your brother travels overseas a great deal?

Answer. He spends the majority of his time overseas. That's the way I understood.

Question. And would he be in Taiwan or China; do you know? I'm going to get into the details later of where he is now, but it is your belief that he called either from Taiwan or China or wherever overseas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I will rephrase the question. You don't know specifically where he was when he called you in March of 1996; do you?

Answer. I couldn't remember.

Question. It's your impression that he was overseas but you don't know in which country he might have been?

Answer. No.

Question. But it was your impression that he was overseas?

Answer. I believe so.

Question. And what did he say with respect to attendance at this event?

Answer. Say that again.

Question. What did your brother say to you about this event that he wanted you to attend?

Answer. He was just asking me if I would go to a dinner function, that Mr. Clinton will be there, that was in San Francisco.

Question. And as to that event, you weren't asked to spend any money?

Answer. No.

Question. And how did you get to the event? How did you go to Hillsborough?

Answer. We drove.

Question. And it is a drive—from here in the Sacramento area, I guess it is a drive of approximately an hour and a half or 2 hours?

Answer. From where I live to Hillsborough, how far is that? About 50 miles or something like that; 50, 60 miles.

Question. And who drove you?

Answer. Joe Landon.

Question. Joe Landon. Anybody else besides you and Mr. Landon travel in the car?

Answer. No.

Question. And did Mr. Landon actually attend the event?

Answer. No.

Question. Where did Mr. Landon stay? He, in fact, remained in the car while you went to the event; is that right?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. How did you actually get to the event? Did Mr. Landon drive you right to the event or did you meet another group of people and attend the event with a group of people?

Answer. We were supposed to—the instruction was to park at the high school parking lot. There is a bus to transport all the guests to the house.

Question. And that was in Hillsborough?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. And you went to the local high school in Hillsborough, Burlingame High School?

Answer. Yes, few blocks away from the house.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, my nephew attended that high school, so I'm somewhat familiar with the area.

Mr. BALLEN. I was wondering how you knew the geography.

Mr. BENNETT. I don't want counsel to think I knew all the details. It doesn't matter much, but my sister-in-law lives in Hillsborough and I think I know the high school where he went. But in any event, the record should reflect that one of the few times in the deposition the counsel are all laughing together in a matter, which is a healthy sign I think.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. You went to the local high school and a bus took a group of people to this private party; is that right?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And at some point in time did you meet an individual there named John Huang?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Had you met Mr. Huang before?

Answer. No.

Question. And what were the circumstances under which you met him? Did he come up and introduce himself to you? Or what were the circumstances?

Answer. He called me prior to the function to ask me to give him some personal information such as name, address, social security, so it was strictly for security clearance.

Question. And did he indicate to you at that time—how did he know you were going to attend the event?

Mr. STEVENS. If he said.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. If he said. My question—I will rephrase it. My question is, Mr. Huang, an individual named John Huang called you prior to the event?

Answer. Right.

Question. And this would have been after your brother, Charlie Trie, asked you to attend the event?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Did Mr. Huang call indicating that he had spoken to your brother, Charlie Trie, and therefore knew you were going to attend the event?

Answer. He must.

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me; do you recall?

Mr. BENNETT. Counsel, I don't mind occasionally clarifying, but why don't I finish the train and you will be free to follow up on it.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I gather Mr. Huang must have known from some source, either your brother or some source, that you were going to attend the event.

Answer. I assume so.

Question. You didn't know this man, John Huang, and he calls you for information because you are going to attend the event?

Answer. Yes, somebody must know I was attending to get my security clearance.

Question. And then on that evening in March of 1996—it was an evening event; wasn't it?

Answer. It was evening, about 6 o'clock.

Question. Did you meet Mr. Huang at that time?

Answer. We met outside the bus.

Question. At the high school parking lot?

Answer. The parking lot, yes.

Question. And then you went to the event on a bus, and both you and Mr. Huang were on the bus together?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. And we'll get back to the details of the event.

Have you seen John Huang since that particular night?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you spoken with John Huang since that night?

Answer. I vaguely remember he called me one more time to ask me if I would attend a function in San Francisco. I said no.

Question. And when would that have been?

Answer. I don't remember.

Question. It would have been prior to the re-election of President Clinton last November?

Answer. I couldn't remember, but I believe—I believe so.

Question. Apart from that one other telephone call from John Huang, is it fair to say that the only time you have met or spoken with John Huang, except for that one additional telephone call, would have been on this particular night in March—strike that.

Apart from John Huang calling you on the telephone and then being with you on that evening in March of 1996, the only other contact you have had with Mr. Huang is one other time when he called you on the telephone?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You have not spoken with him since?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. The only time you have ever seen him face-to-face would have been on this particular evening in March of 1996?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. Now, directing your attention to that particular evening in March of 1996, what were the circumstances giving rise to your actually meeting and speaking with President Clinton? Did someone introduce you to him?

Answer. No, everybody get in line to take a picture with him.

Question. In the trade it is called a photo op.

Answer. Okay.

Question. A photo op. Okay?

And when you met him, what gave rise to his saying to you, as I think you indicated earlier, that Charlie Trie—your brother Charlie Trie has been my best friend for two decades? How did that comment come up?

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me, that's not what she testified. She said "close friend." Not best friend.

Mr. BENNETT. Whatever she said, close friend. Charlie Trie has been my close friend for two decades.

Mr. STEVENS. My notes have her saying that he was, quote, "A close friend for two decades," closed quote.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Going by your counsel's—and if I misrepresented I apologize—Charlie Trie has been a close friend for two decades, what caused him to make that comment? Did someone say, this is Charlie Trie's sister?

Answer. Yes, something like that. Somebody must——

Question. I understand. As best you remember, someone let the President know that you were Charlie Trie's sister?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And as a result of that, he made that comment?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. Did he talk to you at any length at all? How long did you talk with President Clinton?

Answer. I think that was it.

Question. And you had your picture taken with him?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Were there any follow-up notes from President Clinton when you—strike that.

I assume you ultimately got a copy of that photograph, correct?

Answer. No, I didn't.

Question. You did not?

Answer. Huh-uh.

Question. Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. You indicated that you never actually got the photograph of you with the President?

Answer. No, I never did.

Question. And I gather, then, that you have not spoken with President Clinton since that time?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you spoken with any member of the President's family since that time?

Answer. No.

Question. And you have no personal relationship with any member of the Clinton family, correct?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me, can I just follow up one question there? Clarification?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I think in the spirit of comity, I think generally we have the questions of the Majority and Minority, but I don't have any objection to asking a quick question just to move it along.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you very much.

You asked her if she had any contact with any member of the President's family since that time. And I wanted to ask, have you ever had any, other than meeting President Clinton on this one occasion, have you had any contact with him or his family?

The WITNESS. No.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Fair question. Thank you, Mr. Ballen. Thank you, Ken.

Moving on, then—one second, I'm sorry.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Mr. Little was reminding me of one matter. At some point in time did someone explain to you why you were there at the March 1996 event? At some point in time was it explained to you that it was a fund-raising event for the President and his reelection?

Answer. I couldn't remember. Fund-raising—I cannot understand that at all. So it wasn't important to me to know. I only remember I was meeting the President. That's all I can remember. It was exciting.

Question. Do you recall—I will follow up with another question. Do you recall Mayor Brown of San Francisco being there?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you get your picture taken with Mayor Brown?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. Was there any discussion about needing to attend the fund-raiser to show support for Mayor Brown or for President Clinton?

Answer. I would assume if I was asked to attend a function, it will be showing support. I would assume that.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, he doesn't want you to assume. First, he wants you to tell him what you remember people saying to you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Did anyone talk to you about needing to have people in attendance for this event for Mayor Brown and for President Clinton?

Answer. My brother might have said he would like to be there personally; since he couldn't, would I be there on his behalf.

Question. But was there a discussion about trying to make sure there were people in attendance, that the more people, the better, was there that kind of conversation?

Answer. I couldn't remember exactly.

Question. All right.

Now, directing your attention to August of 1996.

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–6 was marked for identification.]

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–7 was marked for identification.]

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–8 was marked for identification.]

Mr. BENNETT. We can go off the record for a minute to help counsel with numbers.

[Discussion off the record.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Directing your attention to August of 1996, I placed before you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit MF–6, which is, in fact, a copy of a $10,000 check made payable to the Birthday Victory Trust.

Do you see that, Ms. Foung?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And, in fact, with respect to that check, did you attend any particular function in connection with that check?

Answer. No.

Question. And that check was prepared, again, at the request of your brother, Charlie Trie; is that right?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And, once again, you were immediately reimbursed for that $10,000; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Now, going back to the specifics, approximately how soon prior to your preparing that check did you speak with your brother?

Answer. I couldn't remember. Maybe the—the same day or the day before, maybe a couple days before.

Question. And, again, he called you on the telephone?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you know where he was calling from?

Answer. No, I don't.

Question. Do you believe he was calling from overseas?

Answer. I—I believe so, yes.

Question. But you don't know what country he was calling from?

Answer. No.

Question. And exactly what was the nature of the conversation you had with your brother at that time?

Answer. It was the same thing. That he needed a check to be in by a certain day; that he couldn't do it himself.

Question. He could not write the check himself and needed someone else to write the check?

Answer. Yeah, because he wasn't able to.

Question. And did he indicate how soon this event was going to take place in connection with this check?

Answer. No.

Question. Did he make any reference to any deadline that he had to meet?

Answer. Not in the exact words, but I was under the impression it has to be in by a certain date.

Question. And did he ask you to do this immediately?

Answer. Must be. Something like that.

Question. And what was the understanding you had in terms of how quickly you were going to be reimbursed?

Answer. I'm sorry?

Question. What was your understanding as to how quickly you were going to be reimbursed for this $10,000 check?

Answer. Was I or——

Question. Yes, you indicated earlier that your brother indicated that he was going to, as he had in February, see that you got repaid for this; correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what was your understanding as to how you were going to get repaid?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know how quickly he was going to do it?

Answer. Has to be—has to be fast enough to cover the check.

Question. Because you didn't have the money in your account to cover that check?

Answer. I guess not.

Question. Now, I put these exhibits in front of you so you could look at them. MF–6 is the check itself for $10,000.

Do you know how that check was delivered? Actually, strike that.

First of all, you note on the bottom left-hand corner there is the word "Federal" written on that check?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you recall why the word "Federal" is written on the check?

Answer. My brother told me to put it there.

Question. In other words, in addition to writing the $10,000 check out, you were told to put "Federal" on the check? On the bottom left-hand corner?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And that was at the request of your brother?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And do you know how this check was delivered or to whom it was delivered?

Answer. I couldn't remember. Again, could be Federal Express or something. I don't know.

Question. And I gather you don't recall exactly where you sent it; is that correct?

Answer. No.

Question. Okay. Would you have sent it wherever your brother told you to send it?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And apart from speaking with your brother, did you have any involvement or discussion with anyone else in connection with the Birthday Victory Trust? Did you talk to the people who were organizing the event, for example?

Answer. No.

Question. So wherever you sent it, it would have been at the instructions of your brother?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me; could I ask one follow-up question, please.

Mr. BENNETT. Sure. By the way, just for the record on this, until certain protocols are established, I don't want my willingness to allow Mr. Ballen to ask questions to in any way waive procedures that we may have established in previous depositions. But in the spirit of comity—C-O-M-I-T-Y, not C-O-M-E-D-Y, as Congress Waxman would sometimes suggest—I have no objection to move this along to allow Mr. Ballen to quickly interject a question. Go ahead.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you, Mr. Bennett.

You indicated when your brother talked to you that he said he wasn't able to write the check himself? Did he tell you why?

The WITNESS. Because he was traveling.

Mr. BALLEN. Okay. And that's why you believed he was overseas?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BALLEN. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Continuing on.

With respect to the repayment of this money, looking at MF–7, in fact there was a wire transfer, was there not, of money into your account at the Travis Federal Credit Union where a $10,000 deposit was made into your account almost the next day; is that correct?

Answer. It appears to be.

Question. And do you know the source of that $10,000 wire?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know an individual named Ng Lap Seng, also known as Mr. Wu?

Answer. No.

Question. I'll get back to that in a minute.

Do you recall any discussion about the money going back into your account, being wired back into your account the next day?

Answer. What do you mean by "discussion"?

Question. Did anyone say to you: By the way, the wire was made today?

Answer. No.

Question. How did you find out that—unlike the February event where you received cashier's checks——

Answer. Oh, I see what you are saying.

Question [continuing]. Here you were reimbursed not by cashier's checks; you were reimbursed by a wire.

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And did anyone talk to you about the wire transfer going into your account?

Answer. I think my brother asked my account number to prepare the money to wire to my account. Now, what I usually do is call the bank to verify, to make sure the check is covered. That was my only concern.

Question. And, in fact, you called your bank to make sure that it had, in fact, been deposited; is that right?

Answer. That's what I normally do if I am expecting something, I normally call.

Question. And then looking at deposition Exhibit MF–8, in fact, that reflects both the wire transfer on August 15, 1996, into your account, and the debiting of your account on August 16 of $10,000; is that correct?

Answer. It appears to be, according to this.

Question. So this document reflects the transmission of funds in and out of your account with respect to that $10,000 check to the President's birthday party; is that correct—the Birthday Victory Trust; is that correct?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. I'm sorry; you didn't understand my question?

Answer. What are you asking?

Question. These two documents, MF–7 and MF–8, reflect the money going into your account and immediately out of your account at the request of your brother to cover this check, Birthday Victory Trust of $10,000; is that correct? To cover this check for the Birthday Victory Trust?

Answer. Cover the check I wrote?

Question. Yes.

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you have any contacts with any other individual, apart from your brother, with respect to this $10,000 check and the transmission into your account the day before, or contemporaneous, the wire transfer, did you have any discussions with anybody else other than your brother, Charlie Trie, with respect to that matter?

Answer. No.

Question. And I don't want to get into the discussions you have had with your attorney subsequent to it, but with respect to that transaction, did you have any discussions with anyone else after you engaged in that transaction?

Answer. No.

Question. I'll get to the matter of Judd Best and the Democratic National Committee later, but around the time of the event——

Answer. No.

Question [continuing]. You didn't talk to anyone from the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you talk about this matter with anyone in connection with the reelection campaign of President Clinton?

Answer. I don't believe I talked to anyone at all.

Question. And were you aware of the particular fund-raising event to which this related?

Answer. No, I assume it was the birthday party; wasn't it?

Question. That's right. And you don't know if anyone went in your place or anything else, correct?

Answer. Not as I know of.

Question. And, certainly, this event actually was in New York. You did not travel to New York to attend this yourself?

Answer. No.

Question. Now, Ms. Foung, let me ask you something. Have you ever met Senator Tom Daschle, a United States Senator?

Answer. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator Daschle, for the record, is from what State?

Mr. BALLEN. South Dakota.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Have you ever been to South Dakota?

Answer. No.

Question. Has anyone ever spoken to you about Senator Tom Daschle?

Answer. Not as I can remember.

Question. Do you know—your mother's name is E-Fong Do Trie; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Am I pronouncing that correctly?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. To your knowledge, do you know whether or not your mother knows Senator Tom Daschle?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Have you ever heard your mother mention Senator Tom Daschle?

Answer. No.

Question. The records of the Federal Elections Commission reflect that you contributed $1,000—reflect that there were two $1,000 checks written by you to Senator Tom Daschle on June 26th, 1995. Do you have any knowledge or recollection of writing one or two $1,000 checks to Senator Tom Daschle in June of 1995?

Answer. I personally couldn't remember I did or I didn't.

Question. Is it your belief that you would have written—according to the records of the Federal Elections Commission, reviewed by the committee—again, I'm not trying to accuse you of some impropriety, I am just trying to get to the facts. I don't know if somebody has used your name or whatever, that is why I am asking—that the records of the Federal Elections Commission reflect that there were two checks, each for $1,000, made payable to Senator Tom Daschle, both of them dated June 26th, 1995. Do you have any recollection of that?

Answer. I cannot remember, same thing like I couldn't remember all those. How come they didn't get the bank records?

Question. I'm going to get into that in a minute. Maybe your counsel can follow up. I don't have reason to believe that you knew about this. Frankly, I believe someone used your name, but I am just trying to get to the facts.

Mr. BENNETT. And the records also reflect one check from the mother, correct? Off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. The records reviewed by the committee also reflect that your mother wrote a $1,000 check. E-Fong Do Trie is listed as having contributed $1,000 to Senator Tom Daschle also on June 26th, 1995.

Do you have any recollection of talking with your mother about making contributions to Senator Tom Daschle?

Answer. No.

Question. Perhaps I can, in the interest of time—well, let me ask you this: Do you recall ever being solicited by anybody to make a contribution to Senator Daschle?

Answer. I couldn't remember.

Question. Okay. Maybe in the interest of time, Ms. Foung, I'll just ask that your attorney, at your convenience, check to see if you have any canceled checks or recollection of having made a contribution to Senator Daschle. And in the event that the answer is in the affirmative, your counsel can advise me. Does that sound appropriate?

Mr. STEVENS. Can we go off the record for a second?

Mr. BENNETT. Sure, off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Ms. Foung, I understand that you don't recall ever making those contributions, and for the record, I suggest that—I understand that. It is my belief, as I ask you these questions, that someone else used your name and that you did not in fact make these. I represent that to be my impression based on the review of FEC records.

But the purpose of this deposition is not for me to state my opinion, but to try to find out what knowledge you have. And your attorney, Mr. Stevens, has indicated that he will see if you have any records or canceled checks that will in any way support the records of the Federal Elections Commission with respect to such donations.

Do you understand that?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And I appreciate again, as always, your high level of cooperation with the committee on this matter.

And again, just for purposes of the record, you don't recall having discussions with anyone from the Democratic National Committee concerning any contributions to Senator Tom Daschle of South Dakota; do you?

Answer. No.

Question. Who is Jim Outlaw?

Answer. My brother-in-law.

Question. And Dai Lin Outlaw is your sister; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. She is the sister who resides in Virginia?

Answer. Yes.

Question. She is your only sister?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. Do you have any knowledge of your brother-in-law, Jim Outlaw, or your sister, Dai Lin Outlaw, giving $2,000, each of them, to Senator Daschle that same day, June 26th, 1995?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. So you have no knowledge at all whether or not they know Senator Daschle?

Answer. No.

Question. You have never had any discussions with your mother or—strike that. Have you ever had any discussions with your mother or your sister or your brother-in-law concerning Senator Tom Daschle?

Answer. No.

Question. Who is Denise Outlaw?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. She is not a relation of Jim Outlaw or Dai Lin Outlaw?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Do Jim and Dai Lin have any children?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what are the names of the children?

Answer. Michael and Elaine.

Question. Do you know an individual named George Chu?

Answer. No.

Question. According to our review, he is an individual who purportedly went to school with your brother in Taiwan. But you don't have any knowledge of him?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you have any familiarity with a company known as Da Tung?

Answer. How do you spell that?

Question. D-A and then T-U-N-G.

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what knowledge do you have of that company?

Answer. That's a very big company that makes rice maker. I use their rice maker, cooker.

Question. That is located where?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Is it here in California, though?

Answer. I know they have a big factory in Taiwan. I don't know about here. They must have some distributor or something.

Question. Do you know what contacts your brother has with that company?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know whether your brother has any business with that company?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Do you know an individual named Ernie Greene?

Answer. No.

Question. I'm going to go down a list of companies in terms of information you may or may not have, and I want you to take your time on this. I can assure you, Ms. Foung, the effort is to not trick you here. I am just trying to get facts in terms of if you have any knowledge of these companies or individuals?

Answer. Okay.

Question. And if, for example, on reflection during this time period before you get to review your transcript, if you may recall a connection, please let Mr. Stevens know if you can't recall now and subsequently you do.

Answer. Okay.

Question. Chy Corporation. Do you have knowledge of the Chy Corporation?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know an individual named Tony Hsu, H-S-U?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever heard your brother mention Tony Hsu?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know an individual named David Mercer?

Answer. No.

Question. Or Ari Swiller?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know an individual named Martha Shoffner?

Answer. No. Wait, wait, wait.

Question. Let me give you some background on this. It may help.

According to the information we have at the committee, your brother had an assistant at the Daihatsu Corporation and her name was Martha Shoffner. Does that ring a bell with you?

Answer. It could be. Where does she work?

Question. She did at one time work at the Daihatsu Corporation, until your brother went to Washington in August of 1994.

Answer. I cannot be certain.

Question. What about a woman named Keshi Zhan?

Answer. No.

Question. Martha Shoffner still now lives in Arkansas. Again, you don't have any recollection of Martha Shoffner?

Answer. Did she ever work in Washington?

Question. No, according to our information she's still in Arkansas.

Answer. Then I don't.

[Counsels confer.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Mr. Wilson advises me she might have. I don't know. Suffice it to say, you don't have any knowledge of Ms. Shoffner and don't recall meeting her?

Answer. No.

Question. What about an individual named Lorin Fleming who was the head of an electronics company in Arkansas and an acquaintance of your brother, according to our information.

Answer. Yes.

Question. How well do you know Ms. Fleming?

Answer. Not very much. I think I met him once.

Question. That is an individual—I'm sorry, a man named Fleming, Lorin Fleming?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have you ever had any discussions with Mr. Fleming concerning your brother's business activities?

Answer. No.

Question. There is an individual who had Power of Attorney for several of your brother's bank accounts, and according to our information was your brother's bookkeeper at one time, an individual named Maria Mapili. Do you know Maria Mapili?

Answer. Not by that name.

Question. Do you know anyone named Maria who worked with your brother?

Answer. No.

Question. There was an assistant at the Daihatsu Corporation, your brother's corporation, Jody Webb; do you know Jody Webb?

Answer. No.

Question. There is a gentleman named Yue, Y-U-E, Fang, F-A-N-G, Chu, C-H-U. Do I know that individual?

Answer. No, huh-uh.

Question. There is an individual with whom your brother has done business according to the records of the subcommittee, named Ng Lap Seng, also know as Mr. Wu, and I think I asked you earlier about Mr. Wu. Do you recall, first of all, ever hearing his name?

Answer. Not as I can remember. I was in Little Rock in 1994, late 1994, I met a lot—I went to his office and met some staff.

Question. You went to whose office?

Answer. My brother's office. I met a bunch of people but I have no idea who they are and I don't remember any names.

Question. I think I asked you about a woman named Keshi Zhan and you have no knowledge of her at all?

Answer. Not that name, no.

Question. Do you know an individual named Ming Chen?

Answer. No.

Question. How about Xiping Wang, X-I-P-I-N-G?

Answer. No.

Question. And I apologize to you if I mispronounce these names in any way.

Answer. No, it's fine. All the people I know seems like they will be Mike, Dave, Bob. When you start spelling those, I don't know anybody that by that names, yes.

Question. You're indicating to me—and if I'm misstating this correct me if I am wrong—you have met associates of your brothers who have been given first names such as Mike, Dave and Bob and you don't necessarily know their last names?

Answer. No, just introduction, say, "Hi," that was the end of it; never speak to them again, never seen them again.

Question. Okay. Do you know an individual named Zhengwei Chang?

Answer. No.

Question. Charles Chiang?

Answer. No.

Question. There is an individual who according to our information signed for your brother's—strike that.

Your brother signed for her apartment in Washington, a woman named Bei-Bei Liu?

Answer. Never heard of her.

Question. Okay. And how about Zhengkang Shao? Have you ever heard that name before?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know any individuals at the Asia-America Trade Center in Hong Kong?

Answer. No.

Question. You don't know an individual named Peter Chen?

Answer. I heard of his name, yes.

Question. You heard of his name? From whom have you heard about Mr. Chen?

Answer. He's a family friend.

Question. He's a friend of the family's? Of your family's?

Answer. Not mine, but my brother, sister. I think they know him.

Question. Would he be from Arkansas?

Answer. I don't know where he's from.

Question. But do you recall ever meeting him?

Answer. I think I met him once.

Question. Do you know an individual here in the San Francisco area named Sy Zuan Pan?

Answer. No.

Question. How about Yogesh Gandhi?

Answer. No. I would have remembered if I heard that name.

Question. It is a name you would remember, I guess; is that right?

Lottie Shackleford, a friend of your brother's from Arkansas?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever met a man—strike that.

Have you ever heard your brother mention a name, Mark Middleton?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever met Mr. Middleton?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever been to Washington?

Answer. No.

Question. Then you have never attended any political or government events with your brother in the city of Washington?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you recall your brother being appointed to a commission with respect to international trade? I think it had the name Bingaman Commission. Do you recall anything in connection with your brother being appointed to a commission by President Clinton?

Answer. I remember he was—there was a possibility to be appointed, but I don't know—I didn't follow up because it wasn't important to me.

Question. Let me, if I can, get into another area now. At some point in time in connection with the $12,500 represented by Exhibit MF–1 and the $10,000 represented by MF–6, at some point in time you had a series of discussions with representatives of the Democratic National Committee; didn't you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And, in fact, Mr. Landon ultimately, as represented by his check, represented by MF–4, his $12,500 check, Mr. Landon received $12,500 back from the Democratic National Committee; isn't that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. Have you ever received any money back from the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. Not yet.

Question. And you had discussions with people at the Democratic National Committee concerning getting the $22,500 returned to you; did you not?

Answer. Yes.

[Foung Deposition Exhibit No. MF–9 was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I show you what is marked as MF–9, which in fact are some telephone records reflecting some of the calls you have had to make to Washington, and according to our review of the numbers, you have, in fact, made calls to Washington seeking to have this money be returned to you; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. With whom have you spoken concerning—you have called the Democratic National Committee; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And with whom have you spoken at the Democratic National Committee concerning the return of $22,500 to you for the two contributions that you made for which you were reimbursed by your brother? With whom have you spoken concerning those contributions?

Answer. I recall at first it was Mr. Joe Sandler.

Question. Joseph Sandler?

Answer. Joseph Sandler, yes.

Question. And how many times have you spoken with Mr. Sandler?

Answer. Once or twice.

Question. And did Mr. Sandler make any representations to you about money being returned to you?

Answer. No. I couldn't remember. I don't think so.

Question. Who else have you spoken with?

Answer. He referred me to talk to the counsel, John Best.

Question. Mr. Judah Best, Judd Best?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And how many conversations have you had with Mr. Best?

Answer. I couldn't remember.

Question. When was the last conversation you had with Mr. Best?

Answer. The last conversation was right after the investigator left. I called him to let him know according to this record, the money was reimbursed me by the cashier's check, but I didn't remember previously.

Question. And did Mr. Best accuse you of changing your story?

Answer. Not so much accuse. I guess I didn't remember any detail, so my detail might be different.

Question. I guess what I'm trying to—the point I'm trying to get to is that the Democratic National Committee determined to return $12,500 to Mr. Landon, correct?

Answer. Say that again.

Question. The Democratic National Committee returned $12,500 to Mr. Landon, correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And they haven't returned any of the money to you?

Answer. Yes—no, I mean.

Question. That is correct, they have not returned any money to you; have they?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And you have discussed that with Mr. Best or Mr. Sandler about their paying Mr. Landon $12 500, but not paying you $22,500 for your contributions.

Have you had any discussions with Mr. Sandler or Mr. Best about that matter?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you discussed that you be reimbursed?

Answer. Yes.

Question. My point is when you asked to be reimbursed, what was the response?

Answer. At first, he was asking me a question to see——

Question. "He" being Mr.——

Answer. Mr. Best.

Question [continuing]. Best? Okay.

Answer. To determine whether it should be refunded or not. And at first, I don't think I gave him the correct information, because I couldn't remember this $15,000 and my bank record does not reflect the twelve-five deposit, so I thought—I couldn't give him the exact on that part. And on the $10,000 wire, he say, yes, that should be refund. He will have to get back with me. He will talk to the DNC.

Question. And that conversation was in August?

Answer. I couldn't remember when.

Mr. STEVENS. Just tell him if you remember.

The WITNESS. I couldn't remember.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. As you speak today, have you received any money back from the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. Not yet.

Question. Has anyone—did you at any time indicate to the Democratic National Committee that this money was not yours; in fact, it had been reimbursed to you by your brother or by some friends of your brothers?

Answer. I did mention initially, according to my bank record, the money was wired to me. I did mention that to him. I couldn't remember this one, so I cannot tell him exactly what happened. And later on I did call back to confirm that according to the investigator, the record, that is what happened.

Question. Do you know if Mr. Landon indicated to officials of the Democratic National Committee that the $12,500 was not his money?

Answer. I—I don't know—I don't know.

Question. I understand. Mr. Landon will be here. We will ask him.

Answer. Yes, you will have to ask him.

Question. I wondered if you had any knowledge of what he has said to the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. I think he mentioned that he never spoke to anybody about it.

Question. Has anyone from Ernst & Young, the accounting firm of Ernst & Young ever contacted you?

Answer. Not as I can remember.

Question. In connection with the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you recall how Mr. Landon's contribution for which he was reimbursed by your brother, or friends of your brother, of $12,500, do you recall how that money was returned to him? Was it in the form of a check?

Answer. I'm sorry?

Question. Do you recall how the $12,500 returned to Mr. Landon, do you recall how it was returned to him?

Answer. You mean from DNC?

Question. Yes.

Answer. I think it was a check.

Question. Apart from contacts with the Democratic National Committee, and contacts with Mr. Little and investigators working with the Majority members of the committee, the Republican side of the committee, have you had contacts with those working with the Democrats on the committee, with the Minority on the committee prior to this morning?

Answer. Mr. Ballen called me one time, asked to speak to my counsel, my attorney, and I didn't have one.

Question. Apart from that one call from Mr. Ballen, any calls from any other representatives of the Democrats on the committee?

Answer. No.

Question. I meant to ask you about an individual at the DNC in addition to Mr. Sandler and Mr. Best named Steve Grossman. Have you ever spoken with Mr. Grossman?

Answer. No. I spoke to somebody who answered the phone, but it wasn't him, I know. I know that.

Question. Mr. Grossman is not answering the phone at the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No, he didn't answer the question.

Question. No, I'm just kidding.

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me, Dick, could I have a brief break?

Mr. BENNETT. I was going to say we are literally about to stop. We have been going for 2 hours or an hour and 45 minutes. Why don't we take a brief break for 10 minutes.

[Brief Recess.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Ms. Foung, with respect to your contacts with individuals at the Democratic National Committee, do you recall speaking with anyone other than Mr. Best, Mr. Sandler, or Mr. Grossman, apart from someone who answered the telephone, but in terms of having any substantive discussions with anybody other than Best, Sandler, or Grossman?

Mr. STEVENS. I'm sorry; did she say she actually spoke to Grossman?

The WITNESS. No, I never did spoke with him.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I'm sorry. Besides Best and Sandler, you said you did not speak with Grossman but you spoke with someone who answered the phone?

Answer. Yes.

Question. But it was probably not Mr. Grossman?

Answer. No, it wasn't.

Question. Do you recall speaking with anyone else other than Best or Sandler?

Answer. No.

Question. You obviously had to make some phone calls. I mean, just in July alone there are a series of six phone calls, and I gather from your testimony you've had to make others.

Have you been having sort of an engaging dialogue with the Democratic National Committee? I mean, looking at Exhibit MF–9, just in July there are a series of six phone calls in a period of 13 days. You also called the Democratic National Committee sometime in August after being interviewed by investigators; is that correct?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. How many times in August do you think you called to the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. I couldn't remember. No, I never did call Democratic National Committee. I always talked to Mr. Best. But prior to talking to Mr. Best, I did call a couple of times.

Question. Mr. Best is the lawyer for the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. Right.

Question. Let me ask you two questions. You called Mr. Best after meeting with investigators in August; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And how many phone conversations have you had with Mr. Best since August?

Answer. After talking to the investigator?

Question. Yes.

Answer. Only one time.

Question. Have you talked to him within the last month?

Answer. No.

Question. To your knowledge since speaking with investigators, have you only spoken with Mr. Best one time?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. With respect to other representatives of the Democratic National Committee—and for the record, Mr. Best is the lawyer for the Democratic National Committee representing that group—how many conversations have you had with anybody else at the Democratic National Committee after speaking with investigators?

Answer. None.

Question. None? Okay. Since basically speaking with investigators, have you only had one conversation with Mr. Best and you have had no conversations with anyone else as a representative of the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. How many phone calls do you think all told, in total, the total number of phone calls you have had with either Mr. Best or with any other representatives of the Democratic National Committee, total?

Answer. I don't know. I couldn't remember.

Question. Certainly we have the six reflected on Exhibit 9, plus the other one with Mr. Best, so there have been—there have been at least seven phone calls that you have had; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. I think that would assume that in each of these six phone calls on Exhibit MF–9 that she actually spoke with someone. I would note that a few of them are 30, 40, 60 cent telephone conversations. And in light of my knowledge of long distance rates, that would suggest to me that these were very brief——

The WITNESS. Leave a message.

Mr. STEVENS. —leave-a-message type calls.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Take a look at MF–9, if you would, Ms. Foung. The phone call on July 3rd lasted for a minute. Another phone call a minute later on July 3rd lasted for 2 minutes, but you don't have any recollection of the specifics of that phone call?

Answer. Probably just left a message.

Question. All right. And then the phone call, again looking at MF–9, on July the 11th lasted for 6 minutes. Again, you don't recall the substance of that call?

Answer. No, not at all.

Question. And then there was a phone call on July 14th lasted 1 minute, then another phone call a few minutes later on July 14th lasting for 5 minutes, but you don't recall the specifics of that call?

Answer. The 5 minutes is probably the person who answered the phone. I have maybe had a brief——

Question. How about July 16th, there was a 22-minute telephone call?

Answer. That's Mr. Best's number.

Question. Okay. And you believe that's the conversation——

Answer. The initial——

Question [continuing]. The lengthy conversation with Mr. Best at that time?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. And you believe you have had—we don't have your records for August before us, but you recall that you did make one other phone call in August; is that right?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. What about the calls that you have received from the Democratic National Committee or from Mr. Best? You have in fact received calls from Mr. Best, haven't you? He's called you back on occasion; hasn't he?

Answer. Yes, Mr. Sandler called me once and gave me Mr. Best's number. And so I was keeping in touch with Mr. Best.

Question. How many times do you believe Mr. Best has called you?

Answer. He called me once.

Question. Has he called you more than once?

Answer. No, just once.

Question. Has any representative of the Democratic National Committee, apart from Mr. Sandler, ever called you?

Answer. No.

Question. And that was one time that he called you?

Answer. Mr. Sandler? He called me once.

Question. So again to be clear, Mr. Sandler has called you one time?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And Mr. Best has called you one time?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. Now, let me get into the matter which obviously relates to why you're here, and that is your brother, Charlie Trie?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. When did your brother first immigrate to this country?

Answer. I can't remember.

Question. Your brother's 3 years older than you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. He was born in 1949; you were born in 1952.

Answer. I was born 1952; I think he was born in '49. I don't know his birthday.

Question. Okay. Do you recall how old you were—did you all come as a family? You all came as a family when you came to this country, correct?

Answer. No.

Question. You did not? I'm sorry.

Answer. My sister came—I don't remember when, long, long, long time ago.

Question. Is your sister, Dai Lin, older than you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How much older, if you know, approximately?

Answer. I don't.

Question. I'm just trying to make sure I understand the arrival of your family. I know you said your father is deceased. When did your father die?

Answer. When I was 13, so about 32 years ago.

Question. Okay. He died here in this country, in the United States?

Answer. No.

Question. Did your father—I need to step back if we can in terms of your family history with respect to your brother and arrival.

Answer. Okay.

Question. Did your mother and father both immigrate to this country, or just your mother after your father's death?

Answer. Just my mother.

Question. Your father died in China?

Answer. In Taiwan.

Question. In Taiwan, I'm sorry.

And then your mother immigrated to this country with how many children at the time?

Answer. Three—we have three of us.

Question. Three. So all three of you came with your mother when she came to this country?

Answer. No.

Question. If you will explain. I am trying to get the answer from you and I don't know how to do it with the questions I am asking. Perhaps you can tell me. Why don't you explain when did your mother come to this country?

Answer. 1978 or '79.

Question. And you were——

Answer. 1978.

Question. And she had adult children by that time?

Answer. We were all adult, yes.

Question. Okay. Then I'm just trying to clarify, then your mother did not come to this country with young children?

Answer. No.

Question. Your mother came in 1978 or '79, after all three of her children had already come to this country?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. Then let's step back. Correct me if I am wrong, I believe you indicated you first immigrated to this country when you were 25?

Answer. Twenty-one, '73, yes.

Question. In 1973. Your sister Dai Lin was already here?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Was your brother Charlie Trie already here?

Answer. No.

Question. Okay. Again, trying to go back over what you went over earlier this morning. Your brother came approximately 1973?

Answer. '74 or '5 or '6, I can't remember.

Question. And he went directly to Arkansas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. So your brother came from China and moved directly to the State of Arkansas?

Answer. From Taiwan.

Question. From Taiwan to Arkansas?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And your sister was already there?

Answer. Yes.

Question. So when your brother came to this country, in the mid-1970s, he went directly to Arkansas and I believe you indicated earlier he began working for or with your sister in her restaurant?

Answer. I believe so.

Question. Okay. And your brother would have been, in the mid-'70s he would have been late twenties, perhaps approaching 30 years of age; is that correct?

Answer. Something like that, 20-something.

Question. What is your brother's educational background?

Answer. He graduated from high school in Taiwan. He was in some kind of engineering school, or something.

Question. Do you know, did your brother ever go to college?

Answer. I don't think so.

Question. When your brother came to Arkansas in the mid to late '70s, there was a time period from 1977 to 1983 when you lived in Arkansas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. So you would see your brother with some frequency, at least during those 6 years; isn't that correct?

Answer. Yes, I see him.

Question. I mean, your sister and your brother and you were all living in the State of Arkansas?

Answer. Right.

Question. From 1977 to 1983?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And were you living in the Little Rock area?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. So you were all living in the same city?

Answer. Yes, that's correct.

Question. Incidentally, before I get—on the matters we discussed earlier this morning, the reimbursement to you for the $12,500 check and the $10,000 check,

did you ever discuss with your brother the source of the repayment, where he got the money to reimburse you or where anyone got the money to reimburse you?

Answer. No.

Question. Okay. Do you have any knowledge of anybody, other than your brother, seeing that you got repaid?

Answer. No.

Question. Directing your attention to the period of time, the late 1970s, mid to late 1970s, I wasn't clear this morning whether or not your brother ultimately took over the restaurant from your sister or established his own restaurant. Do you know?

Answer. I remember at first he was working for my sister, then they were—opened a new restaurant as a partnership together.

Question. Okay.

Answer. Then after my sister moved to Virginia, I assumed he was on his own.

Question. And how long was he in the restaurant business?

Answer. Since he came here until he sold his business. I don't remember what year.

Question. Up until the time he sold his business and went to Washington, he was in the restaurant business, correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And that would have been approximately up until, like, 1994?

Answer. I don't know. I don't remember.

Question. Do you know—strike that.

I think you previously indicated to the investigators that on some occasions—and correct me if I am wrong—you have indicated that on some evenings, receipts at the restaurant on a given evening might be made as political contributions to Governor Clinton for his re-election campaigns in Arkansas at your brother's restaurant.

Do you recall making that statement?

Answer. I remember saying something like that. But—I don't know——

Question. Can you give me some facts on that?

Answer. No, I don't have no facts. I don't remember. Probably just my brother had—or somebody might have mentioned something to me, but——

Question. I understand. I just want to explore what your understanding of that was about.

Do you believe that your brother's relationship with Governor Clinton was such that he was a political supporter of Governor Clinton in Arkansas?

Answer. I don't know if political supporter at first. I think they were just friends. They played basketball together or something like that.

Question. And how often would he play basketball with Governor Clinton?

Answer. I don't know. See I moved away from Little Rock.

Question. In 1983?

Answer. 1983.

Question. President Clinton was then the Governor of Arkansas?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. And your knowledge in terms of his playing basketball, I think that your brother—you have a niece named Darcy Trie; is that correct?

Answer. Say that name again.

Question. Do you have a niece named Darcy Trie?

Answer. No.

Question. What are the names of the children of your brother? I am sorry; does your brother have any children?

Answer. He has one daughter.

Question. What is her name?

Answer. E-Mei.

Question. E-Mei. I am sorry; I thought her nickname was Darcy Trie. She is actually a student at the University of Arkansas?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And do you recall a relationship between your brother and President Clinton, then Governor Clinton, that would cause them to play basketball together?

Answer. I think it was a comment that was made. I don't know. Just back in my mind seems like they played basketball together.

Question. The simple fact is, then, that your brother, apart from the comment that the President made to you last year at the party in Hillsborough——

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question [continuing]. In terms of his friendship with your brother, your brother clearly considered President Clinton, then Governor Clinton, to be a friend; isn't that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. Don't speculate. It sounds like you are asking her to read someone else's mind.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. We will step back. I usually interpret people who play basketball together and are political supporters to be friends. And I'm asking you, given what the President of the United States said about his friendship with your brother, Ms. Foung, clearly there must have been some comments by your brother with respect to how he felt about Governor Clinton, if he played basketball with him. That's my question to you.

Answer. Okay. Could I give you a little background?

Question. I would like it. That would be fine.

Answer. I have been away from Arkansas since 1983. And since 1983 until now, I spoke to my brother maybe three times, four times a year. Mostly he will call me and say, how you doing? And half of the time it is answering machine, because I am working. So we have very little discussion on a lot of things, not to mention the President of the United States.

So I really—I was under the impression that my brother and Mr. Clinton, they know each other. And he's very loyal to the President, and a supporter. But I really cannot tell you anything more.

Question. What does the phrase "lao ke" mean?

Answer. I don't understand what that is.

Question. Again, if you don't, I will be up the creek because I don't. L-A-O, and then ke, K-E. It is my understanding that it is a term of endearment in the Chinese language, but obviously you would know that better than I.

Mr. STEVENS. "Lao ke," does that mean anything to you at all?

The WITNESS. No, no.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Do you know exactly how Charlie Trie ever met Governor Clinton?

Answer. No, I don't know.

Question. Do you know the facts surrounding your brother's appointment to any boards? Apart from Federal boards in Washington, any State boards, for example the Fire Extinguisher Board? Do you have any knowledge of any of that?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know exactly why he sold his restaurant business?

Answer. Not really, but I was under the impression same reason—he got tired of, I guess. I don't know.

Question. Do you know anything about the businesses that he went into after or he tried to establish after he sold his restaurant?

Answer. I remember he was trying to manufacture some kind of a tool that somebody had a patent on it.

Question. Do you know any of the specifics of whether he procured the patent or whether he manufactured the tool or not?

Answer. I believe they got the patent.

Question. Who's "they"?

Answer. My brother and somebody else. Whoever invented the tool.

Question. Okay.

Answer. And they were talking about going to China to have—hopefully to have it manufactured there.

Question. But you don't have any knowledge of that?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you have any knowledge of Daihatsu International Trading Company?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what knowledge do you have of that company?

Answer. Just the letterhead, the envelope.

Question. Did you ever see the offices of Daihatsu International Trading Company?

Answer. I seen the office. I don't know that that's what it is. Remember, I told you back in Christmas '94, I was in Little Rock visiting my mother. I visited his office.

Question. Your brother's office?

Answer. My brother's office.

Question. And there was an office. Did you see the sign "Daihatsu International Trading Company" on the door?

Answer. I didn't. I didn't see.

Question. I understand. And do you know whether that business was successful or not?

Answer. It looks very successful to me. It is a very impressive envelope and letterhead.

Question. Apart from seeing the envelope and letterhead, did you see any offices?

Answer. The office——

Question. Did you go—you said you went to your brother's office?

Answer. Yeah, the business office.

Question. Did you see, were there many employees there?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay.

Answer. I met at least 10 people, maybe. Big office.

Question. And to your knowledge, this was the Daihatsu International Trading Company?

Answer. I was under the impression.

Question. Okay. I don't want you to speculate. I'm just trying to ask you. Do you know anything about San Kin Yip International? Does that name ring a bell to you?

Answer. Not really.

Question. How about America-Asia Trade Center, Incorporated?

Answer. No.

Question. Sanyou Science & Technology?

Answer. No.

Question. Premier Advertising?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know if your brother has any family sources of income? Does your mother have a great deal of money that she gives you and your brother and your sister?

Answer. No, I know my mother received some kind of something from the Chinese government for my father's death, some kind of death benefit.

Question. And how long ago was that? Does she still receive such benefits?

Answer. I'm not so sure. Maybe. I don't know.

Question. I guess my question to you is in terms of——

Answer. I think it was a yearly distribution or something, I don't know.

Question. I understand. But apart from that, is your mother an independently wealthy woman?

Answer. No.

Question. And to your knowledge there is no family source of money that comes to your brother or to your sister or to you?

Answer. Not to me.

Question. And do you have any knowledge of your brother receiving money from your mother in terms of some family source of money?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. You don't have any knowledge of that?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you discussed with your brother at any time his involvement in the election and re-election campaigns of President Clinton in 1992 and 1996?

Answer. Not at all.

Question. And I gather that that would also apply with respect to Mrs. Clinton or any other members of the Clinton family? You have not discussed your brother's involvement with any of them at any time?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you have any knowledge as to why your brother moved to Washington in the summer of 1994?

Answer. I didn't know he moved to Washington. As far as I know, he lived in Arkansas—I mean, his residence is in Arkansas.

Question. Until when?

Answer. Still now; isn't it?

Question. As a matter of fact, I was going to ask you that.

Answer. His house is in Arkansas, but he's out of the country the majority of the time.

Question. When was the last time your brother was in the country?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. When's the last time you spoke with your brother?

Mr. STEVENS. In person or on the telephone?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. On the telephone.

Answer. On the telephone? I think it was after I spoke to the investigator. He called me one night.

Question. Okay. Do you know how your brother would have known that you spoke with an investigator?

Answer. Because I told my mother. I asked my mother if my brother calls, please give me a call.

Question. Let me ask you again. You spoke with investigators in the latter part of August last month; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And then you called your mother?

Answer. Yes, I didn't call her—I called her after I find out I have to go to Washington for a hearing.

Question. And you spoke with your mother. And what conversation did you have with your mother concerning your brother?

Answer. Basically how ridiculous the whole thing was—is—or was—is.

Question. And you spoke with your mother about that?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. And did you ask your mother to get in contact with your brother?

Answer. I asked my mother if my brother calls her, have him give me a call. Because I'm really——

Question. I understand.

Answer [continuing]. Trying to find out what is going on.

Question. Do you know if your mother has the telephone number for your brother where she can reach him if she desires?

Answer. No.

Question. You don't know the answer to that?

Answer. I don't know the answer, but I don't think so.

Question. She has to wait for your brother to call her?

Answer. My mother rarely call us. We call her, any one of us.

Question. Do you know if your mother has the ability to contact your brother in the event of a family emergency?

Answer. I never asked that. But my brother calls my mother sometimes.

Question. I am going to get into that in a minute. My question is, is there any member of your family that has the ability to contact your brother in the event of any kind of an emergency?

Answer. I don't know. I only know I don't.

Question. Do you know if your sister has the ability to contact your brother?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Getting back to the matter of after you were notified that you may have to attend a hearing, in fact that was the earlier part of this month, wasn't it in September?

Answer. Something like that. Has to be.

Question. So in this month when an initial appearance had been scheduled for you before a hearing before the committee, you contacted your mother?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you asked that the next time your brother called, that he call you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And how soon after that conversation did your brother call you?

Answer. A few days.

Question. A few days later?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Where was he calling from?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Do you know whether or not he was overseas? Do you have any idea?

Answer. I believe he was—he didn't tell me. Did I ask him? I couldn't remember. I might have asked him, "Where are you?"

Question. And what did he say?

Answer. I don't remember he said anything or not. Maybe he say Taiwan, maybe Singapore. I don't know.

Question. But you believe you asked him where he was and you believe——

Answer. I couldn't remember because our normal conversation whenever he calls me I always say, hey, where are you, where are you now? He will tell me San Francisco or Washington or Taiwan or China, Hong Kong, or wherever he was. But there is so many.

Question. Certainly in this conversation in this month of September, he didn't indicate he was in San Francisco or Washington; did he?

Answer. Oh, no, no. I believe he was overseas.

Question. And did you ask him when he was coming back to this country?

Answer. No, I didn't ask that. In fact, the conversation was very brief. He indicated he shouldn't be talking to me, because I am a potential witness. So he doesn't want to say anything to influence me.

The only thing—the only reason he say he called is he recommend I speak to an attorney. That's basically the reason he called.

Question. Did he indicate to you whether he had been speaking with anyone else, other than your mother, concerning your situation?

Answer. Concerning my situation?

Question. I guess, specifically, your brother called you?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. After you called your mother?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. Did your brother indicate to you that he had spoken with anybody else—strike that.

Did your brother indicate to you that he had even spoken with your mother?

Answer. I—we didn't discuss that, I would assume so, otherwise——

Question. But you don't know?

Answer. No, I don't know.

Question. When he called, did he indicate that he was aware of the fact that you were about to be called before a hearing?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And did he indicate whether or not he had spoken with anybody about your being called for a hearing?

Answer. I couldn't remember. Maybe—maybe he mentioned his attorney or something.

Question. Do you believe he spoke with his attorney concerning your coming before the hearing?

Answer. I don't know. He asked me to call—call attorney.

Question. Let me ask you this, Ms. Foung. I want to get back to this conversation, but have there been any other conversations with your brother, apart from this conversation, this month?

Answer. Oh, no. The last time I spoke to him I think was earlier in the year, February or March.

Question. Well, obviously you spoke with him in August because you had the transaction with the $10,000 check.

Mr. BALLEN. '97?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I'm sorry; excuse me, that was '96. So, you believe that prior to this phone call with your brother in September of this year, that the last time you would have spoken with him would have been February or March of 1997?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. And except for this one particular phone call, you have not spoken with him any other time?

Answer. No, no.

Question. Now, in terms of his knowledge of your having been called before a hearing, did he specifically say with whom he had spoken concerning your having been called?

Answer. I think he did mention he had his attorney—he had spoken to his attorney.

Question. And do you know whether he called his attorney or his attorney called him?

Answer. That I don't know.

Question. Did he indicate that he'd spoken with anyone else concerning your having been called?

Answer. No, no.

Question. And what exactly did he say to you in connection with your coming before the committee before a hearing?

Answer. Like I said earlier, he said he cannot discuss anything me because I'm a potential witness, and I need to speak to attorney.

Question. Did he recommend any particular attorney for you to see initially?

Answer. No.

Question. Did he indicate that he had spoken with anyone else about your seeing an attorney?

Answer. No, the conversation was very brief.

Question. Did he ask you if you had been asked any questions?

Answer. No.

Question. And he did not discuss the content of the statements you made to investigators?

Answer. Not at all.

Question. And you don't have any knowledge of any other individuals speaking with your brother?

Answer. Say that again.

Question. Do you have any knowledge of any other individuals speaking with your brother over the past 6 weeks?

Answer. My other family members?

Question. Any other people, family member or——

Answer. Oh, no, I wouldn't know at all. My mother would be the only person that I would know that speak to my brother periodically.

Question. And apart from your mother having spoken with him, you don't have any knowledge of anyone else having spoken with him?

Answer. No, not at all.

Question. Do you know what your brother's source of income is now?

Answer. I don't.

Question. Is his wife still living in this country?

Answer. No.

Question. His wife has also left?

Answer. She's—she's always staying overseas the past few years.

Question. Where does she reside?

Answer. She—she go to Taiwan sometimes. She's in China sometimes. I don't know, I never keep track of that.

Question. And what is her name, I'm sorry?

Answer. Wa Mei.

Question. And there is only one child of that marriage and that is Denise who goes to the University of Arkansas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. That is the only child?

Answer. That I know of.

Question. That you know of. I understand. I understand. I'm not going to get into that. Believe me. I'm not going to begin to get into that.

To your knowledge that is the only child he has?

Answer. That's correct.

Question. Do you have any knowledge of his financial situation?

Answer. No, not at all.

Question. Would you know where your brother would have—I guess you've read all the reports about your brother and the large contributions that he made or sought to make?

Answer. To be honest with you, I never did.

Question. You say you have never read all the press reports about that?

Answer. No, I never did.

Question. Do you have any knowledge of where your brother would have access to hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Do you know, has he ever mentioned the various political groups that he's been involved with or efforts in terms of Vote Now '96, or Defeat Proposition 209 here in California?

Answer. Not at all. We never discussed.

Question. Never discussed political matters with him?

Answer. Never discussed political matters. I asked him, do you think Mr. Clinton's going to win? He feel confident he will. That is the extent of our discussion as far as political.

Question. Have you ever discussed his foreign trips with him in terms of his frequency of foreign trips?

Answer. Like I said earlier, we spoke to each other three, four times a year. And we really don't discuss much. I'm not that curious. I'm more concerned about my personal business.

Question. Sure, I understand. Since 1993, you have spoken two, three or four times a year?

Answer. Maybe more or less.

Question. Has he spoken to you in terms of any of his person or business problems?

Answer. No.

Question. He hasn't discussed any financial matters with you or his financial matters or problems?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever had any knowledge of his being in financial trouble?

Answer. No, but earlier in the year he told me that he would have to obtain an attorney and it is very expensive. As far as I know.

Question. Have you ever loaned him any money?

Answer. I might have in the past, but I couldn't remember.

Question. In the last 2 years——

Answer. Oh, no.

Question [continuing]. Have you loaned him any money?

Answer. No.

Question. Are you aware of any times he has had to borrow money from any of his friends?

Answer. No.

Question. And you indicated you don't know who Mark Middleton is?

Answer. No.

Question. Would you know why Mr. Middleton might be giving your brother $5,000?

Answer. I have no idea.

Question. And you have never discussed that with your brother?

Answer. No.

Question. And you have never discuss Mr. Mark Middleton with your brother?

Answer. No, I never know that person.

Question. Has your brother ever discussed with you the group Suma Ching Hai?

Answer. No.

Question. How about in September of 1995? According to our records, your brother attended a conference, actually with Mrs. Clinton. Do you remember discussing that with him in any way?

Answer. No.

Question. And you have not discussed any of his business trips to China or Hong Kong with him?

Answer. No.

Question. Did he ever discuss with you his appointment to a Presidential commission in terms of people who assisted him in that regard?

Answer. I think he mentioned something about they have a very thorough background check, so they might check me as a sister.

Question. And did he speak to you about that?

Answer. Maybe, yes, I think so.

Question. And what kind of conversation—basically, what was the content of that discussion?

Answer. I couldn't remember. It was something that I'm not interested in.

Question. Okay. Did you ever discuss with him his effort to assist the Presidential Legal Expense Trust in terms of President Clinton's legal expenses and a trust created for that?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever discussed the late Secretary of State, a gentleman who died, a gentleman named Ron Brown?

Answer. No. I saw on the TV.

Question. That he died in the plane crash?

Answer. That he died, yeah. That's all I know.

Question. You never discussed Ron Brown with your brother?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know of any contact which your brother has had with President Clinton over the last year?

Answer. My brother's what?

Question. Do you know of any contact which your brother has had with President Clinton in the last year?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know if he has had any contact with President Clinton?

Answer. I don't know. I have no interest in that. So I wouldn't—the time he speak to me, the time is so precious, I wouldn't be asking something that I'm not interested.

Question. I understand. Hold on just one second.

Just a few things. One, you don't have any knowledge of your brother's financial affairs in terms of whether or not the restaurant was successful or not?

Answer. I believe the restaurant was successful.

Question. But you don't know——

Answer. While the time I was there.

Question. When you were there, from '77 to '83?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You don't know any financial facts in terms of his sale of the restaurant?

Answer. No.

Question. And with respect to your niece, the daughter of Dai Lin Outlaw, Elaine Outlaw, do you know how old she is now?

Answer. 20-something.

Question. Do you know where she works?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know whether or not she's ever worked for the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. Not as I know of.

Question. Where does she presently live?

Answer. Elaine?

Question. Yes.

Answer. I thought it was Virginia.

Question. Do you know where in Virginia?

Answer. No.

Question. And with respect to your attendance at any political or business events with your brother, I gather from your answers you have not attended any political events with your brother?

Answer. No.

Question. Ever?

Answer. Never, except the one in Hillsborough.

Question. And he was not there, but you were there?

Answer. No, he wasn't. No, never together.

Question. Have you ever gone—has your brother ever shown you photographs of him with the members of the Clinton family?

Answer. No. He showed me the picture of him and Mr. Clinton and himself.

Question. Okay. And when was that? First of all, when did he show you the photograph?

Answer. Years and years ago.

Question. And this would have been when President Clinton was Governor Clinton or would have been when he was President Clinton?

Answer. President. It would be between '90—I think it was in California; yeah, I was in California. So it would be after '90.

Mr. BENNETT. Hold on one second. Ms. Foung, I have no further questions. As I mentioned to you when we started, Mr. Ballen may have some questions. Maybe I will wind up.

Ken, do you have any questions?

Mr. BALLEN. I do, if we could just take a moment before we begin. Maybe a 5-minute break. Thanks very much.

[Brief Recess.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. First of all, I want to very much thank you for coming here this morning. I realize this is an imposition on your time. And on behalf of the Democratic Members of the committee, I would like to thank you.

I think your answers this morning have been very candid, very honest, very forthcoming. Sometimes what is not reflected in the bare record of a deposition is the effort a witness makes and the facial expressions a witness may make to try to search for the truth. And I think we would all agree, both my counterparts on the Republican side and your own attorney, that throughout this deposition you have searched your memory very carefully and tried to come forward with truthful and complete answers, and I think we all appreciate that.

Answer. Thank you.

Question. And, frankly, I'd like to say that based upon what you have said, we are not sure why at this point you are being called or your life is being put under the kind of microscope that it is.

Mr. BENNETT. Objection.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. Well, Mr. Bennett is entitled to his objection, but, we are not sure. We don't see, based upon the record, the necessity for that.

But maybe can I go to a bottom line here, if you will. As I read to you earlier in this deposition, Mr. Bennett's boss, Chairman Burton from Indiana, has said that there may be a conspiracy of the Chinese government at work here and that your brother is part of it.

I want to emphasize that there is no particular evidence of that fact, and the Democratic Members have seen no evidence to support it, but I want to ask you about your knowledge of that.

Do you have any reason whatsoever to believe that your brother is an agent or a spy of the Government of China?

Answer. No.

Question. I notice you're smiling.

Answer. I think it was ridiculous.

Question. And why do you think it is ridiculous?

Answer. Just knowing my brother for being a brother-sister for 40-some years, that's not him.

Question. And you see no evidence to indicate that?

Answer. Oh, no, absolutely.

Question. How about of the Government of Taiwan? Is there any evidence whatsoever to show that your brother may be an agent or spy of the Government of Taiwan?

Answer. No.

Question. Government of Indonesia?

Answer. I don't believe so.

Question. Do you have any reason whatsoever to believe that the money that your brother reimbursed you for on the contributions came from the Government of China or the Government of Taiwan?

Answer. No. China and Taiwan both are friendly with the United States. Why would they wanted to have a spy or anything like that? It's something beyond my understanding.

Question. Okay. As far as you know, I believe you testified the money that your brother gave you, you thought came from him?

Answer. I believe so.

Question. And you still believe that now?

Answer. Yeah.

Question. Because he was doing—he has his own businesses, correct?

Answer. Yeah, I don't know anything otherwise.

Question. I'm sorry?

Answer. I don't know otherwise, of why it would be from anywhere else.

Question. All right. So you knew he had a business, and you knew he asked you to make some contributions and he reimbursed you for the contributions?

Answer. Yes. And I viewed it no different than if he's late for his PG&E bill and asked me to pay the money and he reimbursed me. To me it was the same thing and I didn't think anything of it.

Question. And you didn't——

Answer. I didn't explore any further. It was just something that was not that important to me.

Question. And that's all you know?

Answer. That's all I know, uh-huh.

Mr. STEVENS. Just in case, Counsel, don't appreciate the reference to PG&E, that's a utility company. The reference was to making a utility bill payment on a timely manner.

The WITNESS. Or house payment. If he saw some way he couldn't make that check in time, he asked me to advance the check. To me it was no difference to me at the time.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. Because this was something he was interested in doing, make these contributions?

Answer. Yeah. I wasn't.

Question. And so he asked you to do it?

Answer. Yeah.

Question. And that's basically all you know about this whole affair?

Answer. Right.

Question. And because you know that, your life has been put into turmoil; hasn't it?

Answer. It has been very, very difficult. Stressful, and a lot of worries. I lost a lot of money, financial loss and everything. It wasn't pleasant.

Question. This has been quite an ordeal for you; hasn't it?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you talk about worry and stress. Could you tell us about that a little bit, about what this has done to you?

Answer. My job is on the line. It's very—because a word has been mentioned about I being used by my brother, which I don't believe is true. If he knew it would cost me—if something was wrong or something, he would not ever ask me to do it. He would not use me. He always do things for me in the past.

And I'm worried about my job because of the negative publicity, and I'm worried about—prior to getting the immunity, I didn't know I was in violation of anything. And it turned out to be I could have faced jail time. I could have faced a big penalty that I couldn't afford. Who's going to take care of my son, you know? All those things just back and forth in my mind.

Question. You are a single mother?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And when you have to come and give the deposition or meet with your lawyer or go to Washington, that's time away from your job?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And does that put your job in jeopardy in any way?

Answer. More than in jeopardy.

Question. How so?

Answer. First of all, I am not getting paid for the time I'm away from my job, because it's not like a sick or something that is covered.

Then I have to arrange all kinds of child care for my son. And at my job, I am the person responsible for that unit. If I'm not there, they have to hire overtime people, somebody has to be there, and it was my responsibility to take care of it. So I tried to always be dependable being there.

Question. So in other words, these repeated inquiries from the committees, this is a real problem for you on your job?

Answer. It hasn't been because in the past the investigator has been very accommodating toward my schedule, although I still have—facing the graveyard, I still have to be up all night working and come back on days, and I couldn't rest. I have to worry about it. It was very stressful. It is what is in the future? What impact is going to be on my life, my job and everything?

Question. Let me ask you this, I mean, if you had to go back to Washington——

Answer. That's what I mean. That's my biggest concern.

Question. What would that do for your job?

Answer. First of all, my son is year-round school. October is their offtrack, so he has no school daytime then—so he'll be out of care for 24 hours. I have to arrange 24-hour care for him, which will be very difficult.

I'll be away from my job. Not only I don't get paid for, also I have been having a perfect attendance award for the past years I have been with [Employer's name] and I will have to lose that and I'm not willing to, because this job means a lot to me.

Not only my whole family depends on this job, also I like the job very well. I like the people I work with. I like the people I work for. And that's, I guess, the most important thing to me.

Question. So it's your hope that you don't have to come back?

Answer. I hope, since I don't think I can offer information that they are looking for, I really think it is a waste of everybody's time for me to be there.

Question. And more than a waste of time, you're talking about your son and your job and——

Answer. My life, yes.

Question [continuing]. Your life. The disruption that might occur as a result of that?

Answer. And the negative publicity that probably can hurt me for a long time.

Question. I see this has made you quite upset?

Answer. Very upset, because I love my brother very much. And seems like I am kind of being made to hurt him or to against him. And for Chinese tradition, that is something you shouldn't be doing.

But I'm here to tell the truth, and I told the truth. Whatever I know, has very little impact on the overall case. I just don't know why I'm being treated like somebody so important or something like that. I mean, I like the attention, but not this type.

Mr. STEVENS. But you could live without it?

The WITNESS. Uh-huh.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. In fact, you would rather live without it?

Answer. I rather this not happening.

Mr. BALLEN. Maybe we can clarify right now what the plans are for Ms. Foung. Do you know the plans whether to bring her back to Washington or not?

Mr. BENNETT. I have no intentions of telling you that, Mr. Ballen. I would like to know, first of all, when you say "We're not sure why you are being called," just for the record, are you as a counsel for this committee saying that you are not sure? Is that what you think Congressman Waxman—or was that you as a lawyer for the committee?

Mr. BALLEN. Well, that's me as a lawyer. And if I talked to Congressman Waxman——

Mr. BENNETT. I have no doubt about Congressman Waxman's position. I am wondering if you as a lawyer are representing as a lawyer for the committee, that you are representing that you as a lawyer are not sure why this witness is being called.

Mr. BALLEN. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. In response to that, we have two clear indications of the laundering of money through this witness by Charlie Trie. We also—her brother. We also have indications that this witness's name was used illegally to make a contribution to a United States Senator.

I'll wait until Mr. Barnett finishes, so I can address you. I want to make sure you hear me.

It doesn't really strain my background to understand why it would be relevant for a witness to testify as to two clear violations of law committed by her brother who, incidentally, Ms. Foung, so you know, it was on national television with Tom Brokaw. Did you see your brother on national television?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Your brother was seen on national television saying, I quote, "They'll never find me." And he was interviewed on national television by Tom Brokaw of NBC News and it was a topic of a great deal discussion in terms of your brother's boast that he will never come back from China and that "They'll never find me."

To put on record to this witness as lawyers, apart from the politics, as lawyers that you are not clear why the witness is being called, I must tell you, Ms. Foung, that the reason you are being called is because you were used—you did nothing wrong as far as we're concerned, but you are used by your brother with respect to two particular transactions.

And before the committee, you will see that the $25,000 that came for the February payments, in fact, was placed in an account by an individual named Antonio Pan and within minutes of a $25,200 deposit, within minutes, $25,000 was taken out of that account and sent to you.

So we're not going to sit and debate the entire case with you other than to tell you that we believe as lawyers for the Majority that those indications of a violation of law are a piece of the puzzle. No one is casting aspersions on you, but it is my judgment as a lawyer, and Mr. Wilson's judgment as a lawyer, totally apart from the politics of the situation, that the testimony is relevant.

And we don't expect you to have any knowledge of any allegations about what your brother did or did not do in China. I don't know that you would have knowledge of that. But you may not have seen your brother on national television, but he was interviewed by Tom Brokaw, as I say, of NBC News, interviewed at length, and was the topic of a great deal of national discussion about his interview and the fact that the government would never find him. And it's because of that, and because of your involvement in these two transactions with your brother, as well as the other matters that have come to our attention, that we believe that you have relevant testimony to offer to the committee, because it is our job to present facts.

So, my role here is not to get into a political debate over the merits of Republicans versus Democrats. We are here as lawyers trying to present evidence. And I apologize to you that to the extent that you have been inconvenienced, unfortunately many times when facts have to be brought to light, unwilling or unwitting participants are dragged into the process, and that is unfortunate.

We are doing everything we can to minimize your inconvenience. We have two lawyers and an investigator for the Republican side of the committee and three lawyers for the Democratic side of the committee out of the committee's budget, all of whom have flown here to California to interview you because we wanted to make it convenient for you.

I will tell you that we were asked to have you come to Washington earlier and do it in Washington. We've come out here. We are trying to make things as convenient to you as possible and I apologize for any inconvenience.

So in response to Mr. Ballen's question about when we are going to tell him when you will be called, given the pattern of conduct on the part of some of the people with whom Mr. Ballen works, we will let you know as quickly as possible in terms

of when you will be called before a hearing. But you will need to come before the committee. No one at the committee level, either Republican or Democrats, I don't believe is going to be yelling at you or casting aspersions on you.

It is my professional judgment as a lawyer, totally apart from the politics of the matter, that I believe you have relevant testimony to offer. I can assure you that that judgment is made by me as a lawyer. It would be made by me as a lawyer whether I was an Independent, a Republican, a Socialist or a Democrat. And because of that, that is why you are being called. Do you understand that? I am trying to be as honest with you as I can be. My judgment as a lawyer is that you have relevant testimony as to offer and you will be called a witness and we regret the inconvenience.

Are you finished with your questions, Mr. Ballen? I wanted to respond to your inquiry to me directly.

Mr. BALLEN. You haven't responded and I would like to know, sir, what is your basis, when the Democratic Members vote, and the committee voting unanimously to grant this witness immunity, what is your basis for not informing us and informing this witness when she is going to be called?

Mr. BENNETT. I will certainly, as soon as that decision——

Mr. BALLEN. Are you saying that you don't know?

Mr. BENNETT. I don't know yet. My point is that once I know the decision by the Chairman, and the Chairman advises me what his decision is about when she should be called, I will let you know within 2 minutes, either this afternoon or tomorrow. And I will let Mr. Stevens know immediately. I can't represent to you the exact day. I have reason to believe it will be next week, but until that decision is made by the Chairman, I can't let you know that. So I can't respond to you on that.

Mr. BARNETT. We were advised last week that we would begin the hearings on the 7th, and then the 8th and the 9th would be days when Ms. Foung would testify. Has there been a change in the plans?

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, not having introduced himself for the record, that is Mr. Phil Barnett, Minority counsel who has just spoken. That is not a change in plans now. I believe that is the case, but I need to confirm that. We can probably confirm that before we leave Mr. Stevens' office here today. But I am not prepared to respond directly this minute in terms of the actual day. I have reason to believe that is correct, but I want to confirm that with the Chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. May I suggest that we finish with the questioning of Ms. Foung so she can get back to work? She was planning to get back to work. Her place of employment is waiting for her. And then we can continue this illuminating discussion——

Mr. BALLEN. I have no further questions.

Mr. BENNETT. I am just responding to a direct——

Mr. STEVENS. I appreciate that. I know you need to state your intentions.

Mr. BENNETT. I've not had a lawyer direct an inquiry to me like that on the record, so I want to make sure that the record is clear back in terms of that direct question of me.

Mr. STEVENS. I think it is wonderful that I don't have to go watch C–SPAN to hear these kinds of arguments.

Mr. BENNETT. Hopefully you will see lawyers conduct themselves as lawyers, and not on political side.

Mr. STEVENS. I appreciate that.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. And a quick question to you, Ms. Foung. I'm frankly surprised, you're not aware then of your brother's interview with NBC News?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you see the broadcast with Tom Brokaw?

Answer. No, I wish——

Question. I assumed you had seen that. Perhaps someone could get a tape of that for you and you could see it and see the manner in which he presented himself to the American public in terms of his response.

Do you know when your brother might be coming back from China, Ms. Foung?

Mr. BALLEN. Objection. You're assuming she knows where he is.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. You can answer the question.

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Has your brother indicated to you, in light of his comment to Tom Brokaw of NBC News that, quote, "They'll never find me," end of quote, and his

intention to stay in China, do you know whether—has he ever made that representation to you or your mother that he does not intend to come back to this country?

Answer. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no further questions.

Do you have any further questions, Mr. Ballen?

Mr. BALLEN. No, I do not.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Ms. Foung, you have a right, obviously, to review this transcript. We will see that we get a transcript to you as quickly as possible, and as I advised you at the start, you will have an opportunity to review the transcript with Mr. Stevens, and if there are any errors in transcription or what have you, we will make sure that you are given an opportunity to do that. And I thank you very much for your patience here today.

Mr. BALLEN. Did you have something you wanted to say?

Mr. STEVENS. Off the record for a second.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. BENNETT. I don't want counsel to think I knew all the detail. We should note on the record that any reference to Ms. Foung's employer should be deleted and just reference to "her employer." It need not name her specific employer and all such references shall be stricken, and I assume the court reporter will see that that is done.

Mr. STEVENS. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

[Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the deposition was concluded.]

[The exhibits referred to follow:]



EXHIBIT
MF-1

STATEMENT F14

ACCOUNT NUMBER	SOCIAL SECURITY NO.	FROM	THROUGH	PAGE	OF
198111		02-01-96	02-29-96	1	2

TRAVIS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

TRAVIS AFB BRANCH
[illegible] MATHER STREET
TRAVIS AFB, CA 94535
PHONE (707)438-4000

FAIRFIELD BRANCH
[illegible] N. TEXAS ST.
FAIRFIELD, CA 94533
PHONE (707)438-4000

VACAVILLE BRANCH
[illegible] CEDRON STREET
VACAVILLE, CA 95688
PHONE (707)448-6000

CASTLE AFB BRANCH
[illegible] AVENUE
CASTLE AFB, CA 95342
PHONE (209)726-[illegible]

MERCED BRANCH
[illegible] 16TH STREET
MERCED, CA 95340
PHONE (209)723-[illegible]

ALL CORRESPONDENCE:
P.O. BOX [illegible]
VACAVILLE, CA 95688-[illegible]

THE FINANCE CHARGE FOR AN OPEN-END LOAN IS COMPUTED BY APPLYING THE PERIODIC RATE TO EACH DAILY BALANCE FOR THE EXACT NO. OF DAYS THE BALANCE IS OUTSTANDING. THE DAILY BALANCE USED TO COMPUTE THE FINANCE CHARGE IS THAT BALANCE EACH DAY AFTER CREDITS ARE SUBTRACTED AND NEW ADVANCES OR OTHER CHARGES ARE ADDED.

DIVIDENDS AND/OR INTEREST OF $10.00 OR MORE WILL BE REPORTED TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND APPLICABLE STATE AGENCY THROUGH PERIOD ENDING DEC 1993 AS INTEREST INCOME FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR.

YOU CAN SAVE AT LEAST $375! TRAVIS FEDERAL IS WAIVING ALL FEES ON ALL HOME EQUITY LOANS AND LINES OF CREDIT, NOW THROUGH MARCH 31, 1996. AVAILABLE FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA ONLY. CALL PHONELOAN SEVEN DAYS A WEEK TO APPLY AT (707) 451-3350 OR 1-800-449-4310.

NAPLIN YOUNG
3685 DALEWOOD CT.
FAIRFIELD CA 94533

SHARE ACCOUNTS ARE NON-TRANSFERABLE EXCEPT ON THE BOOKS OF THIS CREDIT UNION. TO START YOUR DIRECT DEPOSIT, CALL US AT (707) 448-6000 EX. 728

TRAN. NO.	EFFECT DAY	EFFECT MO	EFFECT YR	TRANSACTION DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
				SUFFIX:00 PRIME SHARE ACCT		5408.45
	02	01	96	DIVIDEND	37.35	5445.80
02	14	02	96	ESIGN	-1336.97	4108.83
04	02	15	96	ESIGN	-1338.97	2769.86
	02	29	96	SHARE WITHDRAWAL	-2500.00	269.86
02	20	29	96	ESIGN	1338.89	1608.75
02	20	29	96	ESIGN	-1338.89	270.86
				Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 42.86		
				(A 3.5000 DIVIDEND OF 13.47 WILL BE POSTED TO YOUR ACCOUNT ON 03/01/96)		
				TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
				BALANCE RANGE RATE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		3.56%
				.00 - 9,999,999.99 3.50% ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		3.56%
				SUFFIX:10 365 - 446 DAY CERT		1500.00
	02	19	96	DIVIDEND	3.43	1503.43
				Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 3.43 FORFEITURES: .00		
				MATURITY DATE:041597 DIV RATE: 4.2200		
				(A 5.2200 DIVIDEND OF 6.24 WILL BE POSTED TO YOUR ACCOUNT ON 03/01/96)		
				TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
				BALANCE RANGE RATE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		5.35%
				.00 - 9,999,999.99 5.22% ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		5.35%
				SUFFIX:50 SHARE DRAFT ACCOUNT		
				BEGINNING BALANCE 3532.26 MAINT/SERVICE CHGS .00		
				DEPOSITS 17634.87 ENDING BALANCE 3545.75		
				DRAFTS 16272.02		
				MISC DEBITS 150.00 TOTAL NUMBER DRAFTS CLEARED 13		
	02	19	96	DIVIDEND	1.95	2534.21
	02	19	96	SHARE DRAFT # 384 0000007464	-17.36	2516.85
	02	19	96	SHARE DRAFT # 381 0000011377	-92.99	2423.86
	02	20	96	SHARE DRAFT # 379 0000006632	-1285.58	1138.28
	02	20	96	SHARE DRAFT # 380 0000003548	-121.25	1016.83
	02	20	96	SHARE DRAFT # 382 0000019819	-80.00	936.83
	02	20	96	SHARE DEPOSIT	77.06	1013.89
	02	20	96	SHARE DRAFT # 389	-120.00	893.89
02	14	02	96	PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM 198111- 0	1375.97	2270.86
	02	26	96	SHARE WITHDRAWAL	-190.00	2080.86
	02	26	96	SHARE DRAFT # 387 0000013569	-1595.94	484.92
	02	26	96	SHARE DRAFT # 388 0000020189	-18.41	466.51
	02	26	96	SHARE DRAFT # 386 0000016133	-171.15	295.36
	02	29	96	SHARE DEPOSIT	14500.00	14795.36
	02	29	96	SHARE DRAFT # 393 0000016403	-83.19	14712.17
	02	29	96	SHARE DRAFT # 390 0000018328	-12000.00	2711.17
02	20	29	96	PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM 198111- 0	1018.89	3730.06
	02	29	96	SHARE DRAFT # 395 0000016556	-163.07	3566.99
	02	29	96	SHARE DRAFT # 392 0000013251	-21.88	3545.11

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS TO DISPUTE BILLING ERRORS.

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING

PERCAD-Bayonne, N. J.

EXHIBIT
MF-1A

STATEMENT	ACCOUNT NUMBER	SOCIAL SECURITY NO.	FROM	THROUGH	PAGE	OF
G14	198111		2-01-96	02-29-96	2	2

TRAVIS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

TRAVIS AFB BRANCH
100 UNITED STREET
TRAVIS AFB, CA 94535
PHONE (707)448-4000

FAIRFIELD BRANCH
2870 N. TEXAS ST.
FAIRFIELD, CA 94533
PHONE (707)449-4000

VACAVALLE BRANCH
41 ORMONDO STREET
VACAVILLE, CA 95688
PHONE (707)449-4000

CASTLE AFB BRANCH
CASTLE AFB, CA 95342
PHONE (209)388-2110

MERCED BRANCH
2000 MERCED ST.
MERCED, CA 95340
PHONE (209)723-9733

ALL CORRESPONDENCE:
P.O. BOX 2000
VACAVILLE, CA 95696-2000

THE FINANCE CHARGE FOR AN OPEN-END LOAN IS COMPUTED BY APPLYING THE PERIODIC RATE TO EACH UNPAID BALANCE FOR THE EXACT NO. OF DAYS THE BALANCE IS UNPAID. THE FINANCE CHARGE IS THE SUM OF THE DAILY FINANCE CHARGE IN THAT BALANCE EACH DAY AFTER CREDITS ARE SUBTRACTED AND NEW ADVANCES OR OTHER CHARGES ARE ADDED.

DIVIDEND AND/OR INTEREST OF $10.00 OR GREATER WILL BE REPORTED TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND APPLICABLE STATE AGENCY THROUGH PERIOD ENDING DEC. 31ST AS INTEREST INCOME FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR.

YOU CAN SAVE AT LEAST $3751
TRAVIS FEDERAL IS WAIVING ALL FEES ON ALL HOME EQUITY LOANS AND LINES OF CREDIT, NOW THROUGH MARCH 31, 1996. AVAILABLE FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA ONLY. CALL PHONELOAN SEVEN DAYS A WEEK TO APPLY AT (707) 451-5350 OR 1-800-449-4110.

MANLIN FOURC
1483 RALEWOOD CT.
FAIRFIELD CA 94533

PHONE ACCOUNTS ARE NON-TRANSFERABLE EXCEPT ON THE BOOKS OF THIS CREDIT UNION. TO VERIFY YOUR DIRECT DEPOSIT, CALL US AT (707) 449-4000 EX. 720

TRAN. NO.	EFFECT DAY	MO	DAYS	TRANSACTION DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
				NO. AMOUNT NO. AMOUNT NO. AMOUNT	NO. AMOUNT	
				378 1283.58 *384 17.56 388 18.41	391 86.19	
				380 131.25 *386 171.15 389 120.00	392 23.88	
				381 92.00 387 1503.94 390 12500.00	*393 863.07	
				382 40.00	TOTAL: 16272.02	
				T-T-O DIVIDENDS: 5.02		
				(A 1.5000 DIVIDEND OF 3.07 WILL BE POSTED TO YOUR ACCOUNT ON 03011961)		
				TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
				BALANCE RANGE RATE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		1.51%
				.00 - 9,999,999.99 1.50% ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		1.51%
				SUFFIX:01 VEHICLE LOAN		
				ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE 8.2500% DAILY PERIODIC RATE .0226027%		
				PREVIOUS LOAN BALANCE		11193.29
				FINANCE CHARGE PRINCIPAL		
	02	23	96	LOAN PAYMENT CREDIT 91.08 408.92	500.00	10784.37
				YTD FINANCE CHARGE PAID: 91.08 NEW LOAN BALANCE		10784.37
PERIOD TOTALS-PAYMENTS & CREDITS: 408.92 DEBITS: .00 *FINANCE CHARGE*:						91.08
				SUMMARY OF PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS AND DIRECT DEPOSITS		
DATE				TOTAL S.O S.J		
02-15				1,336.97 .00 1,336.97 .00 .00	.00	.00
02-29				1,518.89 .00 1,518.89 .00 .00	.00	.00
FOR YTD REPORTING SEE				* IRA YTD * OTHER YTD * TOTAL YTD * TOTAL YTD * TOTAL YTD * TOTAL YTD * TOTAL YTD		
				DIVIDENDS DIVIDENDS DIVIDENDS FED WHH STATE WHH FORFEITURES		
				.00 51.29 51.29 .00 .00		.00
TOTAL **FINANCE CHARGE** PAID 91.08						

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS TO DISPUTE BILLING ERRORS

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
(718) 463-3600

18100

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $5,000.00***

DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

⑈018100⑈ ⑆026011484⑆ 171000178⑈ ⑈0000500000⑈

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
217706889

EXHIBIT
MF-2


0000029954
AMERASIA BANK
Cashier's Check
$5,000.00
EXHIBIT
NF-3



BEST POSSIBLE PHOTO



BEST POSSIBLE PHOTO

JOSEPH R LANDON USN RET
PH 707-554-4810
P O BOX 4382
VALLEJO, CA 94590

1337

19 Feb, 96

N. C.

$ 12,500.-

⑆321470839⑈ 0000000000 2000735⑈ 1337

Check Tracking Form
(All information must be provided before entry)

Name/Contact: JOSEPH R. LANDON
Company/Employer:
Home/Company Address (street, city): P.O. BOX 4382
VALLEJO, CA 94590
City/State/ZIP:

Telephone:
Work:
Home: 707-554-4810
Fax:
Alternate:

Program:
NAVY:
TRS:
SS:
NFR:
VRF:
SS:
LS:
OTH: Apple

Designation:
TRS:
NAV:
SSN:
Spouse:
NAVY:
OTH:

10/96
Prior: BRIAN DIVARE - HAY ADAMS
Source Code: 1A52
Prospect Code: 821
Contact: JOHN HUANG
Evaluator:

Disposition Code: PST ✓ NAV ___ PRO ___ PROST ___ NAVY ___ GROUP ___ NAV ___ NAVY ___
*DO NOT PROCESSING: PRE ___ PAS ___ PDA ___ TRANS ___ NAV ___ OTH ___ SSN ___ SSN/PRO

0 0000350
CONFIDENTIAL

EXHIBIT
MF-4



AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
136-08 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11354
(718) 463-3600

Cashier's Check

1811

FEB. 22 19 96

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $5,000.00***

$5,000.00 DOLLAR

MEMO

PAID

"018101" :026011484: 1210001 7" "0000500000



FEB '96 26 4
0212-0400-5
0212-0400-5 4

FB '96 26

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
321176939

Cashier's Check

初約第一銀行
41-06 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

1810

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $ 5,000.00***

DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

⑈018102⑈ ⑆026011484⑆ 1710001 7⑈ ⑈0000500000⑈

4 FB '96 26 4
0212-0400-5
0212-0400-5 4

FB '96 26

1210-0037-4

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
321170039

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
初約第一銀行
(718) 463-3600

1810

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON***

$ 5,000.00***

5,000 00

DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

⑈018103⑈ ⑆026011484⑆ 1710001 7⑈ ⑈0000500000⑈

4 FB '96 26 4
0212-0400-5
0212-0400-5 4

FB '96 26

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
321170839

EXHIBIT
NE-5

Cashier's Check

1610

紐約第一銀行
41-60 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

FEB. 22 1996

1-1148-25

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK $5,000.00 DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

⑈018104⑈ ⑆026011484⑆ 171000187⑈ ⑈0000500000⑈

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
321170839

01331 02/28/96
FB 96 27
121000374



BEST POSSIBLE PHOTO

EXHIBIT
DF-6

BANK: 001
R1005 WASH

MONEY TRANSFER SYSTEM
TRANSACTION JOURNAL-AMOUNT ORDER
FOR PERIOD 08/15/96-08/15/96

R 5010

DATE 08/15/96
PAGE 1215 1A

DATE: 08/15/96 AMOUNT: 10,000.00 ACCT NO: 17191501 REQ NO: 6455
STATUS: COMPLETE TRANSACTION TYPE: OUT WIRE SERVICE: FEDWIRE

USD AMOUNT: 10,000.00 REPETITIVE CODE: ORIG REF NO:

FGN AMOUNT: CURRCODE: VAL DATE: RATE:

DEBIT AC: 17191501 D-CLLBCK: N SAN.KIVITOOD 71A: PR:

ORD: LAP SEND NO

CREDIT AC: C-CLLBCK: CONTROL NO:

DEST
BK: DESTBIC: MSG TYPE:

BNF BANK: 57(A,B,D) BENEFICIARY BANK INFO:
ADD: BOX 2069 VACAVILLE CA
TRAVS FED CR UNION

RCVR CORR: 56(A,B,D) IBK: 56(A,D)
ADD: ADD:

CHG CODE: 14

BENEFICIARY: ORIGINATOR TO BENEFICIARY INFORMATION:
AC: 190111
MAN LIN FOUNG

REFERENCE FOR BENEFICIARY:

ORG BANK: 52(A,D)
ADD: DEBIT DETAIL:
17 25

CREDIT DETAIL:

PENGAD Bayonne, N.J.
EXHIBIT
MF-7

TRAVIS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

TRAVIS AFB BRANCH: 506 MATHER STREET, TRAVIS AFB, CA 94535, PHONE (707)439-5000
CAMPBELL BRANCH: 3970 N. TEXAS ST, FAIRFIELD, CA 94533, PHONE (707)864-5000
VACAVI: [illegible], VACAVILLE, CA [illegible], PHONE (707)446-5000
CASTLE AFB BRANCH: 7446 ST. ELMO, CASTLE AFB, CA 95342, PHONE (209)726-2192
MERCED BRANCH: 1800 G STREET, MERCED, CA 95340, PHONE (209)723-0732
ALL COMMUNITY/FAMILY: P.O. BOX 7000, VACAVILLE, CA 95696-7000

THE FINANCE CHARGE FOR VA OPEN-END LOANS IS COMPUTED BY APPLYING THE PERIODIC RATE TO EACH UNPAID BALANCE FOR THE EXACT NO. OF DAYS EACH BALANCE WAS OUTSTANDING. THE BALANCE USED TO CALCULATE THE FINANCE CHARGE IS THE PRIOR BALANCE LESS ANY DAYS CREDITS PLUS ANY NEW ADVANCES OR OTHER CHARGES ARE ADDED.

DIVIDENDS AND/OR INTEREST OF $10.00 OR MORE WILL BE REPORTED TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND APPLICABLE STATE AGENCIES. CALENDAR PERIOD EARNINGS DEC. 1st AS INTEREST INCOME FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR.

MEMBER APPRECIATION DAYS ARE COMING TO A BRANCH NEAR YOU! TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR MEMBERSHIP AND FOR REFERRING YOUR FAMILY, WE'RE HAVING A PARTY.

STOP BY OUR BRANCHES SEPTEMBER 23RD - 29TH AND MEET OUR FRIENDLY STAFF. WE'LL HAVE REFREHMENTS AND BALLOONS FOR EVERYONE.

WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU!

MANLIN POUNS
1485 BALENOOD CT.
CORDELIA CA 94565

Share accounts are non-transferable except on the books of this credit union. To verify your direct deposit, call us at (707) 439-5000 ex 326.

TRAN MO	TRAN DAY	EFFECT MO	EFFECT DAY	TRANSACTION DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
				SUFFIX:00 PRIME SHARE ACCT		5814.07
		08	19	96DIVIDEND	16.38	5832.45
		08	19	96TFR TO LOAN 198111- 2	-207.00	5625.45
		08	19	96	-330.00	5295.45
08	14	08	15	96PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM 207075- 0	103.50	5378.95
08	14	08	15	96EXXON	1403.23	6782.18
08	14	08	15	96EXXON	-1403.23	5378.95
		08	15	96FED WIRE 198111-F0	10000.00	15378.95
		08	16	96TFR TO SHARES 198111-30	-10000.00	5378.95
		08	27	96TFR TO SHARES 198111-30	-2000.00	3378.95
		08	29	96FED WIRE 198111-F0	2000.00	5378.95
08	29	08	30	96PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM 207075- 0	103.50	5482.45
08	29	08	30	96EXXON	1942.74	7425.21
08	29	08	30	96EXXON	-1942.74	5482.45
				Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 181.09		
				TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
				BALANCE RANGE / RATE / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		
				.00 - 9,999,999.99 / 3.50% / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		3.56% / 3.56%
				SUFFIX:30 365 - 449 DAY CERT		1334.18
		08	19	96DIVIDEND	6.81	1340.99
				Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 42.99 / FORFEITURES: .00		
				MATURITY DATE:011597 / DIV RATE: 5.22CO		
				TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
				BALANCE RANGE / RATE / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		
				.00 - 9,999,999.99 / 5.22% / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		5.35% / 5.35%
				SUFFIX:11 182 - 209 DAY CERT		3002.05
		08	19	96DIVIDEND	21.16	3023.21
				Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 23.21 / FORFEITURES: .00		
				MATURITY DATE:122796 / DIV RATE: 4.98CO		
				TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
				BALANCE RANGE / RATE / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		
				.00 - 9,999,999.99 / 4.98% / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		5.10% / 5.10%
				SUFFIX:50 SHARE DRAFT ACCOUNT		
				BEGINNING BALANCE 2309.83 / MAINT/SERVICE CHGS .00		
				DEPOSITS 13347.29 / ENDING BALANCE 2499.74		
				DRAFTS 14807.98 /		
				MISC DEBITS 550.00 / TOTAL NUMBER DRAFTS CLEARD 12		
				DEPOSITS		
		08	07	96DIVIDEND	3.30	2311.13
08	14	08	15	96PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM 198111- 0	1403.23	2308.49

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS TO DISPUTE BILLING ERRORS

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS TO DISPUTE BILLING ERRORS

EXHIBIT
MF-8

PENGAD-Bayonne, N. J.

STATEMENT C02 ACCOUNT NUMBER 198111 SOCIAL SECURITY NO. FROM 01-96 THROUGH 08-31-96 PAGE 2 OF 3

TRAVIS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

TRAVIS AFB BRANCH
[illegible]
FAIRFIELD, CA 94533
PHONE (707)429-3000

FAIRFIELD BRANCH
[illegible] TEXAS ST.
FAIRFIELD, CA 94533
PHONE (707)429-3000

VACAVILLE BRANCH
[illegible] CANNON STREET
VACAVILLE, CA 95688
PHONE (707)449-4000

CASTLE AFB BRANCH
740 "G" STREET
CASTLE AFB, CA 95342
PHONE (209)726-2110

MERCED BRANCH
2000 "G" STREET
MERCED, CA 95340
PHONE (209)722-0750

ALL CORRESPONDENCE:
P.O. BOX 2500
VACAVILLE, CA 95696-2500

MAHLON FOUNG
1683 BALBOADA CT.
CORDELIA CA 94585

THE FINANCE CHARGE FOR AN OPEN-END LOAN IS COMPUTED BY APPLYING THE PERIODIC RATE TO THE AVERAGE BALANCE FOR THE CLOSE OF EACH DAILY BALANCE. THE DAILY BALANCE IS THE BALANCE UPON TO CONSIST OF THE PRIOR CHARGE IN THAT BALANCE EACH DAY AFTER CREDITS ARE SUBTRACTED AND NEW ADVANCES OR OTHER CHARGES ARE ADDED.

DIVIDENDS AND APR INTEREST OF $10.00 OR MORE PAID DURING THE YEAR WILL BE REPORTED TO REVENUE SERVICE AND APPLICABLE STATE AGENCY THROUGH PERIOD ENDING DEC 31ST AS INTEREST INCOME FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR

MEMBER APPRECIATION DAYS ARE COMING TO A BRANCH NEAR YOU! TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR MEMBERSHIP AND FOR REFERRING YOUR FAMILY, WE'RE HAVING A PARTY.

STOP BY OUR BRANCHES SEPTEMBER 23RD - 29TH AND MEET OUR FRIENDLY STAFF. WE'LL HAVE REFRESHMENTS AND GALLONS FOR EVERYONE.

WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU!

SHARE ACCOUNTS ARE NON-TRANSFERABLE EXCEPT ON THE BOOKS OF THIS CREDIT UNION. TO VERIFY YOUR DIRECT DEPOSIT, CALL US AT (707) 429-3000 EX. 720

TRAN. NO	EFFECT MO	EFFECT DAY	EFFECT YR	TRANSACTION DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
				DEPOSITS		
	08	16	96	TFR FROM SHARES 198111- 0	10000.00	13146.63
	08	27	96	TFR FROM SHARES 198111- 0	2000.00	3241.63
08	27	03	00	6 PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM 198111- 0	1942.74	2499.74
				TOTAL:	13547.29	
				DRAFTS		
NO.		EFF DATE	AMOUNT	NO.	EFF DATE	AMOUNT	NO.	EFF DATE	AMOUNT
460		08-13	7.00	*466	08-13	137.74	470	08-21	300.00
*462		08-07	30.00	467	08-08	100.00	471	08-19	105.00
463		08-05	17.87	468	08-09	200.00	472	08-26	10000.00
464		08-09	1401.00	469	08-14	24.12	473	08-28	2485.25
							TOTAL:		14807.98
				MISCELLANEOUS DEBITS		
	08	19	96		-30.00	2461.13
	08	20	96	TFR TO LOAN 198111- 1	-500.00	11541.63
				TOTAL:	530.00	
				T-T-D DIVIDENDS: 14.27		
				TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
				BALANCE RANGE RATE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		
				.00 - 9,999,999.99 1.50% ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		1.51% 1.51%
				SUFFIX:01 VEHICLE LOAN		
				ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE 8.2500% DAILY PERIODIC RATE .0224027%		
				PREVIOUS LOAN BALANCE		8611.07
	08	20	96	TFR FROM SHARES 198111-30 **FINANCE CHARGE** PRINCIPAL 64.23 435.77	500.00	8175.30
				TTD FINANCE CHARGE PAID: 482.01 NEW LOAN BALANCE		8175.30
PERIOD TOTALS-PAYMENTS & CREDITS: 435.77 DEBITS: .00 *FINANCE CHARGE*:						64.23
				SUFFIX:02 VEHICLE LOAN		
				ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE 8.9900% DAILY PERIODIC RATE .0246301%		
				PREVIOUS LOAN BALANCE		9937.00
	08	01	96	TFR FROM SHARES 198111- 0 **FINANCE CHARGE** PRINCIPAL 66.22 140.78	207.00	9814.22
				TTD FINANCE CHARGE PAID: 66.22 NEW LOAN BALANCE		9814.22
PERIOD TOTALS-PAYMENTS & CREDITS: 140.78 DEBITS: .00 *FINANCE CHARGE*:						66.22

SUMMARY OF PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS AND DIRECT DEPOSITS

DATE	TOTAL	S.D.	S.S.				
08-13	3,706.73	103.50	1,403.23	.00	.00	.00	.00
08-30	2,046.24	103.50	1,942.74	.00	.00	.00	.00

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING

Account Number	Statement Date	Page
[redacted]	Aug 1, 1997	

AT&T billing questions on this page: 1-800-222-0300

AT&T

AT&T Monthly Charges

•Taxes and Surcharges

	Description	Amour
1.	Tax: Fed	.5
2.	CHCF-A, CHCF-B	.1
3.	CA Relay Service and Communications Devices Fund	.0
4.	California Teleconnect Fund	.0
5.	Univ Lifeline Tele Serv Sur	.1
6.	Tax: 911	.0
		.85

Total AT&T Monthly Charges $.85

AT&T True Reach (SM)

Charges in the Amount column are informational. See Summary for actual charges.

•Eligible Calls

	Date	Time	Place and Number Called		Type	Rate	Minutes	Amoun
7.	Jun25	5:54pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	1	.0
8.	Jun25	5:57pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	1	.0
9.	Jun25	7:05pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	2	.1
10.	Jun27	10:37pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	3	.3
11.	Jun28	8:50am	[redacted]		Direct	Night	5	.2
12.	Jun28	8:10pm	[redacted]		Direct	Night	1	.0
13.	Jun30	5:44pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	5	.5
14.	Jun30	6:02pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	3	.5
15.	Jul 1	10:08pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	2	.1
16.	Jul 2	5:31pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	1	.0
17.	Jul 2	7:11pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	1	.0
18.	Jul 2	9:55pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	7	.39
19.	Jul 3	4:48pm	[redacted]		Direct	Day	2	.62
20.	Jul 3	4:50pm	WASHINGTONDC	202 863-7110	Direct	Day	1	.3
21.	Jul 3	4:51pm	WASHINGTONDC	202 863-7110	Direct	Day	2	.62
22.	Jul 3	5:20pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	3	.5
23.	Jul 5	7:04pm	[redacted]		Direct	Night	1	.0
24.	Jul 6	10:17am	[redacted]		Direct	Night	3	.1
25.	Jul 6	4:41pm	[redacted]		Direct	Night	4	.3
26.	Jul 6	6:54pm	[redacted]		Direct	Night	4	.3
27.	Jul 6	8:54pm	[redacted]		Direct	Night	2	.0
28.	Jul 7	7:17pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	1	.1
29.	Jul 7	7:18pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	2	.2
30.	Jul 7	8:02pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	2	.1
31.	Jul11	11:32am	WASHINGTONDC	202 327-5876	Direct	Day	6	1.8
32.	Jul13	5:02pm	[redacted]		Direct	Night	1	.0
33.	Jul14	10:42am	[redacted]		Direct	Day	2	.2
34.	Jul14	1:10pm	[redacted]		Direct	Day	0	.9
35.	Jul14	1:20pm	[redacted]		Direct	Day	4	.5
36.	Jul14	1:26pm	WASHINGTONDC	202 863-8000	Direct	Day	1	.31
37.	Jul14	1:28pm	WASHINGTONDC	202 863-8000	Direct	Day	5	1.55
38.	Jul16	10:56am	WASHINGTONDC	202 383-8060	Direct	Day	22	6.82
39.	Jul21	9:38pm	[redacted]		Direct	Eve	3	.18
40.	Jul23	3:47pm	[redacted]		Direct	Day	1	.16
								18.94

continues

[redacted]

EXHIBIT
AF-9

EXECUTIVE SESSION

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEPOSITION OF: JOSEPH RAYMOND LANDON, JR.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1997

The deposition in the above matter was held in the offices of Charles J. Stevens, Esq., 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1450, Sacramento, California, commencing at 1:20 p.m.

Appearances:

Staff Present for the Government Reform and Oversight Committee: James C. Wilson, senior investigative counsel; Richard D. Bennett, special counsel; Charles F. Little, investigator; Kenneth Ballen, minority chief investigative counsel; Phil Barnett, minority chief counsel; and Christopher Lu, minority counsel.

For JOSEPH RAYMOND LANDON, JR.:

CHARLES J. STEVENS, ESQ.
Stevens & O'Connell
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1450
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Landon, good morning. On behalf of the members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, I thank you very much for coming here today.

This proceeding is known as a deposition. The person transcribing the proceeding is a House reporter and notary public, and I'll now request that he place you under oath.

THEREUPON, JOSEPH RAYMOND LANDON, JR., a witness, was called for examination, and after having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. WILSON. I'd like to note for the record those who are present at the beginning of this deposition. My name is James Wilson. I'm the designated Majority counsel. Appearing with me today are Mr. Richard Bennett and Mr. Chuck Little.

Mr. Landon is represented by Mr. Charles Stevens, and appearing on behalf of the Minority are Ken Ballen and Christopher Lu.

Although this proceeding is being held in a somewhat informal atmosphere, because you have been placed under oath, your testimony here today has the same force and effect as if you were testifying before the committee or in a courtroom.

If I ask you about conversations you have had in the past, and you are unable to recall the exact words, you may state that you are unable to recall the exact words, but then please give me the gist or substance of that conversation to the best of your recollection. If you recall only part of a conversation or only part of an event, please give me your best recollection of either the conversation or the event.

If I ask you whether you have any information about a particular subject, and you have overheard conversations about that subject or have seen correspondence or documents about that subject, please tell me that you do have such information and tell me the source from which you derived such information.

Before I begin questioning, I want to give you some background on the investigation and your appearance here.

Pursuant to its authority under House Rules X and XI of the House of Representatives, the committee is engaged in a wide-ranging review of possible political fundraising improprieties and possible violations of law. Pages 2 through 4 of House Report 105–139 summarize the investigation as of June 19, 1997, and describe new matters which have arisen in the course of this investigation. Also, pages 4 through 11 of the report explain the background of the investigation. All questions related either directly or indirectly to these issues, or questions which have the tendency to make the existence of any pertinent fact more or less probable are proper.

The committee has been granted specific authorization to conduct this deposition pursuant to House Resolution 167, which passed the full House of Representatives on June 20, 1997. The committee Rule 20 outlines the ground rules for this deposition.

The Majority and Minority counsels will ask you questions about the subject matter of this investigation. Majority counsel will ask questions first, and then when

we are finished, Minority counsel will follow and ask whatever questions they have to ask at that time. After they have finished, a new round of questioning may begin.

Pursuant to the committee's rules, you are allowed to have an attorney present, and as we mentioned at the beginning, you are accompanied today by Mr. Charles Stevens.

Any objections raised during the course of the deposition shall be stated for the record. If the witness is instructed not to answer a question, or otherwise refuses to answer a question, the Majority and Minority counsel will confer to determine whether the objection is proper. If the Majority and Minority counsels agree that the question is proper, the witness will be asked to answer the question. If an objection is not withdrawn, the Chairman or a Member designated by the Chairman may decide whether the objection is proper.

This deposition is considered as taken in executive session of the committee, which means that it may not be made public without the consent of the committee pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of House Rule XI. You are asked to abide by the rules of the House and not discuss with anyone other than your attorney this deposition and the issues and questions raised during this proceeding.

Finally, no later than 5 days after your testimony is transcribed and you have been notified that your testimony is available, you may submit suggested changes to the Chairman. Practically speaking, the transcripts will be turned around very quickly. I imagine we will be able to Federal Express a copy of the transcript to Mr. Stevens within a day or two, and you will have an opportunity to review the deposition to ensure that the statements you made are correct.

The committee staff may make any typographical or technical changes requested by you. Substantive changes or modifications, clarifications or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by you must be accompanied by a letter requesting the changes and a statement of your reasons for the proposed changes. A letter requesting substantive changes or modifications must be signed by you. Any substantive changes, modifications clarifications or amendments will be included as an appendix to the transcript of the deposition conditioned upon your signing of the transcript.

Do you understand everything we have gone over so far?

The WITNESS. Good enough.

Mr. WILSON. Are there any other statements or observations to be made?

Mr. BALLEN. Yes, I do have a brief statement. Thank you very much.

Mr. Landon, on behalf of the Democratic Members of the committee, I want to thank you for being here today. I represent the Democratic Members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

As you may know, every committee in the Congress is represented by two parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, and the Republican Party is in the Majority and in control of the committee in terms of deciding what witnesses to call and what hearings to have. And Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bennett represent the Republican Majority.

I do not represent either the Democratic National Committee or the current administration, but simply Democrat Members of the House who sit on our committee. Some of them you might be familiar with are from California. Our Ranking Member is Mr. Waxman from Los Angeles. We have other Members from this area, Gary Condit and Mr. Tom Lantos from the Bay Area.

We want to take this opportunity at the outset to apologize because we know this has been an inconvenience on your time and your life.

I don't know what, if anything, you have been informed, but certainly if you have any questions, what the nature of any proceedings might be if you have to come back to Washington in terms of testifying in a committee room with some 40-odd Members of Congress, and possibly television cameras or reporters or things along those lines, so if you have any questions in that regard, we would be happy to help, and certainly from our point of view, we will try to make this process as painless and as simple as possible in terms of what is in our control.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. WILSON. I will be asking you questions concerning the subject matter of this investigation.

Do you understand?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. If you don't understand a question, please say so, and I will repeat it or rephrase it so that you do understand the question.

Do you understand that you should tell me if you don't understand my question?

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. WILSON. The reporter will be taking down everything that we say and will make a written record of the deposition, and I'd ask to you give verbal and audible answers so that the reporter can adequately transcribe all that takes place today.

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. WILSON. If you can't hear me, please say so, and I will repeat the question or have the court reporter read the question back to you.

Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Please wait until I finish each question before answering, and I'll try to wait until you finish your answer before I ask the next question.

Do you understand that this will help the reporter make a clear record of the questions and answers today?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON. Your testimony is being taken under oath as if we were in court, and if you answer a question, it will be assumed that you understood the question and the answer was intended to be responsive to it.

Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. And it's my understanding that you are here voluntarily today; is that correct?

The WITNESS. That's correct.

Mr. WILSON. Do you have any questions about this deposition before we begin the substantive portion of the proceedings?

The WITNESS. Nope.

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. Just to begin, I'd like to ask you a few background questions for the record.

Could you please state your full name and spell it for the record?

Answer. Joseph Raymond Landon, Jr.

Question. And what was your birthdate?

Answer. 3/27/49.

Question. And if you could, give me a brief explanation of your employment history from the time of secondary school until the present—high school until the present.

Answer. Out of high school I worked for a couple of electrical companies. Then I went down to the Navy, talked to the recruiter. And just so happens that the Army sent me a draft notice, and the next day I was supposed to go to the Navy, so I spent 20 years in the military; 20 years and 3 months. After the military I worked two technical jobs on the outside. I retired in '89.

Question. You retired from the military in 1989?

Answer. Correct.

Question. And where did you live when you were working with the military?

Answer. After boot camp I was stationed in Georgia, Rhode Island; spent a few years in Antarctica. I was on the USS Midway, the Coral Sea, the USS California. I was stationed in Mare Island for a few years, I taught there, and I got out in Alameda.

Question. And Alameda was your final posting?

Answer. It was final. I was on the USS California there.

Question. And after you retired in 1989, where did you work up until the present?

Answer. I worked for George Martin Engineering Company, Mar Wais Steel, Current Affairs Electric. I had a bunch of temporary jobs, small jobs, and I'm currently with [Employer's Name].

Mr. STEVENS. Do we have the same stipulations?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, if we could go off the record for a moment.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. WILSON. We just had a conversation about Mr. Landon's employment, and it's agreed by all present that his employer will not appear in the transcript of this deposition if possible. Please insert "his employer" if that subject does come up again.

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. Now, from 1989 to the present, where did you live in the different positions you have had?

Answer. '89 to present? Up to '89, I was in the barracks. Then I lived in Vallejo from 1986 to present. I've also lived with Ms. Foung in Cordelia.

Question. When did you first meet Ms. Foung?

Answer. I think it was '94.

Question. Okay. Prior to 1996, had you ever made any political contributions?

Answer. No. I think it's only a dollar or whatever on the 1040.

Question. Had you ever participated in any political activities or political campaigns?

Answer. No. I don't talk good enough for that.

Mr. WILSON. I'm providing the witness with a document which has been marked Exhibit JL–1.

[Landon Deposition Exhibit No. JL–1 was marked for identification.]

[Note.—All exhibits referred to may be found at end of deposition on p. 89.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. And if you would take just a moment to review this. Let me just explain what it is. It is a one-page copy of a check, and then at the bottom of the page there is what is headed "Check Tracking Form," and it is a document that was provided to this committee by the Democratic National Committee, and it represents some background information on the check and the contribution that appears to be made by Mr. Landon.

Bearing in mind it's very difficult to see this check, do you recall writing a check to the DNC on February 19, 1996?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Just if you could, give me the general background to why you came to write this check to the DNC in February of 1996.

Answer. Ms. Foung asked if I would. I did it as a favor to her.

Question. And beyond that, were you aware at the time of why she asked you to write this check?

Answer. No, sir, at the time I didn't even know what the DNC was.

Question. Have you had any subsequent conversations, any conversations since you wrote this check, about why she asked you to write the check to the DNC?

Answer. She said it was for a function in Washington for someone overseas. I assumed at the time it was her brother, but I wasn't positive.

Question. Did she mention to you around the time that you wrote this check that it had something to do with her brother?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you have an understanding, did you know whether or not in February of 1996 that you would be reimbursed for this check?

Answer. She told me I would be.

Question. And what did she tell you?

Answer. Well, she said if I write, I could be reimbursed within a couple of days.

Question. Do you recall whether she gave you any explanation about why you would be writing a check and you would be reimbursed a few days later?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you ask her any questions about why she wanted you to write the check and then you would be reimbursed right afterwards?

Answer. No, I figured that was her business.

Question. Now, once you wrote this check, if you could, again, just give me a description how you were reimbursed for the check that you had written.

Answer. It was two $5,000 checks and $2,500.

Question. Actually I'll show you in a moment some checks just to help us walk through this process, but before you actually got the checks, or before you were, in fact, paid back, were there any conversations during which you discussed how you were going to be reimbursed?

Answer. How?

Question. Yes.

Answer. No, she just told me I would be.

Question. So it's fair to say she told you you would be reimbursed if you wrote the check, and you expected that to happen?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Apart from Ms. Foung making the request for you to write this check, do you remember any other names that came up at the time? Did she describe anything else about this check or this contribution beyond what you have told us so far?

Answer. No, she just said it's something to do with the Democrats, because I asked her what the DNC was. I didn't know. And she said it's just something to do with the Democrats.

Question. Do you know whether she had had any conversations with anybody affiliated with the DNC——

Answer. No.

Question [continuing]. Before that?

Answer. No.

Mr. WILSON. I'm giving Mr. Landon a document which has been marked JL–2 for the record. It is a copy of two cashier's checks from the Amerasia Bank. And if you could take just a moment to review that.

[Landon Deposition Exhibit No. JL–2 was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. Do you remember how you received these checks?

Answer. They were given to me by Ms. Foung.

Question. Do you know how she got the checks?

Answer. No.

Question. Did she tell you at any time whether it was by mail or delivery or anything about how she got the checks?

Answer. No, she just gave me the checks.

Question. Now, when she gave you these checks, you had previously written a check for $12,500, and the two checks that have your name on them are for a total of $10,000, two $5,000 checks. Did you have any discussions with her about the balance of your contribution? What was your understanding of how you would get paid the balance of the contribution you had made?

Answer. She gave me the difference. There was two $5,000 checks, and then $2,500 she gave me.

Question. And how did she give you that?

Answer. I think it was a check, her personal check.

Question. Had you had any discussions about the reimbursement or the circumstances of the reimbursement before she got the checks and gave you the two $5,000? Actually what I'm trying to find out is did the $2,500 come to you about the same time as these two $5,000 checks?

Answer. Yeah. She handed me those two and I'm pretty sure a personal check for $2,500 all about the same time.

Question. So you were—just going back over what we've looked at, you wrote a check on February 19 of 1996, and you received a check from Amerasia Bank on February 22nd of 1996. So you were reimbursed right after the time that you wrote the check originally?

Answer. Yes, just a couple of days.

Question. Speaking about or just turning your attention to that same time period, did you know whether Ms. Foung also made a contribution to the DNC?

Answer. I think she did.

Question. And did you have any discussions with her about whether she was making a contribution to the DNC?

Answer. If she was?

Question. Making a contribution in February of 1996?

Answer. No, no.

Question. Did you know that she also wrote a $12,500 check to the DNC?

Answer. She told me that she did.

Question. Did she tell you that at same time that she was asking to you write your check?

Answer. She might have. I don't remember for sure.

Question. Do you remember when you first knew that she was going to be making a contribution in the same amount that you were making the contribution?

Answer. She didn't tell me what amount, if any, she was going to write it for.

Question. But it's fair to say you knew that approximately the same time that you were writing your check that she was going to be doing the same thing?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And was it your understanding that she was also going to be reimbursed for the check that she wrote?

Answer. That I don't know.

Question. I won't spend too much longer on this, but you wrote a check for $12,500, and you had the understanding that you would be reimbursed. Did you have—do you recall when you first, if you ever did, have a conversation with her when you found out that she was going to get paid back for her contribution?

Answer. My only concern was covering my check. She said, yes, that she was to get reimbursed.

Question. Do you know whether she had—I mean, do you know whether she had concerns about covering the check that she wrote?

Answer. That I don't know.

Question. When you wrote your check on February 19 of 1996, was there enough money in your bank account to cover the $12,500 check?

Answer. No, there wasn't.

Question. Did you have any conversations with her about there not being enough money in your bank account to cover the $12,500 check?

Answer. I told her that I didn't, but she said just there's a time period in there, and they just wanted to write the check just so it would be at a Washington function, and it would be reimbursed before the check was cashed.

Question. Did she tell you then that your check would be held for a period of a few days?

Answer. That I don't know—well, she figured there would probably be a few days before it was cashed, so I shouldn't have any problem covering the check.

Question. How—do you know how your check was forwarded on to the DNC? Was it sent by mail or Federal Express or?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Do you know whether somebody picked it up or somebody did not pick it up?

Answer. I have no idea.

Question. Have you ever met an individual named Antonio Pan? The last name is spelled P-A-N?

Answer. No.

Question. In February of 1996, apart from your conversations with Ms. Foung about you writing the check, had you had any conversations with anybody about making a contribution to the DNC?

Answer. No.

Question. Later in the year, in August of 1996, Ms. Foung made a second contribution, a second contribution for her, to the DNC, and it was for an amount of $10,000. Did you have any conversations with Ms. Foung about the second contribution that she made to the DNC?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you know that she made a second contribution to the DNC?

Answer. No.

Question. Between February and August of 1996—actually let me make that a little bit less broad.

After you had written your check for $12,500, and after you had been reimbursed, did you have any other conversations with Ms. Foung about that check, about that process?

Answer. No. I didn't care.

Question. Well, come to the present, actually. Let's take it right to the present then. When did you first become aware that there might be an issue about the whole process of you writing the check and then you getting reimbursed for the check?

Answer. I think it was the newspaper or something said that they were returning checks to certain people. I'm pretty sure it was the newspaper. I read it in the newspaper.

Question. Something that you saw in the newspaper?

Answer. Yeah.

Question. And do you recall approximately when that might have been? Not the day, but the month is fine.

Answer. End of '96. Yeah, somewhere around the end of '96.

Question. Did you ever—before you saw something in the newspaper, did you ever get any telephone calls, or did anybody ever make any inquiry of you about these checks?

Answer. Somebody called me at work. They said they were from the Washington newspaper. I don't know if it was the Post, the Times, or something.

Question. And when was that?

Answer. About February of this year.

Question. Do you remember whether they told you their name?

Answer. They told me the name, but I'm not sure. I could only guess right now. I think it was an Asian name, but I'm not sure who it was.

Question. At the time when they called you on the phone, did you make any notes, or did you write anything down?

Answer. No, they left it on one of those memo pads and asked if I'd call an 800 number somewhere back in Washington.

Question. I'll return in a minute to maybe some other contacts, but have you ever had any discussions with Ms. Foung about any other political contributions that she might have made?

Answer. No.

Question. I should simplify that question and actually make it easy for everybody to understand. Do you know whether she made any other political contributions apart from—I just mentioned two. She made one in February and she made one in August. Do you know of her ever having made any other political contributions?

Answer. No, she didn't mention anything.

Question. Has she ever mentioned contributions to Senator Tom Daschle?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever heard her mention that name before?

Answer. I have no idea who he is.

Question. Going back into 1996, and I think I've asked you this, so bear with me if I have asked in this form, but did you get any calls or contacts at all in 1996 about the check that you wrote to the DNC?

Answer. Nothing.

Question. Do you know whether Ms. Foung got any telephone calls or letters or any inquiry of any sort about the contributions that she had made to the DNC?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever met any of Ms. Foung's relatives?

Answer. Her mother and her brother. I met him twice. Twice—maybe three times, but I know of twice.

Question. And when and where did you meet? When you say "her brother," you are referring to Yah Lin Trie, who is known as Charlie Trie?

Answer. Yeah.

Question. When did you meet him, and where did you meet him?

Answer. He came by her home Christmas one year. I can't remember what—I'm not sure if it was this year. I know when he was there, I had to work, so I'm not sure if it was '95 or '96. And the other time is he flew into San Francisco, and we went down there. I think it was in '95. Might have been '94.

Question. And do you know why he flew into San Francisco?

Answer. No.

Question. How long did you spend with him on that occasion?

Answer. In San Francisco?

Question. Yes.

Answer. There were—he had some people with him, but she didn't talk to him too much. I mean, what they talked about, I have no idea.

Mr. STEVENS. He just asked you approximately how much time you spent with Charlie on that visit.

The WITNESS. Oh, with Charlie? Two minutes.

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. And where was it that you met Mr. Trie and the people that were with Mr. Trie?

Answer. It was a hotel in San Francisco. Which one, I don't remember.

Question. Apart from meeting at the hotel, did you do anything with them at that time?

Answer. We drove around; the beach, Golden Gate Park.

Question. Was this—I don't want to put words in your mouth, but was it a sightseeing type of visit?

Answer. Yeah.

Question. Were they there for business as far as you knew?

Answer. No.

Question. And who all ended up driving around?

Answer. I drove.

Question. So you drove. Who else was in the car?

Answer. A few other people. Ms. Foung and some other people.

Question. And one of them was Mr. Trie, Charlie Trie?

Answer. No, he wasn't in that car.

Question. Do you remember the names of any of the people that were in the car?

Answer. I have no idea.

Question. Where was Mr. Trie?

Answer. He stayed at the hotel. Yeah, he stayed at the hotel. We just drove around to different—I think it was Golden Gate Park and the beach.

Question. Do you remember the relationship of Mr. Trie to the people that he was with?

Answer. No.

Question. You mentioned that you have met Ms. Foung's mother on one occasion. Where was that?

Answer. She's come to visit a couple of different times. She came Christmas one year, and she came to her home last year sometime.

Question. Have you ever met Ms. Trie's—or Ms. Foung's sister whose name is Dai Lin?

Answer. Once. Yeah, I'm sure once.

Question. Where was that?

Answer. I met her in—I met her in Las Vegas. We were going to make a trip over there, and she said he would be there.

Question. And was she there by herself, or did she have family members with her?

Answer. I think her mother was with her. Yeah, her mother was with her.

Question. Was her husband with her at that time?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever met Ms. Outlaw's, Ms. Dai Lin Outlaw's, children?

Answer. Not that I know of, no.

Question. Do you know whether Ms. Foung has ever attended any political events, fund-raisers or events that could be described as political gatherings?

Answer. Yeah. There was a place, Oakland, Hillsborough around here close. '96, the first part of '96. The President was at somebody's home. She was invited to that.

Question. Who invited her?

Answer. I have no idea.

Question. And how did she go from where she lives to Hillsborough?

Answer. I drove her.

Question. And if you could just provide a little bit of background, where did you go?

Answer. I wound up in the parking lot with about—I guess about 100 security people, and a bus came in and drove a bunch of them off.

Question. Do you know where they went?

Answer. Up the street. Don't know.

Question. Do you know what the arrangement was? Why you were in the parking lot?

Answer. I guess you had to have an invite, and I didn't get one.

Question. I can understand. I've been in some parking lots, too, without invitations.

When you got down to Hillsborough, did Ms. Foung meet with anybody?

Answer. Nobody that I know of.

Question. Do you know whether she was supposed to meet with anybody or talk to anybody?

Answer. No, I don't.

Question. Once, just to summarize, it is my understanding that you waited in the parking lot until the event was over, and she came back to the car, and you drove back to where you lived; is that correct?

Answer. Correct.

Question. And did she tell you anything about the fund-raiser when you were driving back or about the event?

Answer. She said the President was there, and she got a bottle of wine with his name on it. She didn't mention anything—talking about anything.

Question. Did she tell you whether or not she met the President?

Answer. She said—let me see—I think she said she got to talk to him, but it was no big deal.

Question. Did she tell you what he said to her?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know whether he made any comments to her about her brother Charlie?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Now, apart from that one event in Hillsborough in California, do you know of any other political event that Ms. Foung went to?

Answer. No.

Question. Did she ever discuss with you her brother Charlie and whether he was appointed to a government commission or not?

Answer. No.

Question. I've got a short list of names, and not to be mysterious here, I'm just interested in finding out whether you ever met them or you know them. If you do, then I'll ask you more questions. If you don't, then I'll move on.

Have you ever met John Huang?

Answer. No.

Question. On that one name, it's our understanding that Ms. Foung met Mr. Huang at the Hillsborough event while in the parking lot. Were you in the car during the whole time?

Answer. I stayed in the car. She got out, and she was standing there at the bus.

Question. Have you ever heard of an organization called the CHY Corporation, which is C-H-Y?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever had any contacts here, made calls yourself or received calls, from anybody at the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever heard the names David Mercer or Ari Swiller?

Answer. Who?

Question. Ari Swiller?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever visited Ms. Foung's mother in Arkansas?

Answer. No. I tend to stay away from the east coast.

Question. Those of us from the true east coast, it is a long way from our home. That eliminated, I'm not going to ask you a lot of questions about people who live in Arkansas.

Have you ever heard of George Chu, C-H-U?

Answer. No.

Question. He is associated with a company called Da Tung. D-A T-U-N-G. Do you know of that organization?

Answer. Never heard of it.

Question. Have you ever heard the name Mark Middleton mentioned?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know whether Ms. Foung ever attended any events with her brother?

Answer. No. Nope.

Question. Apart from the two times that you mentioned Mr. Trie being in the same place that you have been, do you know whether Ms. Foung visited Mr. Trie anywhere outside of California in the last 3 or 4 years?

Answer. I don't think so. I'm not sure, but I don't think so.

Question. How often did Mr. Trie call his sister Ms. Foung?

Answer. I can't say for sure. I don't know what year it was, but he called one year, I guess it was around February, but he just wanted to wish her a happy new year. I answered the phone, told him, she's in bed, she's got to work on the graveyard shift.

Question. So, I mean, if you have to characterize contacts, is it fair to say that they spoke fairly infrequently?

Answer. Yeah. As far as I know; two, maybe three times a year.

Question. Just turning for a minute to Mr. Trie and his background, did Ms. Foung ever discuss what her brother was doing from the time you knew her, from the time you have known her to the present? Did she ever tell what you his job was or what he was doing to make a living?

Answer. She said he owned a restaurant back in Arkansas, and then he was international trade or something like that. Something to do with a tool, some kind of tool.

Question. Did she ever tell you why he got out of the restaurant business?

Answer. No.

Question. And do you know anything about once he got out of the restaurant business what he was doing after that time?

Answer. No.

Question. What was—you mentioned the tool a minute ago. What did she tell about that?

Answer. Something about he was trying to get it made or market it or something of that—I never really paid too much attention when she talks about it.

Question. On the two occasions that you met him, did he ever tell you what he was doing?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever—and I'll give you a couple of names of some companies just because I'm interested whether you know about them or what you know about them.

The Daihatsu International Trading Company, have you ever heard of that name before?

Answer. I saw it, I think, on an envelope. I can't be positive, but I think it was on an envelope sent to Ms. Foung. I think Charlie wrote her a letter or something.

Question. Did you have any understanding about what Daihatsu—what it did, what the company was all about?

Answer. No. When I first saw it, I thought it was from a car dealer or something.

Question. A company called San Kin Yip International, have you ever heard of them?

Answer. No.

Question. America-Asia Trade Center, Incorporated?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever heard of Sanyou Science & Technology?

Answer. No.

Question. Have you ever heard of Premier Advertising?

Answer. No.

Question. Apart from the tool that you were mentioning, do you know anything more about what that was all about, what Mr. Trie was trying to do with the tool that you mentioned?

Answer. I don't know anything else about it. He was trying to get it made or marketed or something to that effect, but I'm not positive.

Question. Did you ever have any conversations with Ms. Foung during which she talked about how her brother was doing financially?

Answer. No.

Question. Did she ever make any comments to you about how her brother was doing——

Answer. No.

Question [continuing]. Financially or otherwise? In his life?

Answer. She doesn't say too much about him.

Question. Did Mr. Trie, on the occasion you talked to him, did he ever make any comments about knowing President Clinton?

Answer. No.

Question. Did Ms. Foung ever make any comments to you about her brother knowing President Clinton?

Answer. She said he knew him from Arkansas when he was in the restaurant business.

Question. Just sort of casting your mind back to that Hillsborough event, when you drove down and you were coming back, did Ms. Foung make any comments to you about anything the President told her about her brother?

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me; I'm going to object. I mean, I've tried to be patient with the questioning, but we have at length—this witness has been asked this question and many similar questions. We got Ms. Foung's testimony. I mean, counsel's not trying to—I don't understand the purpose of these questions. Is it to trap Ms. Foung in an inconsistency? Why are we covering the same exact ground about what was said at the same time, especially multiple times? I guess I am going to enter an objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Stevens, do you have any objections?

Mr. STEVENS. Well, it strikes me as long as it is a relatively quick in-and-out follow-up, appropriate follow-up, now that he has some material that might refresh the witness' recollection as to what may have happened. My guess is the answer is not going to change, but I am happy to let him do it as long as we are not going to replow the whole prior event in Hillsborough, and I don't think we are going to.

Mr. WILSON. No. In fact, that was my last question, and I don't know why we would take up any time discussing it.

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. Turning your attention to when your contribution was returned, and I should ask you first whether your $12,500 contribution was returned. Was it returned?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you have, prior to that, any conversations with anybody about whether they were going to return, somebody was going to return, your money?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you ever talk to anybody from the accounting firm of Ernst & Young?

Answer. Not that I can remember. No.

Question. How—when you got your money back, when was the first you realized that you were going to get your money back?

Answer. It was when the reporter called. And they gave me the 800 number to call this woman back from The Washington Post or Washington Times. Surprised me.

Question. Do you know whether that woman's name was Sue Schmidt? Does that ring any bells?

Answer. No.

Question. And what did they tell you?

Answer. They asked me if I knew I was going to get the money back, and I said, nope.

Question. And then after that, after that exchange, what was the next sort of link in this chain of you getting your money back? Was there any other communication with anybody, or was it when you got the money back?

Mr. STEVENS. This may seem like—you refer to it as "his money," and you're—it may seem small, but I know from talking to him that he doesn't view it as his personal money.

Mr. WILSON. And I am being imprecise there, and I shouldn't do that.

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. Thinking about the $12,500 that was sent to you, when was the next time that you knew anything about this $12,500?

Answer. I got one of those yellow slips from the post office for certified mail, and it showed up in an envelope.

Question. And what was in the envelope?

Answer. A check for twelve-five.

Question. Was there any communication in addition—any additional communication apart from the check? Was it just a check in the envelope?

Answer. Just a check.

Question. And was there any——

Answer. Well, it was a stub at the top.

Question. Right. But was there any indication as to why the check was in the envelope and why you were getting this check?

Answer. Not that I can remember.

Question. Did you make any inquiries?

Answer. Nope.

Question. Did anybody—after you got the check, did anybody make any contacts with you to explain why the DNC—I should ask you that. Who sent you the check?

Answer. I think it was DNC on the envelope.

Question. Do you remember the account that the check was drawn on?

Answer. No.

Question. Did anybody contact you at any time to explain why you received a check for $12,500?

Answer. Just the reporter.

Question. When you received the check for $12,500, what did you do with it?

Answer. I put it in the bank.

Question. And did you put it in your account?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what did you do with the money?

Answer. It's still sitting there. I brought it in the first day I saw Mr. Stevens. I wanted to know what to do with it, and he said put it back in your account, and it's back in the bank.

Question. Do you know whether any of the contributions that Ms. Foung made, the $12,500 one that was made at the same time that you made yours, and then there was a later $10,000 one, do you know whether any money was returned to her?

Answer. I don't think so.

Question. Do you know whether she has been contacted by anybody at the DNC or affiliated with the DNC about these two——

Mr. BALLEN. I'm going to object to this line of questioning. The same objection I had before. We have been over this. And I don't understand the purpose of questioning this witness.

Mr. WILSON. Well, I think these are new questions and entirely appropriate.

Mr. Stevens do you have any objections?

Mr. STEVENS. I've leave it to you folks. I'm along for the deposition. I'll leave it to you two to work out your own objections. I am happy to be viewed as judge, but I don't think this has reached the point of oppressing the witness. So I am happy to let both of you ask as many questions as you would like, until my boredom threshold kicks in, which is probably not too far away.

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILSON:

Question. Did Ms. Foung have any contacts with anybody about the two checks that she had contributed to the DNC?

Answer. Did anybody call her?

Question. Yes.

Answer. Not that I know of.

Question. Did she ever mention to you any calls from anybody that she received about the contributions she had made?

Answer. If anyone contacted her? No.

Question. Did she ever tell you whether she was going to call anybody about the checks?

Answer. She said she called back to the DNC a few times.

Question. And what happened when she made the calls?

Answer. She didn't go into too much detail. She just said she's waiting to contact somebody else or talk to somebody else about getting the money back, and that was it.

Question. Did you ever have any discussions with her about why you got money back and she didn't get money back?

Answer. I thought it strange, but I didn't ask any questions.

Question. Did you have any discussions with her about that, though?

Answer. Well, I guess she was curious why I got mine back but she didn't, and that's why she got in touch with the DNC.

Question. And did she tell you at any time what they told her when she had contacts with the DNC?

Answer. No. She just kept calling back.

Question. Do you know whether she was ever told whether she would get her money back or that she would not get her money back?

Answer. She never said.

Question. Has Ms. Foung been in contact with her brother in 1997?

Answer. I'm not sure. I really don't know.

Question. Do you know whether after you were first approached by investigators from this committee, do you know whether Ms. Foung made an attempt to get in touch with her brother?

Answer. Not that I know of.

Question. Do you know whether she called her mother suggesting—do you know whether she called her mother and discussed the visit of the investigators or whether she might or might not have to go to Washington?

Answer. She calls her mother once in a while, but I don't know what they talk about.

Mr. WILSON. I don't have any further questions for now.

Mr. BALLEN. Could we have——

Mr. STEVENS. Want to take a short break?

Mr. BALLEN. Yes, a 5-minute break.

[Brief recess 2:20 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.]

Mr. WILSON. As I stated before, I've finished with my questions. Mr. Ballen, if you have any questions.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. I just want to take this opportunity again to thank you for coming here, Mr. Landon. I'd just like to ask you two questions if I might.

Has this whole process been a burden on you, sir?

Answer. Well, it's not something I'd want to do every day.

Question. Why is that?

Answer. Well, I guess I'm not the most sociable person. I'd rather be alone.

Question. Do you have any concern about your job and missing time from your job?

Answer. Well, whenever I'm away, I'm not making money. But I had a job when I came to this one. I'll probably have a different one before I retire. So I guess the military gets you used to the idea that you need to work here; next week we'll find some other place for to you go. And I'm used to traveling around.

Question. Is there any danger of you losing your job by missing it?

Answer. No, I'm a good worker.

Question. So you're not in fear of that?

Answer. No, even when I worked unions, they didn't want my name to come up on the list for me to leave.

Question. Let me ask you this. What's your impression of this whole process, as a citizen?

Answer. It's politics. I try to stay away from it.

Question. I understand, sir.

Answer. Every 4 or 6 years I'll vote for somebody, and if he does a good job, I'll vote for him again.

Question. Thank you very much. I have nothing further.

Mr. WILSON. I have nothing further apart from thanking you very much for being here today.

[Whereupon, at 2:31 p.m., the deposition was concluded.]

[The exhibits referred to follow:]

JOSEPH R LANDON USN RET
PH 707-554-4810
P O BOX 4382
VALLEJO, CA 94590

1337

19 Feb 96

N. C. $12,500.

⑆321170839⑈ 0000350000 2007 75⑈ 1337

Check Processing Form
(All information must be provided before entry)

Name/Contact: JOSEPH R. LANDON
Company/Institution:
Street/Mailing Address (optional): P.O. BOX 4382
VALLEJO, CA 94590
City/State/Zip:

Telephone:
Voice:
Data: 707-554-4810
FAX:
Alternate:

Program:
SDS:
TRD:
GE:
GPS:
GDF:
GS:
LS:
OTH: Aphrc

Demographics:
TRD:
GE:
GPS:
GDF:
Gender:
SDS:
OTH:

2/19/96
Event: ASIAN DINNER - HAY ADAMS
Service Date: 1 APR
Prospect Date: 821
GDS Contact:
Solicitor: JOHN HUANG

Donation Date: PDT ✓ GIS PDS ___ PMGT PDR ___ GRP PDG ___ GIS PDA ___ VEC
Tax Ack Acknowledged: PDE ___ PAS PDR ___ TRANS PDE ___ GIS PDR ___ RECEIPS

0 0000350
CONFIDENTIAL

EXHIBIT
JRL-1

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
41-60 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11354
(718) 463-3600

1810

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERICAN EXPRESS 5,000 dollars 00 ct. DOLLARS

MEMO 699/7075/90

PAID

⑈018103⑈ ⑆026011484⑆ 171000172⑈ ⑈0000500000⑈

4- FB 96 26 4
0212-0400-5
0212-0400-5 4

FB 96 26

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
321070839

EXHIBIT
SL-2

Cash. 's Checl

7075150

(718) 463-3600

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK $5,000.00 DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

⑈018104⑈ ⑆025011484⑆ 171000117⑈ ⑈0000500000⑈

FEB '96 28 3
0212-0400-5
0212-0400-5 3

02/28/96
FEB '96 27
121000374

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
321170839
⑆321170839⑆

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Ms. Foung and Mr. Landon, you're accompanied here today, are you not, by your attorney here in Washington, Mr. Sedwick Sollers; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And do you have the microphones turned on in front of you?

Mr. BURTON. Ms. Foung, can you pull the microphone pretty close, because it does not pick up your voice unless it's fairly close to your mouth?

And you, too, Mr. Landon.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that correct, Ms. Foung?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. OK.

And Mr. Landon, Mr. Sollers is also representing you?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. At any time, if you have any questions, do not hesitate to ask your counsel for advice.

Mr. Sollers, it's nice to see you here.

Mr. SOLLERS. Thank you, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to thank you very much for being here today. As you'll recall, I met you both for the first time, I think, last week and had the opportunity to take your depositions in Sacramento, CA, along with Mr. Kenneth Ballen, the minority counsel; and I believe Mr. Phil Barnett, also minority counsel, was present.

I appreciate your—and for the record, Mr. Jim Wilson of our staff was also there.

I appreciate your being here today. As you know, we have asked that you appear before this committee today to discuss contributions which both of you made to the Democratic National Committee; and then a second contribution, Ms. Foung, which you made to the Presidential re-election campaign of President Clinton.

Let me begin by asking both of you, I believe that this is, in fact, the second time you've been here in Washington in the past week; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And I believe that you also agreed to appear and were cooperative with a Federal grand jury and appeared before a Federal grand jury last Friday here in Washington; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that correct, Mr. Landon?

Mr. LANDON. Correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And that was at the request of the task force of the Department of Justice looking into campaign fund-raising violations; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung, you are in fact the sister of Yah Lin Trie, also known as Charlie Trie?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And, Mr. Landon, you have indicated that you previously have met Mr. Trie and that you may have met him on two or three occasions; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung, when was the last time that you saw your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. I believe it was Christmas of 1995.

Mr. BENNETT. And that would be the last time that you met with him in any fashion?

Ms. FOUNG. I—the best I can remember, yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And, Mr. Landon, when was the last time that you saw Mr. Charlie Trie?

Mr. LANDON. It was the same Christmas, 1995.

Mr. BENNETT. And have you spoken with Mr. Trie since that time?

Mr. LANDON. He called, I think it was January, February of this year to wish his sister Happy New Year.

Mr. BENNETT. And let me ask you one thing, Ms. Foung. When was the last time that you would have spoken with your brother, Charlie Trie?

Ms. FOUNG. I would say it was late August or early September.

Mr. BENNETT. Of this year?

Ms. FOUNG. Of this year.

Mr. BENNETT. And was it in connection with your being called before this committee?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe there may be some followup questions with reference to that, but let me ask you this, do you know where your brother was when he called you within the last 3 weeks?

Ms. FOUNG. I was under the impression it was at Taiwan, he was in Taiwan.

Mr. BENNETT. And did you make an effort to make contact with your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And exactly how did you go about making contact? Because there are a few people trying to make contact with him, that's why I'm asking.

Ms. FOUNG. I asked my mother if my brother ever call her, give him the message I would like for him to call me.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe your brother was at one time interviewed on NBC News and there are a few people in this room who may want to know, if he would return the phone calls if they're contacted. Do you have any reason to believe he might be willing to return their phone calls?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't know.

Mr. BENNETT. OK. Do you know whether or not your brother has any intentions of returning voluntarily to this country? Have you talked with him about that?

Ms. FOUNG. I try to remember the conversation.

Mr. BENNETT. Take your time.

Ms. FOUNG. I mentioned it to him, that the investigator from the committee mentioned to me that, because of statute of limitation or something, he should be back here in a couple years. I mentioned that to him. But I don't think he responded to that.

Mr. BENNETT. He had no response to your discussion about a statute of limitations?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. And to your knowledge, does he intend to come back to this country within the next few years?

Ms. FOUNG. I'm sure he would like to. But the past few years, he has been overseas the majority of his time and on a regular basis. So it would all depend on where his business is.

Mr. BENNETT. And with respect to his activities abroad of the last few years, that would have been true even during the election year 1996, that he was generally abroad most of the time?

Ms. FOUNG. That's the way I understood.

Mr. BENNETT. How often would he have been in the country during 1996 to your knowledge?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't know his schedule at all. The only time I will know is if he call me and left a message on my machine, if he is passing through San Francisco. The majority of time, he call me from overseas.

Mr. BENNETT. All right. Directing your attention to February 1996, or in fact, let's go back prior to February 1996. Before you made any contributions about which we'll discuss today, Ms. Foung, had you, to your knowledge, ever made any contributions to any candidates or any political campaigns prior to February 1996?

Ms. FOUNG. Not that I'm aware—I can't remember.

Mr. BENNETT. And were you politically active?

Ms. FOUNG. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Landon, had you, again, prior to February 1996, had you ever made any political contributions to any candidate at that time or campaign prior to February 1996?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And are you politically active?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. In fact, Ms. Foung, I believe that last week when I took your deposition in California, you indicated to me that you have at least, as of last week, never seen the tape of your brother being interviewed by Tom Brokaw of NBC News; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Have you still not seen that tape?

Ms. FOUNG. No. I don't know how to get it.

Mr. BENNETT. I think NBC might be able to accommodate you if you would like, Ms. Foung.

Directing your attention to the time period of February 1996, I believe there came a point in time when both of you prepared checks made payable to the Democratic National Committee; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Landon.

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. What were the circumstances causing both of you to write checks to the Democratic National Committee? Ms. Foung, I'll ask you first.

Ms. FOUNG. My brother called me.

Mr. BENNETT. If you can speak up a little bit into the microphone, I'm sorry.

Ms. FOUNG. My brother called me, asked if I would advance a check to a certain place at a time. I wasn't familiar, it was DNC.

Mr. BENNETT. And it was the DNC. And what was the purpose of the check for in February 1996? Did your brother tell you that?

Ms. FOUNG. Not really.

Mr. BENNETT. And Mr. Landon, in connection with that same phone call to Ms. Foung, you were, in fact, asked also to prepare a check to the Democratic National Committee; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. Yes. Ms. Foung asked me.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung asked you. I'm now asking if we can have exhibit 68 on the screen, please?

And Mr. Chairman, for the record, minority counsel has seen these exhibits and I believe we have an agreement with respect to the presentation of these exhibits here.

Showing you first, Ms. Foung exhibit 68, looking at that exhibit, in fact, I gather you have a TV monitor in front of you. Can you see that? Mr. Sollers can your clients see that check on the screen?

Mr. SOLLERS. Yes, they can, Mr. Bennett.

[Exhibit 68 follows:]



EXHIBIT

68

Mr. BENNETT. Looking at that exhibit, in fact, that was a check which was drawn on your bank account, is it not, Ms. Foung, made payable to the Democratic National Committee?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And that is, in fact, your signature on the check on the lower right-hand corner?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And I ask that exhibit 69 be—and that, I'm sorry, 68, that's in the amount of $12,500, correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And was it your understanding that you were going to be reimbursed for this payment?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And did your brother indicate that he would see that you were immediately reimbursed?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And Mr. Landon, we'll now ask that exhibit 69 be placed on the screen.

And again, that is a check dated February 15, 1996. And I think the bottom half of that exhibit for the record, Mr. Chairman, reflects the DNC tracking slip in conjunction with that check. And Mr. Landon, that was drawn on your bank account in the amount of $12,500, as well; is that correct?

[Exhibit 69 follows:]

JOSEPH R LANDON USN RET

[redacted]

1337

19 Feb 96

N. C.

$12,500.-

[redacted]

1337

Client Tracking Form

(All information must be provided before entry)

JOSEPH R. LANDON

[redacted]

[redacted]

Telephone

Work

[redacted]

Fax

Alternate

Prospect

Referred

Referrer

Tel

Fax

Email

Address

Phone

Cell

Email

Address

Phone

Cell

Email

Address

Phone

Cell

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And that is your signature on the check?

Mr. LANDON. Can it get a little closer? I think it is.

Mr. BENNETT. We'll try.

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, as to both of you preparing these checks, Mr. Landon, did you, yourself, speak with Charlie Trie when he asked his sister to prepare these checks?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. So you did so basically at the instruction of Ms. Foung?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Did either of you at the time when you wrote these checks in the amount of, total amount of $25,000, did you respectively have that kind of money in your bank account at that time?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Did either of you or were either of you aware of the fund-raising event at the Hay-Adams Hotel in Washington, DC, to which I believe Congressman Waxman made reference a few minutes ago in February 1996?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Ms. FOUNG. What was the question?

Mr. BENNETT. Were either of you aware of the fund-raising event for the Democratic National Committee at the Hay-Adams Hotel here in Washington in February 1996?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And clearly neither of you attended that event, did you?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. LANDON. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung did your brother talk to you about the event at the Hay-Adams Hotel? Did he explain to you why he was seeking to get checks to the Democratic National Committee?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, directing your attention for both of these checks in February 1996, Ms. Foung, first, as to you, you did have an understanding that you were going to be reimbursed, and, in fact, you were very quickly reimbursed; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. I'll ask now if we can have exhibit 70.

We'll go step by step. First of all, I'm going to show you three exhibits, Ms. Foung, exhibits 70, 71, and 72. And each of these checks are, in fact, cashier's checks drawn on the Amerasia Bank from the State of New York in the town of Flushing, I believe it's Flushing, NY. Do you see that there, Ms. Foung?

[Exhibits 70, 71, and 72 follow:]

(7) 1 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
41-08 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

18100

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK $5,000 00/100 DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

⑈018100⑈ [redacted] ⑈0000500000⑈

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

EXHIBIT
70

(7) 2 OF 5

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
(718) 463-2600

Cashier's Check

FEB. 20 19 96

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $5,000.00***

DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

[redacted]

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

[redacted]

EXHIBIT
71

(7) 3 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
41-06 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

1810

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA $5,000.00 DOLLAR

MEMO

PAID

⑈018102⑈ [redacted] ⑈0000500000

[redacted]

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

[redacted]

FB '96 '26

[redacted]

EXHIBIT
72

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And as to each one of these cashier's checks in the amount of $5,000, first as to exhibit 70, can you identify your signature on the bottom of the check—on the back of the check, I think it's on the bottom of the exhibit?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And then looking at exhibit 71, and then 72, again these cashier's checked were in the amount of $5,000, each dated February 22, 1996, a week after you made your contribution; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And you did, in fact, receive that money and were reimbursed as your brother had promised; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Did you immediately deposit those into your bank account?

Ms. FOUNG. I believe so.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, showing you exhibit 73, that's your bank statement of your account at Travis Federal Credit Union, correct, Ms. Foung?

[Exhibit 73 follows:]

STATEMENT F14

ACCOUNT NUMBER	SOCIAL SECURITY NO.	FROM	THROUGH	PAGE	OF
[redacted]		02-01-96	02-29-96	1	2

TRAVIS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

TRAVIS AFB BRANCH
100 HATCH STREET
TRAVIS AFB, CA 94535
PHONE (707)424-4000

CASTLE AFB BRANCH
THE "W" STREET
CASTLE AFB, CA 95342
PHONE (209)726-3700

FAIRFIELD BRANCH
2874 N. TEXAS ST.
FAIRFIELD, CA 94533
PHONE (707)864-4000

MERCED BRANCH
2440 "M" STREET
MERCED, CA 95340
PHONE (209)723-3753

VACAVILLE BRANCH
19 DERBY STREET
VACAVILLE, CA 95688
PHONE (707)447-4000

ALL CORRESPONDENCE:
P.O. BOX 2660
VACAVILLE, CA 95696-2660

THE FINANCE CHARGE FOR AN OPEN-END LOAN IS COMPUTED BY APPLYING THE PERIODIC RATE TO EACH UNPAID BALANCE FOR THE EXACT NO. OF DAYS EACH BALANCE WAS OUTSTANDING. THE DAY OCCURRED TO COMPUTE THE FINANCE CHARGE IS THE DAY AFTER PAYMENT DAY AFTER CREDITS AND SUBTRACTING ANY NEW ADVANCES OR OTHER CHARGES ARE ADDED.

DIVIDENDS AND/OR INTEREST OF $10.00 OR MORE SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND APPLICABLE STATE TAXING AUTHORITIES UNDER THE TITLE OF INTEREST INCOME FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR.

YOU CAN SAVE AT LEAST $3751
TRAVIS FEDERAL IS WAIVING ALL FEES ON ALL HOME EQUITY LOANS AND LINES OF CREDIT, NOW THROUGH MARCH 31, 1996. AVAILABLE FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA ONLY. CALL PRORELOAN SEVEN DAYS A WEEK TO APPLY AT (707) 451-5350 OR 1-800-449-4110.

MARLIN FOURS
[redacted]

SHARE ACCOUNTS ARE NON-TRANSFERABLE EXCEPT ON THE BOOKS OF THIS CREDIT UNION. TO VERIFY YOUR DIRECT DEPOSIT, CALL US AT (707) 450-4000 EX. 720

TRAN. NO.	EFFECT DAY	MO	DAY	YR	TRANSACTION DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
					SVFF13:100 PRIME SHARE ACCT		5408.45
		02	01	96	DIVIDEND	37.35	5445.80
02	14	02	15	96	EXCHGE	1336.97	6782.77
02	14	02	15	96	EXCHGE	-1336.97	5445.80
		02	23	96	SHARE WITHDRAWAL	-2500.00	2945.80
02	28	02	29	96	EXCHGE	1518.89	4464.69
02	28	02	29	96	EXCHGE	-1518.89	2945.80
					Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 42.84		
					(A 3.5000 DIVIDEND OF 15.47 WILL BE POSTED TO YOUR ACCOUNT ON 030196)		
					TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
					BALANCE RANGE RATE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		3.56%
					.00 - 9,999,999.99 3.50% ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		3.56%
					SVFF13:10 345 - 449 DAY CERT		1500.00
		02	01	96	DIVIDEND	3.43	1503.43
					Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 3.43 FORFEITURES: .00		
					MATURITY DATE:Q31597 DIV RATE: 5.2200		
					(A 5.2200 DIVIDEND OF 6.24 WILL BE POSTED TO YOUR ACCOUNT ON 030196)		
					TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
					BALANCE RANGE RATE ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		5.35%
					.00 - 9,999,999.99 5.22% ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		5.35%
					SVFF13:50 SHARE DRAFT ACCOUNT		
					BEGINNING BALANCE 3532.26 MAINT/SERVICE CHGS .00		
					DEPOSITS 17434.87 ENDING BALANCE 3545.11		
					DRAFTS 16272.02		
					MISC CREDITS 150.00 TOTAL NUMBER DRAFTS CLEARD 13		
		02	01	96	DIVIDEND		
		02	01	96	SHARE DRAFT # 384	-17.95	2534.21
		02	01	96	SHARE DRAFT # 381	-117.56	2576.45
		02	02	96	SHARE DRAFT # 379	-92.99	2423.66
		02	05	96	SHARE DRAFT # 380	-1285.59	1138.08
		02	06	96	SHARE DRAFT # 382	-121.25	1016.83
		02	13	96	SHARE DEPOSIT	-89.00	935.83
		02	14	96	SHARE DRAFT # 389	-77.04	1012.87
02	14	02	15	96	PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM [redacted]	-120.00	893.87
		02	14	96	EXCHGE	1336.97	2230.84
		02	14	96	SHARE WITHDRAWAL	-150.00	2080.84
		02	20	96	SHARE DRAFT # 387	-1595.94	484.92
		02	20	96	SHARE DRAFT # 388	-38.41	446.51
		02	21	96	SHARE DRAFT # 386	-151.15	295.36
		02	23	96	SHARE DEPOSIT	14500.00	14795.36
		02	26	96	SHARE DRAFT # 391	-84.19	14711.17
		02	26	96	SHARE DRAFT # 390	-12500.00	2211.17
02	28	02	29	96	PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM [redacted]	1518.89	3730.06
		02	28	96	SHARE DRAFT # 395	-143.07	3586.99
		02	29	96	SHARE DRAFT # 392	-51.88	3535.11

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS TO DISPUTE BILLING ERRORS.

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING

EXHIBIT 73

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. For purposes of your own privacy, we agreed last week, Ms. Foung, I want to assure you we have deleted account numbers on that check for purposes of publication, but it does reflect that you deposited $14,500 of the $15,000 you received in cashier's checks; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And the other $500 you kept for your own personal use?

Ms. FOUNG. I think so.

Mr. BENNETT. All right. At the time that you received the $15,000 in cashier's checks from the Amerasia Bank in Flushing, NY, did you have any knowledge as to who had actually sent the checks to you?

Ms. FOUNG. No. I thought it was my brother arranged it.

Mr. BENNETT. All right. Did your brother ever mention the individual named Antonio Pan?

Ms. FOUNG. Not that I can remember.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the basis of your believing that this money came from your brother? Why did you believe that it come from your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. Where else could it be?

Mr. BENNETT. Essentially, you felt that he arranged to see to it that you were reimbursed for your check.

Ms. FOUNG. I'm sorry.

Mr. BENNETT. You felt he was keeping his word to you, you were being reimbursed for your check, and I gather you presume these cashier's checks were from your brother.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes. From his business.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, you were, in fact, paid back, Ms. Foung, and I want to now, if I can for a second, move over to Mr. Landon.

Mr. Landon, showing you exhibits 75 and 76, exhibit 75 is also a cashier's check drawn on the Amerasia Bank from Flushing, NY, dated February 22, 1996. Do you see that, sir?

[Exhibits 75 and 76 follow:]

(7) 4 OF 5

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
43-06 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

1810

Cashier's Check

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK 5,000.00 DOLLARS

MEMO 699/1015/90

PAID

⑈018103⑈ [redacted] ⑆0000500000⑆

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
[redacted]

EXHIBIT
75

(7) 5 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
(718) 463-3600

1810.

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK $5,000.00

DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

"018104" [redacted] "0000500000"

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRANS APP.
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

[redacted]

12100037 4

FEB 96 27

[redacted] 3

10027265

CR. UN.

137-7050

EXHIBIT
76

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And can you identify your signature on the lower portion of that exhibit which is the back of the check?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And, in fact, you did receive that money?

Mr. LANDON. I did.

Mr. BENNETT. And also looking at exhibit 76, the same thing would apply. You received that cashier's check from the Amerasia Bank and that is your signature on the back, correct?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, your contribution to the Democratic National Committee the week before had been for $12,500 and you had been promised that you would be repaid immediately. Those two cashier's checks total $10,000. How did you get the remaining $2,500?

Mr. LANDON. It came from Ms. Foung.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung, do you agree with that? You gave the other money to Mr. Landon in cash?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Before you wrote the check to the Democratic National Committee, you indicated you had never made a political contribution before and that was also true of Mr. Landon; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. Are you asking me?

Mr. BENNETT. Both of you. Neither of you had been involved in the political process, so this was your very first contribution and your first experience with anything like this, correct?

Ms. FOUNG. To the best of my recollection.

Mr. LANDON. Except for a 1040 box.

Mr. BENNETT. All right checking off the $1 for contributions.

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps people will encourage more of that in the future, Mr. Landon.

Now, do either—let me ask you this, I asked Ms. Foung, Mr. Landon, do you know an individual named Antonio Pan?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. I'm going to place on the screen now, if I can, some information. I need to know whether or not you have any knowledge with respect to some of the transactions surrounding these cashier's checks.

And I would ask that essentially there is information which has come to this committee in the course of its investigation thus far, and I would ask that exhibit 77, I believe it's up there now on the screen.

First of all, looking at the information from the Amerasia Bank in the State of New York, sort of tracking where this money came from that came to the two of you, it indicates that an individual named Antonio Pan opened an account at the Amerasia Bank with a deposit of $25,200 the same day of the cashier's checks. And you'll notice that the address at the top there of that account is listed as Hong Kong in the bank records.

Do you see that there, Ms. Foung? The second line down underneath the name, Pan, Antonio, there's reference to Central Hong Kong on the second line.

[Exhibit 77 follows:]

☑ SAVINGS ACCOUNT (PERSONAL)
☐ CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT (PERSONAL)

AMERASIA BANK
61-4th MAIN ST
FLUSHING, N.Y. 11355

☐ INDIVIDUAL
☐ JOINT
☐ TRUST

ACCOUNT TITLE	SEX	DATE OF BIRTH	ACCOUNT NUMBER
YUAN PEI PAN (ANTONIO)	M ☒ F ☐	[redacted]	[redacted]

ADDRESS: 2912 NO 200 CONNAUGHT ROAD CENTRAL HK [redacted]

SOCIAL SECURITY NO	ID NO	NATIONALITY	DATE OF BIRTH
N/A	TAIWAN [redacted] P.P.	TAIWAN	02/25/47

NAME AND ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER [redacted] TELEPHONE NO

I/We hereby agree that this account when accepted shall be governed by the rules and regulations of the AMERASIA BANK, relative to Savings Accounts and Time Deposits, which are available on request. If there be more than one undersigned, each of us declare this account to be a joint account payable to either of us or to the survivor, also applicable to joint account in trust, designating a beneficiary. Each of the undersigned does hereby authorize the other to endorse for deposit and to deposit in the said account checks and other instruments for the payment of money belonging to either or both of us. If account is other than individual or joint tenants, signature(s) required must be in accordance with terms of resolution or agreement.

NOT TRANSFERABLE

1 SIGNATURE: Antonio Pan

2 SIGNATURE:

NO SIGS REQUIRED: ONE

INSTRUCTIONS

JOINT ACCOUNT ..... COMPLETE "A"
INDIVIDUAL TRUST ..... COMPLETE "B"
JOINT ACCOUNT,TRUST ..... COMPLETE "A" & "B"

SECTION "A" DEPOSITOR	NAME		SEX M ☐ F ☐	DATE OF BIRTH
	ADDRESS			HOME TEL.
	SOCIAL SECURITY NO.	ID NO.		NATIONALITY
"B" BENEFICIARY	RELATIONSHIP TO TRUSTEE(S)/CUSTODIAN		SEX M ☐ F ☐	DATE OF BIRTH
	ADDRESS			HOME TEL.
	SOCIAL SECURITY NO.	ID NO.		NATIONALITY

DATE OPENED	AMOUNT	BY	OFFICE	APPROVED
02/22/96	CA$25,200.00	ERIC		JM

01309

EXHIBIT
77

Ms. FOUNG. OK.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you see that?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And, Mr. Landon, do you see that?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Does that name, again the name, Antonio Pan, does not register with either one of you, correct?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. How about the address in Hong Kong? Do you know anyone at that address, Ms. Foung?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Landon?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. For your purposes, exhibit 78—if we put 78 on the screen—I believe some of these were matters that we went over with you both last week in California; is that correct?

[Exhibit 78 follows:]

(3) 1 OF 6 PAGE

YUAN PEI PAN (ANTONIO)
2912 NO. 200 CONNAUGHT ROAD
CENTRAL HONG KONG, HK
Hong Kong

Statement Date
MAR 31, 1996
Account Number
[redacted] 01 01 Y

****

Statement Summary

Last Stmt Date	Beginning Balance	Deposits	Withdrawals	Ending Balance
2/22/96	.00	25,200.54	25,000.00	200.5

Number of Days in Statement Period- 39 Interest Earned- .5
Average Daily Balance- 200.00 Annual Percentage Yield Earned- 2.5

****

Statement Activity

Post Date	Eff Date	Description	Activity	Balanc
2/22/96		Beginning Balance		.0
2/22/96	2/22/96	Deposit	25,200.00	25,200.0
2/22/96	2/22/96	Withdrawal	25,000.00-	200.0
3/29/96	3/31/96	Interest Posting	.54	200.5
3/31/96		Ending Balance		200.5
		Interest Year to Date		.5
		Last Year Interest		.0

01:30

EXHIBIT
78

Ms. FOUNG. When we were in California.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. I'm trying to go—if you don't understand my questions, Ms. Foung, let me know and Mr. Landon. Exhibit 78 indicates that on the same day that that account was opened by Mr. Pan and some attaching documents would show that within a matter of minutes after the $25,000 was placed into that account, the cashier's checks were written and only $200 was left in the account. Have you all ever received any further funds from that particular account, from that account at the Amerasia Bank in New York?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. One second, please. Ms. Foung, after you made the $12,500 February contribution to the Democratic National Committee, did there come a time when you had any further political involvement in either attending events or making political contributions?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And what event did you attend? Specifically, directing your attention to March 1996, there was a fund-raising event in Hillsboro, CA; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. At the time, I didn't know it was fund-raising.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me ask you this, there was an event that you attended in which you had the opportunity to meet President Clinton; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And that, I believe, would have been approximately March 1996 in Hillsborough, CA.

Ms. FOUNG. That's right.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Landon, did you attend that event as well?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir. I got as far as the parking lot.

Mr. BENNETT. You got as far as the parking lot.

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. They wouldn't let you go in.

Mr. LANDON. I just drove Ms. Foung.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand. You weren't invited. Ms. Foung was.

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Ms. Foung, did Mr. Landon wait for you until the event was over?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Did you at that time meet an individual or talk to an individual named John Huang in connection with that event?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. How did you speak with Mr. Huang? What caused you to speak with him?

Ms. FOUNG. What do you mean by that?

Mr. BENNETT. Did you know Mr. Huang prior to March 1996?

Ms. FOUNG. No, I spoke to him over the phone.

Mr. BENNETT. Had you ever heard of Mr. Huang?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. And what was the purpose of his call?

Ms. FOUNG. He asked for some background information for a security clearance to attend that event.

Mr. BENNETT. And exactly who asked you to attend the event given that you haven't been politically active except for writing the check and being reimbursed the month before? Did your brother talk to you about attending this event?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, he called me.

Mr. BENNETT. And did he tell you that Mr. Huang would be calling you?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't remember.

Mr. BENNETT. So you were ready for a call from Mr. Huang as a result of your brother putting you on notice that someone would be calling you.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And did your brother ask that you attend the event?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Did you need to make any contribution to attend the event?

Ms. FOUNG. Nobody mentioned anything about it.

Mr. BENNETT. When you attended, you ultimately did attend this event? Did you meet Mr. John Huang at the fund-raising event in Hillsborough, CA?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Was President Clinton also at this event?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, Ms. Foung, you had occasion to especially speak with the President, at that time to President Clinton; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, I think some other Members may have followup questions in terms of your conversations with President Clinton, so I'll move on. But let me ask you this, after this fundraising event in March 1996, Mr. Landon, did you have any further political involvement in terms of driving Ms. Foung to any other political events?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Have you attended any other political events?

Mr. LANDON. Just this one.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, let me ask you this, Mr. Landon, did anybody ask—did you have to pay to get in here today? Did anybody ask you? Apart from Mr. Sollers, I don't want you to get into that. You may have paid more than the rest of us for that.

Ms. Foung, I would like to turn your attention now to August 1996. Let me make sure that we're clear, apart from the February 1996 payment of $12,000, $12,500 to which you were reimbursed from the money from Mr. Pan and apart from the March 1996 event in Hillsborough, CA, did you have any other political involvement in 1996 with respect to any other political candidates, to your knowledge?

Ms. FOUNG. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Directing your attention to August 1996, did you in fact at that time make a second contribution at the request of your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, directing your attention to exhibit 93, which I believe is on the screen, exhibit 93, in fact, is a check written out to the Birthday Victory Trust. Do you see that on your check?

[Exhibit 93 follows:]


MARLIN YOUNG
Birthday Victory
Ten Thousand & 76/100
Federal


FOR DEPOSIT ONLY

EXHIBIT

93

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And that is, in fact, your check?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the reason for your preparing this check, Ms. Foung?

Ms. FOUNG. My brother called me to see if I would advance the check.

Mr. BENNETT. And was there indication that you were going to be immediately reimbursed as you were for the first check?

Ms. FOUNG. Say that again.

Mr. BENNETT. Was there an understanding that you were going to pay this money yourself or you were going to get the money back?

Ms. FOUNG. I would be reimbursed, yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And who told you that you were going to be reimbursed?

Ms. FOUNG. My brother.

Mr. BENNETT. And did he indicate how quickly he was going to reimburse you?

Ms. FOUNG. No. But I trust he will take care of it.

Mr. BENNETT. And, in fact, did you have $10,000 in your account at that time to pay to the Presidential Victory Trust?

Ms. FOUNG. I might. I might not. I couldn't remember.

Mr. BENNETT. We'll go through some records in a minute. But, in fact, you were reimbursed the very same day, weren't you, when you wrote the check?

Ms. FOUNG. According to the bank statement, yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And I note that on that check, Ms. Foung, along with making it payable to the Birthday Victory Trust, were you aware of any birthday celebration or fund-raising event in connection with the President's birthday in August 1996?

Ms. FOUNG. Not very much, not, in fact, not really.

Mr. BENNETT. I'm sorry did you, in fact, or were you invited to attend an event in New York City with connection with this event?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. And I notice that the word "Federal" is written on the bottom left-hand corner of the check that's on the screen now. Do you see where the word "Federal" is written on the lower left-hand corner?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Why did you write the word "Federal" on that check?

Ms. FOUNG. I was told.

Mr. BENNETT. You were told by whom?

Ms. FOUNG. By my brother.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, looking at exhibit 94, on the projector screen, in fact, there is a record of a wire transfer to you from the Riggs National Bank, which, in fact, went into your account that same day in August 1996. Is that correct, Ms. Foung?

[Exhibit 94 follows:]

BANK: 001
RIDOS WASH

MONEY TRANSFER SYSTEM
TRANSACTION JOURNAL-AMOUNT ORDER
FOR PERIOD 08/15/96-08/15/96

R 5016

DATE 08/15/96
PAGE 1215 1A

DATE: 08/15/96 AMOUNT: 10,000.00 ACCT NO: [redacted] SEQ NO: 6635
STATUS: COMPLETE TRANSACTION TYPE: OUT WIRE SERVICE: FEDWIRE

USD AMOUNT: 10,000.00 REPETITIVE CODE: ORIG REF NO:

FGN AMOUNT: CURRCODE: VAL DATE: RATE:

DEBIT AC: [redacted] D-CLLBCK: N SAN.KIVITOOO 71A: PR:

ORD: LAP SENO NO

CREDIT AC: C-CLLBCK: CONTROL NO:

DEST BK: DESTBIC: MSG TYPE:

BNF BANK: 57(A,B,D) BENEFICIARY BANK INFO:
ADD: BOX 2069 VACAVILLE CA
TRAVS FED CR UNION

RCVR CORR: 56(A,B,D) IBK: 56(A,D)
ADD: ADD:

CMB CODE: 16

BENEFICIARY: ORIGINATOR TO BENEFICIARY INFORMATION:
AC: [redacted]
MAN LIN FOUNG

REFERENCE FOR BENEFICIARY:

ORG BANK: 52(A,D)
ADD: DEBIT DETAIL:
17 25

EXHIBIT
94

Ms. FOUNG. The document there, yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And according to your records, you were immediately reimbursed the same day for this $10,000 check, as your brother promised; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, do you know an individual named Ng Lap Seng, sometimes known as Mr. Wu, Ms. Foung?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Have you ever heard the name before?

Ms. FOUNG. Not before the deposition.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you know the individual—that individual from whose account this money apparently came into your account? Did you have any knowledge of the transfer of money from Riggs National Bank here in Washington to your account in connection with Ng Lap Seng?

Ms. FOUNG. No. My brother does do business in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, all different places. So I assume that was his bank back there, that he uses.

Mr. BENNETT. I am going to ask if you can now look at exhibit 96 and ask if you have any knowledge or information concerning some of the financial transactions. I know it is somewhat complicated, Ms. Foung, but if you will just look at this to make sure that you cannot provide the members of the committee with any information.

There was, in fact, almost $200,000 wired from the Bank of China in Macao to the Watergate branch of the Riggs National Bank. Did your brother at any time in his conversations make reference, if not to Mr. Wu or Ng Lap Seng, if he made reference to the Riggs National Bank at any time with you?

[Exhibit 96 follows:]

Intermediary Bank:
ID:
Opt: UID DDA/BIC:
UID: SWIFT:
Orig Ref: FOR FREIGHT
To
Rene
Bank
To Bank
Info
Receive Bank Information
Intermediary Bank Information Advice code & description
Beneficiary's Bank Information Advice code & description
Beneficiary Information

E:LN A:ME -Complete/Released

NAME Sting Alert: YAH LIN TRIE.NB LAP SENG
Func: INQ * MOney TRANsfer System * 14-MAY-1997 12:46:31
Key: 08/07/96-170005

Type: FEDWIRE/DEBIT Value: 08/07/96 Amount USD: 200,000.00
Receiving Bank: RIGGS NATIONAL BANK Tran Nr: Unit:
[redacted] WASHINGTON,DI
Debit Party Credit Party
[redacted] AC
Type: Type:
UID: 100333 SWIFT: BKCHMOMX UID: SWIFT:
BANK OF CHINA, MACAU BRANCH
BANK OF CHINA BUILDING
AVENIDA DOUTOR MARIO SOARES
MACAU
Source: SWI Date: 08/07/96 Nr: 41e335 Credit Adv: MT
Reference: Sender: [redacted] Customer:
CTR/ORG=CIA DE INVESTIMENTO E FOMENTO PREDIAL GOODWILL LDA OGB=BA BEK=YR
WATERGATE OFFICE 2600 VIRGINIA AVE N.W. WASHINGTON D.C. 20037 USA BNF=NB LAP
SENG YAH LIN TRIE SUITE 121 700 NEW HAMPSHRE AVE. WATERGATE SOUTH WASHINGTON
D.C. 20037 USA/AC-[redacted] BBI=LS FEE USD15.
Debit Adv: Charges: By: Commission: 15.00 By: C
Chips Cable Charge: By:
Charge/Comm Account:
Telex No (optional):
Send bank sub-acct: Recv Bank sub-acct:
Send bank Info:
Recv bank info:
Security Desc : CUSIP # : Par Value:
Security Reference info:

EXHIBIT
96

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. It was sent from the account of a company on the document—again, if you can look closely at it, a company called Investimento E Fomento to the account of your brother and Ng Lap Seng. Do you have any knowledge of the company Investimento E Fomento?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Have you ever heard your brother talk about that company?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. You can say—apparently according to the records of this committee, available to both the majority and minority Members, it was from this account that the $10,000 was wired to you.

Finally, Ms. Foung, if I can put up exhibit 97 on the chart, and looking at exhibit 97, just again for your purposes, you will note that it does, in fact, indicate that the same day, on August 15, 1996, that you wrote out the check to President Clinton's birthday party at your brother's request; that you received the wire transfer in that amount. Do you see that there?

[Exhibit 97 follows:]

TRAVIS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

[redacted]

[redacted]

VACAVILLE BRANCH
IN CORNICHON SHOPPE
VACAVILLE, CA 95688
PHONE (707)449-4000

CASTLE AFB BRANCH
FIRE "B" STREET
CASTLE AFB, CA 95342
PHONE (209)333-3710

MERCED BRANCH
3100 "G" STREET
MERCED, CA 95340
PHONE (209)723-0730

ALL CORRESPONDENCE
P.O. BOX 2988
VACAVILLE, CA 95696-2988

THE FINANCE CHARGE FOR ALL OPEN-END LOAN IS COMPUTED BY APPLYING THE PERIODIC RATE TO EACH UNPAID BALANCE FOR THE ACCT NO THE BALANCE UPON WHICH THE FINANCE CHARGE IS THAT BALANCE AFTER THE OFFSETTING CREDITS HAS SUBTRACTED AND NEW ADVANCES OR OTHER CHARGES ARE ADDED

DIVIDENDS AND/OR INTEREST OF $10.00 OR MORE WILL BE REPORTED TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND APPLICABLE STATE REGULATIONS. TOTAL DIVIDEND EARNED DEC 1981 OR INTEREST PAID IN FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR

MEMBER APPRECIATION DAYS ARE COMING TO A BRANCH NEAR YOU! TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR MEMBERSHIP AND FOR REFERRING YOUR FAMILY, WE'RE HAVING A PARTY.

STOP BY OUR BRANCHES SEPTEMBER 23RD - 29TH AND MEET OUR FRIENDLY STAFF. WE'LL HAVE REFRESHMENTS AND BALLOONS FOR EVERYONE.

WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU!

MARLIN YOUNG
[redacted]

SHARE SECURITIES ARE NON-TRANSFERABLE EXCEPT ON THE BOOKS OF THIS CREDIT UNION. TO VERIFY YOUR DIRECT DEPOSIT, CALL US AT (707) 449-4000 OR 726

TRAN NO	DATE	EFFECT MO	DAY	MO	DAY	TRANSACTION DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
						SUFFIX:00 PRIME SHARE ACCT		5834.07
		08	01	96		DIVIDEND	16.38	5832.45
		08	01	96		TFR TO LOAN [redacted]	-207.00	5625.45
			01	96			-350.00	5275.45
08	14	08	15	96		PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM [redacted]	103.50	5378.95
08	14	08	15	96		EXXON	1403.23	6782.18
08	14	08	15	96		EXXON	-1403.23	5378.95
		08	15	96		FED WIRE [redacted]	10000.00	15378.95
		08	16	96		TFR TO SHARES [redacted]	-10000.00	5378.95
		08	29	96		TFR TO SHARES	-2000.00	3378.95
		08	29	96		FED WIRE [redacted]	2000.00	5378.95
08	29	08	30	96		PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM [redacted]	103.50	5482.45
08	29	08	30	96		EXXON	1942.76	7425.21
08	29	08	30	96		EXXON	-1942.76	5482.45
						Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 181.09		
						TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
						BALANCE RANGE / RATE / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		
						.00 - 9,999,999.99 / 3.30% / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		3.56%
						SUFFIX:10 365 - 449 DAY CERT		1534.18
		08	01	96		DIVIDEND	8.81	1542.99
						Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 42.99 / FORFEITURES: .00		
						MATURITY DATE:011597 / DIV RATE: 5.2200		
						TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
						BALANCE RANGE / RATE / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		
						.00 - 9,999,999.99 / 5.22% / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		5.35%
						SUFFIX:11 182 - 209 DAY CERT		5002.05
		08	01	96		DIVIDEND	21.16	5023.21
						Y-T-D DIVIDENDS: 23.21 / FORFEITURES: .00		
						MATURITY DATE:122796 / DIV RATE: 4.9800		
						TRUTH IN SAVINGS INFORMATION		
						BALANCE RANGE / RATE / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD		
						.00 - 9,999,999.99 / 4.98% / ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		5.10%
						SUFFIX:50 SHARE DRAFT ACCOUNT		
						BEGINNING BALANCE 2509.83 / MAINT/SERVICE CHGS .00		
						DEPOSITS 15347.29 / ENDING BALANCE 2699.14		
						DRAFTS 14807.98		
						MISC DEBITS 550.00 / TOTAL NUMBER DRAFTS CLEARED 12		
						DEPOSITS		
		08	01	96		DIVIDEND	1.30	2311.13
08	14	08	15	96		PAYROLL ALLOCATION FROM [redacted]	1403.23	2308.49

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS TO DISPUTE BILLING ERRORS

NOTICE: SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS TO DISPUTE BILLING ERRORS

EXHIBIT
97

Ms. FOUNG. I remember in the past when we discussed this, the check was written first. I guess it just come to my bank at the same time.

Mr. BENNETT. Finally, Ms. Foung, I will show you exhibit—I think it is marked C–28. Just so you understand, it is evidence before this committee at this time, in terms of the flow of money into a foreign account into an account here into this country, and ultimately into your account, from the Bank of China over to your brother and through accounts over to your account.

Has your brother ever spoken to you about any foreign bank accounts?

[Exhibit C–28 follows:]

Foreign Money Contribution by Charlie Trie through Manlin Foung, August 1996



EXHIBIT
C-28

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Has your brother ever discussed with you the source of money in terms of how he would have access to any amounts of money in terms of international wire transfers?

Ms. FOUNG. No. But for business purpose, I am sure there is a reason.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe my time has now expired, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ms. Trie.

Thank you, Mr. Landon.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. We now have a vote on. What I would like to do, if it is all right with the minority, is to keep the questioning going; and those of us who want to run and vote right now, may. We will put somebody else in the Chair temporarily while I go vote, and then I will come back and then they can go vote, if that is all right.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I plan to pursue the questioning, and I have to vote and I prefer to start and not be interrupted. So if you would permit, let's vote and I will get back here as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. BURTON. The Chair will stand in recess until the call of the gavel.

[Recess.]

Mr. BURTON. The committee will come to order. When we recessed, the general counsel for the committee, Mr. Bennett, concluded his first half-hour. We will now yield to the ranking minority member for his half-hour.

Mr. WAXMAN. Ms. Foung and Mr. Landon, welcome to our hearing today. I appreciate your being here. As I mentioned to you during the recess, I am also from California and lived in Sacramento for a period of time. It's a lovely place, and was also a long distance to travel to be here.

When lawyers go into a court of law, if there is something not in dispute they have something they call "stipulate." In other words, they don't fight over every fact. They say we will stipulate to this fact. And we could have stipulated to everything you had to say as factual.

The Senate had a hearing. I don't know if either of you have been following the Senate hearings, but they had a hearing on July 29th.

Ms. Foung, are you—were you watching these Senate hearings? Are you familiar with them?

Ms. FOUNG. Not until after I was involved.

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, they had a hearing on the same subject, whether your brother had given money to pay for contributions that others had made. And they had a hearing on July 29th and had two witnesses, that I mentioned in my opening statements, testify; and I have to say that you have less knowledge about this whole business than those two witnesses. So we learned more than what you have told us.

We already knew, in fact, what you have said to us about the fact that contributions had been made and that your brother was responsible for reimbursing the people that made the contributions. The reason I raise that issue is, it just seems to me a real waste to have this hearing, have you come all the way from Sacramento,

CA, and tell the committee information that we already know about.

We ought to be advancing our knowledge about the campaign finance matters rather than spend taxpayers' dollars to learn what we already knew.

Ms. Foung, I would like to begin by cutting to the heart of the committee's investigation. On June 20th, Chairman Burton stated on the floor of the House—and I want to quote—he said, "We are investigating a possible massive scheme of funneling millions of dollars in foreign money into the U.S. electoral system. We are investigating allegations that the Chinese Government at the highest levels decided to infiltrate our political system," end quote.

Ms. Foung, Charlie Trie is your brother. You have known him your whole life. Do you have any reason to believe that he is an agent or spy of the Chinese Government?

Ms. FOUNG. No, sir, not at all.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you have any reason to believe he is part of a massive scheme by the Chinese Government to influence our political system?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. And I assume, Mr. Landon, you wouldn't answer any differently?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. WAXMAN. As you testified this morning, I think you gave us good testimony, very direct. I had heard both of you had done that in your depositions, from my staff who were out there in California for those depositions, and you were straightforward. And I thought to myself, what if my sister had been called to answer questions about me?

We are very close, but I don't think she knows much about me, but I know how she would react if somebody called me a spy. How do you feel about these kinds of accusations?

Ms. FOUNG. I have a lot of respect for this place, but I really felt my brother was overestimated, and the—whatever you call the Government or public official is underestimated, to believe that he could influence a big country, the biggest country in the world, like this by—according to the newspaper, his biggest contribution was $600,000.

And knowing him for all my life, he has been nothing but a wonderful person to me, to everybody else. He would do anything for people, never expect anything in return. He has done everything that I asked for, or I don't ask for it, to help me, to take care of me as a little sister.

So I really don't know what to say about it.

Mr. WAXMAN. You don't believe he is a spy. You don't know whether he is a spy, but you certainly don't believe he is a spy?

Ms. FOUNG. He is not material for that kind of thing. Ninety percent of the time he left the house, he couldn't even find his key. He is not a spy material, I guarantee you.

Mr. WAXMAN. Let me ask you some questions about the money.

The majority has tried to track down the source of the money that you were paid by your brother. And their effort has yielded the same results that the Senate efforts yielded last July. The money that appears to have come from a Bank of China account

in Macao, and this bank account apparently belonged to Ng Lap Seng. Do you know Ng Lap Seng, sometimes called Mr. Wu?

Ms. FOUNG. No, I don't; never heard of him.

Mr. WAXMAN. Have you ever met or talked to him, to your knowledge?

Ms. FOUNG. Not as I can remember.

Mr. WAXMAN. My understanding is, he might have been a business associate of your brother. Do you have any knowledge about your brother's business dealings with him?

Ms. FOUNG. Not to him. I just—I was under the impression that my brother was a successful businessman, and I was happy for him; but other than that, the detail of his business or what does he do when he travels is really none of my business, so I never really asked that question.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you have any knowledge at all about the source of money that was used to reimburse your contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. No. I thought it was his, or part of the business. I really don't understand all this.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Landon, those same questions?

Mr. LANDON. The source?

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you know Mr. Ng Lap Seng?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. To your knowledge, you never met him?

Mr. LANDON. Never.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you know the source of the contribution, other than Ms. Foung's brother?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. One of the contributions that you made for her brother was a contribution for $12,500 on February 18, 1996. This contribution was for a fund-raiser at the Hay-Adams Hotel in Washington, DC, on February 19th.

Did either of you attend that fund-raiser at the Hay-Adams Hotel in Washington?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Ms. FOUNG. No, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. In the Senate hearings, two witnesses testified you made contributions for the same event after being asked by your brother to do so, and these witnesses were Yue Chi and Xi Ping Wang. These witnesses also were reimbursed for these contributions. Do you know either of these two people?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. Now, in the Senate hearing, these two witnesses explained why they were asked to make the conduit contribution. These witnesses both said that they were asked to make their contributions so that a man named Ng Lap Seng could attend the fund-raiser and meet the President.

Did your brother tell you that your contribution was so that Ng Lap Seng could go to the Hay-Adams Hotel fund-raiser?

Ms. FOUNG. No, not at all. We didn't even know—I didn't even know anything about the fund-raising event.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did he give you any explanation at all about why he was asking you to make the contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. I cannot remember the exact conversation we had, but it seems like the check has to be in by a certain day or something like that; and at the time, to me, there is no difference than I advanced the check for him for a utility bill or a house payment. I didn't understand anything about the fund-raising or anything like that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Landon, did you get any explanation of why you were asked to write this check?

Mr. LANDON. I—it was stated to me it was for a Washington, DC, function, and it was coming from someone overseas that wasn't able to be there in time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did you talk to Mr. Trie directly or just through Ms. Foung?

Mr. LANDON. Ms. Foung.

Mr. WAXMAN. I would like to ask you briefly whether you have knowledge about your brother's activities that you think would be useful to this committee. Let me ask you—I guess you have said this before—how often do you talk with him?

Ms. FOUNG. Talk to him directly, I want to say three, four times a year. A lot of times he calls me he left messages on the answering machine to say, I am just calling you to say hello, because I work all the time and because the time difference with overseas, he never knows whether I am home or not. So he just occasionally called to let me know that he is fine or if I am fine.

Mr. WAXMAN. One of the companies your brother is involved in is the Sin Kin Yap Corp. Have you ever heard of it?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. Have you ever heard of it?

Mr. LANDON. Never heard of it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Another company he is associated with is the America-Asia Trade Center. Have you ever heard of this?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. LANDON. Never heard of it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Have you ever discussed any of your brother's business trips to Hong Kong or China with him?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Landon?

Mr. LANDON. Never spoke to him about it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you even know the names of your brother's business associates?

Ms. FOUNG. I am sorry?

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you even know the names of your brother's business associates?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Back in 1995—no, back in Christmas of 1994, I went to Little Rock to visit my mother, and he took me to his office and I met all of his employees. There was about 1 in 10—maybe 10 or 15 of them, but I don't remember it—I don't remember it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Let me switch over to your knowledge of your brother's political activities.

First, let me ask you, you are not politically active yourselves, are you?

Ms. FOUNG. No, sir.

Mr. LANDON. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you discuss politics with your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. No, never.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Landon?

Mr. LANDON. Never.

Mr. WAXMAN. Have you ever discussed with your brother his involvement in President Clinton's 1992 and 1996 campaigns?

Ms. FOUNG. Not in depth. He might have mentioned—he never even emphasized that much about they were good friends or anything like that.

Mr. WAXMAN. He didn't think he could impress you?

Ms. FOUNG. The—not really, not really in depth. We really didn't have the time to talk about things like that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did you have any knowledge that your brother was trying to raise money for the President's legal expense trust?

Ms. FOUNG. No, I didn't know.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Landon?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. Aside from the two times that your brother asked you to make campaign contributions for him, do you have any knowledge at all about your brother's political fund-raising activities?

Ms. FOUNG. No, not at all.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Landon, you have heard this question I just asked. Is your answer the same?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. WAXMAN. In fact, Mr. Landon, I believe that you testified at your deposition that when you made your contribution, you didn't even know what the initials "DNC" stood for; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, after asking these questions, I really must say that I am really at a loss as to why we called these witnesses here today. Months ago, the Senate heard testimony from witnesses who knew a lot more about Charlie Trie's activities than these two witnesses.

We have spent millions of dollars on this investigation. We have been at work nearly a year with no hearings. If this is all we have to show for it, I find it hard to see how the taxpayer is being well served.

I still have time, and I want to yield to Mr. Condit for some questions.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield real briefly for me?

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, we have our time allocated.

Mr. BURTON. That's fine.

Mr. WAXMAN. And I think we should pursue it here.

Mr. CONDIT. Thank you, Mr. Waxman. I would like to first thank both the witnesses for being here today. I know you are here at great personal inconvenience, and I appreciate your being here very much.

I have just a few questions and they will go pretty quick. I would like to first start with Ms. Foung and go through the series of questions with her and then, Mr. Landon, I will get to you.

Ms. Foung, have you been asked for information by any other investigative body or have you testified before any other body besides this committee?

Ms. FOUNG. No. No.

Oh, I am sorry. The grand jury, I——

Mr. CONDIT. So, on the record, you have appeared before the grand jury, the Department of Justice grand jury; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. CONDIT. Have other's requests for information overlapped with requests by this committee? In other words, are they asking for the same questions or the same types of questions or the same material that we have asked this morning?

Ms. FOUNG. You mean besides the investigator that came over and the attorney?

Mr. CONDIT. The other——

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. CONDIT. Are we asking similar questions, the same questions that you have already been asked by the Department of Justice and the grand jury?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. CONDIT. So you—on the record, you are saying that the questions we are asking this morning are similar or the same as you have been asked by the other bodies; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. CONDIT. Can you estimate for me how much time you have spent responding to this committee's requests for information?

Ms. FOUNG. Do you mean including the flying back and forth to DC?

Mr. CONDIT. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. FOUNG. Just coming here each time we will start 7 a.m., and we get here 7 p.m., and same thing for the returns, about an 8-hour flight. I have been to DC twice; and I try to minimize the amount of time that I have lost on my job, so I usually do it in 2 days, coming 1 day and returning 1 day.

We had two trips here. Then we had the deposition in my attorney's office, numerous phone calls, and try to gather together information that was requested.

I am sorry. I didn't keep a log of it, account of it.

Mr. CONDIT. Would you say that it is a lot of time? How much work have you missed? Have you calculated how much work you have missed because of being deposed?

Ms. FOUNG. Five days.

Mr. CONDIT. Five days?

Ms. FOUNG. Minimum, yes.

Mr. CONDIT. Have you been reimbursed by anyone for that loss of time and for your cost of being here?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. CONDIT. Has being here and testifying before this committee, appearing before the grand jury caused you any problems at your job?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. CONDIT. Can you clarify for us what those problems might be?

Ms. FOUNG. I had a perfect attendance at my job for every year that I was there; and now I have to take time off, which I feel terribly about it and the loss of wages, or my vacation time I have to use. It is just no use to get into.

Mr. CONDIT. Can you respond to all the publicity that you have received because you have been here? How has that affected your life and your children's life?

Ms. FOUNG. That's the reason I requested not to be broadcast or anything because I never was looking for—never cared for publicity, and I would rather just be my own—I have very private life. I would just rather keep it that way. And since I was forced to come here, I tried to limit the damage in that respect as minimum as I could.

Mr. CONDIT. Have you—obviously you have incurred some expense by coming here and all the things that you have had to do for this committee. Have you—can you tabulate for us or give us an estimate of how much you have spent in preparing materials, legal counsel, travel, hotel expense? Can you tell us how much approximately you have spent?

Ms. FOUNG. To the best—I understood all the expense, as far as the travel and hotel is being—is paid for. Right? I mean, I haven't seen the reimbursement, but I understood it will be reimbursed.

Mr. CONDIT. Can you clarify that for me? Who is reimbursing you for the cost of that?

Ms. FOUNG. My last trip, I understand, will be reimbursed by the Department of Justice and this trip will be reimbursed by the committee or something.

Mr. BURTON. Point of order. Just for the gentleman's edification, the committee is going to be paying their expenses as part of the expenses of the trip for all witnesses.

Mr. CONDIT. Well, let me finish this and I may have an attitude or a problem or a suggestion or a question about that.

Let me finish up with Mr. Landon.

I—first of all, Ms. Foung, thank you very much. I know this has been a hardship on you and I appreciate you being here very much and I appreciate you trying to be as candid as you can with the questions.

I would like to ask Mr. Landon, if I can, have you ever been asked by any other official investigative body to testify or provide information on matters being investigated by this committee? In other words, are we duplicating the other committees? Can you respond to that?

Mr. LANDON. Some of the questions are the same, but I am talking a lot less here.

Mr. CONDIT. Are you—can you tell me, identify for me, what other committees you have appeared before?

Mr. LANDON. The Department of Justice, I went before the grand jury, and the attorneys in Sacramento during the deposition.

Mr. CONDIT. And can you clarify for me, maybe in a little more detail, have there been requests for information of this committee that overlapped the requests of the other bodies?

Mr. LANDON. Some of the questions are close to being the same.

Mr. CONDIT. Have you provided documents, information or testimony to this committee that you have previously provided to other investigative bodies? The answer would be, yes, I take it?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONDIT. Can you estimate how much time you have spent in responding to requests from this committee?

Mr. LANDON. The same as Ms. Foung.

Mr. CONDIT. She has missed 5 days of work and travel time. Was that similar?

Ms. FOUNG. Four to—4 days travel time, yes, sir.

Mr. CONDIT. Time off work?

Mr. LANDON. I took vacation.

Mr. CONDIT. Heck of a way to spend your vacation.

Have you incurred expense in responding to demands from this committee?

Mr. LANDON. Rooms, taxis and so forth.

Mr. CONDIT. Are you being reimbursed?

Mr. LANDON. I haven't.

Mr. CONDIT. Has anyone indicated to you that you are being reimbursed?

Mr. LANDON. The possibility was mentioned, but I don't know by who.

Mr. CONDIT. Do you think you should be reimbursed?

Mr. LANDON. Well, I don't know.

Mr. CONDIT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate my earlier statement regarding the unnecessary burden that I think we have placed on these two individuals and our ranking member, Mr. Waxman, I think, pointed out earlier that he is not real sure why these two people are here, because in all due respect to them, and I don't mean this in any bad way at all, but they really have not added anything new that we didn't already know.

Once again, I think that we have indicated—it indicated to us that we have sort of flattened out here. This has not offered us any new information that we didn't already know and I think it is a great expense to these two people, not to mention the inconvenience on their personal life to have to come here. I am real saddened that we have started this hearing off like this. It proves that we could have taken the other road and the other road would have been to have been cooperative and not duplicate what the other body is doing, and I think this is evidence that we have got massive problems with duplication of witnesses and information and on and so forth.

The other thing I would like to add, what is going to be the policy? Mr. Waxman, can I——

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, let me ask this of you. I think we ought to have an answer to that question, but I do want to yield to other Members while these witnesses are here——

Mr. CONDIT. OK.

Mr. WAXMAN [continuing]. To pursue any matters they want to ask of the witnesses. Then we ought to pursue from the chairman what our policy is going to be.

Mr. CONDIT. OK.

Mr. WAXMAN. Because we are clearly inconveniencing a lot of people and causing them to spend money.

Mr. Lantos, I want to yield to you.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Waxman.

We are dealing with conduit payments in the 1996 Presidential race, and as I raised the point yesterday, a company in Pennsylvania, a landfill company, paid $8 million in fines for making illegal conduit payments.

Now, one of the items that the other side repeatedly raises is that we are talking about the notion that, well, maybe there are problems, but everybody does it and, of course, they very self-righteously say, but of course, everybody doesn't do it.

Well, on the front page of the Washington Post, the story details, how the Dole-Kemp campaign received $80,000 in conduit payments, the Clinton-Gore campaign only $10,000 in conduit payments from this landfill company. And then it goes on to tell us that six Republicans: Senator Specter, Senator Santorum, Senate candidates Haytaian and DuHaime and Congressmen Fox and Paxon combined received $35,000 and two Members of Congress, who are Democrats, Mr. Baucus of Montana and Mr. Pallone, received a total of $4,000.

Now, it seems to me that there are two ways of dealing with these issues and with these facts. It so happens that having served with former Vice Presidential Candidate Jack Kemp and with Vice President Gore, those two are good friends of mine. I think Mr. Clinton and Mr. Dole would also qualify as friends.

There is no doubt in my mind that not one of those four gentlemen would, for a moment, have entertained the notion of having their campaign committees receive conduit payments, for two reasons:

First, because they are honest people, and this is against the law. And I would bet my bottom dollar that Dole and Clinton and Gore and Kemp have the same view that every Member of this body has, that we would not engage in illegal transactions. Receiving conduit payments is an illegal transaction.

The second reason why they would never do it, of course, is because this is absurd and counterproductive. This can cost them the election, unbelievable embarrassment afterwards as we are now seeing.

It seems to me that this morning I got my answer as to whether this is Alice in Wonderland or the Theater of the Absurd.

I want to express my apology to the two of you. You are two fine citizens. You should be more politically involved and active than you have been. I am a little disappointed that you are as apolitical as you obviously are. You should be making contributions to the party of your choice. You should support candidates vigorously of your choice and that's really the only disappointment I have; that you are wonderful people, hard-working, honest and all that, but you are nonpolitical and perhaps—and perhaps this experience will make you want to become politically more active, so such Theaters of the Absurd will not be inflicted upon others.

I might mention, by the way, that the party you attended, Ms. Foung—and you got to the parking lot, I understand, Mr. Landon—in the town of Hillsborough is my hometown, but I was not invited to the party. So I met neither of you; nor the President nor anybody else who was at that event.

I must say that this hearing is so profoundly embarrassing and disappointing. Not a single shred of new fact or evidence has come forward and here we are going through this circus.

Now, since the circus also relates to the Bank of China, I would like to request that a letter to our ranking minority member from

Professor Naughton of the University of California at San Diego be admitted in the record.

Mr. BURTON. Reserving the right to object, may I see the letter, please?

Mr. LANTOS. You certainly may.

This letter outlines Professor Naughton's understanding of the Bank of China which, of course, is one of the large international banks on the face of this planet with 12,300 offices in China, 525 branches overseas, including two branches in New York City and one in California.

Presumably, Professor Naughton says, anyone, including you or I could walk into the New York branch on Madison Avenue and open an account.

I think it is sort of important for all of us who are looking at these issues with a degree of maturity and knowledge and understanding is to recognize that while there are probably not many in the Congress who are as opposed to the policies of the current China—Government in China as I am, it is important to realize that the Bank of China, quoting again, "it is unreasonable to assume that the Chinese Government or its officials would have direct knowledge of any individual wire transfer or any other transaction from an individual or corporate commercial account at the Bank of China. Such transfers are routine and occur millions of times each day at the bank."

There is nothing to prevent the Chinese Government from using the Bank of China to transfer funds internationally, but it is equally true that the Chinese Government could just as well use any other international commercial bank for the same purpose.

Now, the point of my raising this issue is very simple. I detest the Government in China. Unlike some—many of my colleagues here, I have voted against Most Favored Nation treatment and I will vote for the package of anti-Beijing measures that we will be debating on the floor soon. And it was my resolution that resulted in the President of Taiwan being allowed to get a visa and come to Cornell to obtain his honorary doctorate. So I have very little good to say about the Chinese Government. But I think it is part and parcel of this attempt to blow smoke and create this mysterious impression that since the transfer came from the Bank of China, this, chances are, could be Chinese Government money.

Well, it could be, but it could just as well be money of an American business corporation or a citizen of any country who chose to engage in the transfer.

I again ask, Mr. Chairman, to place the letter in the record.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection, so ordered.

[The letter referred to follows:]

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
AND PACIFIC STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA, 92093-0519
(619) 534-2481 FAX (619) 534-3939
e-mail: bnaughton@ucsd.edu

Barry Naughton, Associate Professor

October 8, 1997

The Honorable Henry A. Waxman
Ranking Minority Member
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
B-350A Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Waxman,

I am writing in response to your inquiry as to the operations of the Bank of China (BoC). I am an Associate Professor at the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies at the University of California, San Diego. I am an economist who has researched the Chinese economy for fifteen years. I have written a comprehensive study of Chinese economic reforms (published by Cambridge University Press), entitled *Growing Out of the Plan: Chinese Economic Reform 1978-1993*, which won the Masayoshi Ohira memorial prize in 1996. In addition, I have edited two volumes of studies of the Chinese economy, and published over thirty articles in academic journals and edited volumes.

As I understand, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is investigating campaign finance violations that may have occurred during the 1996 U.S. presidential election. I also understand that witnesses testifying may testify that they made conduit contributions, which might have originated from individuals or corporate accounts at the Bank of China. I would like to provide you with some information which would shed light on the commercial structure and activities of the Bank of China.

First, the Bank's activities are not limited to Chinese government accounts. The Bank of China (BoC) is one of four "specialist" banks, along with the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, the Agricultural Bank of China, and the People's Construction Bank of China, which operates under the auspices of The People's Bank of China, the central bank of China. Though the BoC is technically a government entity, it is the 30th-largest commercial bank in the world with millions of private personal accounts, and is by far the most international of all of China's banks. Indeed, approximately 80% of its deposits and lending are made in foreign currency. Furthermore, the BoC maintains an extremely high ratio of foreign to domestic currency, and had the highest ratio in the world in 1994.

Secondly, the BoC has a global presence. More than one-quarter of its operations are conducted in Hong Kong and Macau. It has some 12,300 offices in China and 525 branches overseas, including two branches in New York City and one in California. Branches can accept personal deposits, make loans, or receive wire transfers. Anyone, including you and I, could walk into the New York branch on Madison Avenue and open an account.

Thirdly, the Bank of China regularly deals with international and U.S. firms. Though its primary customer base is naturally located in East Asia, it has sought to form ties with Western banks such as Citibank, and U.S. firms such as Cisco Systems Inc., a worldwide leader in networking for the Internet. Most U.S. firms with a presence in China routinely open an account with the Bank of China. In addition, other branches of the People's Bank of China have conducted business with Visa International Inc., Price Waterhouse, Morgan Stanley, and the Asian Development Bank. Bank of China shares are even sold on Hong Kong's Hang Seng stock market, under the ticker symbol (Q.BCH)

As a result of the size and scope of commercial operations by the Bank of China, it is unreasonable to assume that the Chinese government or its officials would have direct knowledge of any individual wire transfer or any other transaction from an individual or corporate commercial account at the Bank of China. Such transfers are routine and occur millions of times each day at the Bank. There is nothing to prevent the Chinese government from using the Bank of China to transfer funds internationally, but it is equally true that the Chinese government could just as well use any other international commercial bank for the same purpose.

I hope that I have been of assistance in providing the Committee with insight as to the nature and activities of the Bank of China.

Sincerely yours,



Barry Naughton
University of California, San Diego

Barry J. Naughton

Graduate School of International Relations
and Pacific Studies,
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093-0519
(619) 534-2481
FAX: (619) 534-3939

141 Witham Road
Encinitas, California 9
(619) 943-7255

bnaughton@ucsd.edu

Education and Employment

Ph.D., Economics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, May 1986

Graduate School of International Relations & Pacific Studies (IR/PS)
University of California, San Diego September 1988-present
Assistant, Associate Professor (since 1992) and Associate Dean (1992-95)

Selected Publications

The China Circle: Economics and Technology in the PRC, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. (Editor). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1997.

Growing Out of the Plan: Chinese Economic Reform, 1978-1993, New York: Cambridge University Press. April 1995.

"China's Emergence and Future as a Trading Nation," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*. 1996: 2, pp. 273-344.

"China's Evolving Managerial Labor Market," *Journal of Political Economy*, 103:4 (August 1995). Pp. 873-82. With Theodore Groves, Yongmiao Hong, and John McMillan.

"What is Distinctive about China's Economic Transition? State Enterprise Reform and Overall System Transformation," *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 18:3 (1994), pp. 470-90.

"Autonomy and Incentives in Chinese State Enterprises," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109:1 (February 1994). With Theodore Groves, Yongmiao Hong, and John McMillan.

"How to Reform a Planned Economy: Lessons from China." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 8:1 (Spring 1992). With John McMillan

"The Third Front: Defense Industrialization in the Chinese Interior." *China Quarterly* 115 (Autumn 1988).

Mr. LANTOS. Final observation.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. I would just like to clarify one point before we go to our next questioner, and that is that the grand jury that is investigating campaign finance problems came to us after we had started our investigation and found these witnesses and asked us for the information pertaining to Ms. Foung, Mr. Landon and Mr. Wang.

We provided them with the information. The Justice Department asked us for information we had and not the other way around. And also, the information that goes to the grand jury is secret and it is not a two-way street. We gave to them. They cannot give to us.

Mr. Cox, you are recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just a brief amount of time unlike the preceding questioners, so I will try and be brief in my questions and permit you to answer as fully as you can.

On this last point, it is the case, is it not, that when this committee's investigators contacted both of you, you had not been contacted by either the FBI or the Justice Department?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. COX. But now that this committee has brought your identity as Charlie Trie's sister to the attention of the authorities, they have contacted you; is that right?

Let me rephrase the question. Have you been contacted by the FBI or the Justice Department?

Ms. FOUNG. No, not by those two agencies.

Mr. LANDON. The Department of Justice asked for us to appear.

Mr. COX. So you have been contacted by the Justice Department, Mr. Landon. But you have not?

Mr. LANDON. Well, it was just a subpoena to go before the grand jury.

Ms. FOUNG. Oh, so the FBI and Justice Department are the same thing? I thought they were two different——

Mr. COX. Have you been contacted by either one?

Ms. FOUNG. The Justice Department, yes.

Mr. COX. The Justice Department. OK. But we contacted you before they did and they did not contact you before we did?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. COX. All right. I just want to straighten that out.

I wonder if I might ask you, Ms. Foung, when you met President Clinton, did he say anything to you about your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. Very briefly, something like the—your brother has been a—I don't remember—a good friend or a close friend or a long-time friend for 20 years or two decades.

Mr. COX. He said that he had been a close friend of your brother's for 20 years?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't remember if it was a good friend or a close friend.

Mr. COX. Either a good friend or a close friend?

Ms. FOUNG. Or long-time friend, something like that.

Mr. COX. All right. You said a moment ago that you think people overestimate your brother. What do you mean by that?

Ms. FOUNG. The brother—my brother, the one I know, is just a down-to-earth, good person.

Mr. COX. Do you mean that he is not politically sophisticated?

Ms. FOUNG. Not as I know of.

Mr. COX. Do you think it is odd for somebody who is not very sophisticated to be friends with the President of the United States?

Ms. FOUNG. They both came from the same place. They met in his business as a restaurant owner.

Mr. COX. But your brother is not the kind of person who would be friends with other political figures?

Ms. FOUNG. He never mentioned anything to me about it.

Mr. COX. So you wouldn't say, for example, that he would be tight with officials of the Communist party or the People's Republic of China?

Ms. FOUNG. I have no knowledge of anything like that.

Mr. COX. Would it surprise you if he were?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. COX. Do you know how many legal political parties there are in the People's Republic of China?

Ms. FOUNG. I know there is Communist Red China and Taiwan is the Republic of China.

Mr. COX. Right. In the People's Republic of China, there is just the Communist party, is that your understanding, as far as political parties go?

Ms. FOUNG. That's all I know of.

Mr. COX. So if you were friends with government officials in China, you would be friends with members of the Communist party, presumably, right?

Ms. FOUNG. Do they have a Congress party?

Mr. COX. Communist party. That's who runs the People's Republic of China.

Ms. FOUNG. It is such a big country. I don't know, how does it work? I really have no knowledge of that country. I was born in Taiwan.

Mr. COX. Earlier on, you were asked whether your brother might have any involvement with Communist officials in China, and I wonder—and I took it, you said, that you think not?

Ms. FOUNG. Not that I am aware of. He never mentioned anything like that to me.

Mr. COX. Would it surprise you that he put out a bio on himself just a couple of years ago that says, "Over the course of time I have developed a personal relationship with a number of government officials throughout China"?

Ms. FOUNG. I have no comment.

Mr. COX. Is that a surprise to you?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. COX. It comes as a surprise?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is it a surprise to you that he has moved to the People's Republic of China?

Ms. FOUNG. Is it surprise to me what?

Mr. COX. That he moved there, that he lives there now? Had he ever lived there before?

Ms. FOUNG. I understand he spent a lot of time there for business reasons.

Mr. COX. Was it ever his residence, his home?

Ms. FOUNG. His residence is in Little Rock, AR, I thought.

Mr. COX. And he is a U.S. citizen, isn't that right?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, that's correct.

Mr. COX. So his moving to the People's Republic of China, is that unusual?

Ms. FOUNG. The way I understood it, it was for business reasons, for business needs.

Mr. COX. Now, you have talked to him a few times on the telephone and have done so regularly over the years. And when he talks to you, he is calling lately from the People's Republic of China; isn't that right?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't know. I only talked with him twice this year.

Mr. COX. Let me put up on the screen, if I might, the picture that shows where the money came from that you ended up giving to the DNC.

You're familiar with what's in front of you on the TV screen, the $200,000 moved from the Bank of China in Macao, as the ranking member said—and he's no more sure of it than I am, but it's our suspicion that this money came from Ng Lap Seng, that $200,000 moved from the Bank of China eventually to you.

Are you familiar with how that works now, having had it all covered in the weeks since we've contacted you?

Ms. FOUNG. No. The screen is, the screen that you come up was, I'm looking at it. That's all my knowledge.

Mr. COX. You don't remember the questions that Mr. Bennett asked you?

Ms. FOUNG. Could you repeat that question?

Mr. COX. Didn't you just go over these transactions earlier?

Ms. FOUNG. Yeah, we went over this screen before.

Mr. COX. Yes. Thank you very much.

Now, you therefore understand at this point that you and Mr. Landon laundered $35,000?

Ms. FOUNG. Could you repeat that?

Mr. COX. Are you familiar with these transactions now?

Ms. FOUNG. I only am familiar with my part.

Mr. COX. Yes. And do you think that your part involved giving money through your checking account that wasn't yours?

Ms. FOUNG. Like I testified earlier, the only knowledge I have is, I have——

Mr. COX. You've been granted immunity, so we're not trying to trip you up.

Ms. FOUNG. No, you're not, but it seems like you're putting words in my mouth that I have no idea of any laundering activity or anything like that.

To me, I simply did my brother a favor; and I will do things for him because he's done things for me over time as a family.

Mr. COX. Ms. Foung, I want to believe, as the minority has suggested, that you're an honest person.

Ms. FOUNG. I am.

Mr. COX. And everyone in this room looking at this and understanding these transactions and looking at the exhibits and looking at the checks and knowing that your brother promised to reimburse you and did so, for amounts of money to you and Mr. Landon totaling $35,000, means that you laundered money. It wasn't your money; it was somebody else's money.

You gave it politically. And I, for one, think that it's one thing to not know it at the time; it's another thing weeks later to suggest that you don't know what the hell's going on. At some point, it's got to become clear, because I'd like to encourage you also to be involved in politics, but I don't want to encourage you to be involved in politics if you still haven't figured out that this is money laundering.

It's a serious problem to us because, according to our most recent information, over $900,000 went from Ng Lap Seng to your brother just in the years that he was raising money. You know that your brother was a 20-year friend of the President of the United States. You personally talked to the President of the United States about it. And I hope that, in addition to the information that you provide today, that you will work with us, because we're after information from your brother who is now hiding in the People's Republic of China. We want to get him back. It's something of sufficient importance that the President of the United States hopefully will raise it with Jiang Zemin when he is visiting in just a few weeks.

So I look forward, particularly in light of the grant of immunity that the minority and majority Members agreed jointly to extend to both of you, to your thorough cooperation on this matter. I yield back.

Ms. FOUNG. Could I respond to that?

Mr. COX. Of course you may respond. My time is up, but yours is not.

Ms. FOUNG. First of all, I am a very honest person. I believe everybody here already checked my background, checked my record. I'm clear as a piece of paper. Never had any unlawful activities. I'm a hard-working blue collar; and I pay my taxes, I pay my bills. And I don't know what you are trying to say that I'm lying. I really cannot, even if I wanted to.

I have no more information to offer to you than I already did. I don't know anything.

To me, my brother asked me for a favor, to advance a check. I didn't even know what DNC means. I asked him, what does it mean? And I don't know how else I can explain to you.

Something like that really wasn't important to me at all. And you make it like I should have known what's going on. I didn't care. This whole fund-raising thing is like a football game that I don't understand. I'm not interested. I turn away every time it shows up on the TV. That's the extent of my understanding of this whole thing.

Mrs. MORELLA [presiding]. The gentleman's time has expired.

I would now like to recognize Mr. Waxman for extended questioning for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I'm going to have to hold on asking the questions, because we've got the people that we're going to yield to running back onto the House floor.

Let me say, I don't agree with anything that Mr. Cox just had to say to you and I want that very clear. We're going to withhold on asking questions at this moment.

Mrs. MORELLA. The committee will now recess subject to the call of the Chair.

[Recess.]

Mr. BURTON [presiding]. The committee will resume its business.

Mr. Waxman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to note for the record that there's been another violation of our committee rules. You told us a few minutes ago that you provided materials about these witnesses to the grand jury. Under paragraph C(3)(a) of the document protocol we adopted on April 10, the chairman is required to notify me before—at least 24 hours prior to releasing committee documents. I did not receive any notice of this release, as required by our document protocol.

And Mr. Chairman, I don't think I would have objected, but I just wanted to point that out for the record.

Mr. BURTON. If the gentleman will yield real briefly?

Mr. WAXMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. I stand corrected. The only thing we gave them were the names of these people, so they could contact them. I did not give them any documents.

Mr. WAXMAN. All right. I'm pleased to hear that.

Mr. BURTON. Our document protocol allows us to give documents of any kind to law enforcement agencies.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take issue with Mr. Cox's inference about Charlie Trie's connection to the Chinese Government. In the July 29 Senate hearing, it was revealed that Ng Lap Seng, sometimes referred to as Mr. Wu, sits on a local provincial advisory committee in China. This, of course, shouldn't be surprising; since China is a Communist country, anyone wanting to do business with China would be foolish not to have some friends in government. However, this does not mean that Ng Lap Seng is a high-level Chinese official.

It's absurd to suggest that simply because Charlie Trie is a business partner of Ng Lap Seng that Charlie Trie has connections to the Chinese Central Committee. It's like saying because someone is on a school board that therefore they know the President of the United States.

As Ms. Foung correctly stated, China is a big country. There are, no doubt, millions of people who have some connection to the government, as indeed 3 millions of people in the United States who have some connection to the Government, as there are millions of people in the United States who have some connection to the Government as well.

I want to yield now to the gentlelady from New York, Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you. I would like to ask Manlin Foung, have you ever met the First Lady?

Ms. FOUNG. No, ma'am.

Mrs. MALONEY. Have you ever met the Vice President?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mrs. MALONEY. Have you ever been to the White House?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mrs. MALONEY. So I take it you've never had coffee at the White House?

Ms. FOUNG. No, madam.

Mrs. MALONEY. And you never slept in the Lincoln Bedroom?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mrs. MALONEY. Did you expect to receive any political favor as a result of your contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mrs. MALONEY. Did you ever ask anyone else to make a contribution to the DNC?

Ms. FOUNG. No, except Joe.

Mrs. MALONEY. Do you have any personal knowledge of any donations other than ones that you made and your friend, Mr. Landon?

Ms. FOUNG. Not at all.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would like to ask Mr. Landon, did you ever expect to receive any political favors as a result of your contribution?

Mr. LANDON. None.

Mrs. MALONEY. Did you ever ask anyone else to make a contribution?

Mr. LANDON. No, ma'am.

Mrs. MALONEY. Do you have any personal knowledge of any donations other than the ones that you and Manlin made to the DNC?

Mr. LANDON. No.

Mrs. MALONEY. I have no further questions.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

I want to yield to Mr. Barrett.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, like probably most people in this room, have made mistakes in judgment in my life. And I will probably continue to make mistakes in judgment. In fact, when constituents from time to time either compliment me on the job I'm doing or am critical, I tell them, don't worry, I will make a mistake someday.

I believe that you both made a mistake. I don't know whether—whether you knew it was wrong, but it was a mistake to do what you did for your brother. I probably would do the same for my brother if my brother asked me to do something. But it was a mistake.

My concern goes more to the fact that you made these contributions, but to what it shows about our political system. And what concerns me about these hearings today is that it does, I think, quite effectively—and maybe some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle disagree, but I think it quite effectively shows some of the cancer in our system.

It is wrong for the Democratic National Committee or wrong for anybody on this side of the aisle to take contributions that are not legally given. But this hearing process is a charade; and the reason it's a charade is because someone in this room would be left to believe that the Democrats are the bad guys and the Republicans are the good guys, and the reality couldn't be further from the truth.

We've heard people mention this morning the headline in the Washington Post today, and it talked about contributions, $120,000

in contributions, I think was the figure. $80,000 in contributions to the Dole campaign, exactly the type of contributions that you made where someone was asked to make a contribution, and they were reimbursed; $35,000 in contributions to Republican Senate and congressional candidates, $4,000 to Democratic Senate and congressional candidates.

We will hear nothing about that in this hearing. We will hear nothing about money that has been illegally given to Republicans, because that's not the purpose of these hearings.

And, Mr. Landon, when you said that this was only the second time that you've been to a political event, this is a political event. That's what this is today; this is a political event. Because this is not a serious attempt to look at the systemic problems in the system, because if it were, we would be trying to get at "Firm to Pay $8 Million Fine for Illegal Campaign Gifts." We would be trying to deal with that. We would be bringing employees from that company here to talk about it. But that's not what this is about.

I'm sorry you made a mistake; I hope that it was an innocent mistake. Obviously, the committee unanimously felt that you were not crucial cogs in any sort of scheme, or we wouldn't have given you immunity. But just as I will make mistakes in the future, I assume you will.

But I want to thank you for being here today. But what I want to say is, don't make the same mistake twice.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I also, I want to associate myself with the words of Mr. Barrett, who just spoke. I don't have any questions, because I mean, I'm a trial lawyer. I practiced for 20 years. And I've listened to your testimony, I think you've been very candid with us. And we really appreciate your testimony.

I think for me to sit here and to ask you any questions is merely taking up more of your time, taking more of the time of this committee when we need to be getting on to other things.

I'm a new Member of the Congress, and I must tell you that I—and this is more to our committee, and I'm very, very disappointed. I am sure that there will be other questions trying to solicit information, but basically, I think any—most people who know anything about testimony would probably pretty much conclude that we've—I mean, through the questioning that has already taken place, we've gotten about as much as we are going to get.

But, again, I thank you all for being here, and I hope that you can go on with your lives. Thank you.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of moving forward with this hearing and not wasting any time, we yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time.

Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Ms. Foung, it's true you're not Webster Hubbell, who's refused to cooperate with the Justice Department and the committee, a major figure in this investigation.

It's also true you're not John Huang, who's taken the fifth and refused to cooperate. And it's also true you're obviously not Charlie

Trie, who—your brother who has fled the country, a major figure in our investigation.

And it's also true you're here at great inconvenience of your time. That's true.

But you're also here because both of you collectively laundered $35,000. And in my way of looking at it, $35,000 is a lot of money. And it was laundered money; this money was not your money, correct?

Mr. LANDON. Correct.

Mr. SHAYS. Ms. Foung, was this your money? You don't need a long time to answer it. Yes or no.

Ms. FOUNG. Would you repeat your question again, without all that statement prior to that?

Mr. SHAYS. No, I'm not going to repeat the question again.

You testified to that.

Ms. FOUNG. OK. I'll answer your question.

No, I did not—I didn't think I was laundering money. That wasn't my money. I was simply doing my brother—did my brother a favor.

Mr. SHAYS. You testified to Mr. Waxman that your brother was a successful businessman. What was his business and where did he get his money?

Ms. FOUNG. That is none of my business. I don't know.

Mr. SHAYS. How do you know he's a successful businessman then?

Ms. FOUNG. I told you, back in 1994, I had gone to Little Rock for Christmas. He showed me his office. It was a big, good-looking office with—full of employees.

Mr. SHAYS. You testified in deposition and before this committee that your brother asked you for money for a house payment. Why would he have asked you for money?

Ms. FOUNG. No. Apparently you misunderstood. I said this is—to me, is the same as if he could not come back to the country, he asked me to advance a house payment until he can get back, reimbursement to me.

Mr. SHAYS. So you said, it is not testimony that he borrowed money from you, you likened the laundering of $35,000 to a campaign in your name as the same as his borrowing money for your house?

Ms. FOUNG. Could you repeat that? I really lost somewhere what we're trying to find out.

Mr. SHAYS. I'm not going to repeat the question.

Ms. Foung, according to your deposition and testimony, other than your two contributions to the Democratic National Committee, the DNC, on February 1996 and on August 1996, you have never made any other political contribution; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. To the best of my recollection, that's correct.

Mr. SHAYS. To the best of your recollection. So you stand on record that you've contributed on two occasions 10—10, $12,000, $12,500 on February 19th, which was money that you got from your brother, and on 8/18/96, $10,000. That's the extent of your political contributions?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. SHAYS. Are you aware that Federal Election Commission records show you making two $1,000 contributions to the minority Leader of the Senate, Tom Daschle, on June 26th, 1995?

Ms. FOUNG. I saw the document, yes.

Mr. SHAYS. Did you make that contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. Not to my knowledge—my recollection.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, I mean, did you or didn't you?

Ms. FOUNG. Like I said, not to the best of my recollection, no.

Mr. SHAYS. See, you've been immune from testimony, so——

Ms. FOUNG. Exactly.

Mr. SHAYS [continuing]. So you don't need to keep anything from us.

Wouldn't you know if you made a contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, if I made contribution, I would know.

Mr. SHAYS. Did you know?

Ms. FOUNG. I'm speaking under oath. I don't want something I didn't remember to come back to me as I'm lying.

Mr. SHAYS. It's possible you made a contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. To the best of my recollection, no.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. Are you aware that Federal Election Commission records show that Dai Lin Outlaw, your sister, contributed $1,000 to Mr. Daschle on 6/26 and another $1,000 on 6/26. Are you aware of that?

Ms. FOUNG. To the extent if you're showing me the document.

Mr. SHAYS. Have you been told that this happened?

Ms. FOUNG. I might have. I just——

Mr. SHAYS. Did you ask your sister if she made this contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SHAYS. Are you aware that Federal Election Commission records show that Jim Outlaw, your brother-in-law, made two $1,000 contributions on the same date?

Ms. FOUNG. If that's what the record reflects.

Mr. SHAYS. Are you aware that that contribution——

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SHAYS [continuing]. Was made?

Are you aware that the Federal Election Commission records show that E-Foung Do Trie, your mother, made two $1,000 contributions to—again, to Mr. Daschle's campaign in 1995?

Ms. FOUNG. No, I'm not aware of it.

Mr. SHAYS. No one on this committee has asked you about these contributions?

Ms. FOUNG. They probably have. I've been asked a lot of questions. I answered it.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, so, you were asked and you remembered, or you don't remember? That's kind of a surprising thing to forget, isn't it?

Ms. FOUNG. Not really. All this fund-raising thing might be very important thing to you, but it's not to me, except to the extent that it affects my life greatly.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, it affected your life greatly because your brother asked you to commit a felony.

Ms. FOUNG. No, my brother didn't. If my brother knew that, he would never ask me something like that.

Mr. SHAYS. No, your brother asked you to launder money, and to put it in your name. And it wasn't your money.

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SHAYS. That's what your brother did. That is a felony.

Ms. FOUNG. My testimony is, my brother asked me a favor because he cannot make those checks in time. That's the extent of what he asked me. He did not ask me to launder money. If he knew——

Mr. SHAYS. When you——

Ms. FOUNG [continuing]. That he was going to get me in this position, he wouldn't ask me.

Mr. SHAYS. Your testimony is, your brother didn't know he was asking you to launder money?

When I asked you—when you met the President, according to your deposition, President Clinton knew your brother. What did he say about your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. Just what I testified earlier.

Mr. SHAYS. Why don't you do this? Why don't you turn to page 29 of the deposition, since you have a hard time remembering things you said to us, and tell me if, when the question was asked, exactly what did the President say to you about his relationship with your brother back in Little Rock, AR, days.

Your answer was—excuse me, it's on page 30; I'm sorry, on page 30.

Your answer was: He said my brother, Charlie Trie, is a close friend of his in two decades. Is that the answer you still stand by?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes. And I believe that was the answer I gave you earlier.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. No, it wasn't, because I didn't ask that question.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, I did.

Mr. SHAYS. Have you had any contact with the Democratic National Committee, the DNC?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, I did.

Mr. SHAYS. Who initiated that contact?

Ms. FOUNG. I did.

Mr. SHAYS. Why did you initiate that contact?

Ms. FOUNG. Because there's a combination of several reasons. The first reason was, I thought maybe the DNC had made a mistake that had overlooked my contribution. So I wasn't——

Mr. SHAYS. Was that your contribution?

Ms. FOUNG. English is my second language. If you're picking on what I said all the time, I am sorry, it will be very difficult to me.

Mr. SHAYS. I'm sorry, too. But the bottom line is, I only have 10 minutes.

You can complete your story here. You called them because you wanted your money back?

Ms. FOUNG. I want my brother's money back.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. And why do you think your brother was entitled to his money back?

Ms. FOUNG. To the best of my knowledge, that was his money.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, but he gave it to you to give to the party. And why wouldn't you just be happy with your contribution? Why would you have made the contribution then, and felt good about it; and now want your money back, which wasn't your money?

Ms. FOUNG. No, I didn't feel good or bad. I had no feelings. I simply did a favor for my brother.

Mr. SHAYS. So your brother wanted his money back?

Ms. FOUNG. And it turned out to be—no.

Mr. SHAYS. Did your brother ask you for the money back?

Ms. FOUNG. I thought that was the way it was supposed to be handled. My limited knowledge of that was, they were refunding money related to my brother.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. Ms. Foung, did you receive—excuse me.

Mr. SOLLERS. Mr. Landon.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Landon, I'm sorry.

Did you receive—have any contact with the DNC?

Mr. LANDON. No, I did not.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. Did the DNC return the money that you laundered to the DNC?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, they did.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. Did they explain why they were doing that?

Mr. LANDON. All I got was the check is in the mail. I got no communication with the DNC.

Mr. SHAYS. OK.

Ms. Foung, have you received any money back from Senator Daschle?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SHAYS. Are you inclined to ask him for your money back?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. How come?

Ms. FOUNG. Because that's something I'm not aware of.

Mr. SHAYS. Would you like—I would like to yield to Mr. Cox.

Do you have a question?

Mr. COX. I just wondered, as a followup, Mr. Landon, when you got the check, did you keep it?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. Do you still have it?

Mr. LANDON. I put it in the bank, and it's still there.

Mr. COX. Boy, good for you.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. I thank you. I yield back my time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back his time.

Mr. Barr.

Mr. SHAYS. Isn't it on that side, Mr. Condit?

Mr. CONDIT. I can wait.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Barr.

Mr. BARR. Point of order, are they yielding back their time?

Mr. BURTON. If the gentleman, Mr. Condit——

Mr. CONDIT. No, I would like to claim my time.

Mr. BARR. I'm sorry.

Mr. BURTON. OK, Mr. Condit, then we'll go back to your side.

Mr. CONDIT. Are you yielding to me Mr. Chairman at this point?

Mr. BURTON. We recognize you for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONDIT. Pardon? I would like to take my time, Mr. Chairman, and clarify something we started a little bit ago with you, if I may; I'll do it now, if you like, or—I can do it now, or you——

Mr. BURTON. You can take your 5 minutes.

Mr. CONDIT. What is the policy of the committee on how we reimburse these witnesses? What are the guidelines? Do we intend to

reimburse Ms. Foung for her child care, her travel and the hotel; and Mr. Landon, too? Is that the policy of the committee.

Mr. BURTON. We reimburse for travel, hotel, meals, and incidental expenses for their trip out here.

Mr. CONDIT. How about her time off work and her child care?

Mr. BURTON. We provide what the rules of the House and the Government normally require.

Mr. CONDIT. And what is that?

Mr. BURTON. What I just stated. Travel, hotel, meals and incidentals.

Mr. CONDIT. Do you intend to do this for Mr. Landon, as well?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. CONDIT. And all witnesses that appear here?

Mr. BURTON. All witnesses that we subpoenaed and have come before the committee.

Mr. CONDIT. It was my understanding Ms. Foung, there was a commitment made to her about her son traveling with her, that she would be allowed to bring her 9-year-old son, later was told that she couldn't do that. She had to get child care to take care of him for 24-hour periods.

Mr. BURTON. That was discussed. But under the rules of the House and the rules of the investigation, that's not allowed. The only thing is allowed is for witnesses. We did look into some other way to facilitate that, but there was no other way to do it. So we provided transportation, hotels and meals and incidentals for Ms. Foung and Mr. Landon.

Mr. CONDIT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Does the gentleman yield back?

Mr. CONDIT. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back.

Mr. Barr.

Mr. BARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Landon, just to followup briefly on the previous questions from my colleagues, Mr. Shays and Mr. Cox here, that $12,500, is that in a bank account over which you have control?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. Has that been declared as income to you?

Mr. LANDON. No, it's not mine.

Mr. BARR. Who's is it?

Mr. LANDON. I assume it's Charlie Trie's.

Mr. BARR. Is he the one you received it from?

Mr. LANDON. No, I got it from Ms. Foung.

Mr. BARR. What information is available to you that it is Mr. Trie's money?

Mr. LANDON. Just she said it was.

Mr. BARR. OK.

Mr. LANDON. I assume from what I've read in the paper that it belongs to him.

Mr. BARR. OK. Nothing that you've gathered through these hearings or through the grand jury proceedings would lead you to that conclusion.

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BARR. You testified earlier, Mr. Landon, I think it was in response to some questions my colleague, Mr. Waxman, had asked

you that you understood that the checks that you received were from overseas.

Mr. LANDON. Yes sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. You don't know from who they were from, though?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. But it's your conclusion now that they were from Mr. Trie?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. During the course of your discussions with your attorney and with the Department of Justice, and I presume that you have had discussions concerning immunity; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BARR. OK. And it's your understanding that you are immunized and that means safe from prosecution for anything that you talk about here; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BARR. OK. Are you aware that it is illegal under the laws of this country to make political contributions in the name of another person?

Mr. LANDON. I am aware.

Mr. BARR. OK. Are you also aware that it is against the laws of this country to launder money?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. And are you aware that there are, indeed, criminal penalties that attach to violations of those U.S. laws?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. Do you know what those penalties are?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. But you—it is your understanding that you are here under a grant of immunity so you are not to be prosecuted—you cannot be prosecuted for any of these offenses.

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir. As long as I tell you everything I know.

Mr. BARR. OK.

Ms. Foung, is that your understanding also that you are here under a grant of immunity and that you cannot be prosecuted for violation of election laws or money-laundering laws of this country?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. BARR. OK. And are you aware, as Mr. Landon has testified that he is aware, that it is indeed against the laws of this country to make contributions, political contributions in the name of another person?

Ms. FOUNG. I do now. But I didn't know then.

Mr. BARR. Nobody has made you aware of that up until this point today.

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct. Not today, until the whole thing that happened to me.

Mr. BARR. Sure. In other words, but you've had discussions, I presume, with your lawyer and so forth about these various laws that you are being immunized from.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. OK. Are either of you familiar with—familiar with the gentleman named Antonio Pan?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. Ms. Foung, you previously testified that you and Mr. Landon were reimbursed for your two separate February 1996 contributions to the DNC in the amount of $12,500 each for a total of $25,000. And I believe those checks have already been shown. Were you, Ms. Foung, aware of before being informed by this committee that Antonio Pan was the source of that $25,000?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. BARR. And Mr. Landon?

Mr. LANDON. No.

Mr. BARR. OK. And are both of you under the impression that it was your brother's money, Ms. Trie——

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. Ms. Foung?

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Mr. BARR. OK. As has been discussed previously before today, the committee has learned through the bank records of February 22, 1996, Antonio Pan, a former Lippo associate and close executive to John Huang and your brother, Mr. Trie, opened a savings account at Amerasia Bank in Flushing, NY, with an initial deposit of $25,200 cash. If we could see document 78 please?

Within minutes of that initial deposit, Mr. Pan withdrew $25,000 from the savings account and purchased from Amerasia Bank five sequentially numbered $5,000 cashier's checks totaling $25,000. Three of the cashier's checks totaling $15,000 were made payable to you, Ms. Foung, and two totaling $10,000 were made payable to you, Mr. Landon.

If we can see briefly documents 70 to 72 and 75 and 76. And let me add this question to both of you, please. Would it surprise you if you discovered that the money sent to you was, in fact, your brother's and that Antonio Pan was merely assisting your brother in sending the money?

[Exhibits 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, and 78 follow:]

(7) 1 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
41-06 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

18100

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK $5,000.00 DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

⑈018100⑈ [redacted] ⑈0000500000⑈

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

EXHIBIT
70

(7) 2 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
41-08 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

181

FEB. 22 19 96

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG***

$5,000.00***

$5,000.00

DOLLAR

MEMO

PAID

⑈018101⑈ [redacted] ⑈0000500000C

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AIR
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
[redacted]

[redacted]

EXHIBIT
71

(7) 3 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
61-08 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

1810

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***MANLIN FOUNG*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA $5,000.00 DOLLAR

MEMO

PAID

"018102" [redacted] "0000500000

[redacted]

FB '96 26

[redacted]

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
[redacted]

EXHIBIT
72

(7) 4 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
41-06 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

1610

FEB. 22 1996

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON***

$ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK 5,000 00

DOLLARS

MEMO 699 / 7075 / 90

PAID

⑆018103⑈ [redacted] ⑈0000500000

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
[redacted]

Joe Landon

EXHIBIT
75

(7) 5 OF 5

Cashier's Check

AMERASIA BANK
紐約第一銀行
41-06 MAIN STREET FLUSHING, NY 11355
(718) 463-3600

1810.

NTC Landon
7075 | 50

FEB. 22 1996

1-1148-26

PAY TO THE ORDER OF ***JOE LANDON*** $ 5,000.00***

AMERASIA BANK $5,000.00

DOLLARS

MEMO

PAID

"018104" [redacted] "0000500000"

FOR DEPOSIT ONLY
TRAVIS AFB
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

Joe Landon

121000374

EXHIBIT
76

YUAN PEI PAN (ANTONIO)
2912 NO. 200 CONNAUGHT ROAD
CENTRAL HONG KONG, HK
Hong Kong

Statement Date
MAR 31, 1996
Account Number
[redacted] 01 01 Y:

****

Statement Summary

Last Stmt Date	Beginning Balance	Deposits	Withdrawals	Ending Balance
2/22/96	.00	25,200.54	25,000.00	200.5

Number of Days in Statement Period- 39 Interest Earned- .5
Average Daily Balance- 200.00 Annual Percentage Yield Earned- 2.5

****

Statement Activity

Post Date	Eff Date	Description	Activity	Balanc:
2/22/96		Beginning Balance		.0:
2/22/96	2/22/96	Deposit	25,200.00	25,200.0:
2/22/96	2/22/96	Withdrawal	25,000.00-	200.0:
3/29/96	3/31/96	Interest Posting	.54	200.5:
3/31/96		Ending Balance		200.5:
		Interest Year to Date		.5:
		Last Year Interest		.0(

0:130:

EXHIBIT
78

Mr. LANDON. It would be a surprise to me.

Mr. BARR. Would that surprise you, Ms. Foung?

Ms. FOUNG. Are you talking about back then or now?

Mr. BARR. You have to testify truthfully. So it doesn't matter. Would that surprise you now?

Ms. FOUNG. Back then, his name is not there, so, no, I—it didn't surprise me. But now, yes. Maybe they do business together or something, I don't know.

Mr. BARR. OK. It's interesting to note that except for the $25,200 deposit and the $25,000 withdrawal, from this particular savings account established by Mr. Pan on February 22, 1996, no other activity whatsoever has ever occurred in that account, except for the minimal payment of interest on the $200 that he left remaining in the account, as we can see from documents 115, and 119.

No other deposits or withdrawals were ever made after the establishment of the account and purchase of the $25,000 in cashier's checks that were sent to you, Ms. Foung and Mr. Landon. Just so the American people and you will know, Antonio Pan's business card indicates that he is the executive director of your brother's company, America-Asia Trade Center Inc., as can be seen from document No. 60.

Another one of Mr. Pan's business cards indicates that he is the chief executive officer of Daihatsu International Trading, Inc., another company established and owned by your brother, Ms. Foung, Mr. Trie, as shown in document 61.

Antonio Pan is relevant to Mr. Wang's testimony that we'll hear later today, as well as the testimony by the two of you. According to Mr. Wang, Mr. Pan accompanied then DNC executive, John Huang, to Mr. Wang's car dealership in California where John Huang solicited a $5,000 contribution for the DNC from Mr. Wang and a $5,000 contribution from Mr. Wang's friend David Wu.

Later that same day, and again a few days later, Antonio Pan delivered envelopes of cash totaling $10,000 to reimburse both Mr. Wang and Mr. Wu for their contributions. Evidently, your brother was a friend of John Huang, as well. He served as a fund-raiser for the DNC and in doing so worked with John Huang. In fact, your brother wrote a check for $1,775 to John Huang from his America-Asia Trade Center checking account held at Riggs Bank. Document 53. The committee continues to investigate this check.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that Antonio Pan visited the White House on at least eight occasions between August 1995 and October 1996, including one occasion with Mr. Charlie Trie. Document 67.

Mr. Chairman, with today's hearings, we see the introduction of another key player in this campaign finance scandal, ex-Lippo executive, Antonio Pan. What is particularly interesting is the two friends of the Riadys, both ex-Lippo executives, Antonio Pan and John Huang, appear to be working in concert with the President's long-time friend, Mr. Charlie Trie.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

[Exhibits 115, 119, 60, 61, 53, and 67 follow:]

(3) 2 OF 6 PAGE

YUAN PEI PAN (ANTONIO)
[redacted]
CENTRAL HONG KONG, HK
Hong Kong

Statement Date
JUN 30, 1996
Account Number
[redacted] 01 01 Y

****

Statement Summary

Last Stmt Date	Beginning Balance	Deposits	Withdrawals	Ending Balanc
3/31/96	200.54	1.27	.00	201.8

Number of Days in Statement Period- 91 Interest Earned- 1.2
Average Daily Balance- 201.00 Annual Percentage Yield Earned- 2.5

****

Statement Activity

Post Date	Eff Date	Description	Activity	Balanc
3/31/96		Beginning Balance		200.5
6/28/96	6/30/96	Interest Posting	1.27	201.8
6/30/96		Ending Balance		201.8
		Interest Year to Date		1.8

01730

EXHIBIT
115

(3) 6 OF 6 PAGE

YUAN PEI PAN (ANTONIO)
[redacted]
CENTRAL HONG KONG, HK
Hong Kong

Statement Date
JUN 30, 1997
Account Number
[redacted]01 01 Y

****

Statement Summary

Last Stmt Date	Beginning Balance	Deposits	Withdrawals	Ending Balance
3/31/97	205.68	1.30	.00	206.9

Number of Days in Statement Period- 91 Interest Earned- 1.3
Average Daily Balance- 206.00 Annual Percentage Yield Earned- 2.5

****

Statement Activity

Post Date	Eff Date	Description	Activity	Balanc
3/31/97		Beginning Balance		205.6
6/30/97	6/30/97	Interest Posting	1.30	206.9
6/30/97		Ending Balance		206.9
		Interest Year to Date		2.5

No Activity



柏

FREDERICK BURKE

AMERICAN ATTORNEY AT LAW
LUAT SUMY

克

14TH FLOOR HUTCHISON HOUSE
10 HARCOURT ROAD
HONG KONG
TELEPHONE (852) 2845 1888
DIRECT LINE (852) 2845 1909
FACSIMILE (852) 2845 2478

58 DONG KHOI STREET, 4TH FLOOR
DISTRICT 1, HO CHI MINH CITY
VIETNAM
TELEPHONE (848) 8295585
(848) 8295602
FACSIMILE (848) 8295618
E-mail Address: fred_burke@ahernet.com

CITIC Pacific Ltd

Henry H L Fan
Managing Director

Level 35, Two Pacific Place, 88 Queensway, Hong Kong
Tel: 2820 2111 Fax: 2877 2771 Telex: 80516 CITIC HX

Terence K Cuddyre
Senior Vice President &
Country Manager

1/F, Bank of America Tower
12 Harcourt Road
Central, Hong Kong
Tel : (852) 2847 5868
Fax : (852) 2847 5232
Telex : 802-73373 BKOAM HX

Bank of America

HongkongBank

Vincent H C Cheng OBE JP
Executive Director

The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Limited
Level 34, 1 Queen's Road Central, Hong Kong
Telephone: 2822 1249
Telex: 73201 HSBC HX
Facsimile: 2596 0646
Member HSBC *Group*

LAW OFFICES OF
ROY IAN DELBYCK

U.S. AFFILIATE:
RODE & QUALEY

ROY IAN DELBYCK
MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA BAR

SUITE 308 OCEAN CENTRE, HARBOUR CITY
5 CANTON ROAD, TSIM SHA TSUI,
KOWLOON, HONG KONG
TEL: (852) 2810-5488 (DIRECT)
(852) 2810-6777
FAX: (852) 2810-2888

Antonio Pan
Executive Director

潘

AMERICA-ASIA TRADE CENTER I
美亞貿易中心有限公

700 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Suite 121
Washington, DC 20037 U.S.A.
Tel: (202) 965-9899
Fax: (202) 965-9809

200 Connaught Rd., 5
Central, H
Tel: (852) 2
Fax: (852) 2

Timothy C. Chang
Director of the Board

PEREGRI

Peregrine Capital Limited
23/F, New World Tower, 16-18 Queen's Road Central, Hong
Telephone (852) 2825 1777 Direct Line (852) 2825 1735
Facsimile (852) 2845 5366 Telex 69251 PEREX HX
E-Mail timoth@asia.com

Hong Kong Trade Development Council

Mrs. Anna Lai
Deputy Executive Director

38th Floor, Office Tower
Convention Plaza, 1 Harbour Road
Wanchai, Hong Kong
Tel: 2584-4333
Direct Line: 2584-4230
Fax: 2824-0249
Email: annalai@tdc.org.hk
Web Site: http://www.tdc.org.hk

AUSTRALIA OFFICE
5th Floor, 575 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000, Australia
Tel: (613) 9629 7566
Fax: (613) 9629 7159

HONG KONG OFFICE:
Room 704-705, 7th Floor, Sheraton House,
20 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong
Tel: (852) 2877 6828
Fax: (852) 2526 0451

SINGAPORE REP OFFICE:
16 Collyer Quay #29-02 Hitachi Tower Singapore 049318
Tel: (65) 538 2500 Fax: (65) 538 1048

MALAYSIA REP OFFICE:
Level 9/F, 9th Floor, [illegible] 207 Jalan Tun Razak,
50400 Kuala Lumpur, West Malaysia
Tel: (603) 264 4740 Fax: (603) 264 4748

SWITZERLAND OFFICE:
Zweierstrasse 18 CH-8004 Zurich
Switzerland
Tel: (411) 290 [illegible]
Fax: (411) 241 [illegible]

Rue Neuve-De-Molard 7
1204 Geneve, Switzerland

EXHIBIT
60

CHIANG

EXHIBIT 61

DAIHATSU

INTERNATIONAL TRADING, INC.

ANTONIO PAN
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CORPORATE OFFICE
2224 Cottondale Lane, Suite 102, Little Rock, AR 72202

AMERICAN ASIA TR[illegible] CENTER, INC.

1006

DATE June 14

PAY TO THE ORDER OF Cash

EIGHT THOUSAND xx/00

RIGGS

FOR

⑈001006⑈ [redacted] [redacted]

AMERICAN ASIA TRADE CENTER, INC.

1008

DATE June 26, 96

PAY TO THE ORDER OF John [illegible]

RIGGS

FOR

⑈001008⑈ [redacted] [redacted]

AMERICAN ASIA TRADE CENTER, INC.

700 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE. NW. #121
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

DATE June 7, 96

PAY TO THE ORDER OF Daihatsu International Trading, Inc.

Four Thousand & 00/00

RIGGS

⑈001010⑈ [redacted] [redacted]

EXHIBIT

53

E-Pass Records of Antonio Pan



Entry/Exit Dates: 01/01/95 to 12/31/95

Epass Entry/Exit Report

04/02/97

Date	Time	Name	Badge	Type	Post	Status
`/28/95	19:40:19	PAN, ANTONIO	34DA6F	A	A1	ENTERING
./28/95	19:40:19	PAN, ANTONIO	34DA6F	A	A1	MULT ENT ATMPT

002150

Entry/Exit Dates: 01/01/96 to 12/31/96

Epass Entry/Exit Report

04/02/97

Date	Time	Name	Badge	Type	Post	Status
/23/96	09:58:46	PAN, ANTONIO	34C3D9	A	D2	ENTERING
./20/96	17:17:54	PAN, ANTONIO	34A98E	A	D2	EXITING
05/22/96	17:19:41	PAN, ANTONIO	34D989	A	D2	ENTERING
05/22/96	17:35:49	PAN, ANTONIO	34D989	A	D2	EXITING
09/06/96	10:58:59	PAN, ANTONIO	34DB11	A	D2	ENTERING
09/06/96	11:25:51	PAN, ANTONIO	34DB11	A	D2	EXITING
09/30/96	13:09:26	PAN, ANTONIO	34F126	A	D2	ENTERING
09/30/96	14:33:39	PAN, ANTONIO	34F126	A	D2	EXITING
09/30/96	19:45:46	PAN, ANTONIO	34E3EC	A	D2	ENTERING
09/30/96	20:34:38	PAN, ANTONIO	34E3EC	A	D2	EXITING
10/02/96	12:10:46	PAN, ANTONIO	34E310	A	D2	ENTERING
10/02/96	12:36:01	PAN, ANTONIO	34E310	A	D2	EXITING

002151

All Entry Exits for 05/01/96 - 05/31/96; L_NAME - PAN; F_NAME - ANTONIO;
BETWEEN 12:00:00AM AND 11:59:59PM - Page 1

DATE	TIME.....	L NAME.....	F NAME....	M	BADGE.	TYP	POS	L	STATUS.....
22	05:35:49PM	PAN	ANTONIO		34D9B9	A	D2	3	EXITING
22	05:19:41PM	PAN	ANTONIO		34D9B9	A	D2	2	ENTERING
20	05:17:54PM	PAN	ANTONIO		34A98E	A	D2	3	EXITING

All Entry Exits for 10/01/96 - 10/31/96; L_NAME - PAN; F_NAME - ANTONIO;
BETWEEN 12:00:00AM AND 11:59:59PM - Page 1

DATE	TIME.....	L NAME.....	F NAME....	M	BADGE.	TYP	POS	L	STATUS.....
02	12:36:01PM	PAN	ANTONIO		34E310	A	D2	3	EXITING
02	12:10:46PM	PAN	ANTONIO		34E310	A	D2	2	ENTERING

004685

All Entry Exits for 04/01/96 - 04/30/96; L_NAME - PAN; F_NAME - ANTONIO;
BETWEEN 12:00:00AM AND 11:59:59PM - Page 1

DATE	TIME.....	L NAME.....	F NAME....	M	BADGE.	TYP	POS	L	STATUS.....
23	09:58:46AM	PAN	ANTONIO		34C3D9	A	D2	2	ENTERING

All Entry Exits for 08/01/95 - 08/31/95; L_NAME - PAN; F_NAME - ANTONIO;
BETWEEN 12:00:00AM AND 11:59:59PM - Page 1

DATE	TIME.....	L NAME.....	F NAME....	M	BADGE.	TYP	POS	L	STATUS.....
28	07:40:19PM	PAN	ANTONIO		34DA6F	A	A1	1	MULT ENT ATMPT
28	07:40:19PM	PAN	ANTONIO		34DA6F	A	A1	1	ENTERING

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. Does anyone on the minority side seek time? If not, anybody on the majority side seek time? Mr. Shadegg, or excuse me, Mr. Mica. You're recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, I know it appears that both of you innocently participated in this activity, at least that's what you've testified to today; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. MICA. And I know you've been inconvenienced, both of you. You said 4 days or 5 days and other disturbances to you personally. That's correct?

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. LANDON. Yeah.

Mr. MICA. Did anyone tell you what the penalty would be if you did not cooperate, if you did not have immunity, and you, you had a problem facing you, a legal problem facing you?

Ms. FOUNG. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

Mr. MICA. Did anyone tell you the severity—I mean, you are clearly, it appears, innocent participants in this. But you were granted immunity both to come before this committee, and I understand that you have immunity, I guess, with the Department of Justice.

Mr. LANDON. Correct.

Mr. SOLLERS. Correct.

Mr. MICA. OK. But did anyone explain to you that there might be some penalty for what you did or your participation?

Ms. FOUNG. I was told by your investigator over and over I didn't do anything wrong.

Mr. MICA. No. But again, you were granted immunity.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. MICA. From possible prosecution. I mean, if you did nothing wrong, there would be no reason to really get immunity from the Department of Justice. They've basically provided you cover, and this committee has, to come before us, tell us the truth, and you will not be prosecuted. But what you did, it's been explained to you, is basically served as a conduit. And your action has been illegal. It is illegal. Do you understand this, Mr. Landon?

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Mr. MICA. What you did was not right.

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. So you could have been inconvenienced a great deal more, I—if.

Mr. LANDON. That is correct.

Mr. MICA. If the Department of Justice wanted to——

Mr. LANDON. Without the immunity, that is correct.

Mr. MICA. That's my understanding. Now, I heard about the money coming back. Now, you have $5,000 in an account or $1,000?

Mr. LANDON. $12,500 in an account.

Mr. MICA. You have $12,500. Do you have any money in an account? Did you get any money back?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. MICA. And you called DNC and asked for your money back?

Ms. FOUNG. Well I better make this clear. My brother's money.

Mr. MICA. OK. Well, but did you get the money back?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. MICA. You never got anything.

Ms. FOUNG. Not yet.

Mr. MICA. And how did you get your money back? Did you place a call, too?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir, I didn't. It was sent to me in, I believe, it was June of this year.

Mr. MICA. Now, the only way you can get in trouble, I guess, is if you don't tell the truth or you change your story. When you talked to your brother, he didn't say anything about not cooperating with anyone, did he?

Ms. FOUNG. No. He emphasized over and over that he will not discuss anything with me, because I'm a potential witness. He don't want to influence me.

Mr. MICA. But he said to—did he say to cooperate with us?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't believe we discussed that.

Mr. MICA. But did he say anything about you being able to get your money back? Is that what prompted you calling DNC, to get the money back?

Ms. FOUNG. No, he didn't indicate one way or the other.

Mr. MICA. How did you find out about the ability—how did you find out you could get the refund?

Ms. FOUNG. That was in the paper, isn't it, that they were refunding anything relating to my brother.

Mr. MICA. Did you just call DNC and——

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. Do you remember who you talked with?

Ms. FOUNG. Joe Sandler. That was the counsel for DNC.

Mr. MICA. They put you in touch with DNC counsel?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, he put me in touch with DNC counsel. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. I guess you—you two must have a pretty close relationship, because she asked you to participate in this, right?

Mr. LANDON. Correct.

Mr. MICA. And did you have any clue of what you were doing might be—I mean——

Mr. LANDON. At the time, no, sir.

Mr. MICA. But I've got good friends and I've never had anybody ask me to write a check for $12,000——

Mr. LANDON. She asked me to write the check. My only concern when I did her this favor was make sure I got my money back, to cover the check.

Mr. MICA. Did you ask her any questions about it?

Mr. LANDON. She——

Mr. MICA. You testified earlier——

Mr. LANDON. She mentioned something, it was something for the Democrats.

Mr. MICA. It was something for the Democrats.

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Mr. MICA. But again, it was your close relationship, she told you it was something for the Democrats so you wrote a check for that amount?

Mr. LANDON. Correct.

Mr. MICA. And didn't question the source?

Mr. LANDON. Well, my initial was I didn't know what the DNC was until she mentioned that it had something to do with the Democrats.

Mr. MICA. Wait, she testified earlier that she didn't—she didn't even know what the DNC stood for.

Mr. LANDON. I'm pretty sure.

Mr. MICA. I thought I heard her say that.

Mr. LANDON. Something to do with the Democrats.

Mr. MICA. And she told you that. I'm afraid my time is expired, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Souder.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Foung, I wanted to followup briefly on a question that Mr. Shays had asked. When he asked you whether you were going to request your $1,000 back that was sent to Senator Daschle, you said you weren't; is that correct? There is $1,000 that was sent to Senator Daschle from you. You said you weren't going to request that $1,000 back.

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SOUDER. That pretty strongly suggests that you earlier answered that you didn't recollect and that the reason you didn't want to say that you flat out didn't know about the contribution is you didn't want to discover later that, in fact, you did know; is that not true? In other words, when he asked you did you know about the $1,000 that was sent to Senator Daschle, you said to the best of your recollection, you don't remember.

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you write a lot of $1,000 checks?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes. My house payment is over $1,000 every month.

Mr. SOUDER. But that's—do you write a lot of $1,000 checks that aren't repetitive?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SOUDER. In other words, my house payment check is over a $1,000, too, and occasionally you have a major thing. But a $1,000 check pretty likely you would remember it; isn't that true?

Ms. FOUNG. Exactly.

Mr. SOUDER. So most likely, even though you said to the best of your recollection, especially since that you aren't asking for rebuttal, it means you almost are 100 percent certain that you didn't write that check. It would just be a fluke of memory that if somebody came back to you, because you really don't remember that check.

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. SOUDER. And so most likely it was sent by somebody else on your behalf using your name, and that's why you aren't asking for the refund.

Ms. FOUNG. I'm sorry. I didn't understand that part.

Mr. SOUDER. Most likely that check was sent by someone else using your name, and that's why you don't—aren't asking for a refund, and that's why you don't remember.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. Your brother.

Mr. COX. I'm sorry, would you yield for just a moment?

Mr. SOUDER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. COX. For the record, my understanding of the witness testimony to Mr. Shays was there was two, $1,000 checks to Mr. Daschle written on the same day in the witness' name. And I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. I understand that you earlier said that you felt your brother's influence was overestimated. Had he spoken to you or others in the past about any of his opinions on China policy?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SOUDER. You've never had a discussion about those issues anywhere in family discussions over the years? Do you know if he has been active in any other organizations?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SOUDER. To your knowledge, not only about American politics, but do you have any information about how he felt about China?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. SOUDER. The——

Ms. FOUNG. Let me correct that. We grew up in Taiwan. We were brought up to believe Red China is a different country, is our enemy. But as I grow up, it's not as important to me anymore. They're old China.

Mr. SOUDER. Does it surprise you that your brother would have first raised, which has been reported, fairly extensively $460,000 in checks for the Presidential campaign and then followed that with a letter to the President urging restraint in how they handled the—when Mainland China threatened, at least—at least blustered a threat at Taiwan, and that he would have been interested in trying to influence that policy in the United States?

Ms. FOUNG. For the best interest of the United States, the experience that we learned from China—learned from Vietnam war and Korean war, wouldn't that be the best interest of the United States to not get involved with the war or something like that? And he is citizen of the United States. He and me both love this country very much. I'm sure his way of thinking is maybe most of the Americans' here thinking too. So how come when he say something like that, it's influencing policy. If it's American people so nice to me say the same thing, it's not influencing policy. So are we being separated from—just because we're Asian-American?

Mr. SOUDER. He absolutely has a right to speak. And all Americans have the right to speak. But when you bring checks in for $460,000, at the time you're influencing policy, and you raise that money from overseas sources, it's a little bit different. That's what we're trying to get to.

Ms. FOUNG. Right. I understand.

Mr. SOUDER. It's not about Asian-Americans. In fact, I want to say this for the record. I think Asian-Americans have been used by this administration. We don't see other continents and people from other types of nations being drug through this like this. Asian-Americans like you were used to launder money. And it's a discredit to this administration the way they've abused the Asian-Americans. And with that, I yield back.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. Mr. Shadegg.

Mr. SHADEGG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to begin by establishing that, first of all, when you wrote this check, you wrote two checks, one for $12,500, and later, one for $10,000; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. And as I understood your earlier testimony, when you wrote the $12,500 check, you did not have $12,500 in your account; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. And I guess you weren't clear as to when you wrote the $10,000 check as to if you had money in your account at that time. You might or might not have.

Ms. FOUNG. I might or might not have.

Mr. SHADEGG. OK. Not sure. Mr. Landon, when you wrote the $12,500 check, as I understand it, you did not have $12,500 in your account.

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. I want to ask another question of you, ma'am. As I understand it, you did not get paid any money for doing this. Your brother did not offer you any money for doing this, did he?

Ms. FOUNG. No, my brother does give me money periodically, you know, being gifts or being just help me out and things like that.

Mr. SHADEGG. So he does make gifts to you or sometimes gives you money.

Ms. FOUNG. To my kids or, yes. He's a very generous person.

Mr. SHADEGG. How much has he given you over time?

Ms. FOUNG. Thousand, a few hundred, and—I didn't keep track of it. Or if I need, I ask him to give the amount he can afford.

Mr. SHADEGG. When he asked you to write this $12,500 check to an entity you didn't know the name of, did you have and—and didn't know what it was, did you have a belief or understanding that if he did that, he might later make a gift to you or to your children?

Ms. FOUNG. I didn't expect anything.

Mr. SHADEGG. You didn't expect anything.

Ms. FOUNG. Huh-uh.

Mr. SHADEGG. You were doing this because you care about your brother and he's family and this was a favor to him.

Ms. FOUNG. It was something small. I have no financial loss. Why not? If I knew it was wrong, I'm sure I wouldn't do it. He wouldn't ask me. That's the extent of what I believe in.

Mr. SHADEGG. I know you're here under a grant of immunity and you've been protected and I don't—and I appreciate you coming forward, as our colleagues on the other side have expressed.

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. SHADEGG. I have to tell you that I'm a little concerned that you're caught up in a web of serious conduct here, which I think goes to the integrity of this Government. If we corrupt the political process in this country, people won't have faith in the Government, and I think it has serious consequences.

You say it wasn't anything wrong, it was a little thing. For most of us—you described yourself as a blue collar worker. For most of

us, writing a $12,500 check, later writing a $10,000 check, is not a little thing. It would not be a little thing particularly to a group we had never heard of. So I am having some trouble.

I believe you. I believe the speech you made earlier about you are an honest person, but there are other people out there in America who may get used, next year or today, like it appears you got used; and quite frankly, what is evident here, whether you like it or not, is that your brother corrupted the American political process. And that does serious damage.

And when you say, well, there was nothing wrong, it was a little thing, I guess I have to ask you, did it occur to you that it might not be a good idea to write a check for $12,500 to an organization you didn't know what it was when you didn't have $12,500 in your bank?

Ms. FOUNG. I guess there would be several answers to your question. It's a long question. When I said—I said at the time when I did it, it was a small thing to me because there is no financial impact to me. I didn't know it was wrong. I thought I was simply putting a check in for him because of time, and what was I—and I think I repeated over and over, if I knew it was wrong, it wouldn't have happened. I wouldn't be sitting here.

Mr. SHADEGG. Let me go to that, because my time is beginning to run out here.

Most of us know that it is not right to write a check out of our account for an amount we don't have in the account. And so most of us would have been very concerned about—that's called kiting checks. It is improper.

I am a little stunned that you would sit here and say, well, I wrote a check for $12,500 knowing I didn't have it in my account. I am a little worried about that. And if other people across America are going to get asked to do it, I hope that, as a result of this hearing, they will ask themselves, even if it is their brother, gee, I don't think I ought to write a check for $200 that isn't in my account, much less $12,500 that isn't in my account. Why don't you just write the check?

And I think it should have been a clue to you, and I hope is a clue to future Americans, that if somebody asks them to write a check, they are really making a statement that I think is fundamentally dishonest. When I send a check to somebody, I am claiming that's my check; and to do that to the tune of $12,500, when I don't have that in my bank, I ought to be asking a few questions.

You know, what is this organization? You would have us believe, for example, that you didn't really care whether this group was nuclear terrorists. Your brother asked you and you did it, even though the check itself was a crime; and I just am concerned about that, and I hope other Americans will understand that there are consequences to their conduct, and that money laundering in this country, whether it is for political purposes or otherwise, is dangerous.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired. Does anyone on the minority have any desire for time?

If not, who seeks time on the majority side?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Does Mr. McHugh? Mr. Pappas.

Mr. PAPPAS. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Pappas.

Mr. PAPPAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I would like to get back to something we spoke about earlier.

At the time, Mr. Landon, you received the request by Ms. Foung to make this, I guess it was a $12,500 check, you said that she asked you to make a check out for, I guess it was the DNC, and you obliged.

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAPPAS. Did you ask—would you tell me again what—did you ask her any questions? Did you ask her to elaborate?

Mr. LANDON. Well, when I first got the—saw the DNC, I didn't know what it was. And she says it was coming from something overseas—someone overseas was requesting it, and it was to be sent to Washington, DC.

Mr. PAPPAS. And did you know—I guess you assumed that you would be reimbursed?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAPPAS. And did you know within what timeframe you would be reimbursed?

Mr. LANDON. I believe she told me it was a couple of days.

Mr. PAPPAS. OK. And were you made aware that her brother was in any way involved in this, at the time?

Mr. LANDON. At the time, I am not sure she specifically said her brother. I think I might have assumed it was her brother because that was the only one she had ever mentioned overseas.

Mr. PAPPAS. OK.

Ms. Foung, I guess the same question for you—and these may have been questions you probably have been asked many times: It was your brother who was the one that made the request that you write this initial $12,500 check?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. PAPPAS. And at the same time, did he ask that you have Mr. Landon do the same?

Ms. FOUNG. I have to say yes, because otherwise I have no other reason.

Mr. PAPPAS. OK. And did you ask him why?

Ms. FOUNG. I might have.

Mr. PAPPAS. OK. Do you remember if he had told you, or did he—in response to a question that you asked him, did he tell you why?

Ms. FOUNG. He might have told me something that I—it just didn't mean anything to me. I didn't understand the whole thing.

Mr. PAPPAS. And do you remember if your brother specifically gave a reason, even if you did not ask him a question, why he was asking you to do this?

Ms. FOUNG. I honestly didn't pay attention. I really didn't at the time. I didn't pay attention.

Mr. PAPPAS. And assuming—I think that's what you said earlier, that you did not believe, or you weren't sure whether you had that amount to cover that check, did you know within what timeframe you would receive a reimbursement?

Ms. FOUNG. My brother has never cheated me with money, and if I write a check that has—it bounces, it doesn't do him any good, it doesn't do me any good.

Mr. PAPPAS. So you assumed, based upon your experience with your brother previously, that that would be something that would be resolved quickly?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. PAPPAS. OK. Did you wonder when the money appeared—evidently it was wired into your account. Did you wonder where it came from?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. PAPPAS. Can you tell me why you didn't wonder?

Ms. FOUNG. Why should I wonder? My concern is that the check was covered.

Mr. PAPPAS. So at the time you were not specifically concerned where that money may have been wired from or from whom?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. PAPPAS. OK. And shifting gears a bit, you mentioned that you were aware that your brother had a relationship with the President in some way.

Ms. FOUNG. I didn't say "relationship." Just what——

Mr. PAPPAS. Friendship, acquaintanceship, whatever. I am not trying to put words in your mouth, but some sort of contact.

Ms. FOUNG. I know my brother knew Mr. Clinton ever since—back in Little Rock.

Mr. PAPPAS. Right. And are you aware of whether your brother had any acquaintanceship or friendship or working relationship with any other public figure or—any political or public figure?

Ms. FOUNG. Not at all.

Mr. PAPPAS. OK. I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. Does anyone else seek time?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Cox.

Or Mr. McHugh, did you seek time?

Mr. MCHUGH. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Let me go to Mr. McHugh first, and then I will could come back to you.

Mr. MCHUGH. I was—under what I assume is the protocol of this committee, I was going to yield to Mr. Cox.

Mr. COX. I think, as it happens, we have reached the end of the first round, so it would be the same result in either case.

Mr. BURTON. OK. Who seeks time? Mr. Cox.

Mr. COX. I will seek time. Thank you.

Ms. Foung, you said earlier that you contacted the Democratic National Committee because you wanted your money back. And what did you propose to do with the money if they gave it back to you?

Ms. FOUNG. That would be up to my brother to decide.

Mr. COX. And how would you work that out with your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't know. I never had a problem with getting in touch with him in the past.

Mr. COX. It is pretty easy to get in touch with him?

Ms. FOUNG. I wouldn't say "easy." If there was some emergency, I must talk to him, I usually just ask my family member if my brother calls, have him give me a call.

Mr. COX. Like the time you asked your mother——

Ms. FOUNG. Right.

Mr. COX [continuing]. "Have him call me," and he called you right back?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. COX. So you get in touch with him, you discuss with him, "I got the money back from the DNC; what do you want me to do with it?"

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. COX. And since you have said it is not your money, would you probably want to give it back to him?

Ms. FOUNG. It is up to him to decide.

Mr. COX. Maybe he will make a gift of it to you, maybe not?

Ms. FOUNG. It is up to him.

Mr. COX. I am just trying to—what are the options? It is up to him. His choice is, let you keep it, have you send it to him; any other options that you can think of?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't know. I haven't thought about it.

Mr. COX. OK. So those are pretty much the main options then, either you keep it or you send it back to him.

If you send it back him, how might you do that?

Ms. FOUNG. I am sorry?

Mr. COX. If he said, I want the money back, how would you send it to him?

Ms. FOUNG. I don't know. I am sure he will let me know how.

Mr. COX. Give you some specific instructions on how to wire it or something?

Ms. FOUNG. Probably, yes.

Mr. COX. OK. Now, since apparently you can get in touch with your brother like this, will you undertake to help this committee get in touch with your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, I did. I tried to get in touch with him is because of doing something for this committee.

Mr. COX. On a continuing basis, in the future, will you help us to get in touch with him?

Ms. FOUNG. That, I don't know.

Mr. COX. You don't know whether you will help? Will you try to help?

Ms. FOUNG. I have very bad experience with this whole thing, so I really—it is to be determined.

Mr. COX. Well, we have had a bad experience, as well. We are trying to locate a man who has fled to the People's Republic of China for the purpose of avoiding the process of this committee.

And it is not just the House of Representatives, it is not just this committee; it is also the U.S. Senate and the Department of Justice, and the FBI. So you would be helping your Government if you would—because we have given you immunity from prosecution by your Government, if you would assist us in locating the man who is the reason you are here today, who unwittingly used you to launder money.

So do you think you might be willing to help us?

Ms. FOUNG. I have done everything I could so far.

Mr. COX. I am sorry?

Ms. FOUNG. I have done everything I could to be cooperative as I could.

Mr. COX. And as you can tell from the comments of the committee, we are appreciative. But what we are particularly interested in—and this is a matter between our two governments right now, between the United States Government and the Government of the People's Republic of China—is getting your brother to return to the United States. And we need to get in touch with him for that purpose.

We have been unable to get in touch with him. Do you think you could put us in touch with your brother?

Ms. FOUNG. Like I said, I tried already. I already told him exactly what your investigator told me, that he is not what you guys are really looking for and they wanted to talk to him anywhere, like anywhere outside the country, outside the United States; and I repeat that to him.

And he said—I remember he said something about, yes, I tried—we tried over and over, wanted to talk to him, but it hasn't been successful. So I don't know what the true story is.

Mr. COX. Well, I do hope that you will. Because this committee and this Government has been very generous to you in being sure that you will not be prosecuted in return for your cooperation, I hope you will, in fact, provide cooperation with us on this very important matter.

In March 1996, you attended this event with the President and talked to the President there, as we have covered here. And you also at that event talked to John Huang; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. COX. And you talked to John Huang on the telephone before that event; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. COX. And you talked to John Huang on the phone after that event; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. I believe so.

Mr. COX. In connection with all of this, did you learn that your brother had introduced Wang Jun, who is the head of one of the largest parts of the Chinese—the People's Republic of China's military-industrial complex, to the President, at a White House coffee just a month before?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. COX. My time has expired.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Mica.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I seek time.

Mr. BURTON. Do you seek time?

Mr. CUMMINGS. When the second round comes up.

Mr. BURTON. We will give you time right now, Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I wasn't going to ask you any questions but after all this series of questions, I just want to clear some things up for the record.

Ms. Foung, when you did this for your brother, you did not know that you were committing any kind of crime; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct. I also didn't cover anything up. Everything was very clear, what I had done.

Mr. CUMMINGS. All right. But now looking at it in retrospect, having gone through the grand jury, spoken to your lawyer, you understand that you probably did do something wrong. And I take it that if you had it to do all over again, you wouldn't do this, is that right, that is, the writing of the check? Is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. CUMMINGS. All right.

Mr. Landon, you are a Navy veteran; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. CUMMINGS. You don't have a criminal record?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Never been in any trouble with the law?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And so—and when you did this, you didn't even know what the DNC was; did you?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And so did you know that you were possibly violating the law when this took place?

Mr. LANDON. Not at the time, but I found out real quick since then.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And I take it that if you had to do this again you wouldn't do it based upon the knowledge that you have today; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's very correct.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Now, you are retired from the Navy?

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Honorable discharge?

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. You served your country?

Mr. LANDON. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Now, let me ask you this, Ms. Foung: There have been a number of questions asked with regard to your brother and your knowledge of all his political goings on. I take it that you didn't have a lot of knowledge about what he did politically; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. CUMMINGS. So did you—so you didn't have regular discussions about what his involvement was with the Democratic party or President Clinton or anything of that nature; is that right?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. CUMMINGS. All right. I don't have anything else.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time.

I think we have one more questioner, Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. Ms. Foung, I have previously referred to you as rather innocent in this process, and now I am reviewing some of the documentation that we have received at this hearing, but I find that on—in June 1995, you, in fact, gave $1,000 to—well, $2,000 on that date to this—a lot of people supporting Tom Daschle; is that correct?

I will put up exhibit 110.

[Exhibit 110 follows:]

"A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle"

Manlin Foung (Sister of Yah Lin "Charlie" Trie)
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "Primary"
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "General"

Dailin Outlaw (Sister of Yah Lin "Charlie" Trie)
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "Primary"
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "General"

Jim Outlaw (Brother-in-law of Yah Lin "Charlie" Trie)
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "Primary"
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "General"

E-Fong Do Trie (Mother of Yah Lin "Charlie" Trie)
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "Primary"
6/26/95 $1,000 to A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle "General"

EXHIBIT
110

Ms. FOUNG. This one is the first time I have seen it.

Mr. MICA. So back in 1995, June 1995, you were giving $2,000 in this—into a campaign. You got that money from your brother, too?

Mr. SOLLERS. Congressman, she has already testified that she did not recall giving that money. It has already been made clear on the record.

Mr. MICA. Now, this Dai Lin Outlaw; that's your sister?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. And your brother-in-law is Jim Outlaw. Did you talk to them? They both gave the money on the same day. Did you ever talk to your brother—your sister or brother-in-law about giving money back in 1995?

Ms. FOUNG. No, never talked about it at all.

Mr. MICA. Have you ever talked to your brother or sister-in-law?

Ms. FOUNG. My sister and brother-in-law.

Mr. MICA. Your sister and brother-in-law, you have never talked to them about it?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. MICA. What about—your mother gave $2,000 on the same day?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. MICA. And you have never discussed with your mother the giving of any contribution?

So according to the records we have, the whole family gave on that day, just coincidentally.

Then on—the next experience is February 1996, we have the $12,500, which you, Mr. Landon, you sent $12,500 in February the 19th and you sent $12,500 the 19th of February; both the same date; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. I believe that date is correct.

Mr. MICA. Is that correct, Ms. Foung; $12,500 was your first——

Ms. FOUNG. I don't remember.

Mr. MICA. This was your second experience? This is a year later. You didn't remember the first one.

Ms. FOUNG. I remember, according to the record, it was the day after.

Mr. MICA. So we go back to June 1995, and we have a record of contributions that suddenly appear under each of the family member's name; February. Then we get to August 1996, a little over a year ago, the $10,000. And you do recall that, Ms. Foung; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes.

Mr. MICA. So it is sort of a trail of doing this over and over again and you never had a question about it?

Ms. FOUNG. No. There was only two times.

Mr. MICA. Now. We all sympathize with your inconvenience, but the law—and I asked for a copy of it—here says that any person who knowingly or willfully violates—commits a violation of any provision of this act, which involves making, receiving, or reporting any contribution or expenditure aggregating $2,000 or more during a calendar year, shall be fined and imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both, and the amount of the fine shall not exceed $25,000

or 300 percent of any contribution or expenditure involved in such violation.

That could be a lot more inconvenience than 4 or 5 days; couldn't it?

Ms. FOUNG. There is a word "intentionally."

Mr. MICA. You don't have to answer, because you didn't—you didn't violate it to the degree. I mean, you only did $12,500; is that right?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. Well, OK. The other assumption is that there is nothing new here today. So you testified and you testified that no one contacted you prior to our committee contacting you; is that correct?

Ms. FOUNG. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. That's correct?

Mr. LANDON. As far as?

Mr. MICA. Anything about this matter, the FBI, the Department of Justice.

Mr. LANDON. A newspaper reporter.

Mr. MICA. Oh, a newspaper reporter got to you first?

Mr. LANDON. It was back in February of—February of this year.

Mr. MICA. Tell me which one just for the heck of it. Do you remember?

Mr. LANDON. It was a Washington paper. I don't know Post, Times or what it was.

Mr. MICA. All right. We want to give the Times full credit. They are beat up lately.

Now, the first contact that took place with you from any official body was this committee, correct? Is that correct? On this matter? The first contact with you from any official Government body was this committee; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. Well, the Department of Justice got in touch with me, too.

Mr. MICA. But no, who got to you first? Do you remember when?

Mr. LANDON. When did you guys?

Ms. FOUNG. Yes, the investigator.

Mr. MICA. When?

Mr. LANDON. Sometime in September, I believe.

Ms. FOUNG. I am sure your record will——

Mr. MICA. September of this year?

Ms. FOUNG. No. Your record should have shown the date. They came to my house.

Mr. MICA. OK. We will just say 2 or 3 months ago.

Has anyone from the Senate investigations, Senate committee, contacted you?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. MICA. Have they contacted you?

Ms. FOUNG. No.

Mr. MICA. OK. And when did the FBI or the Department of Justice contact you? Can you remember? A month ago or 2 months ago?

Ms. FOUNG. No, they didn't.

Mr. MICA. They have not contacted you?

Ms. FOUNG. No, except we know we went to the grand jury.

Mr. MICA. When you were called into the grand jury?
Ms. FOUNG. Uh-huh.
Mr. MICA. The same with you?
Mr. LANDON. Correct.
Mr. MICA. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back my time.
Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired.
And I guess we have one last questioner, Mr. Barr.
Mr. BARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Ms. Foung, who do you work for? You talked about your job but I don't recall——
Mr. BURTON. We agreed to keep the witnesses' employment confidential.
Mr. BARR. OK. What is the nature of your duties, without disclosing who you work for? What is the nature of your employment duties?
Ms. FOUNG. It is real complicated. We do mechanical maintenance work.
Mr. BARR. I am sorry, what?
Ms. FOUNG. Mechanical or maintenance or operator.
Mr. BARR. OK. Have you worked for an insurance company or companies in the past?
Ms. FOUNG. Yes.
Mr. BARR. OK. USF&G?
Ms. FOUNG. Yes.
Mr. BARR. Any others?
Ms. FOUNG. St. Paul, Aetna.
Mr. BARR. OK. Approximately how many years total were you in the insurance business?
Ms. FOUNG. Approximately 8 years.
Mr. BARR. OK. If we could have up the Birthday Victory Fund check. Is that August 15th, 1996, for $10,000, the one, Ms. Foung, that is noted at the bottom, "Federal." You testified, I think earlier today, and I believe also in your deposition, that the word "Federal" was written in the lower left-hand corner because your brother had asked you to put that there?
Ms. FOUNG. Yes.
Mr. BARR. Did he offer any explanation at all about what that meant?
Ms. FOUNG. No.
Mr. BARR. Did you ask him?
Ms. FOUNG. No.
Mr. BARR. Is your brother a fairly particular type person? In other words, if he says something, is there usually a reason for what he says?
Ms. FOUNG. Yes.
Mr. BARR. OK. So you figured—you would agree with me that there was a reason why he asked you to put "Federal" on the check there? He didn't just pull that name out of the air?
Ms. FOUNG. Yes, I agree with you.
Mr. BARR. OK. The check is made out to the Birthday Victory Fund. Whose birthday is that?
Ms. FOUNG. I believe he mentioned that something was to Mister—the President's birthday.
Mr. BARR. OK. Did you ask him about that at the time?

Ms. FOUNG. About what?

Mr. BARR. Did you say, Charlie, whose birthday am I giving this to, or something like that?

Ms. FOUNG. I probably did.

Mr. BARR. OK. Why did you ask him about that and not the rest of the information on the check? You don't know?

Ms. FOUNG. Birthday, that's interesting—that's something interesting me more than politics.

Mr. BARR. Well, I don't know that birthday means politics to most of us. But asking you to put the word "Federal," which could relate to the Federal Government, that didn't interest you?

Ms. FOUNG. Not really. I thought it was a part of a business.

Mr. BARR. What business is that?

Ms. FOUNG. His business.

Mr. BARR. Well, what business?

Ms. FOUNG. A lot of corporations or businesses have a lobbyist, contributions, things like that; is that right? I mean, that's something I don't understand. So if it is something I don't understand, I don't ask.

Mr. BARR. A lot of us don't. That is why we are trying to sort of be able to ask him directly.

Ms. FOUNG. I am not talking about him. I am talking about corporation in this country in general.

Mr. BARR. I am talking about him. I am talking about this check and this incident.

Ms. FOUNG. Until this moment, I still don't know what that "Federal" means. Maybe you can explain it to me?

Mr. BARR. I could explain to you but I doubt that our colleagues on the other side would be interested.

What I am interested in is what you know about the check, what you knew about it at the time and what he intended, and we have covered that.

Mr. Landon, if I could, refer back to another document, and I apologize—I don't recall whether we looked at this earlier, but you, I believe, testified that you don't know Mr. Huang; is that correct?

Mr. LANDON. That's correct.

Mr. BARR. Prior to all of this happening, did you ever—had you ever heard his name before?

Mr. LANDON. No, sir.

Mr. BARR. Yet you are now aware that this document, which details the check to you—from you coming in for the dinner was attributed to Mr. Huang's account, as it were?

Mr. LANDON. I know it was given to the DNC.

Mr. BARR. I am sorry?

Mr. LANDON. I know it was wrote for the DNC.

Mr. BARR. Right. Do you see there where Mr. Huang's name appears on the bottom left?

Mr. LANDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARR. OK. Does it at this point bother you that you have apparently been, to some extent, used by somebody that you don't even know?

Mr. LANDON. If you mean do I wish I hadn't wrote the check, that's correct.

Mr. BARR. Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much.

And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time.

I want to conclude this part of our hearing today, by thanking Mr. Landon and Ms. Foung. I know you had a couple of uncomfortable moments. I apologize for that, but we really appreciate your cooperation. And Mr. Sollers, we appreciate your being here. We will stand in recess until 3 p.m., so we can get a bite to eat.

[Whereupon, at 2:15 p.m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 3 p.m., this same day.]

Mr. BURTON. The committee will reconvene. Would the officers shut the doors, please?

We are now ready for our second panel that consists of Mr. David Wang. Mr. Wang, please approach the table, please.

Mr. Wang, would you raise your right hand?

[Witness sworn.]

Mr. BURTON. On behalf of our committee, Mr. Wang, we welcome you here today. We understand that you may be in need of an interpreter and one has been provided for you. And I ask that all Members who are going to be questioning the witness be as patient as they can because there will be a translation, in many cases, necessary.

I now recognize the committee's chief counsel, Mr. Bennett, for 30 minutes.

[The deposition of David Wang follows:]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEPOSITION OF: DAVID WANG

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1997

The deposition in the above matter was held in Room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building, commencing at 1:05 p.m.

Appearances:

Staff Present for the Government Reform and Oversight Committee: Richard D. Bennett, chief counsel; James C. Wilson, senior investigative counsel; Barbara Comstock, chief investigative counsel; Kenneth Ballen, minority chief investigative counsel; Christopher Lu, minority counsel; Michael T. Yang, minority counsel; Andrew Su, staff assistant; Michael J. Raphael, minority counsel, Phil Schiliro, minority staff director; Agnieszka Fryszman, minority staff; Phil Barnett, minority staff.

Also Present: Paul N. Herbert, criminal investigator, Department of the Treasury.

Interpreter for the Witness: Herman Liang.

For DAVID WANG:

MICHAEL CARVIN, ESQ.
R. TED CRUZ, ESQ.
Cooper & Carvin
Suite 401
2000 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

For DAVID WANG:

MARK T. FLEWELLING
Walker, Wright, Tyler & Ward, LLP
Suite 900
626 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90017–3209

THEREUPON, DAVID WANG, a witness, was called for examination by counsel, and after having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. BENNETT. Good afternoon, Mr. Wang. I'm Dick Bennett, chief counsel for the Government Reform and Oversight Committee. On behalf of all of the members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, I want to thank you for appearing here today. The record should reflect that you have a translator who has been provided by the committee seated to your right and if you would identify yourself please, sir.

The INTERPRETER. Herman Liang.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang is here to translate any questions which you don't understand or translate your answers. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you have a working understanding of the English language so you believe you understand what I have said thus far?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Also, we should note that you are appearing here pursuant to an immunity order signed by Judge Johnson of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a copy of which has been provided to your counsel, Mr. Carvin. Is that correct, Mr. Carvin?

Mr. CARVIN. Yes, that's right.

Mr. BENNETT. This proceeding is known as a deposition, Mr. Wang. The person transcribing this proceeding is a House reporter and notary public. You have been placed under oath.

I would like to note for the record those who are present at the beginning of the deposition. As I said, I am Dick Bennett, chief counsel for the committee. To my right is Jim Wilson, chief assistant Majority counsel for the committee. I am accompanied here today by Mr. Paul Herbert, who is a criminal investigator with the Department of the Treasury and I believe you have met Mr. Herbert before, correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Also, Mr. Ken Ballen and Mr. Chris Lu are Minority counsel for the committee, and they are accompanied by, and perhaps I should make sure I have the names correctly.

Mr. BALLEN. Michael Yang, Andrew Su, and Michael Raphael.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, Mr. Wang, you are represented here today by?

Mr. CARVIN. Michael Carvin, Cooper & Carvin, with my associate Ted Cruz. And Mark Flewelling, who is Los Angeles counsel.

Mr. BENNETT. I would advise you, first of all, Mr. Wang, that although this proceeding is being held in a somewhat informal atmosphere, because you have been placed under oath, your testimony here today has the same force and effect as if you were testifying before the committee or in a courtroom. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And for the record, as a courtesy to Congressman Waxman, Congressman Waxman of California has arrived, Congressman, it is nice to see you, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. In a minute, Congressman, I'll defer to you, if you have any questions.

But in advising the witness in terms of the procedures to be followed, if I ask you or anyone asks you any questions about conversations you have had in the past and you are unable to recall the exact words used in that conversation, you may state that you are unable to recall those exact words and then you may give the gist or substance of any such conversation to the best of your recollection. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. If you recall only part of a conversation or only part of an event, please give me your best recollection of those events or parts of conversations that you recall.

If I ask you whether you have any information about a particular subject and you have overheard other persons conversing with each other regarding that subject or have seen correspondence or documentation about that subject, please tell me that you do not have such information and indicate the source from which you derive such knowledge. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Okay.

Mr. BENNETT. Before we begin the questioning, I want to give you some background about the investigation and your appearance here. Pursuant to its authority under House Rules X and XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee on

Government Reform and Oversight is engaged in a wide-ranging review of possible political fund-raising improprieties and possible violations of law.

Pages 2 through 4 of the House Report 105–139 summarizes the investigation as of June 19, 1997, and describe new matters which have arisen in the course of the investigation. Also, pages 4 through 11 of the report explain the background of the investigation. All questions relating either directly or indirectly to these issues, or questions which have the tendency to make the existence of any pertinent fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence, are proper.

Mr. Liang, I think in an abundance of caution, if you will translate that for Mr. Wang as well, because that was somewhat involved.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. The committee has been granted specific authorization to conduct this deposition pursuant to House Resolution 167 which passed the full House on June 20, 1997. Committee Rule 20 outlines the ground rules for the deposition.

Majority and Minority committee counsels will ask you questions regarding the subject matter of the investigation. Minority counsel will ask questions after Majority counsel has finished, which means after I ask questions, then Mr. Ballen or Mr. Lu will ask questions. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. As a matter of courtesy to a Member of Congress, Congressman Waxman in a few minutes will be accorded the opportunity to ask questions initially, or Congressman Waxman at any time may interject questions that he has. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. After the Minority counsel has completed questioning you, a new round of questioning might begin. As I said, Members of Congress who wish to ask questions will be afforded an immediate opportunity to ask their questions. When they are finished, we may continue to ask questions.

Pursuant to the committee's rules, you are allowed to have an attorney present to advise you of your rights being here today. Any objection raised during the course of the deposition shall be stated for the record. So I note your attorneys are here, and if your attorneys object or instruct you not to answer, then you are not to answer. Absent your attorney objecting or instructing you not to answer, you should answer the question. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. If the witness is instructed not to answer a question or otherwise refuses to answer a question, Majority and Minority counsel will confer to determine whether your attorney's objection was proper. If Majority and Minority counsels agree that a question is proper, the witness will be asked to answer the question. If an objection is not withdrawn, the Chairman or a Member designated by the Chairman, in this case Congressman Dan Burton of Indiana, may decide whether the objection is proper.

Again, Mr. Liang, in an abundance of caution, if you would translate that again to make sure Mr. Wang understands.

Mr. Wang, continuing, this deposition is considered as taken in executive session of the committee, which means it may not be made public without the consent of the committee pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of House Rule XI. You are asked to abide by the rules of the House and not discuss with anyone other than your attorney this deposition and the issues and questions raised during this proceeding.

Finally, no later than 5 days after your testimony is transcribed and you have been notified that your transcript is available, you may submit suggested changes to the Chairman. The transcript will be available for your review at the committee office. The committee staff may make any typographical and technical changes requested by you. Substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by you must be accompanied by a letter requesting those changes and a statement of your reasons for each proposed change. A letter requesting substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments must be signed by you. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be included in an appendix to the transcript conditioned upon your signing of the transcript.

In light of the fact that you have been called as a witness before the full committee this Thursday, October 9, I have indicated to your counsel that a daily copy will be provided by tomorrow to your attorney for you to have an opportunity to review that.

Do you understand what I have said? Again, Mr. Liang, if you could translate.

The INTERPRETER. By Thursday you will provide?

Mr. BENNETT. By the end of the day tomorrow, he will be provided a copy of his testimony transcript because he will be testifying as a witness on Thursday. Do you understand what I said, Mr. Wang?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, do you understand everything we've gone over so far?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. Let me if I may just ask for the record, are you following, Mr. Wang? Are there any problems that you have with the translation or are you understanding everything he says?

The WITNESS. In fact, there are something here, some words.

Mr. CARVIN. In English?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. But you are following everything he said carefully?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. And if at any time you don't understand, please just raise your hand and indicate. You don't have any questions about anything we have gone over so far?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Just a few other housekeeping matters. I will be asking you questions concerning the subject matter of this investigation. If you don't understand a question, please say so and I will repeat it or rephrase it.

As I said, the reporter will be taking down everything we say and he will make a written record of the deposition. Therefore, you must give verbal answers. A mere nod of the head or a gesture—you have to give an answer so the court reporter understands. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. As I said, your testimony is being taken under oath as if you were in court. If you answer a question, it will be assumed that you understood the question and the answer was intended to be responsive. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Are you here voluntarily or here as a result of a subpoena? I think the record should reflect that you have a subpoena to appear before the committee for a hearing on Thursday. I don't believe you are here pursuant to a subpoena for the deposition, however. Is that correct, Mr. Carvin?

Mr. CARVIN. There was a Notice of Deposition, but after the immunity order was entered, we are here cooperating voluntarily.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank you for that.

As a courtesy to Congressman Waxman, who is present, I shall defer questioning to Congressman Waxman at this time.

Congressman, if you have any questions.

For the record, Mr. Ballen, designated Minority counsel.

Mr. BALLEN. If we could have on the record the translator's qualifications and credentials, where he is employed, I think that will be helpful.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you.

The INTERPRETER. I've been contract interpreter for State Department for the past 15 years. I work over at USIA. I have translated for Presidents and Vice Presidents, both past and present, from President Reagan until President Gore's last trip to China. Also, for former Secretary of State when they have visited China or when they had Chinese delegations visiting over here on a variety of subjects, and for the executive—different branches of the executive branch, different heads. And also for the Navy on a very wide range of issues, from the launching of satellites to maybe gasification.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. CARVIN. Just to clarify the record, what particular language are you speaking?

The INTERPRETER. Mandarin.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Wang, I'm a Congressman from your area, Los Angeles, not precisely your part of Los Angeles, I'm from West L.A., I'm also the senior Democrat on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee. I want to thank you for your assistance in this investigation. I appreciate your being here.

I wanted to ask you some questions briefly, and I appreciate counsel allowing me to do it. You met on August 15 with two investigators from the committee, Paul Herbert and Jim McFadden; is that correct?

The WITNESS. Yes action.

Mr. WAXMAN. They wrote up what is called a Memorandum of Interview that summarized their interview with you. I have a copy here and I would like to give

it to—I understand your lawyer was given a copy of this document before the deposition.

Mr. BENNETT. Just for the record, Congressman, I note that the document we received actually has all three interviews stapled together; is that correct?

Mr. LU. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. They being August 15, 1997, August 19, 1997, and September 2, 1997; is that correct?

Mr. LU. That is right.

Mr. CARVIN. This procedural question. The Congressman will you be asking questions about this document. I was just wondering if we were going to make this an exhibit to the deposition assuming there is reference to it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Why don't we make that——

[Minority Exhibit No. 1 was marked for identification.]

[Note.—All exhibits referred to may be found at end of deposition on p. 217.]

Mr. WAXMAN. When you met with our committee investigators, did they tell you it was important to tell the truth?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did you tell the truth when you answered the questions to the investigators?

Mr. CARVIN. I am going to seek a clarification. We are talking about three different meetings here over a space of time.

Mr. WAXMAN. I'm merely asking when he talked to them.

Mr. CARVIN. And if there was a particular question, it may help focus the witness on—I'll note, for example, on the August 15 memo, there are inconsistencies between the first part and the second part of the meetings after the 10-minute break. I just don't want my witness to get tripped up on technicalities. And I know that is not your intent, but if perhaps you could focus in on something more specific, that would be helpful.

Mr. WAXMAN. I want to go through some basic questions with you about your contribution to the Democratic National Committee. My question is based on the statements you gave the committee investigators and my questions will ask you some of the same things the investigators asked you. I apologize for going over this with you again, but since we are having this deposition, I wanted to hear it, exactly what happened.

In your statement to the committee investigators on August 15, you said that you knew John Huang and had met him; is that correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. I think the statement said that you socialized with John Huang a couple of times at the 888 Seafood Restaurant in the San Gabriel Valley; is that correct?

The WITNESS. This question, named some restaurant, I'm not sure of the 888.

Mr. WAXMAN. That's not important. But you knew him and you socialized with him at a restaurant.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. In the statement you also said that your brother-in-law John Liu——

The WITNESS. John.

Mr. WAXMAN [continuing]. Also knew John Huang; is that correct?

The WITNESS. In fact, he also met on some social party.

Mr. WAXMAN. Then he had met him?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Does your father or other members of your family know John Huang?

The WITNESS. I think my father. My father.

Mr. WAXMAN. Your father. Does your father know John Huang?

The WITNESS. Same thing like me, we met on a social party at a restaurant.

Mr. WAXMAN. I see. Your father, your brother-in-law, and you?

The WITNESS. In fact my brother-in-law, I'm not so sure, because one thing I must correct because one time we met on John Huang, me and my father, the meeting in a restaurant.

Mr. WAXMAN. You and your father met him in a restaurant?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Your statement said that you met with John Huang in August 1996 and that John Huang asked you to make a contribution to the Democratic National Committee; is that correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Your statement also says you made a contribution of $5,000 to the DNC and we have a copy of your check to the DNC. It is dated August 16 and it is check Number 178.

Did you write a check to the DNC on August 16, 1996, for $5,000?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Why don't we make that Exhibit 2.

[Minority Exhibit No. 2 was marked for identification.]

Mr. WAXMAN. Your statement says that John Huang and another man picked up the $5,000 check from you at your place of employment; is that correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. I take it that John Huang picked up the check to the DNC on August 16, 1996, the same day you wrote the check; is that right?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. The check is dated August 16. Did he pick it up that same day?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did you have a different meeting with John Huang when he asked you to write a check?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. So he asked you to write the check on that date, you wrote the check, and then he took the check?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. And that was on August 16, the day the check was written?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Where did this occur?

The WITNESS. In my office.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you remember what time of day it was, morning, afternoon?

The WITNESS. Morning. In the morning.

Mr. WAXMAN. Who was there? Who was present when you met with John Huang and he asked you to contribute to the Democratic National Committee?

The WITNESS. Me and my father.

Mr. WAXMAN. Your father was there?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Is this a different meeting than the time you were at a restaurant together?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. John Huang asked you to give money, you wrote a check, and he took it all in the same day?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Now, I want to ask you about whether you were reimbursed for your contribution. At this point I'm a little confused because you gave two different statements to the investigators. First, you said you weren't reimbursed, then when the investigators came back you said you were reimbursed. I want to ask you some questions to clarify exactly what happened.

Were you reimbursed for your contribution?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Why did you first tell the investigators that you had not been reimbursed?

The WITNESS. Because I think that maybe give me some trouble. But later I think, be honest. Honest is everything, it's good. So then I change. I got the money back.

Mr. WAXMAN. Could you describe when and how you received the reimbursement?

The WITNESS. After they took the check and they come back, and for the cash.

Mr. WAXMAN. Was that the same day or another day?

The WITNESS. The same day.

Mr. WAXMAN. Was the day that they took the check from you the day they gave you money, the same day?

The WITNESS. The same day. They come that afternoon.

Mr. WAXMAN. Were the people that took your check the same people that came and gave you money?

The WITNESS. In fact, money come to person and that afternoon only that Mr. Pan, he come back.

Mr. WAXMAN. Was Mr. Pan at the meeting in the morning?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. He was with John Huang?

The WITNESS. You mean afternoon? In the morning?

Mr. WAXMAN. You're confusing me. In the morning John Huang asked you for the check, you wrote a check, and he took the check. In the afternoon you said somebody came and gave you money. You said that was Mr. Pan?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Was Mr. Pan—had Mr. Pan been in the meeting in the morning?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. He was with John Huang?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. And that was the same day?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did you receive the money all at one time?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. How much money did you get?

The WITNESS. Totally $10,000.

Mr. WAXMAN. You got $10,000?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Was that in a check or in cash?

The WITNESS. Cash.

Mr. WAXMAN. How do you know you were reimbursed by Mr. Pan? He introduced himself as Mr. Pan?

The WITNESS. Your question means I know how he is Pan?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes.

The WITNESS. That's before we know each other in the social party.

Mr. WAXMAN. You knew him before?

The WITNESS. In a social party.

Mr. WAXMAN. Let me see if I understand everything. John Huang and Mr. Pan together asked you and your father for a contribution?

The WITNESS. Yes, in the morning.

Mr. WAXMAN. And then you wrote a check and they took it that morning, yes?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. That afternoon, the same day, Mr. Pan came in and gave you $10,000?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Was that August 16, the same day that you wrote the check?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. When you met with John Huang, did you discuss reimbursements with him and did John Huang say that you would be reimbursed for your contribution?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. The translator told you that I asked whether John Huang told you that morning you would get money back?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. That was a compound question, and I think it was asked and answered. The first time the question was asked was whether Mr. Pan or Mr. Huang said they would be reimbursed, and I believe the second time it was that Mr. Huang would say it, and I would like to clarify for the record whether or not the witness recollects whether it was Mr. Huang or Mr. Pan who said that you would be reimbursed for your contribution. Can you do that?

Mr. WAXMAN. Let me just for clarity of the record, let me make it as simple as I can. Do you recall if it was Mr. Huang or Mr. Pan who said you would be reimbursed?

The WITNESS. I'm not so sure who exactly say they reimbursed me, but I know one of them said the money can be reimbursed, so that's why I make the check.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you know where the money came from that was paid to you for reimbursement?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. According to your statement, you also received reimbursement for a contribution to the DNC made by Daniel Wu. Can explain what you know about Daniel Wu's contribution and the reimbursement he received?

The WITNESS. Daniel Wu?

The WITNESS. Yes. I made the check for Daniel Wu.

Mr. WAXMAN. You made a check for Daniel Wu?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. You wrote it out of your account?

The WITNESS. From his account.

Mr. WAXMAN. From his account?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. You wrote a check from his account. You were able to sign your name on his account or did you sign his name?

The WITNESS. I signed his name.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you know who Charlie Trie is?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. CARVIN. Just again to clarify, there has been some publicity about Mr. Trie. I take it your question is whether he has personal knowledge and acquaintance with Mr. Trie?

Mr. WAXMAN. Have you ever met or spoken with Charlie Trie?

The WITNESS. No. The name only shows on the newspaper I know.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you know if Antonio Pan worked for Charlie Trie?

The WITNESS. No, I don't know.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you know Mr. Pan's first name?

The WITNESS. Before in fact, before I did know him as Mr. Pan until later on, they said I know his first name.

Mr. WAXMAN. When later on did you learn his first name?

The WITNESS. In fact after the investigator.

Mr. WAXMAN. That was after the investigators came to talk to you?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. But when you were at a social occasion with Mr. Pan, you didn't know his first name at that time?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. Have you told about these answers to these questions to anyone other than the investigators and your attorney?

The WITNESS. The people, in fact, my family?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes.

The WITNESS. Yeah. Besides my family, I don't talk to anybody.

Mr. WAXMAN. So you've talked to investigators and your family and your lawyers?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. And no one else?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you again for cooperating with this investigation. We all want to know all the information that will help us decide what the best policy should be to change the campaign finance laws or if there are violations of laws, to be sure that the laws are enforced. You have been very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. Congressman Waxman, I'm not sure if you intend to stay for the whole deposition, but if you were going to leave I wanted to clarify one point in case you wanted to follow up on one question.

Mr. WAXMAN. Sure.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Mr. BENNETT. One point, in fairness to you, if you wanted to follow up, Mr. Wang, I'll start with a little more background and go through step by step but, so Congressman Waxman has the opportunity to follow up on a question, you gave out of your own account a total of $5,000, correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And you had the power of attorney for a friend of yours named Daniel Wu; is that correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And so pursuant to that power of attorney, you made a $5,000 contribution for Daniel Wu as well; is that correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And in terms of the two individuals, Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan indicating to you that you would be reimbursed, you were advised that you would be reimbursed for both your check and Mr. Wu's check; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. Just for clarification, Dick, are you asking whether or not there was specific conversation on reimbursement for both checks or whether that was Mr. Wang's impression from the general conversation?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Mr. BENNETT. Be fine if it's his impression. I'm trying to follow up Congressman Waxman's point about the $10,000 he received.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. So if the Congressman understands, when you received $10,000 back, that was not just for you, it was also for Mr. Wu?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I just wanted to clarify that, Congressman, in case you had any other follow-up questions. I don't want you to misunderstand.

Mr. WAXMAN. No, I understood that.

Mr. BENNETT. Going back, Mr. Wang, I want to thank you also on behalf of the Republican members of the committee and thank you for coming here. Congressman Waxman asked a question concerning an interview that was conducted of you by joint detailees, people who are assigned to work for both the Republicans and the Democrats on the committee. In fact, Mr. Paul Herbert, the record should reflect, is here behind me. Do you recognize Mr. Herbert?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. I'm sorry to interrupt, Dick, but there's some other folks who haven't been identified. For the record, I don't know who they're with, but it would be helpful for my purposes if I knew who they were.

Mr. BENNETT. I'm not sure if I can identify them all.

Mr. BALLEN. You want me to do it?

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps.

Mr. BALLEN. Phil Schiliro, our staff director, Agnieszka Fryszman, Minority staff, and Phil Barnett, Minority staff.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Ballen.

With respect to Mr. Herbert who's here in the room, as well as any other individual who accompanied him, for the record they are required to report to both the Republican and Democrat members of the committee. Do you understand that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Just for their own professional reputations, was Mr. Herbert and the other people who were with him, were they polite and courteous to you at all times?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. They were?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. At any time did they threaten you or frighten you in any way?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Carvin, for the record, do you make a contention that your client's constitutional rights were violated at the time of any of his interviews?

Mr. CARVIN. We do not make such a contention. I do not, of course, waive any arguments that we may make in any subsequent civil or civil prosecutorial enforcement, but for purposes of these proceedings, as I say, we're perfectly content to let the record speak for itself and have David straighten out things.

I do want to put on the record notwithstanding the good faith of the investigators that Mr. Wang is a recent citizen, he has limited English proficiency, he was caught by surprise, and although I don't think anybody intended to threaten him, there is inherently some concerns by recent citizens when visited by the government and there was not an attorney present during any of these conversations. So to the extent there are potential inconsistencies that have been alluded to, I think those can be contradicted to those factors.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand. I can certainly understand that. But you do not contend that his constitutional rights were violated?

Answer. No.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. If I could have some background, Mr. Wang, what is your date of birth, sir?

Answer. February 11, 1963.

Question. And where were you born?

Answer. In Taiwan.

Question. Are you a United States citizen?

Answer. Yes.

Question. When did you become a citizen?

Answer. August 9, 1996.

Question. When did you come to this country?

Answer. December 1988.

Question. I'm sorry, December 1988?

Answer. Uh-huh.

Question. And you actually became a naturalized citizen about a week before two individuals came to see you concerning this contribution; is that right?

Answer. Yes. But I turn out application a whole year.

Question. I understand. But you officially became a naturalized citizen on December 9, 1996?

Mr. CARVIN. I'm sorry, December 9?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. August 9, I am sorry.

Answer. August 9.

Question. Are you married, sir?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you have any children?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How many children do you have?

Answer. One. One daughter 2 years and next month will be another one.

Question. That's wonderful. Good luck to you.

Answer. Thank you.

Question. What is your educational background, sir?

Answer. I graduate in Tangshung University in Taiwan, in banking department.

Question. You are presently employed in the car business in California; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And how long have you been a car salesman and in the car business?

Answer. Since I come to the United States.

Question. Since 1988?

Answer. 1988.

Question. Can I have the names of your—are both your parents here in the United States now?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And the names of your parents, please?

Answer. Father, James Wang.

Question. And your mother's name?

Answer. Shirley Chen.

Question. Do you have any brothers or sisters?

Answer. Yes. One, my elder—my older sister is Diana Wang and the elder brother Joe Wang.

Question. Your siblings, your brothers and sisters, are they United States citizens now?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Are your mother and father, United States citizens?

Answer. My father. My mother is not yet.

Question. Where do your mother and father reside?

Answer. Also living in Los Angeles.

Question. Do your siblings, your brothers and sisters, do they live in the Los Angeles area as well?

Answer. Yes. Yes.

Question. Directing your attention to, first of all, August 16, 1996, about what you testified earlier in response to the Congressman's question, let me ask you to go back a few months prior to August of 1996.

Mr. Liang, you might wand to translate that for him.

Answer. Okay.

Question. Prior to August of 1996, had you been involved in politics?

Answer. Political?

Question. Political involvement, had you made any contributions to any political candidates prior to August of 1996 to your knowledge?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The answer is yes?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How many political candidates?

Answer. A number one time for the city. I think city council, for our city, the mayor election.

Question. In the city of Los Angeles?

Answer. The city of Rosemead.

Question. City of Rosemead?

Answer. Yes, small city.

Question. You made a political contribution to a candidate running for political office in Rosemead, California?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Any other political contributions that you know of?

Answer. No.

Question. When did you first meet John Huang? Not the day when he came to your house but just step back. When was the first time you met him? I believe you said you met him at a social party; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. When would that have been?

Mr. CARVIN. I'm sorry, just to interrupt and clarify your prior questions, when you were asking about contributions, would that encompass writing checks for other people to attend fund-raisers and those kinds of things?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. The President's birthday party, even though you didn't attend?

Mr. BENNETT. That would be separate from the August 1996 event.

Mr. CARVIN. For your brother-in-law?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. Why don't you relate the circumstances of your brother-in-law going to the President's birthday party?

The WITNESS. Oh, yes, write a check. I think I write it for party, for President Clinton in Los Angeles.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. For President Clinton?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How much was that check for?

Answer. For $300.

Question. $300?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you attend that event? Did you go to it?

Answer. No.

Question. Did you send someone in your place to go?

Answer. Yes. That time my brother-in-law, and also he bring two friends.

Question. So the three of them were permitted to go to the birthday party for $300?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And that would have been before August 16, 1996?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Any other contributions?

Answer. I talk to you for city.

Question. I'm just clarifying. So we have the contribution for a local candidate, we have a $300 check for President Clinton's birthday party in Los Angeles, and to your knowledge they are the only political contributions you would have made; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How did you know about the birthday party for President Clinton? Who called you?

Answer. The President come to L.A. for big event in the Chinese community and everybody heard about it in the news and everybody wanted to go there. So, so far I don't remember exactly who tell me, just say, friend, everybody say you want to go.

Question. You did not attend that event, though?

Answer. No. Suppose I called.

Mr. BALLEN. Could we ask when? When was the event? I'm sorry.

Mr. BENNETT. Just for the record, as Mr. Ballen and I discussed in California, many times we have Majority finish with questions and then the Minority has questions. I have no objection to Mr. Ballen interjecting a question at an appropriate time to allow for flow of information, Mr. Ballen.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you. When was this event that you made the contribution, sir?

The WITNESS. I think in July. The day of my check, 22nd or 26th. That's the day the President come.

Mr. BALLEN. Was this the month before you made the August 16 contribution, one month before?

The WITNESS. Yes, almost a month.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. When was the very first time that you believe—I think I had asked this before and Mr. Carvin wanted to clarify a point. When was the very first time that you met John Huang?

Answer. About, I think 1996, June or July. Exactly I don't remember.

Question. Just to the best of your knowledge.

Answer. Yes, in a Chinese restaurant.

Question. Sometime in June or July of 1996, you met Mr. John Huang, and you believe it was at a restaurant?

Answer. Yes.

Question. When was the first time you ever met a gentleman named Antonio Pan?

Answer. In fact the same day.

Question. The same day?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Mr. Pan and Mr. Huang. I don't want to get yet into the matter of when they came to visit you on August 16, 1996. I'm trying to go back before that. Just so I understand, and if I'm not correct, correct me, you would have met Mr. Pan at the same time you met Mr. Huang at this restaurant?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what type of an event was it? Was it a political event?

Answer. I think just very, a social party. No political.

Question. But the two of them were talking there at the event at the restaurant when you met them?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Just a clarification. You met them both at the party, that's what you said?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. When you were at the party, were the two of them together when you met them or just you met them both at that party?

Mr. CARVIN. As best you can recall.

The WITNESS. If question, I don't—two sit together, one here and one there. I can recall they were there in the restaurant.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Did you talk to both of them at that time?

Answer. Yes, I think so.

Question. Do you recall what conversation you had, first of all, with Mr. Huang?

Answer. I'm not—I not remember very well. Common social. A conversation. Not special talking about other thing.

Question. What about Mr. Pan? Do you remember the conversation you had with Mr. Pan?

Answer. I do not remember.

Question. When was the next time you saw either Mr. Huang or Mr. Pan? Was it August 16 when they came to visit you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you recognize both of them from having met them the previous month or two at the restaurant?

Answer. Yes.

Question. So this would have been the second time you saw Mr. Huang and the second time you saw Mr. Pan?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Going into the matter of their initial meeting with you on August 16, 1996, I'm going to show you, if I can, three exhibits, and I want to go through with you the events of that day as you look at these exhibits, sort of going back over what Congressman Waxman went over with you a few minutes ago.

Perhaps you want to explain that to him, Mr. Liang, in the process.

For the record, Congressman, I'm showing the witness what has been marked already as Exhibit DW–1, which is in fact the same document I believe as Minority Exhibit 2, previously shown to the witness, but since these are already tabbed, I'll do that, if you don't mind.

[Wang Deposition Exhibit No. DW–1 was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I'm showing you that exhibit, first of all, Mr. Wang. At the top there, do you recognize your check to the Democratic National Committee for $5,000?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And then at the bottom—so you understand, is some tracking information from the Democratic National Committee. You've not seen that prior to today, I gather; is that right?

Answer. Yes.

Question. When you were first approach by Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan, with respect to the matter of reimbursement in terms of reimbursing you for your $5,000 check, did they ask you at that time if you had any friends who might also be willing to write a check for which he or she might be reimbursed? And if you'll translate that for him, Mr. Liang.

Mr. WAXMAN. Counsel, that was a confusing question. Because you said, when he was first approached, and then was he asked whether he had friends on August 16. We don't know whether that's all the same day or another day.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe it's all the same day, Congressman, but I'll rephrase it.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Directing your attention to August 16, 1996, as you indicated to Congressman Waxman earlier, there was a discussion about your writing a check and then being reimbursed for the money; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. At that time, that same time, when you were talking with Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan, you indicated you don't recall which one said that to you; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. But both of them were present when whichever one would have said that to you, and you probably should translate that, Mr. Liang.

Answer. Yes.

Question. Regardless of which one actually said they were going to reimburse with the other one being present, was there a discussion also about whether or not at that time you may have had any friends, a man or a woman who might also write out a check for which they would be reimbursed; isn't that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And did you give them a name of Mr. Daniel Wu?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. Again to clarify, when you say, give him the name, did he verbally use, state the name Daniel Wu or did he write a check at that time in the name of Daniel Wu? Did you mention the name Daniel Wu to Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan? Do you recall?

The WITNESS. I talked to him as a friend, and he also can do the contribution.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Was Mr. Wu present when you spoke with Mr. Pan and Mr. Huang?

Answer. No.

Question. To your knowledge, did Mr. Pan or Mr. Huang know Daniel Wu?

Answer. No.

Question. If I can show you Exhibit WD–2, showing you, if you can, you have to take a minute to look through it, and your counsel, Exhibit DW–2. For the record, it being photocopies of your account information from the China Trust Bank of California.

[Wang Deposition Exhibit No. DW–2 was marked for identification.]

The WITNESS. Yes.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. For the record, by the way, one of the things we may want to do, counsel, is I would suggest that, unless Minority counsel has any objection, we can line out Mr. Huang's home address in terms of certain privacy considerations for Mr. Wang. If the court reporter wants to line out the home address.

Mr. CARVIN. Yes, we would appreciate that and I would note that would be on the first page and the second page.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps we should do that now in the abundance of caution, if the court reporter would do that, please.

Mr. CARVIN. Can I make a similar request for Exhibits DW–1 and the one that is Exhibit 2. As you can see underneath David Wang's name on both of those checks, it has a phone number in it and a home address. Is there any way to do that?

Mr. BENNETT. That is fine. We can take the home telephone number out. Do you have any objection to that, Mr. Ballen?

Mr. BALLEN. No, I have no objection. But one thing to make clear for the record, I think you already did, Mr. Bennett, but just in the abundance of caution here, Minority Exhibit 2 has a different Bates Stamp than the Majority Exhibit DW–1. I believe that was, the check, so they reflect the same document that we are all referring to and I believe you stated, just so the record is clear, you should probably pen both documents.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, you are quite right. Your exhibit had the DNC Number 1804366 and our document doesn't have a DNC number. It just has 0000323, marked confidential. I think that is the distinction; isn't that correct?

Mr. BALLEN. I think so. I think they are both from the DNC.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe that is correct.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Looking at Exhibit DW–2, that in fact represents, does it not, copies of account information for you dated August 16 and September 17, 1996; is that correct, Mr. Wang?

If the translator would translate that and if you would look at that for a minute, please?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And, in fact, this reflects deposit information in your account out of which you had written the $5,000 check; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Well, strike that.

It is a different account, but it represents information concerning your receiving money back in return for your $5,000 check; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. Are you asking about the deposits?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I am.

Mr. CARVIN. I think it might help things, counsel, if you could point him just to the line you are referring to.

Mr. BENNETT. I am about to.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. To refresh your recollection, the $5,000 check was written on August 16, 1996, correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And in response to questions from Congressman Waxman you indicated that you were told by Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan, one of the two said to you that you would be reimbursed?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And the other who did not speak sat there while the other person who did speak told you that?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And looking at the first page of DW–2, in fact, that reflects a $3,000 deposit back to you the same day; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And the second page of DW–2 reflects a $2,000 payment back to you 4 days later; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And if you will explain the circumstances pursuant to which you received money back on those 2 days, do you recall who—I think Congressman Waxman asked you a question as to whether or not you recalled who came back to give you your money and I believe, and if I am incorrect, correct me, I believe you said that Mr. Pan came back and brought you money; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How many times did Mr. Pan return?

Answer. He returned only one time.

Question. My question is, you received $3,000 or you deposited $3,000 on August 16, and then you deposited $2,000 on August 20th, and I am trying to clarify whether or not Mr. Pan returned to your home two times with money or one time with money. And perhaps to assist you in that regard, Mr. Wang, if I can show you Exhibit DW–3. That is for the reporter right there. Your attorney has that.

[Wang Deposition Exhibit No. DW–3 was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Can you identify Exhibit DW–3?
Answer. Yes.
Question. For the record, it appears it is being a calendar—photocopies, 2 pages of calendar entries from August 15 to August 21, 1996; is that correct?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And reviewing that, what notations do you have on August 16 and then on the second page, August 20th?
Mr. BENNETT. If you will translate for Mr. Wang to assist him, please. I'm not sure if the court reporter got that.
Mr. CARVIN. I think it might be more helpful if you spoke more slowly. On August 16th you did what?
The WITNESS. On August 16th, I deposited cash for I think it was $3,000, under David, $3,000, and then on August 20, it was for David $2,000 and then Daniel $2,000.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. And the Daniel you are referring to is Mr. Daniel Wu; is that correct?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And I will get his financial matters in a minute. But then there was one deposit on August the 16th for you and Mr. Wu for reimbursement and there was a second deposit on August 20 for you and Mr. Wu; is that correct?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And then having looked at the documents, can you recollect the circumstances and who came to your home to give you the money for reimbursement?
Mr. CARVIN. Can you clarify that, "came to his home?"
Mr. BENNETT. Wherever, I'm sorry. Your home, your office, first of all, August the 16th, when you received $3,000 for yourself and $3,000 from Mr. Wu, who came to your home?
Mr. BALLEN. I am going to object, that wasn't his testimony.
Mr. CARVIN. It might be simpler, if you don't mind.
Mr. BENNETT. Sure.
Mr. CARVIN. Mr. Pan came back in the afternoon.
The WITNESS. [By the witness] Yes.
Mr. CARVIN. How much money did he give you at that time?
The WITNESS. A total of $10,000.
Mr. CARVIN. He gave him $10,000.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. That's what I am trying to clarify. He came one time and gave you $10,000?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And then what did you do with the $10,000?
Answer. He told me don't deposit at one time.
Question. Who told you that?
Answer. Pan.
Question. Mr. Pan told you not to deposit it all at one time?
Answer. Yes, so I just spread out for 2 times, $3,000 and $2,000 thousand.
Question. So you had all the $10,000 for both you and Mr. Wu, and pursuant to Mr. Pan telling you not to deposit the $10,000 at one time, you made two different payments or deposits for both yourself and Mr. Wu; is that correct?
Answer. Yes.
Question. Do you know why you were told not to deposit it at one time?
Answer. No. No.
Question. And with respect to the money, this $10,000, do you know the source of that money?
Answer. No, I don't.
Question. When Mr. Pan told you not to deposit it all at one time, did he discuss with you whether or not you should discuss this with anybody?
Answer. Yes.
Question. I'm sorry?
Answer. Yes.
Question. And what did he say, sir?
Answer. He said just don't tell anyone.
Question. When Mr. Huang was speaking with you, did Mr. Huang ever make a reference to this repayment of money as being a secret?

Answer. Well, in fact, I am not sure I remember that he tell me it was a secret or something like that.

Question. I'm sorry?

Answer. He didn't mention this is a secret or something like that.

Question. When was the first time you were told not to tell anyone?

Answer. This is Mr. Pan.

Question. When Mr. Pan came to your home?

Answer. Yes, he put the cash back.

Question. Do you know whether or not these contributions, these two $5,000 checks, for which you and Mr. Wu were reimbursed, do you know if it was related to a particular fund-raising event, a particular party?

Answer. Well, in fact, as I know, he told me this for the President.

Question. When you say he, who is he?

Answer. Either Pan or Huang.

Question. In other words, either one, you are not sure, one of them told you it was for the President's what?

Answer. The President, the campaign, the fund-raising.

Question. Fund-raising for the President?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And it would have either been Mr. Huang or Mr. Pan and you are not sure which one?

Answer. No, I am not sure.

Question. But whichever one said it, was the other then present when the first person spoke?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. BALLEN. Can I just clarify?

Mr. BENNETT. Absolutely. Go right ahead.

Mr. BALLEN. And when did that occur, sir?

The WITNESS. August 16.

Mr. BALLEN. That was the morning meeting at your office.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Any other questions, Mr. Ballen?

Mr. WAXMAN. Was it related to a party or an event or just a contribution?

The WITNESS. Contribution.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did they talk to you in English or in Chinese?

The WITNESS. Chinese.

Mr. WAXMAN. Both Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Both in the morning and the afternoon, Mr. Pan spoke to you in Chinese?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. If counsel wouldn't mind, before that, you had given another contribution for a party that the President attended in Los Angeles that you didn't go to, but the President was there.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did you get reimbursed for the money you paid for that?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did anybody suggest to you that you might get reimbursed?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. And how was it that Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan came to see you that morning? Did they call for the appointment or did they just show up?

The WITNESS. Well, before they come, they must make a phone call.

Mr. WAXMAN. Who called you?

The WITNESS. I think it is Huang.

Mr. WAXMAN. And when was that, the same day or week?

The WITNESS. Same day.

Mr. WAXMAN. He said I am coming by this morning.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did he tell you why he wanted to come by and see you?

The WITNESS. He said he was around that area and he wanted to come to my office to visit.

Mr. WAXMAN. He didn't say why?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. And had you ever heard about anybody else getting paid back for the money they gave to the campaign at that time?

The WITNESS. No.

Mr. WAXMAN. And when you gave the contribution earlier to the party for the President, where he attended, where the President attended, who asked you to give to that? Did John Huang ask you to give to that or someone else? This was in July?

The WITNESS. Well, in fact, at that time, I am not so sure, just before I answered the question, for that particular event, everybody knows, and the event, I am not so sure who would go together by who, and—so we know to go there, bring a check, pay to DNC, and just go there.

Mr. WAXMAN. So you wrote out a check and your brother-in-law took it?

The WITNESS. Took it, yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. And you don't know who asked you to do that, you just heard about the event?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. Any other questions, Congressman?

Mr. WAXMAN. No, those were some questions I figured I would ask.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Mr. Wang, did you have any contact with the Democratic National Committee concerning these contributions when you wrote out the two $5,000 checks that morning, August 16th?

Answer. No.

Question. Did Mr. John Huang at that time——

Mr. BALLEN. Excuse me. I'm sorry, I didn't hear the answer.

Mr. BENNETT. He said, no.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Did Mr. Huang, John Huang, at that time, indicate what his position was with the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No.

Question. Did Mr. Huang subsequently call you to thank you for your contributions for which you were reimbursed?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And do you know where he was when he called you to thank you?

Answer. No.

Question. After you were reimbursed for the $10,000, were you ever contacted by anyone from the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you have any understanding about who John Huang was or who Antonio Pan was with respect to President Clinton's campaign or the Democratic National Committee? It is a compound question and I guess it covers the territory. I am just asking what his understanding was, Counsel, as to John Huang or Antonio Pan?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What was your understanding, first of all, as to John Huang, who was John Huang, what was his position?

Answer. Well, in fact, during that time, John Huang, in the Chinese community, they have some newspaper, and also on TV, they interview John Huang, he is the—I think he is the—he do election for the President and he is a very, like, well-known person in the Chinese community.

Question. And do you know what his position was with either the Democratic National Committee or with President Clinton's re-election campaign in August of 1996?

Mr. CARVIN. Clarification. Did he know what was his understanding at the time or what has he learned subsequently?

Mr. BENNETT. At the time.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I'm sorry, you need to translate his answer. It doesn't require a, yes, response, Mr. Liang, so if you could.

The WITNESS. Well, it seemed to me that at that time, he was on the campaign trying to be either the Vice Chairman on the National—Democratic National Committee or trying to be a Deputy Secretary for Commerce.

Mr. BALLEN. Can we ask how he knew that?

Mr. CARVIN. Yes, and, first of all, did you just say that to him? Are you giving your understanding of what you knew in August of '96 or what you have learned subsequently in the newspapers?

The WITNESS. Before, prior to August 16th.

Mr. CARVIN. What was your understanding, can you say it in English, please? In English, what was your understanding?

Mr. BENNETT. He need not say it in English. He can have it be translated. If he doesn't think he can express it in English, the translator can translate for him.

Mr. CARVIN. That is fine. I am a little concerned about clarity here.

The WITNESS. During the time, I mean, August 16th, before, even the social party, we know John Huang, he is a very important person.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. And now the translator indicated that you had knowledge that he was either the Vice Chairman of the Democratic National Committee or an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; is that correct?

The INTERPRETER. Sorry, correction. I didn't say he was. He was trying to get a job of campaigning for the job.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I understand. So you did not know what position he had at the time?

Answer. No, only I know he is a very important person in the Government.

Mr. BALLEN. Can I just ask, how did you know that, did he tell you that or did you read it in the newspapers?

The WITNESS. From the newspapers.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Did John Huang tell you he was trying to get an important Government job?

Answer. No, no.

Question. When were you first contacted by the Democratic National Committee or any representative of the Democratic National Committee in connection with these $10,000 in payments and the reimbursement?

Mr. CARVIN. I object. It has been asked and answered. He said he wasn't contacted by the DNC, unless you are including John Huang within the definition of people who represent the DNC.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, counsel, he clearly was contacted by Ernst & Young on behalf of the Democratic National Committee. I am about to get there and I am just trying to verify that is the very first time.

Mr. BALLEN. Maybe say after the 16th then.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I don't know how it can be any clearer. I will try again.

Whenever you were contacted by any representative of the Democratic National Committee, after you made the payments of $10,000, and after you were reimbursed, I am just trying to find out when that might have been, whether it was today, yesterday, when was the very first time you were contacted by the Democratic National Committee or a representative of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. CARVIN. And I am really trying to streamline this and not complicate it. He already told you John Huang called him after August 16th and then I take it, included within your question of people who represent the Democratic National Committee would be the accounting firm working in connection with them, Ernst & Young.

Mr. BENNETT. Just for the record, the witness has not said he knew that Mr. Huang was an official of the Democratic National Committee, so in fairness to the Democratic National Committee, I am trying to clarify when in his own mind someone called and said they were calling on behalf of the DNC. That is the nature of the question.

Mr. CARVIN. Fair enough.

Mr. BENNETT. So why don't you translate that. I don't want to trap the witness. I am trying to find out what the witness knows.

The WITNESS. You mean besides John Huang.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. That is correct, sir, when was the very first time? Again, I am not trying to trap you, Mr. Wang. I am just trying to get the information when in your own mind you knew. Apart from John Huang, you were talking to someone else from the Democratic National Committee and I will show you what has been marked as Exhibit DW–4.

Mr. WAXMAN. Before you get into that, Counsel, Mr. Wang's attorney said he was called by John Huang afterwards and I didn't know about that.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, I am sorry, Congressman Waxman. I asked if he was called later and thanked by John Huang and I think he said he was called and thanked. I assume that is what the witness is making reference to. We can clarify that if you want.

Mr. WAXMAN. Is that correct?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did he say anything else to you other than thank you?

Mr. CARVIN. Can you give him a time frame for the question?

Mr. WAXMAN. After August 16th, did John Huang call you up?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. And how long afterwards, a week, 2 weeks, a month, just generally?

The WITNESS. Just a couple days, within 1 week, roughly.

Mr. WAXMAN. And what did he say to you when he called you?

The WITNESS. As I know, he just tried to say thank you for the contribution and that is all. The phone call was very short. He just wanted to say thank you.

Mr. WAXMAN. Before August 16, just so I have this clear, did you only meet John Huang that one time?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Before the day he came to your office, you had only met him one time?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. But you had heard about him.

The WITNESS. Yes, sure.

Mr. WAXMAN. And you knew he was an important person in the Democratic Party?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Did he or Mr. Pan spell out $5,000 or did they just ask for a contribution?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. He asked for $5,000.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. And then asked if someone else could give more money, like another $5,000, a friend.

The WITNESS. Yes, he asked do you know another friend or person who also wants to contribute $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you. I'm sorry.

Mr. BALLEN. So I'm clear, that was on the morning of August 16th.

The WITNESS. Yes, in the morning.

Mr. WAXMAN. I have to run to another meeting, but thank you very much and we will look forward to seeing you in a couple days.

The WITNESS. Okay.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. And at that point during that conversation, just to go back for a second, either Mr. Pan or Mr. Huang then indicated that the full $10,000 will be paid back to you; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now showing you what has been marked as DW–4, if you want to take a look at that with Mr. Carvin, your attorney, it essentially is, I submit to you, a survey form with respect to efforts for the Democratic National Committee on a survey. Have you had a chance to look at this yet, counsel?

[Wang Deposition Exhibit No. DW–4 was marked for identification.]

Mr. CARVIN. Is it intentional that we are skipping every other page or is that a Xeroxing problem.

Mr. WILSON. This is the way the documents are.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, that is how we got the documents and there is a gap in the numbering of pages which is of concern to us, but that is a totally separate issue.

Mr. CARVIN. This is what you got.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what we received on Majority side and in response to subpoenas to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. CARVIN. Just to clarify the record, there is a gap in both the Bates Stamps, and it seems as if the pages on the documents—and Counsel is indicating that that is how the document was received, so my suspicion is, this not a complete copy.

Mr. BALLEN. And just so the record is clear, and counsel for the Majority said that is how the document was received by the Majority, the same document was produced to both Majority and Minority.

Mr. BENNETT. And for the record, I cannot represent that—strike that.

For the record, I cannot represent that this committee has not received—for example, these numbered pages are DNC 1804346, then 349, then 351, then 353, 355, 356, 366 and 368. I cannot represent that the committee has never received or has not received some sequential pages in between there. I believe we definitely have missed pages, but I cannot represent all those pages are missing. Perhaps it is in terms of relevant documents being made a part of this exhibit.

So I don't want the record to reflect the Democratic National Committee has not given us any of the pages in between. I don't believe we have all the pages in between, but it may be that some really weren't relevant in terms of putting the document together in terms of the deposition. So I don't want the record to reflect that I am making that accusation against the DNC, because I don't have a basis for that.

Mr. BALLEN. Just so you understand, Mr. Carvin, the DNC did withhold some documents from the committee on the basis of privilege so that may explain—I do not know why.

Mr. CARVIN. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Ballen.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Looking at this exhibit—particularly, if you will, look at answer number 14, which is on document number DNC 1804351, there, the question from Ernst & Young, the accounting firm retained by the Democratic National Committee. The particular question is asked with respect to, can you confirm that all the money that was used to make this contribution was your money and did not come from some other source or person? And there you indicate, yes, you could confirm that; is that correct, Mr. Wang?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you at any point in this survey from Ernst & Young—do you recognize your handwriting there?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you in fact completed this survey and sent it back to Ernst & Young; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. At any point in this survey, apart from answering, yes, that it was your money, did you indicate anywhere that you had in fact been reimbursed the same day for your contribution?

Answer. No.

Question. No.

And why was that, sir?

Answer. Well, because I am afraid.

Question. You were afraid?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I understand that.

Did anyone from the Democratic National Committee ever get back in touch with you after this survey, after you filled this out?

Answer. From my memory, I am not so sure, but after—the survey, I remember the survey; before, I forget that this was surveyed. And on a Friday, I mentioned they have phone-called me, but in fact I am not so sure—I mean, from the same company.

Question. You say on Friday, you mean this past Friday?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I am going to get to that in a minute. But do you recall any other contact with the Democratic National Committee after you filled this survey out?

Mr. CARVIN. You mean after his memory was refreshed on Friday?

Mr. BENNETT. No, I believe the document has a draft date of December 6, 1996, from Debevoise & Plimpton, and I am trying to confirm or to find out if there was any other contact from the Democratic National Committee after December of 1996, if he knows.

The WITNESS. I am not so sure. Let's say they give me a phone call, but I don't know if it is before this one survey or after the survey.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Who says that they gave you a phone call?

Answer. On Friday.

Mr. CARVIN. Let me help you. The Assistant U.S. Attorney, Mr. McNamara.

Mr. BENNETT. Just for the record, you appeared before a Federal grand jury here in Washington this Friday, October 3, 1997; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And how long did you appear in front of the grand jury?

Answer. About 30 or 40 minutes in grand jury.

Question. And during that period of time, did you have a translator there with you?

Answer. Unfortunately, no, because Friday, there be no translating.

Question. And at that time, someone indicated to you that perhaps you had received a telephone call from the Democratic National Committee in addition to this survey?

Answer. Well, in fact, one thing I want to say, before this one event, this is from the DNC, because the head-letter says Ernst & Young—I don't know if this is from DNC or not—and only the survey and also the one phone call to call me.

Question. Okay. And who gave the one phone call to you when you were called, who called you? You say one phone call; who called you?

Answer. In fact, I don't remember the phone call, but they say they have a phone call in this one.

Question. "They," who is "they," sir? You say, the Assistant U.S. Attorney?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Tom McNamara, Assistant U.S. Attorney?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I am trying to make sure we are clear. In fact, within the last week, one of the lawyers for the Minority called you or called your father; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. I don't know if he understands the term "the Minority."

Mr. BENNETT. Either Mr. Ballen or Mr. Lu; is that correct.

The WITNESS. Yes.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Within the last week?

Answer. Last week, Friday.

Question. All right. And who called you, or did they call you or call your father?

Answer. Called my father.

Question. Okay. I am not referring to that phone call when I ask you about the Democratic National Committee. I am trying to make sure we are talking about two separate phone calls.

Mr. BENNETT. Why don't you translate that, Mr. Liang?

The WITNESS. Yes.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Okay. You didn't get a phone call from Mr. Ballen or anyone? Your father got the phone call?

Answer. Friday, yes, my father, he received one phone call.

Question. One phone call?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Who did he receive the phone call from; do you know?

Answer. As I know, he told me he called Mr. Lu.

Question. Mr. Lu called him?

Answer. Yes. In fact, this is two persons; one speaks English and the other, Mr. Lu, he can speak a little Chinese.

Question. Okay.

Answer. Because my father's English is no good.

Question. So your father was called by two lawyers, Mr. Lu and another lawyer, last week?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what day of last week would that have been?

Answer. Last Friday.

Question. This past Friday, October the 3rd?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Were you able to talk with your father about what the nature of that phone conversation was?

Answer. My father, he told me it's about when my father met John Huang, about how he met John Huang and how many times they see each other.

Question. Was your father present when you met with John Huang and Antonio Pan on August 16, 1996?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you know whether or not your father was asked about that last week?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And do you know what your father responded, what he said to the lawyers who called him last week about whether or not he was present when you met with John Huang and Antonio Pan?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what did your father say to them?

Answer. He said he is also in a meeting.

Question. He said he was present?

Answer. He was present on August 16.

Question. So, to your knowledge, your father told the lawyers who called him last week that he was present at the meeting of August 16th?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. Was anyone else present at the meeting apart from your father?

Answer. No.

Mr. CARVIN. And Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Yes, the meeting with Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan, was there anyone else present besides you and your father?

Answer. No.

Question. Was any money ever returned to you by the Democratic National Committee?

Answer. No.

Question. Now there have been references—we will go back now if we can, to discussions about—let me get these exhibits, if I can.

Now, Congressman Waxman previously asked you and I asked you about Mr. Wu, the individual for whom you wrote the second $5,000 check and which was also reimbursed.

Let me first of all show you, if I can, Exhibit DW–5.

[Wang Deposition Exhibit No. DW–5 was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. In fact, Mr. Wang, you have the power of attorney, do you not, for Mr. Daniel Wu?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And do you still hold the power of attorney for Mr. Wu?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And why is it that you have his power of attorney?

Answer. Well, I think that the reason is for immigration purposes, because he is a green card holder, and he wants to open the account here; and in his bank, they have some transaction that looks like he is living in the United States.

Question. Does he live in the United States?

Answer. No.

Question. Where is he presently residing?

Answer. I think in Taiwan.

Question. What is your relationship with him?

Answer. Just friend.

Question. And how often do you see him?

Answer. In fact, sometimes we use a phone call. But he is busy; he not come here, not so often.

Question. And do you know what he does for a living, what is his occupation?

Answer. Exactly, as I know, he is a businessman in Taiwan.

Question. And what is his business in Taiwan, sir?

Answer. It is like a trading company. I am not sure what kind of thing—I mean, project he does, but I know he does the trading company.

Question. And exactly what does he trade? In terms of having a trading company, what does he trade?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Okay. And when is the last time you saw him?

Answer. I think about 2—almost 2 or 3 years ago.

Question. Two or 3 years ago?

Answer. Yes.

Question. So when you wrote out the check in August of 1996 for Mr. Wu, you had not seen him for over 2 years; is that right?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you did not need to speak with him about this because you already had the power of attorney; is that correct?

Answer. You mean about——

Question. About the $5,000 check?

Answer. Yes, I didn't talk to him.

Question. Because you had this power of attorney, as reflected by Exhibit DW–5, you were able to write out the $5,000 check and then put the money back into his account when you were reimbursed the same day?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I will show you Exhibits DW–6 and 7.

[Wang Deposition Exhibit Nos. 6 and 7 were marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Looking at DW–6 and 7, first, in DW–6——

Mr. CARVIN. Which we are not sure which is which.

Mr. BALLEN. We don't have a copy of both of these.

Mr. BENNETT. I think you do have a copy of both.

Mr. BALLEN. I just have one.

Mr. BENNETT. Counsel, you have that now in front of you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. On DW–6, there are entries similar to the entries of your account, reflecting—are there not, Mr. Wang—a deposit on August 16, 1996, of $3,000, and then August 20 of $2,000. Do you see that in front of you there, sir?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Does that reflect the same types of deposits you made into your account with respect to the $5,000 to Mr. Wu's account?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And looking at Exhibit DW–7, that in fact reflects the check on Mr. Wu's account of $5,000 that cleared through and for which you were reimbursed; is that right?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you know why the check was held until September 25, 1996?

Answer. No, I don't.

Question. How often do you need to make deposits or withdrawals from Mr. Wu's account, Mr. Wang?

Answer. In fact, every month.

Question. Every month?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what kind of transactions do you engage in every month for Mr. Wu's account?

Answer. Well, in fact, I use his name under the other company, like he is employee of our company; and then the company, they write the paycheck to his account.

Question. If I can follow up on this, your company?

Answer. Not my company, other company.

Question. I'm sorry.

Mr. BENNETT. To the extent that I can't understand the witness, Mr. Liang, it might be helpful if you translate the answer for me, if you could, please?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. With respect to the monthly activity into Mr. Wu's account, what is deposited into Mr. Wu's account, Mr. Wang?

Answer. Another company would write a check out in Daniel Wu's name, as an employee of that company; and that is when I would deposit that check into his account.

Question. And you do that each month?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And what is the name of the company that issues a check to Mr. Wu?

Answer. Ji Tai International Company.

Question. And where is Ji Tai International Company?

Answer. Also in Los Angeles.

Question. Are there any other companies that issue checks to Mr. Wu besides Ji Tai International?

Answer. There is another company, Bao Li Hang International, Bao Li Hang International.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps, Mr. Liang, if you could try to spell both of those companies for the court reporter to the best of your ability.

For the record, have we put in the names of both companies?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. So I understand, the two companies, there are two companies which issue checks to Mr. Wu; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And they do it each month?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you deposit those checks into Mr. Wu's account?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And the names of the two companies are Bao Li Hang?

Answer. Bao Li Hang.

Question. Bao Li Hang, and the second company is?

Answer. Ji Tai International.

Question. Ji Tai International?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How much are those checks for, do you know, sir?

Answer. I don't remember exactly the amount. I have to look and see from the statement.

Question. I'm sorry, do you know the approximate amount, sir?

Answer. About $600 something.

Question. $600?

Answer. $600 something, yes, I forget.

Question. Each one?

Answer. Yes, the other is about $700 something.

Question. Do you know what are these for?

Answer. That is for the payroll check.

Question. It is a payroll check?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you know what Mr. Wu does for these two companies?

Answer. No.

Question. Does this money leave the account? Do you withdraw the money from Mr. Wu?

Answer. Yes, and then I return to the two companies, return to them.

Mr. BENNETT. I don't understand the witness' answer. You will need to translate, please.

The WITNESS. I put the money into the account, and then I draw out money, the same amount of money that was put in, and return them to those two companies.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Correct me if I am wrong, you deposit two checks each month into Mr. Wu's account from these companies?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And then you withdraw the same amount that you deposit out of that account?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And then what do you do with the money? You have cash, you will cash them in cash; is that correct?

Answer. No, I just also make a check, write a check.

Question. But you will put it into your account and then write a check?

Answer. Yes, to Daniel Wu account and then use the Daniel Wu account to write a check the same amount for deposit.

Question. And to whom do you send these checks, back to the companies?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Okay. Who is the individual with whom you have contact at these two companies?

Answer. Well, it is just comes in my job, I just return the check to them.

Mr. BALLEN. Can I ask a clarification?

Why do you take the checks that you get from the company, deposit them to Mr. Wu's account and then return them to the two companies? Why do you do that?

Any time you don't understand, please have it translated.

The WITNESS. I can say this is for——

Mr. BALLEN. Please use the translator.

Mr. BENNETT. And, Mr. Liang, it would be helpful—to the extent the witness has difficulty explaining his answer, it would be helpful not only to translate the questions to the witness but translate his answers for counsel here if you could.

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

The WITNESS. So that the two companies make out a certain amount to me to Mr. Wu every month, and which I deposit into his account, and then write out two checks for the same amount that the companies gave Mr. Wu to return them. That was in order to prove to the Immigration Service that Mr. Wu was, in fact, physically in the United States and not outside the States.

Mr. BENNETT. Just for the record, counsel, we don't need to belabor this now, but if you can just supplement and make sure counsel here have the names and addresses of those corporations, if the witness can locate that information, if you can supplement his response for both the Majority and Minority counsel as to the names of the corporations.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I gather, then, Mr. Wu has not had any contact with the Democratic National Committee or Ernst & Young in terms of the survey?

Answer. No.

Question. And to the extent that the Democratic National Committee—and I will show you what has been marked as DW–8.

[Wang Deposition Exhibit No. DW–8 was marked for identification.]

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. To the extent that Ernst & Young, on behalf of the Democratic National Committee, tried to locate Mr. Wu, it is clear from this document they were not able to locate Mr. Wu; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The second page——

The INTERPRETER. To your question, Mr. Huang answered yes.

Mr. BALLEN. I'm sorry, I didn't understand you.

The INTERPRETER. The question counselor raised——

Mr. BENNETT. They said that the Democratic National Committee was not able to get a hold—to contact Mr. Wu, and the witness said, that is correct, they were not able to get a hold of him.

Mr. BALLEN. To his knowledge.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Looking at the second page of that document, DNC, Bates Stamp DNC 1803072, the No. 818–571–2288; do you know whose number that is?

Answer. Oh, yes, that is my company.

Question. That is your telephone number?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And that was the telephone number listed with respect to the contribution initially?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I will go back. How would the Democratic National Committee have your telephone number in connection with this contribution, Mr. Wang? How would the Democratic National Committee have this telephone number in connection with the contribution from Mr. Wu?

Answer. I don't know. I don't know how they get the number.

Question. Mr. Wang, are there any other political contributions made by you that we have not discussed today?

Answer. No.

Question. Are there any other political contributions by Mr. Wu in the name of Mr. Wu that we have not discussed?

Answer. No.

Mr. CARVIN. To his knowledge.

Mr. BENNETT. To his knowledge.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. The question meaning, have you used Mr. Wu's account in any other manner like you did on August 16, 1996, in making a contribution?

Answer. There was only a one-time shot, on August 16th.

Question. And you have had no other activity in a political campaign or political involvement other than what you have mentioned thus far here today?

Answer. No.

Question. I am going to read some names to you and ask if you have any knowledge of these people, and if you have met them. And take your time; if you don't understand or if I mispronounce someone's name, I will do the best I can. And some of these you may have already been asked about.

Do you have any knowledge of or relationship with Mr. Charlie Trie, Yah Lin Trie?

Mr. CARVIN. One is the Americanization and the other is the Chinese name.

The WITNESS. Well, this name I saw so many times in the newspaper, Yah Lin Trie.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. I think the Congressman asked you earlier, have you ever met Mr. Trie?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know anyone with the CHY Corporation?

Let Mr. Liang translate for you, please.

Answer. I heard the firm of CHY. I learned of this firm for the first time because the investigator, Mr. Paul Hubert——

Question. Might have asked about it?

Answer. Yes, that is when I learned about it.

Question. No other knowledge besides that?

Answer. No.

Question. All right. Huan Hsu, also known as Tony Hsu?

Answer. No.

Mr. CARVIN. Spell that, please.

Question. H-S-U?

Answer. No.

Question. David Mercer or Ari Swiller?

Answer. No.

Question. Martha Shoffner?

Answer. No.

Question. Lorin Fleming?

Answer. No.

Question. Maria Mapili?

Answer. No.

Question. Jody Webb?

Answer. No.

Question. Yue Fang Chu?

Answer. No.

Question. An individual named Ng Lap Seng, also known as Mr. Wu?

Answer. No.

Question. Keshi Zhan?

Answer. No.

Question. Ming Chen?

Answer. No.

Question. Xiping Wang?

Answer. No.

Question. Zhengwei Cheng?

Answer. No.

Question. Charles T. Chiang?

Answer. No.

Question. Bei Bei Liu?

Answer. No.

Question. Zhengang Shao?

Answer. No.

Question. George Chu/Da Tung?

Answer. No.

Question. Peter Chen?

Answer. No.

Question. Sy Zuan Pan?

Answer. No.

Question. Yogesh Gandhi?

Answer. No.

Question. Lottie Shackleford?

Answer. No.

Question. Mark Middleton?

Answer. No.

Question. Ernie Green?

Answer. No.

Question. Mr. Wang, I want to thank you for your effort today. Now Mr. Ballen may have some follow-up questions.

Mr. BALLEN. I do. Thank you very much, Mr. Bennett. If I could just have about 30 seconds? I don't even want to take a break. Just 30 seconds.

Mr. BENNETT. Would you like to take a break?

Mr. CARVIN. Let's take a quick 5-minute break.

[Brief Recess.]

Mr. BALLEN. We are back on the record now. I just have several questions to follow up with you, sir.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. First, did you understand the questions that were posed to you today by both Mr. Waxman, Mr. Bennett, and myself and your own counsel?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If there was ever a point when you did not understand the questions, did you consult with the translator who is sitting next to yourself?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I think the record should reflect that, and I do not know whether the court reporter indicated it or not, every time you consulted with the translator, but I believe all counsel would agree with me that it was frequent throughout the deposition. Is that correct? You did frequently consult with him on questions and answers?

Answer. Yes.

Question. So that you feel you had the opportunity to understand each question and each answer that you gave here today?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you had the opportunity throughout this deposition to consult with the translator sitting by your left?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have you understood the translator at all times?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you understand here that you are under oath today?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I notice the translator actually translated that question for you.

Does the translator speak the same dialect of Chinese that you speak?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you already stated that you understand your answers are under oath and that they must be truthful?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you have given truthful answers here today, sir?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you have understood both the questions and the answers and the nature of the answers you have given?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I would like to go back, I believe it is Exhibit No. 1, sir, your Memorandum of Interview. I will wait until you have it before you.

Mr. BENNETT. For the record, it's not his Memorandum of Interview.

Mr. BALLEN. I'm sorry, I stand corrected, Memorandum of Interview you had with the two investigators.

Mr. BENNETT. Actually for the record, the entirety of the exhibit is 5 pages, the first 3 of them are a Memorandum of Interview, both interviews on August 15, 1997, and then the 4th page is August 19, 1997, and the 5th page is September 2, 1997.

Mr. BALLEN. That is correct.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. Sir, I am going to direct your attention to paragraph 4 and I will wait for the translator to translate.

For the record, I believe the translator has just translated for you paragraph number 4 on the first 2 pages of Exhibit No. 1; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Now, in this statement you said you made a contribution for $5,000 because it was a chance to meet President Clinton, and you also said that the contribution bought you two tickets to a party, and you said that you went to the party but did not meet the President, is that correct, sir?

Mr. CARVIN. Objection. Compound.

Mr. BALLEN. I'll ask him one at a time.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. In your statement you said that you made the contribution because it was a chance to meet President Clinton?

Answer. Repeat the question.

Question. Yes. The question is, in your statement you stated, is this correct, that you made the contribution because it was a chance to meet President Clinton?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is that correct? Did you make it for that reason or not?

Mr. CARVIN. There may be confusion. I take it you're not asking him if the statement was made to the investigators but whether that was the real reason that he gave the donation. Or were you asking two questions?

Mr. BALLEN. I asked two questions. The first question, did he make that statement to the investigators, the next question, is it a true statement?

Mr. CARVIN. You want me to ask him again or do you want to go?

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. That is fine. Did you make that statement to the investigators?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is it correct, sir?

Answer. It is not correct.

Question. The next question is, you also said to the investigators that the contribution bought you two tickets to a party. Did you tell that to the investigators?

Answer. In that, yes.

Question. You did say it?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is it correct, sir?

Answer. No.

Question. In the statement you said you went to a party, a fund-raising party, is that correct, did you say to the investigators?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did in fact you go to a party?

Answer. No.

Question. So you never went to any fund-raising party for the President?

Answer. Yes. I mean——

Question. Did you ever go?

Answer. No.

Question. Directing your attention, sir, to August 16, 1996, do you recall how long—you testified, I believe, that you received a phone call from John Huang before he came to your place of business on August 16?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How long before August 16?

Mr. CARVIN. Objection. That mischaracterizes his testimony. He said before they came to the meeting. He didn't say it was before August 16.

Mr. BALLEN. The meeting was August 16.

Mr. CARVIN. You can call at 9 o'clock, you can call at 10 o'clock.

Mr. BALLEN. Let's get that clarified.

The WITNESS. I think not too long. I think within an hour. Within one hour of his phone call, he came to my office.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. John Huang called you on August 16, then, the same day he came?

Answer. Yes, the same day, after the phone call and after, not over one hour, then he came here.

Question. Came to where, sir?

Answer. To the office.

Question. Did he say where he was calling from, John Huang?

Answer. No.

Question. Did he say when he would come to the office?

Answer. No.

Question. He just said he would come that same day to the office?

Answer. Yes. Because he was nearby in the area.

Question. So on August 16 when he called you in the morning, he said he was nearby the office?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How did he come to your office? Did he come in a car?

Answer. I'm not sure because I didn't see how they used the car. They just come in.

Question. When they left, where did they leave? Meaning they, John Huang and Mr. Pan on August 16, 1996.

Answer. I don't know. They just left the office.

Question. Did they say how they arrived, whether they had arrived on foot or bus or taxi?

Answer. No.

Question. Just to go back one moment to my prior questions about your statements, sir, when you said to the investigators that you made the contribution to buy two tickets—because it was a chance to meet the President and because it would buy two tickets to a party and that you went to a party, that was not true, was it, when you told the investigators that?

Answer. I beg to differ. I did not buy the two tickets to that party in the off chance that I might meet President Clinton. And it was a misstatement when I said—when I read in the report that I had attended the party. So I wish to correct these two points.

Question. So that I understand, did you attend a party or did you not?

Answer. No, I don't attend. Sir, I did not attend that party.

Question. Did you buy tickets to attend the party?

Mr. CARVIN. Can I help here?

Mr. BALLEN. Yes.

Mr. CARVIN. Now he's confused. Now we're going back to the fund-raiser for the President, the hundred dollar ticket, you're not asking about that?

Mr. BALLEN. No.

Mr. CARVIN. You're asking about, was the $5,000 donation on August 16 intended to purchase a ticket for a party?

The WITNESS. No.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. Let me go back to August 16 again if I can. You testified you received on the morning of August 16 a call from John Huang; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did John Huang call you?

Answer. Yes. He called.

Question. Did he call you or your father? Do you recall?

Answer. He called us.

Mr. CARVIN. It may be—who picked up the phone?

The WITNESS. I picked up the phone first and then I transferred it to my father. So he called me or called my father. The same.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. Were you surprised when John Huang asked to meet with you on August 16?

Answer. Yes. A little surprised and happy.

Question. And happy? Why were you happy?

Answer. I was happy because such a well-known person gave me a buzz.

Question. And did he say in the phone call why he was coming, John Huang?

Answer. No.

Question. So you did not know why he was coming?

Answer. Yes.

Question. He came within an hour of the phone call?

Answer. Yes. It was within an hour.

Question. Who did he meet with? You testified, I believe, your father, yourself, Mr. Pan, and John Huang?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is that correct, sir?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Where did you meet?

Answer. We met in the office, in my father's office.

Question. In your father's office?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How long did the conversation occur?

Answer. You mean on the telephone?

Question. No, no. When you all met in your father's office on August 16.

Answer. Not so long. I would say about 20 or 30 minutes.

Question. Do you recall who asked you to make a contribution first?

Answer. I know, I don't remember which, whether Pan or Huang exactly.

Question. Did they ask you or did they ask your father?

Answer. In fact we sit together. He asked my father and you interested, me and my father.

Question. So they asked both of you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Were you surprised when they asked you to make a contribution?

Answer. Yes. Surprised.

Question. How did you respond? Did you respond or did your father respond?

Answer. I'm not so sure. The surprise not like this, but in my mind can feel what the contribution is so much about.

Question. What did you say or your father say when John Huang asked for a contribution?

Answer. Well, in fact we didn't—although my father and I did not say it was quite a huge sum, $5,000, but from the expressions on our face which showed that we were a little bit taken aback by being asked for such a great sum or big sum.

Question. Was it at that time that the offer for reimbursement occurred?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you understand at the time when the offer for reimbursement was made that it was wrong?

Answer. I didn't know it was illegal but I had my suspicions about it.

Question. You testified earlier in response to a question of Mr. Bennett about checks from two companies to Daniel Wu's account and that the reason those checks—why don't you—I don't want to characterize your testimony. Why don't you tell us again what the reason for the checks to Mr. Wu's accounts were, why you were doing that?

Mr. CARVIN. Just to clarify, you are now talking about the monthly deposits, nothing to do with the DNC checks?

Mr. BALLEN. Correct, the monthly deposits that have to do with the immigration and naturalization.

The WITNESS. I received two different checks from two different companies showing that Mr. Wu was on their payroll. And I put it—I put the checks into his account after which I reimbursed the two companies. The reason being that for immigration purposes, it would show that Mr. Wu was here in the States physically. And on the part—and that he was working in the States. And on the part of the two companies, it was to show they had an employee on the payroll which might give them a tax credit or a tax break. So it was for tax purposes.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. But if I understand your testimony correctly, Mr. Wu was not here physically in the United States while these checks were being paid, is that correct, sir?

Answer. No, he is not here.

Question. He is not?

Answer. No.

Question. So did you understand when you were doing that that it was wrong, too?

Answer. No, I'm sorry, I didn't.

Question. I just have a few more questions, sir.

I believe you told Mr. Waxman that you did not know Mr. Pan's first name when you met him in 1996; is that correct?

Answer. I don't know his first name.

Question. In fact, the only time you heard his first name was when the investigators from the committee asked you his first name; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. So you don't know whether Antonio Pan is the first name of the Mr. Pan that you met; do you?

Answer. On the day of August 16? Is that it?

Question. Correct.

Mr. CARVIN. Did he know on August 16 his first name or does he know today his first name?

Mr. BALLEN. Did he know on August—let's take them seriatim.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. Did you know on August 16 what his first name was, 1996?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you know today what his first name is?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What I am trying to establish is how do you know that is the same person today that you think it was then if you don't know what his name was then?

Answer. I could put it like this: I knew that it was the same Mr. Pan from the description of Mr. Pan that the investigators gave me. And I also learned from him that Mr. Pan's name was Anthony. And afterwards, I got from my father's place his business card, and that is how I also learned what his first name was.

Question. Do you have his business card, sir?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have you produced that to the committee?

Mr. CARVIN. No.

Mr. BALLEN. Mr. Bennett, would that be something then you can ask the witness to produce to the committee?

Mr. BENNETT. That is fine. We can document that the money came from Antonio Pan, but certainly to the extent he can find the business card, if you have it, we'd love to see it. To the extent the witness recalls getting the business card and recalls it's Antonio Pan, that's sufficient as well. But, Mr. Carvin, if you could see if they have the business card, the committee would like to have it.

Mr. CARVIN. In all candor, this came up on Friday in connection with the grand jury. We received today the original of the business card. The Justice Department, frankly, has first dibs on it. We'll be happy to supply the committee with a copy. I don't think there will be any questions as to authenticity.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you.

Mr. BALLEN. I have nothing further, sir. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BENNETT:

Question. Mr. Wang, when you were first interviewed on August 16, and it was paragraph 4 that was read to you by Mr. Ballen, the first paragraph, you at first were not truthful with the agents and then were honest with them when they came back the second time; isn't that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And the second time they came back for further inquiry, then you told them the truthful story?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. BALLEN:

Question. I just have one follow-up question. Today you're telling us the truthful story; is that correct?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. BALLEN. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, you have the opportunity to read and review your deposition, as we said in the start of the deposition. A transcript will be made available to your attorney within the next 24 hours so you will have an opportunity to review it and we will be in contact with Mr. Carvin with respect to your appearance before the full committee this Thursday, August 9.

Mr. Carvin, you will try to supply the names of the two corporations he discussed as well as provide a copy of the business card which Mr. Antonio Pan left; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. Yes.

[Whereupon, at 3:50 p.m., the deposition was concluded.]

[The exhibits referred to follow:]

MEMORANDUM OF INTERVIEW

Re: House of Representatives Investigation

Date: August 15, 1997

Time: 1:00 pm

Place: C. H. Auto Sales
7821/7825 E. Garvey Avenue, Rosemead, CA

Present: David Wang, Witness
John Liu, Witness's Brother-in-Law
James McFadden, Special Agent
Paul Herbert, Special Agent

1. We introduced ourselves to Wang and asked him if we could ask him questions pertaining to an investigation of fundraising by the House of Representatives. We explained that we were independent congressional investigators, and that whatever information we obtained would be shared by both the Democrats and the Republicans on the congressional committee. Wang agreed to answer our questions. The interview with Wang actually consisted of two parts-we returned immediately (within five minutes) after terminating the first part of the interview to ask some follow up questions. Wang's brother-in-law, John Liu initially sat in for the first part of the interview, but left shortly after the interview started without giving any explanation and did not return. Lui did not attend any of the second part of the interview. Wang provided the following information in reply to our questions, during the first part of the interview:

2. Wang (SSN: 624-18-0119) resides at 803 S. Manley Drive, San Gabriel, California 91776, home phone- (818) 300-0956, was born in Taiwan on February 11, 1963 and moved to The United States in December 1988. Wang has been a salesman at C. H. Auto Sales (phone: 818-571-2288, address: 7821/7825 E. Garvey Avenue, Rosemead, CA) since 1989. Wang's father owns the dealership, and Wang's sister (Diana Wang) is married to John Liu.

3. Wang met John Huang through a friend, N.K. Chen, who worked as the manager at the AIB Bank. Wang and John Liu socialized with John Huang a couple times at the "888 Seafood Restaurant" in the San Gabriel valley.

4. Wang stated that in about August 1996, John Huang asked Wang and Liu to make a donation to the DNC for a fundraising party at a downtown Los Angeles hotel. Huang suggested the amount of $5,000 and Wang and Liu agreed since Wang and Liu figured that was an amount they could afford. For making the donation, Wang and Liu got a formal written invitation to the party. Wang and Liu were happy to oblige Huang's request because: 1) it was a favor to Huang, 2) it was a chance to assist the Asian

MINORITY
EX. 1

community, and 3) it was a chance to be close to, and possibly meet President Clinton. Neither Wang nor Liu got any money in return or reimbursement for their donation. Liu's wife gave her brother David Wang $2,500 in cash for Liu's part of the donation. Wang and Liu stated that they had to pay the money after agreeing to make the donation to Huang. The donation bought Wang and Liu two seats at the party. Wang and Liu attended the party, but did not get to meet President Clinton. Wang and Liu both stated they would not have been invited to the party if they had not made the donation.

5. The first part of the interview terminated at about 2:00 pm. When we returned, Wang agreed again to answer questions. Wang provided the following information in reply to our questions, during the second part of the interview:

6. In a meeting between John Huang, Wang and Liu, Huang asked Wang to make a donation to the DNC of $5,000 and advised Wang that he would be repaid for the donation. Huang and a "Mr. Pan or Pen" picked up the $5,000 check from Wang at C.H. Auto Sales. Wang described Huang's repayment arrangement offer as "secret". Although Wang felt "funny" about the arrangement and thought it "very curious", he did not ask Huang for an explanation for the donation and repayment in this manner. Wang paid the $5,000 and identified his signature on check #178 to the DNC of 8/16/96. Wang knew at the time he wrote the check to the DNC for $5,000 that he would be repaid the $5,000, but Wang did not know when or how he would be repaid.

7. Within a week of making the donation, Mr. Pan or Mr. Pen (40-50 years old) repaid the money by making two hand deliveries totaling $5,000 to Wang of $100 bills in 8" by 10" envelopes at the sales office of C. H. Auto Sales. The envelopes were folded to wrap around the cash, and Wang does not recall any writing or identifying marks on the envelopes. Wang does not recall any letters or notes attached to, or inside the envelopes. The first payment of $3,000 was the same day as the donation-8/16/96; the second and last repayment for the remaining $2,000 was delivered two to four days later. Wang does not believe anyone saw him taking the money from Mr. Pan/Pen. Mr. Pan/Pen did not explain why he was alone and did not explain why he, rather than John Huang was making the repayment of the donation. Pan/Pen asked Wang not to tell anyone about the repayment. Wang does not recognize the name "Antonio Pan". At the time of the first repayment, Pan/Pen told Wang that the remainder would be paid later. Wang did not ask, and Pan/Pen did not offer any explanation or reason why the repayment was broken up into two amounts rather than paid at one time. Further, Mr. Pan/Pen did not give any reason why the repayment was in cash, or why he (Pan/Pen) rather than Huang delivered the repayments. Wang does not know the source of the money used in making the cash repayments. Wang kept the cash in his desk until depositing it either later the day of receipt, or the next day, into his checking account at China Trust Bank.

8. Daniel Wu also made a donation to the DNC, which was reimbursed to him. Wu and Wang discussed their donations and reimbursements with each other. Wang saw Wu at the DNC fundraising party, but they did not drive to the party together. Wang did not

originally know the amount of Wu's check to the DNC, but Wang assumed it was also $5,000. Wu's repayments were deposited by Wang to Wu's account at the Bank of Canton. Wu asked Wang to deposit the money as a favor because their banks are located close to each other and Wu knew that Wang was going to his (Wang's) bank. For the first deposit of Wu's money, Wu gave the cash to Wang to deposit. The cash for Wu's second deposit was given directly by Mr. Pan/Pen to Wang at the same time that Pan/Pen gave Wang his $2,000 cash repayment. Wang does not recall if the cash payments of $2,000 each from Pan/Pen for Wu and Wang were in one envelope or two. Mr. Wang was to give the cash to Wu, but Wu asked Wang, during a phone conversation, to deposit the money to Wu's bank account.

9. We asked Wang if he had a 1996 calendar which he could use to try to reconstruct the dates of the repayments. Wang went to his office and returned with his 1996 journal which notes cash to Wang and Wu of $3,000 each on August 16, 1996, and cash to Wang and Wu of $2,000 each on August 20, 1996. Wang stated these were the repayments of the DNC "donations". The recordings in the journal represent the dates of receipt of the cash by Wang; the check marks next to the recordings represent the deposit of the money. After looking at the journal, Wang stated that he received the first repayment the same day he wrote the $5,000 check to the DNC. We then asked Wang if he had his bank account statement from August 1996. Wang went into his office and returned with his August and September 1996 China Trust Bank account statements which show deposits of $3,000 on August 16, 1996 and $2,000 on August 20, 1996. Wang identified these as the deposits of the DNC "donation". Wang agreed to our request to let us hold onto the journal and bank statements.

10. Neither Wang nor Liu know where Daniel Wu is, but they both believe Wu is in Taiwan. Wu frequently traveled between Taiwan and Los Angeles and stayed at hotels when he was in Los Angeles. Wu used the C.H. Auto dealership as his address in Los Angeles. Neither Wang nor Liu recall ever meeting Julian Liu or Charlie Trie.

I prepared this memorandum on August 15, 1997, after refreshing my memory from notes taken during the interview of David Wang.

Paul N. Herbert

This memorandum contains an accurate account of the interview of David Wang.

James McFadden

MEMORANDUM OF CONTACT

Re: House of Representatives Investigation

Date: August 19, 1997

Place: C.H. Automobile Sales
Rosemead, California

Present: David Wang, Witness
Jim McFadden, Investigator
Paul Herbert, Investigator

We met with Wang to advise him that we were leaving town the next day and that he should feel free to call us in Washington DC if he had any questions. We reminded Wang that he was not in trouble and that he should not be alarmed if he gets contacted by someone else from our office. Wang asked us if he should get a lawyer. We advised Wang that it was his decision on whether or not to get a lawyer and that we could not give him any kind of advice in that regard.

James W McFadden
Jim McFadden

Paul N Herbert
Paul N. Herbert

I prepared this memorandum on August 25, 1997.

Paul N Herbert
Paul N. Herbert

MEMORANDUM OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Re: House of Representatives' Fundraising Investigation

Date: September 2, 1997

Between: David Wang, Witness
Jim McFadden, Investigator
Paul Herbert, Investigator

Wang called to advise us that he had been contacted by Tim Griffin of the House investigation and Steven Hanson (phonetic) of the Senate investigation. Wang asked whether we knew these two individuals, and whether he should talk with them. We advised Wang that we worked with Tim Griffin, but that we did not work with or know any of the Senate staff investigators. We advised and reminded Wang that it was his decision on whether to talk with any investigators.

James McFadden

Paul N. Herbert

I prepared this memorandum on September 2, 1997.

Paul N. Herbert

DAVID WANG
[redacted]

176

2-16 1996

Pay to the Order of D.N.C $ 5000.-

Five Thousand only Dollars

TRANS NATIONAL BANK
[redacted]

For

⑆122210406⑆ 011513639⑈ 0178

(104)
Unsuccessful

Check Tracking Form
(ALL information MUST be provided)

act: DAVID WANG

pany Address (circle one) 7825 E. Garvey Ave
ROSEMEAD CA 91770

ias:
28-571-2288

Demographics:
Title
D.O.B.
SSN
Spouse
D.O.B.
SSN

Event PREC. Bikini NY
DNC Contact JOHN HUANG
Solicitor CHARLIE TRIE

DNC Finance ONLY:
Date Received: 2-26 Amount: 5000
Source Code: BONY In AS-400, no changes
Program: MTR ___ TRU ___ BC ___ NFC ✓ WLF ___ SC ___ LC ___ OTH ___
Revenue Code: E01 Fundraiser Code: 821

Confidential Information

DNC 1804366

MINORITY
EXHIBIT 2

DAVID WANG
[redacted]

178
90-1040/1222

8-16 1986

Pay to the Order of D.N.C $ 5000.-

Five Thousand and ___ Dollars

TRANS NATIONAL BANK
7936 SUNTINGTON DRIVE
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

For ___

[redacted]

Check Tracking Form
(ALL information MUST be provided)

ect: DAVID WANG

pany Address (circle one): 7825 E. GARVEY AVE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770

ies:
78-571-2288

Demographics:
Title ___
D.O.B. ___
SSN ___
Spouse ___
D.O.B. ___
SSN ___

Event: pres. Bilton NY
DNC Contact: JOHN HUANG
Solicitor: CHARLIE TRIE

DNC Finance ONLY:
Date Received: 8-26 Amount: 5000
Source Code: BONN In AS-400, no changes ___
Program: MTR ___ TRU ___ BC ___ NFC ✓ WLF ___ SC ___ LC ___ OTH ___
Revenue Code: E01 Fundraiser Code: 821

0 0000323
CONFIDENTIAL

EXHIBIT
DW-1

CHINA TRUST BANK OF CALIFORNIA FDIC

Head Office • [illegible] Torrance CA [illegible]

DAVID WANG
[redacted]

NOW ACCOUNTS
8/16/96 C
[redacted]
1 [redacted] BRANCH-001

[redacted] SUMMARY FOR NOW ACCOUNTS

	BEGINNING BALANCE	7/17/96	1,639.26	
	DEPOSITS / MISC CREDITS	2	3,002.43	
	WITHDRAWALS / MISC DEBITS	0	.00	
**	ENDING BALANCE		4,641.69	**
	SERVICE CHARGE		.00	
	INTEREST PAID		2.43	
	INTEREST PAID YEAR TO DATE		16.08	
	ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		1.46	
	NUMBER OF DAYS FOR A.P.Y.E.		32	
	AVERAGE BALANCE FOR A.P.Y.E.		1,921	
	MINIMUM BALANCE		1,639	

MISCELLANEOUS DEBITS AND CREDITS

DATE	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
8/16/96	3,000.00 CR	DEPOSIT
8/16/96	2.43 CR	INTEREST EARNED

DAILY BALANCE SUMMARY

DATE	BALANCE	DATE	BALANCE
8/16/96	4,641.69		

EXHIBIT
DW-2

CHINA TRUST BANK OF CALIFORNIA FDIC

[redacted]

DAVID WANG
[redacted]

NOW ACCOUNTS
9/17/96 C
[redacted] [redacted]
1 BRANCH-001

[redacted] SUMMARY FOR NOW ACCOUNTS

BEGINNING BALANCE	8/17/96	4,641.69	
DEPOSITS / MISC CREDITS	2	2,007.81	
WITHDRAWALS / MISC DEBITS	0	.00	
** ENDING BALANCE	9/17/96	6,649.50	**
SERVICE CHARGE		.00	
INTEREST PAID		7.81	
INTEREST PAID YEAR TO DATE		27.39	
ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		1.46	
NUMBER OF DAYS FOR A.P.Y.E.		70	
AVERAGE BALANCE FOR A.P.Y.E.		6,575	
MINIMUM BALANCE		4,641	

MISCELLANEOUS DEBITS AND CREDITS

DATE	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
8/20/96	2,000.00 CR	DEPOSIT
9/17/96	7.81 CR	INTEREST EARNED

DAILY BALANCE SUMMARY

DATE	BALANCE	DATE	BALANCE
8/20/96	6,641.69	9/17/96	6,649.50

WEEK 33

nesday

15 Thursday

16 Friday

17 Saturday

Reminders

Reminders

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

18 Sunday

NIGHT

NIGHT

EXHIBIT
DW-3

8 · AUGUST

WEEK 1

19 Monday	20 Tuesday	21 Wednesday
Reminders	Reminders	Reminders
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
A.M.	A.M.	A.M.
8	8	8
9	9	9
10	10	10
11	11	11
12	12	12
P.M.	P.M.	P.M.
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
NIGHT	NIGHT	NIGHT
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9

DNC / Ernst and Young Survey
for Wang

David Wang
Survey Unsuccessful

104

Confidential Information

DNC 1804346

EXHIBIT
DW-4

ERNST & YOUNG LLP
Financial Advisory Services Group
1225 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202-327-5876
Facsimile: 202-327-6226

#104

To: David Wang
[redacted]
[redacted]

The accounting firm of Ernst & Young LLP has been retained to confirm certain information about contributions to the Democratic National Committee (the "DNC").

We tried to speak with you on the telephone, but we either were unable to reach you or were asked to send our request for information to you in writing.

According to the DNC's records, your name is

David Wang

and you made the following contribution to the DNC

Amount: 5000.00

Date: August 16, 199[illegible]

Would you please answer the following questions to confirm your contribution and that it is in compliance with federal law.

1. If your name is not spelled or listed correctly above, please spell it correctly: _____

2. Your daytime phone number: 818-571-2288

Confidential Information

DNC 1804349

13. What is your social security number?

[redacted]

14. Can you confirm that all the money that was used to make this contribution was your money and did not come from some other source or person?

✓ Yes ____ No

15. If this money was not yours, we need to know whose money it was. Please tell us whose money was given to the DNC and give us his/her name, address and telephone number:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Telephone: _____

16. If you can recall, who was the person who asked or solicited you to make this contribution?

Mr. Huang

17. May we telephone you to ask any follow-up information?

____ Yes ✓ No

18. If so, what number should we call and what is the best time to call you?

Telephone number: _____

Best time to call: _____

If you have any questions, please call me at the number below:

_____

(202) 327-5876

Confidential Information

DNC 1804351

(104)
Successful
Unsuccessful

Debevoise & Plimpton
DRAFT - December 6, 1996 (3:38pm)
Privileged and Confidential
Attorney Work Product

Lines of Inquiry for Individual Contributions:

[redacted]

Name of person called: David Wang

Telephone number called: [redacted] ← confirmation number

Telephone number where the person was reached: ( ) _____

Date of call when the person was reached: _____

Name of person conducting the telephone interview: _____

General Recommendations:

1. The interviewer should know as much about the person he or she is calling as possible. The interviewer should know whether the number is an office, home, message center or some other location.

A full database report on the individual and the telephone number and address should be provided to the interviewer.

2. When possible the interviewer should be female. Female callers are less threatening and often are more successful at getting respondents to cooperate.

3. Plan to make residential calls in the evening and on weekends and office calls during business hours. Try to obtain direct numbers or private line numbers for business calls.

4. Anticipate that the person answering may not speak English. Have

40001904.02

Confidential Information

DNC 1804353

Debevoise & Plimpton
DRAFT - December 6, 1996 (3:38pm)
Privileged and Confidential
Attorney Work Product

Answer: "He's not home."

"Where can I reach him?"

Answer: "He's at the office."

"Do you have that number?"

The point is to avoid revealing the organization or the purpose of the call until the interviewer is talking to the person he/she is seeking. Otherwise, the person being called has too much opportunity to rebuff the question without talking to the interviewer.

The interviewer should not leave a number until he/she is sure that the person being called is unavailable.

Do not leave a message on voice mail. This will provide no verification that you tried to contact the person and will forewarn him/her about the nature of your inquiry.

If the interviewer must leave a number at an office or with a family member or associate, try to obtain the name of the person who is taking the message and make the message compelling. We suggest something like: "Please call the Democratic National Committee to confirm your contribution."

Once the interviewer is in touch with the named party or a representative who says he/she can answer the questions, then the interviewer should proceed with the following questions.

1. Mr./Mrs./Ms. [David Warm], I am calling on behalf of the Democratic National Committee.

2. According to the records of the Democratic National Committee, you made a political contribution to the Democratic National Committee on [date]/ 8/14

Confidential Information

DNC 1804355

Debevoise & Plimpton
DRAFT - December 6, 1996 (3:38pm)
Privileged and Confidential
Attorney Work Product

3. We need to ask you for information about this contribution so that the Democratic National Committee can determine whether it should keep this contribution or return it.

4. Please understand that if we do not get enough confirming information, the Democratic National Committee may have no choice but to return the money to you and report this fact to the Federal Election Commission.

5. We need your cooperation so the Democratic National Committee can determine what to do with the money you contributed.

6. The information you give us will be used only to verify your contribution to the Democratic National Committee.

Do you remember making a political contribution to the Democratic National Committee on [date]/? 5000

8/16

Answer: Yes

7. How much did you give to the Democratic National Committee on [date]?

8/16

Answer: _____

8. Do you have a record of this, like a cancelled check or bank statement?

[redacted]

Answer: _____

9. Would you please confirm the spelling of your name for me? According to the Democratic National Committee's records, [spell it out and confirm.]

Correct spelling: _____

10. Would you please confirm your current address? According to the Democratic National Committee's records, [state address and confirm].

40001904.02

Confidential Information

DNC 1804356

DAVID WANG
[illegible]
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

170

8-16 1996

Pay to the Order of D.N.C. $ 5000.-

Five Thousand only Dollars

TRANS NATIONAL BANK
[illegible]
SAN MARINO, CA [illegible]

For [redacted]

104

Unprocessed

Check Tracking Form
(ALL information MUST be provided)

act: DAVID WANG

pany Address (circle one): 7255 E. Garvey Ave
ROSEMEAD CA 91770

ms:
28-571-2288

Demographics:
Title
D.O.B.
SSN
Spouse
D.O.B.
SSN

Event: pres. Bikini NY
DNC Contact: John Huang
Solicitor: CHARLIE TRIE

DNC Finance ONLY
Date Received: 8-28 Amount: 5000
Source Code: BDNY In ES400, no changes:
Program: MTR ___ TRU ___ BC ___ NPC ✓ WLP ___ SC ___ LC ___ OTH ___
Revenue Code: E01 Fundraiser Code: 821

Confidential Information

DNC 1804366

ERNST & YOUNG

(109)

Unspec.

12/12/96 - Spoke w/ Mr. Wang. He requested we send a worker form to him

Confidential Information

DNC 1804368

CALIFORNIA
DRIVER LICENSE CLASS: C
A5217145
EXPIRES 02-11-01
DAVID WEI CHEN WANG
7825 E GARVEY AVE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
SEX: M HAIR: BLK EYES: BRN
HT: 5-04 WT: 140 DOB: 02-11-
12/27/95 235 / FD/00 K2754

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURES OF DANIEL WU 80-622-066 POWER OF ATTORNEY DAVID WEI CHEN WANG

FOR **Bank of Canton of California**

BANK OF CANTON OF CALIFORNIA

I hereby authorize and empower DAVID WEI CHEN WANG whose signature is given below to sign for me and as my agent, and in my name and on my behalf, checks against any deposit or deposits I now have, or may hereafter have in the COMMERCIAL DEPARTMENT of your Bank, and for me and on my behalf to endorse and cash or deposit checks and drafts payable to me or to my order, and to receive and receipt for statements of my account and cancelled checks, and make settlement in connection therewith and to acknowledge and accept for me and on my behalf the correctness of the balances of my said account.

You are hereby directed to honor the above authority, which shall continue in force until revocation thereof in writing signed by me is delivered to and accepted by an officer of your Bank of the office in which my account is kept.

Daniel Wu

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

POWER OF ATTORNEY AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

BY

019024

EXHIBIT
Dwl-5

BANK OF CANTON OF CALIFORNIA
EDS-RPDD010A

DDA STATEMENT HISTORY AS OF 4/14/97

PAGE: 8832
TIME 8:44:25 DATE 4/14/97

Stmt
Drop
Date. . .: 08/22/96

A C C O U N T I N F O

Account .:	030622066	Int Pd YTD :	$.00	Annual % rate:	
CIF Key .:	WU DANI 0	Svc Chg amt :	$.00	HE Fees due :	$.00
Status. .:		Curr month		Daily % rate :	
Stmt Code:	R	agg bal :	$46,999.44	Late chg due :	$.00
Hold Code:		Agg bal for		Amount due :	$.00
Reserve		Cash W/D :	$40,105.11	Other debts :	$.00
Act. Code:		Curr Month		Stmt princ :	$.00
Previous		agg days : 30		Stmt Interest:	$.00
Stmt Date:	7/23/96	Lst Stmt Bal :	$.00	Stmt C/L :	$.00
Previous		Line of Crdt :	$.00	Stmt A&H :	$.00
Stmt Bal :	$430.00	Stmt Advances:	$.00	HE Stmt to	
Curr Bal :	$5,693.62	Avail Credit :	$.00	date fees pd :	$.00
Debt Amt :	$646.17	Total Pymts :	$.00	Stmt late chg:	$.00
Cred Amt :	$5,909.79	Prin Amt Due :	$.00	Other credits:	$.00
# of Debt:	2	Curr Loan Bal:	$.00	# days since	
# of Cred:	4	Finance Chg :	$.00	lst pay cycle:	
SAV Acct#:		Avg. Balance :	$.00	Int curr due :	$.00
Int. Paid		Tot Past Due :	$.00	C/L curr due :	$.00
Stmt-to-Date:	$.00	Bal @ lst Adv:	$.00	A&H curr due :	$.00
Int bearing		Finance chg			
Plan Code:	004	Past Due :	$.00		

T R A N S A C T I O N I N F O

Seq	Tran Date	DDA bnk #	DDA brn #	User code	Post Code	Addenda Code	Tran amount	Batch/Seq	Check #	Trans Entry Date	Individual Name
1	07/29/96		30	701	1		$639.79	316 00820		07/29/96	
2	08/06/96		30	811	9		$6.38	306 01170		08/06/96	
3	08/08/96		30	811	9		$639.79	301 00260		08/08/96	
4	08/16/96		30	701	1		$3,000.00	310 03590	9956	08/18/96	
5	08/20/96		30	705	0		$270.00	308 01570		08/20/96	
6	08/20/96		30	701	1		$2,000.00	310 01430	9955	08/20/96	

018831

237

FORCAD-Bayonne, N. J.
EXHIBIT
DC-6

BANK OF CANTON OF CALIFORNIA
EDS-RPD0010A

DDA STATEMENT HISTORY AS OF 2/12/97

PAGE: 8797
TIME 8:48:46 DATE 2/12/97

Stmt
Drop
Date. . .: 10/23/96

A C C O U N T I N F O

Account .:	030622066	Int Pd YTD :	$.00	Annual % rate:	
CIF Key .:	WU DANI D	Svc Chg amt :	$.00	HE fees due :	$.00
Status. .:		Curr month		Daily % rate :	
Stmt Code:	R	agg bal :	$59,077.68	Late chg due :	$.00
Hold Code:		Agg bal for		Amount due :	$.00
Reserve		Cash W/D :	$57,844.76	Other debts :	$.00
Act. Code:		Curr Month		Stmt princ :	$.00
Previous		agg days :	30	Stmt interest:	$.00
Stmt Date:	9/23/96	Lst Stmt Bal :	$.00	Stmt C/L :	$.00
Previous		Line of Crdt :	$.00	Stmt A&H :	$.00
Stmt Bal :	$6,333.41	Stmt Advances:	$.00	HE Stmt to	
Curr Bal :	$693.62	Avail Credit :	$.00	date fees pd :	$.00
Debt Amt :	$10,279.58	Total Pymts :	$.00	Stmt late chg:	$.00
Cred Amt :	$4,639.79	Prin Amt Due :	$.00	Other credits:	$.00
# of Debt:	3	Curr Loan Bal:	$.00	# days since	
# of Cred:	2	Finance Chg :	$.00	lst pay cycle:	
SAV Acct#:		Avg. Balance :	$.00	Int curr due :	$.00
Int. Paid		Tot Past Due :	$.00	C/L curr due :	$.00
Stmt-to-Date:	$.00	Bal @ lst Adv:	$.00	A&H curr due :	$.00
Int bearing		Finance chg			
Plan Code:	004	Past Due :	$.00		

T R A N S A C T I O N I N F O

Seq	Tran Date	DDA bnk #	DDA brn #	User code	Post Code	Addenda Code	Tran amount	Batch/Seq	Check #	Trans Entry Date	Individual Name
1	09/25/96		30	811	9		$5,000.00	303 01380	1001	09/25/96	
2	09/30/96		30	701	1		$639.79	313 01530	9953	09/30/96	
3	10/16/96		30	701	1		$4,000.00	311 03620	9952	10/16/96	
4	10/16/96		30	811	9		$4,000.00	306 00730	1002	10/16/96	
5	10/23/96	R	30	811	9		$1,279.58	302 02190	1003	10/23/96	

EXHIBIT
Du-7

018027

238

DNC / Ernst and Young Survey
for Wu

Daniel Wu
On Hold/Call back

EXHIBIT
DW-8

Confidential Information

1803069

Call Back

DANIEL WU 46

Info provided: 7821 E. Garvey Ave.
Rosemead, CA 91770

New info: Above address not found in residential listings.

Listed as the mailing/registered office of:
Pro Sharp Co., James Wang pres.
Ji Tai International Investment Inc., Jiadeng Wang pres.
C H Auto (DBA, used car dealership owned by Pro Sharp)
Phone: (818)571-2288

12/23/96 Called 818-571-2288 - Spoke to receptionist; Said Mr. Wu is out of town and won't be back until after the New Year.

Daniel Wu

Jim McGurry

(46)
CallBack

Debevoise & Plimpton
DRAFT - December 6, 1996 (3:38pm)
Privileged and Confidential
Attorney Work Product

Lines of Inquiry for Individual Contributions:

Name of person called: Daniel Wu

12/9/96 PHONE # FOR DANIEL WU SAMG AS KUM-CHENG YEH

Telephone number called: ( )

Telephone number where the person was reached: ( )

12/9. No Daniel Wu listed at address - check Got information on 2 Daniel Wu's in Redwood, CA. One was wrong number, second was not listed

Date of call when the person was reached: _____

Name of person conducting the telephone interview: _____

DEAD EMO RESEARCH

General Recommendations:

1. The interviewer should know as much about the person he or she is calling as possible. The interviewer should know whether the number is an office, home, message center or some other location.

A full database report on the individual and the telephone number and address should be provided to the interviewer.

2. When possible the interviewer should be female. Female callers are less threatening and often are more successful at getting respondents to cooperate.

3. Plan to make residential calls in the evening and on weekends and office calls during business hours. Try to obtain direct numbers or private line numbers for business calls.

4. Anticipate that the person answering may not speak English. Have

48001904.02

Answer: "He's not home."

"Where can I reach him?"

Answer: "He's at the office."

"Do you have that number?"

The point is to avoid revealing the organization or the purpose of the call until the interviewer is talking to the person he/she is seeking. Otherwise, the person being called has too much opportunity to rebuff the question without talking to the interviewer.

The interviewer should not leave a number until he/she is sure that the person being called is unavailable.

Do not leave a message on voice mail. This will provide no verification that you tried to contact the person and will forewarn him/her about the nature of your inquiry.

If the interviewer must leave a number at an office or with a family member or associate, try to obtain the name of the person who is taking the message and make the message compelling. We suggest something like: "Please call the Democratic National Committee to confirm your contribution."

Once the interviewer is in touch with the named party or a representative who says he/she can answer the questions, then the interviewer should proceed with the following questions.

1. Mr./Mrs./Ms. [David WD], I am calling on behalf of the Democratic National Committee.

2. According to the records of the Democratic National Committee, you made a political contribution to the Democratic National Committee on [date]/ 8/14

Confidential Information

DNC 1803075

1001

ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

8-16 19 96

PAY TO THE ORDER OF D.N.C. $ 5000.-

Five Thousand only DOLLARS

BANK OF CANTON OF CALIFORNIA
MONTEREY PARK BRANCH
535 NORTH ATLANTIC BOULEVARD
MONTEREY PARK, CALIFORNIA 91754

FOR Daniel Wu

[redacted]

Check Tracking Form
(ALL Information MUST be provided)

ect DANIEL WU

party Address (circle one) 7821 E. GARVEY AVE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770

nes:

Demographics:
Title
D.O.B.
SSN
Spouse
D.O.B.
SSN

Event PRES. BIRTH NY
DNC Contact JOHN HUANG
Solicitor CHARLIE TRIE

DNC Finance ONLY:
Date Received 7-30 Amount 5000
Source Code: BDNY Cr. In AS400, no changes
Program: MTR TRL BC NFC X WLF SC LC OTH
Revenue Code: F01 Fundraiser Code: 821

Confidential Information

DNC 1803086

(46)

DNC Finance
Executive Summary

Daniel Wu
7551 East Garvey Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

W: F: W:
H: H: (213) 484-2593 — # NOT AVAILABLE
O: O:
M: M:
C: C:
G: G:
DOB: [redacted]

30+ Wu's in Rosemead, No Daniel Wu's listed

WRITTEN 1996 Total: 3,000 1995 Total: 0 INDIVIDUAL

Date	Amount	Comment	Solicitor	Fundraiser	
9/24/96	3,000	NEW YORK BIRTHDAY PARTY		John Huang	781

WRITTEN 1996 Total: 0 1995 Total: 0 COMPANY

Date	Amount	Comment	Solicitor	Fundraiser

LAIRED
Echo

Amount	Event	Date

PARTICIPATION
Date Activity

RESEARCH NEEDED

Confidential Information

DNC 1803087

RESEARCH INFORMATION FORM

Researcher: Jim Kilcoyne

[redacted]			
Daniel Lim	TRSC		SEE ATTACHED

Confidential Information

DNC 1803088

INFORMATION RESOURCE SERVICE COMPANY
3777 N. Harbor Blvd. Fullerton, CA 92635
Nationwide (800) 640-4772

Copyright (C) IRSC, Inc. 1996. All rights reserved

Report Date : 12-11-1996

ATTN: COREY ENGLE
ERNST & YOUNG
1225 CONNECTICUT AVE N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20036

Claim/Reference #: DNC
Subject : WU, DANIEL, 7821
Search Number : 2257518
Requester : JFM

NAME/ADDRESS (NID)

Data Submitted:

Last Name : WU
First Name : DANIEL
Middle Init :
Generation :
Social Sec # :
DOB :
Street Number : 7821
Street Name : E. GARVEY AVE
City :
State : CA
Zip : 91770

Data Returned :

*** No Records Found ***

*** End of Search ***

Confidential Information

DNC 1803089

INFORMATION RESOURCE SERVICE COMPANY
3777 N. Harbor Blvd. Fullerton, CA 92635
Nationwide (800) 640-4772

Copyright (C) IRSC, Inc. 1996. All rights reserved

Report Date : 12-11-1996

ATTN: COREY ENGLE
ERNST & YOUNG
1225 CONNECTICUT AVE N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20036

Claim/Reference #: DNC
Subject : WU, DANIEL, 7821
Search Number : 2257522
Requester : JFM

NEW ADDRESS/NEIGHBOR (5)

Data Submitted:

Last Name : WU
First Name : DANIEL
Middle Init :
Street Number : 7821
Street Dir :
Street Name : E. GARVEY AVE
Street Dir :
Street Type :
Apartment # :
City : ROSEMEAD
State : CA
Zip : 91770

Data Returned :

SUBJECT VERIFICATION WITH 5 NEIGHBORS
ADDRESS
01. VENADERO SERGIO DU: MF3-9 DOR:1995 (818) 571-0203
7758 GARVEY AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770
NEIGHBORS
01. NGUYEN MD LAN DU: SFDU DOR:1990 (818) 571-6931
7900 GARVEY AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770

Confidential Information

DNC 1803091

02. RETANA MARTHA I DU: MF3-9 DOR:1992 (818) 572-3004
7758 GARVEY AVE #3/4 ROSEMEAD CA 91770
03. LEE SHANEL DU: DUPLEX DOR:1995 (818) 571-5826
7940 GARVEY AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770
04. URIAS DOUGLAS DU: MF50-100 DOR:1995 (818) 571-1509
7709 GARVEY AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770
05. ACOSTA ANNA A DU: MF20-49 DOR:1986 (818) 280-7954
8069 GARVEY AVE #33 ROSEMEAD CA 91770
SUBJECT OR HOUSE NUMBER NOT FOUND, NEAREST RETURNED (40)

*** End of Search ***

** DISCLAIMER **

The accuracy of the data submitted by the requestor will directly determine the accuracy of the results obtained. While the information furnished is from reliable sources, its accuracy is not guaranteed. Use of available data may be subject to FCRA and other applicable law.

End of Report

Thank you for your inquiry.

RESEARCH INFORMATION FORM

Researcher:_____

[redacted]			
Wu Daniel	Information Provided Text Location		Wu Daniel, Wu Christina
			2015 Leeds Pl
			Rosemead CA 91770
			(818) 571-5809-WRONG #
			Mailing Address
			110 Sunset Ave
			San Gabriel, CA
			91776
			Wu Daniel
			9541 De Adelaide St
			Rosemead CA 91770
			Mailing Address
			1500 S. Delta St
			San Gabriel, CA 91776

Confidential Information

DNC 1803093

INFORMATION RESOURCE SERVICE COMPANY
3777 N. Harbor Blvd. Fullerton, CA 92635
Nationwide (800) 640-4772

Copyright (C) IRSC, Inc. 1996. All rights reserved

Report Date : 12-11-1996

ATTN: COREY ENGLE
ERNST & YOUNG
1225 CONNECTICUT AVE N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20036

Claim/Reference #: DNC
Subject : WU, DANIEL
Search Number : 2257540
Requester : JFM

NAME SEARCH STATEWIDE

Data Submitted:

Last Name : WU
First Name : DANIEL
State : CA

Data Returned :

SEL	NO		NON LOR HOH			
1	DANIEL H WU		(310) 000 - 0000			
	10241 PRISCILLA ST		DOWNEY	CA	90242	02
2	DANIEL Y WU		(310) 000 - 0000			
	1 OCEANAIRE DR		RANCHO PALOS VE	CA	90275	02
3	DANIEL B WU		(310) 000 - 0000			
	18322 KINGSDALE AVE		REDONDO BEACH	CA	90278	01
4	DANIEL WU		(310) 000 - 0000			
	534 LINCOLN BLVD		SANTA MONICA	CA	90402	02 *
5	DANIEL H WU		(310) 000 - 0000			
	12714 CUESTA ST		CERRITOS	CA	90703	02
6	DANIEL WU		(818) 000 - 0000			
	2227 S 4TH AVE		ARCADIA	CA	91006	03
7	DANIEL WU		(818) 000 - 0000			

Confidential Information

DNC 1803094

1533 S DEL MAR AVE SAN GABRIEL CA 91776 02
8 DANIEL WU (818) 000 - 0000
6044 TEMPLE CITY BLVD #E TEMPLE CITY CA 91780 05 *
9 DANIEL WU (909) 000 - 0000
21612 CATTAIL CT WALNUT CA 91789 02
10 DANIEL H WU (714) 000 - 0000
3701 PARKVIEW LN #23A IRVINE CA 92612 01
11 DANIEL WU (805) 000 - 0000
308 MONTALVO DR BAKERSFIELD CA 93309 02 *
12 DANIEL WU (415) 964 - 8378
15 MOONBEAM DR MOUNTAIN VIEW CA 94043 21 *
13 DANIEL WU (415) 359 - 6535
3141 FASMAN DR SAN BRUNO CA 94066 11 *
14 DANIEL WU (415) 333 - 7900
259 NAPLES ST SAN FRANCISCO CA 94112 03 *
15 DANIEL WU (707) 429 - 3912
903 DANIEL ST FAIRFIELD CA 94533 09
16 DANIEL H WU (510) 782 - 6891
25790 SCRIPPS ST HAYWARD CA 94545 08
17 DANIEL WU (510) 000 - 0000
110 LESLIE LN ORINDA CA 94563 01 *
18 DANIEL WU (510) 000 - 0000
3450 LAKESHORE AVE #C OAKLAND CA 94610 01

** DISCLAIMER **
The accuracy of the data submitted by the requestor will directly determine the accuracy of the results obtained. While the information furnished is from reliable sources, its accuracy is not guaranteed. Use of available data may be subject to FCRA and other applicable law.

End of Report

Thank you for your inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I will try not to take the full 30 minutes, if possible.

Mr. Wang, thank you very much for being here today. As you recall, I took your deposition on Monday of this week.

Before we start, we should note that Mr. Liang, you are here as an interpreter, is that correct, sir?

Mr. LIANG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And just state your full name, for the record.

Mr. LIANG. Herman H. Liang.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sorry, sir. We can't hear you. You need to pull up the microphone.

Mr. BURTON. If you all will pull the microphone as close to you as possible. Just pull it up.

Mr. LIANG. Herman H. Liang, L-I-A-N-G.

Mr. BENNETT. And your background, sir, is I believe you are with the U.S. Information Agency; is that correct?

Mr. LIANG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And you have been a contract interpreter with the State Department for 15 years, is that correct, Mr. Liang?

Mr. LIANG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang, in light of the fact that Congressman Waxman and I had the occasion to take, and also Mr. Ballen, minority counsel, your client's deposition on Monday and my concerns with his understanding the English language, I would ask in the abundance of caution, if you translate as we go. I will try to go slowly. Sometimes it is difficult for me, but I will try to go slowly, and I ask that you make sure that you translate everything that I say for your client. Could you do that, Mr. Liang?

Mr. LIANG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, sir.

Again, Mr. Wang, we took your deposition on Monday of this week. Before we start, I would like to give you an opportunity to correct or further explain any of the answers which you gave during that deposition.

To the best of your knowledge, are the statements made on Monday here in Washington, during the deposition, attended by me and Congressman Waxman and Mr. Ballen and other staff, are they correct, sir?

[Unless otherwise indicated, all answers of Mr. Wang are in English.]

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. You need to speak more loudly into the microphone, Mr. Wang. You need to bring that closer to you, sir.

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, as you know, this committee has an interest in the contributions that you made to the Democratic National Committee. I would like to ask you some questions in connection with the contribution which you made in August 1996 and also contributions made in the name of Daniel Wu.

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you understand that that will be the area of my questions?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. First of all, Mr. Wang, this is your second appearance, actually your third appearance, with respect to these matters here in Washington over the past 6 days. Is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And you are also represented—I meant to welcome you, Mr. Carvin; I am sorry—by Mr. Michael Carvin, an attorney here in Washington.

You have had an opportunity to be with your client over the last week and a half, I guess, Mr. Carvin; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And did you accompany him to the Federal grand jury?

Mr. CARVIN. Actually, my partner did, but he was represented.

Mr. BENNETT. Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, no lawyer could be in the grand jury with Mr. Wang; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. That's correct.

Mr. BENNETT. And with respect to the matters of August 1996, Mr. Wang, directing your attention to August 1996, records obtained by this committee reflect that you made a contribution to the Democratic National Committee. Do you recall being asked to make a contribution to the Democratic National Committee in August 1996?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And I will ask that we put on exhibit 99 on the projector at this time.

[Exhibit 99 follows:]

DAVID WANG

W [redacted]

178

8-16 1996

Pay to the order of D.N.C $ 5000.-

Five Thousand and Dollars

TRANS NATIONAL BANK
7936 HUNTINGTON DRIVE
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

For

[redacted] 0178

Check Tracking Form
(ALL information MUST be provided)

act DAVID WANG

pany Address (circle one) [redacted]

[redacted]

Demographics:
Title
D.O.B.
SSN
Spouse
D.O.B.
SSN

Event PRES. BILLY NY
DNC Contact JOHN HUANG
Solicitor CHARLIE TRIE

DNC Finance ONLY:
Date Received 8-20 Amount 5000
Source Code: BDNY In AS-400, no changes
Program: MTR ___ TRU ___ BC ___ NFC ✓ WLF ___ SC ___ LC ___ OTH ___
Revenue Code: E01 Fundraiser Code: 821

EXHIBIT
99

0 0000323
CONFIDENTIA

Mr. BENNETT. Let me ask you something first, Mr. Wang. Had you ever made a political contribution to a political campaign prior to August 1996?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And how many political contributions had you made prior to August 1996?

Mr. WANG. One time.

Mr. BENNETT. And that was for how much, sir?

Mr. WANG. That—$99.

Mr. BENNETT. And apart from that one $99 contribution, had you made any other contributions to any political candidates or political parties prior to August 1996?

Mr. WANG. Yes. Another contribution for the President of the party for $300.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang, if you will help Mr. Wang with respect to that answer and translate that for us, please.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] There was another contribution that I made that was for President Clinton's birthday party and I made out a check for $300.

Mr. BENNETT. For $300.

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, to your knowledge, Mr. Wang, apart from the $99 check and the $300 check for President Clinton's birthday party fund-raiser—in fact, you made that contribution yourself; is that correct, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang, verify that the client understands that no one reimbursed him for that contribution. Correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. No one did? If you will translate his answer, Mr. Liang, clarifying that there is no testimony that someone reimbursed him for that payment. Correct?

Mr. LIANG. The answer should have been no because the differences in the two languages.

Mr. BENNETT. All right. Thank you. Directing your attention now to exhibit 99, which is on the projector screen, this is, in fact, a check which you prepared dated August 16, 1996, paid to the order of the DNC, $5,000.

Can you identify that copy, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And so you understand, Mr. Wang, the tracking form on the bottom of that check is, in fact, the tracking form which we procured from the Democratic National Committee. Directing your attention to that check, you can identify your signature on the check?

Mr. WANG. Yes, that's my signature.

Mr. BENNETT. And, Mr. Wang, when were you first asked and by whom to make this contribution? What were the circumstances surrounding your making this contribution?

Mr. WANG. That's on the day August 16th, and it had been—by Huang or Pan.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang, you will have to translate. I thought I understood him to say by Huang or Pan, but you will need to

translate the answer. I am trying to ask who—what person or persons contacted Mr. Wang with respect to this check?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] It could be either one, either Mr. Huang or Mr. Pan.

Mr. BENNETT. All right. Was it by telephone or in person?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] They came in person and asked me to make a donation.

Mr. BENNETT. All right. Was there a telephone call prior to anyone arriving in person to visit with Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, there was a phone call.

Mr. BENNETT. And does he recall who called him?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Mr. Huang.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, with respect to Mr. Huang, does he know Mr. Huang's first name? Mr. Wang, do you know Mr. Huang's first name?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] At that time, I knew only his name in Chinese.

Mr. BENNETT. Directing your attention to August 16, 1996, which is the date of the check, did this occur the same day, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Did you know an individual named John Huang prior to August 16, 1996?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And who was John Huang? I want to make sure we are or not talking about the same person. Who was John Huang, to your knowledge, on August 16, 1996, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. John Huang during that time——

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang, I think you may have to assist him with this, if you will, please.

Can you respond for your client, Mr. Liang?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I think he was one of the better known persons or figures that was involved in raising funds for President Clinton's campaign.

Mr. BURTON. To make it easier for all the Members, would you pull the microphones, both of them, very close to you, please? Pull them close to you so we can hear you better. Thank you.

Mr. BENNETT. Had you met Mr. John Huang before, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And on how many occasions had you met Mr. John Huang prior to the visit by me and another individual, according to your testimony, on August 16, 1996?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Just once, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And except for one time, prior to August 16, 1996, there was only one occasion that you had ever actually met Mr. John Huang; is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And where and when had you met him, sir?

Mr. WANG. In Philadelphia about—at that time, I don't remember, but June or July in 1996 in one Chinese restaurant.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang, I believe your client testified that he had met this individual one time before in June or July 1996 at a Chinese restaurant. Is that what he said?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And that was in California?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Had you ever seen Mr. John Huang's pictures in the newspaper?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Huang, let me ask you this: Does your father know John Huang?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. And if so, how? I don't want you to get into the nature of your business because that is, I think, stricken from the record in terms of privacy concerns for this witness, Mr. Chairman. But how does your father known John Huang?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] It was at a social occasion and some friends introduced my father to Mr. John Huang.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, directing your attention to this particular day in August 1996, August 16, 1996, according to exhibit 99, did there come a point in time when you met with two individuals at your home or at your place of business?

Mr. WANG. In the office.

Mr. BENNETT. In the office?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And was it the same day of the telephone call?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And to the best of your knowledge, it was August 16, 1996?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Huang, I should tell you that Tuesday, the day after your deposition, I was visited by John Huang's attorney, whom I know personally, who insisted that his client was not with you in California on that particular day and that you are mistaken with respect to the identity of one of the two men whom you met on that day.

If you will translate that for him, Mr. Liang?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] To the best of my knowledge, I took that person who came with Mr. Pan to be John Huang.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand. Just, in fairness to your client, Mr. Carvin, I wanted to make sure he understood that. And just in further fairness to your client, Mr. Carvin, I received at lunchtime today, about 35 minutes ago, a copy of a letter which Mr. John Huang's attorney, in fact, given to minority counsel last night, and I had not seen it, but in that—Mr. Cobb is an attorney whom I have known personally for some 20 years. He gave me the heads up and gave me a copy of it. So I only have the copy that John Huang's attorney has given to me and I have provided a copy of that letter to your attorney, Mr. Carvin.

Mr. Carvin, I am just trying to move forward here, but I want to make sure that no one tries to unfairly trap this witness with respect to the two people who visited with him. Absent any further inquiry you have, I am prepared to move forward with respect to the discussion of the events of that particular day.

Mr. CARVIN. I have no further inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Carvin.

Mr. WAXMAN. What was the counsel's answer? I couldn't hear him.

Mr. CARVIN. I have no further inquiry at this point.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, what was the name of the other individual with whom you met? You indicated that you believe that one—in your opinion, one individual was John Huang. Who was the other person who was with Mr. Huang on the day of August 16, 1996?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] His family name is Pan. Mr. Pan, as I know him.

Mr. BENNETT. P-A-N?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, did you subsequently learn that the gentleman, the second gentleman, was a gentleman named Antonio Pan?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Did you have any knowledge of Mr. Huang's prior employer, the Lippo Group?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] No, I didn't know anything about it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, directing your attention, then, to August 16, 1996, the same day on which you prepared the check to the DNC in the amount of $5,000 on that day, did you have a discussion with these two individuals with respect to your immediately being reimbursed for this contribution?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] All I remember is that when I wrote out the check those two individuals said that the money would be reimbursed.

Mr. BENNETT. And I am going to get to the later events of the day, but with respect to the two individuals who said you would be reimbursed, do you recall which individual said you would be reimbursed?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I don't quite remember, sir, but anyway, it was one of the two.

Mr. BENNETT. Whichever one told you that, was the other one sitting there and present when the first person said that you would be reimbursed?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, then, in fact, you prepared this check in the amount of $5,000 and there was a second check also prepared by you, isn't that correct, Mr. Wang, on this day?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you know an individual by the name of Daniel Wu, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And, Mr. Wang, who is Daniel Wu?

Mr. WANG. He is my friend.

Mr. BENNETT. Did you discuss with these two gentlemen, when they met with you, whether or not a contribution to the DNC similar to that represented by exhibit 99 could also be made through any other accounts?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] At that time, so far as I recollect, those two individuals asked me if I had any friends who could make a donation, and at that time I brought up the name of Mr. Daniel Wu.

Mr. BENNETT. And I will ask if we can put an exhibit on the projector, exhibit 100. Looking at that exhibit, Mr. Wang, that is, in fact—well, why don't you identify that? I believe it is a power of attorney form for Mr. Wu; is that correct?

[Exhibit 100 follows:]



AUTHORIZED SIGNATURES OF DANIEL WU [redacted] POWER OF ATTORNEY DAVID WEI CHEN WANG

FOR **Bank of Canton of California**

BANK OF CANTON OF CALIFORNIA

I hereby authorize and empower DAVID WEI CHEN WANG whose signature is given below to sign for me and as my agent, and in my name and on my behalf, checks against any deposit or deposits I now have, or may hereafter have in the COMMERCIAL DEPARTMENT of your Bank, and for me and on my behalf to endorse and cash or deposit checks and drafts payable to me or to my order, and to receive and receipt for statements of my account and cancelled checks, and make settlement in connection therewith and to acknowledge and accept for me and on my behalf the correctness of the balances of my said account.

You are hereby directed to honor the above authority, which shall continue in force until revocation thereof in writing signed by me is delivered to and accepted by an officer of your Bank of the office in which my account is kept.

Daniel Wu

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

POWER OF ATTORNEY AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

BY

0130

(2)

EXHIBIT 100

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. How is it that you have the power of attorney for Mr. Daniel Wu?

Mr. WANG. Yeah, he is my friend. He want me——

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] As he is my friend, or rather as I am his friend, he gave me the power of attorney for to act on his behalf in the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. In fact, Mr. Wu has not been in this country for several years; is that correct, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now then, showing you—did you, in fact, write out a check on Mr. Wu's account also for $5,000?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And that was made payable to whom, sir?

Mr. WANG. The DNC.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sorry. The DNC?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And did you give both of those checks to the two individuals who were visiting with you in your office?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, then, I will show—ask that the projector place up on the exhibit screen exhibit 101. In fact, that account reflects a $5,000 transaction ultimately clearing your account with respect to the $5,000 payment you made; is that correct, Mr. Wang?

If we can try to expand that in size a little bit on the projector?

[Exhibit 101 follows:]

BANK OF CANTON OF CALIFORNIA
EDS-RPDD010A

DDA STATEMENT HISTORY AS OF 2/12/97

PAGE: 8797
TIME 8:48:46 DATE 2/12/97

Stmt
Drop
Date. . .: 10/23/96

A C C O U N T I N F O

Account .:	[redacted]	Int Pd YTD :	$.00	Annual % rate:	
CIF Key .:	WU DANI 0	Svc Chg amt :	$.00	HE Fees due :	$.00
Status. .:		Curr month		Daily % rate :	
Stmt Code:	R	agg bal :	$59,077.68	Late chg due :	$.00
Hold Code:		Agg bal for		Amount due :	$.00
Reserve		Cash W/D :	$57,844.76	Other debts :	$.00
Act. Code:		Curr Month		Stmt princ :	$.00
Previous		agg days :	30	Stmt interest:	$.00
Stmt Date:	9/23/96	Lst Stmt Bal :	$.00	Stmt C/L :	$.00
Previous		Line of Crdt :	$.00	Stmt A&H :	$.00
Stmt Bal :	$6,333.41	Stmt Advances:	$.00	HE Stmt to	
Curr Bal :	$693.62	Avail Credit :	$.00	date fees pd :	$.00
Debt Amt :	$10,279.58	Total Pymts :	$.00	Stmt late chg:	$.00
Cred Amt :	$4,639.79	Prin Amt Due :	$.00	Other credits:	$.00
# of Debt:	3	Curr Loan Bal:	$.00	# days since	
# of Cred:	2	Finance Chg :	$.00	lst pay cycle:	
SAV Acct#:		Avg. Balance :	$.00	Int curr due :	$.00
Int. Paid		Tot Past Due :	$.00	C/L curr due :	$.00
Stmt-to-Date:	$.00	Bal @ lst Adv:	$.00	A&H curr due :	$.00
Int bearing		Finance chg			
Plan Code:	004	Past Due :	$.00		

T R A N S A C T I O N I N F O

Seq	Tran Date		DDA bnk #	DDA brn #	User code	Post Code	Addenda Code	Tran amount	Batch/Seq	Check #	Trans Entry Date	Individual Name
1	09/25/96			30	811	9		$5,000.00	303 01380	1001	09/25/96	
2	09/30/96			30	701	1		$639.79	313 01530	9953	09/30/96	
3	10/16/96			30	701	1		$4,000.00	311 03620	9952	10/16/96	
4	10/16/96			30	811	9		$4,000.00	306 00730	1002	10/16/96	
5	10/23/96	R		30	811	9		$1,279.58	302 02190	1003	10/23/96	

EXHIBIT
101

018829

262

3

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you know whether the check you wrote out to the DNC on Mr. Wu's account was cashed?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me just get into the matter of what occurred with respect to these payments. At the time you wrote the second $5,000 check on Mr. Wu's account, did you have an understanding that this money would be paid back also? And who did you believe was going to pay the money back?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And who was going to pay you back, Mr. Wang, for the total of $10,000 in contributions to the DNC on August 16, 1996?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I am sorry to say, I don't know.

Mr. BENNETT. Ultimately, you were, in fact, paid back the same day, weren't you, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And the individual who paid you back and came back to your office, who was that person?

Mr. WANG. Mr. Pan.

Mr. BENNETT. You do not contend, nor did you contend in your deposition, that the individual whom you believed was John Huang brought back the $10,000. It is your contention that it is the other individual who you know by the name Pan, who brought the $10,000; is that correct?

And I am saying that in such a lengthy fashion, Mr. Liang, so that you have an opportunity to translate that and make sure that he understands his response.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I believe it was Mr. Pan.

Mr. BENNETT. I am going to ask to be put on the projectors, exhibits 102 and 103.

First of all, 102, Mr. Wang, reflects a deposit by you directly back into your account on August 16th, the same day, of $3,000.

Do you see that there, sir?

[Exhibits 102 and 103 follow:]

CHINA TRUST BANK OF CALIFORNIA Member FDIC

Head Office • 22833 Hawthorne Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90505 • 310 [illegible]

DAVID WANG [redacted]

NOW ACCOUNTS

8/16/96 C

[redacted]

1 [redacted]

[redacted] SUMMARY FOR NOW ACCOUNTS

BEGINNING BALANCE	7/17/96	1,639.26	
DEPOSITS / MISC CREDITS	2	3,002.43	
WITHDRAWALS / MISC DEBITS	0	.00	
** ENDING BALANCE		4,641.69	**
SERVICE CHARGE		.00	
INTEREST PAID		2.43	
INTEREST PAID YEAR TO DATE		16.08	
ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		1.46	
NUMBER OF DAYS FOR A.P.Y.E.		32	
AVERAGE BALANCE FOR A.P.Y.E.		1,921	
MINIMUM BALANCE		1,639	

MISCELLANEOUS DEBITS AND CREDITS

DATE	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
8/16/96	3,000.00 CR	DEPOSIT
8/16/96	2.43 CR	INTEREST EARNED

DAILY BALANCE SUMMARY

DATE	BALANCE	DATE	BALANCE
8/16/96	4,641.69		

EXHIBIT 102

CHINA TRUST BANK OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID WANG
[redacted]

NOW ACCOUNTS
9/17/96 0
[redacted]
1 [redacted]

0001151363 SUMMARY FOR NOW ACCOUNTS

BEGINNING BALANCE	8/17/96	4,641.69	
DEPOSITS / MISC CREDITS	2	2,007.81	
WITHDRAWALS / MISC DEBITS	0	.00	
** ENDING BALANCE	9/17/96	6,649.50	**
SERVICE CHARGE		.00	
INTEREST PAID		7.81	
INTEREST PAID YEAR TO DATE		23.39	
ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD EARNED		1.46	
NUMBER OF DAYS FOR A.P.Y.E.		20	
AVERAGE BALANCE FOR A.P.Y.E.		6,575	
MINIMUM BALANCE		4,641	

MISCELLANEOUS DEBITS AND CREDITS

DATE	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
8/20/96	2,000.00 CR	DEPOSIT
9/17/96	7.81 CR	INTEREST EARNED

DAILY BALANCE SUMMARY

DATE	BALANCE	DATE	BALANCE
8/20/96	6,641.69	9/17/96	6,649.50

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Exhibit 103, if we can put that up, reflects a deposit back into your account of $2,000.

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you see that?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. If we can also—with respect to the other account, Mr. Wu's account, if you will look at exhibit 106—looking at exhibit 106, that also reflects August 16, 1996, $3,000 is placed into Mr. Wu's account and $2,000 was placed 4 days later on August 20, 1996, into Mr. Wu's account. Is that correct?

[Exhibit 106 follows:]

018031

BANK OF CANTON OF CALIFORNIA — DDA STATEMENT HISTORY AS OF 4/14/97 — PAGE: 8832
EDS-RPD0010A — TIME 8:44:25 DATE 4/16/97

Stmt
Drop
Date. . .: 08/22/96

A C C O U N T I N F O

Account .:	[redacted]	Int Pd YTD :	$.00	Annual % rate:	
CIF Key .:	WU DANI 0	Svc Chg amt :	$.00	HE Fees due :	$.00
Status. .:		Curr month		Daily % rate :	
Stat Code:	R	agg bal :	$46,999.44	Late chg due :	$.00
Hold Code:		Agg bal for		Amount due :	$.00
Reserve		Cash W/D :	$40,105.11	Other debts :	$.00
Act. Code:		Curr Month		Stmt princ :	$.00
Previous		agg days :	30	Stmt Interest:	$.00
Stmt Date:	7/23/96	Lst Stmt Bal :	$.00	Stmt C/L :	$.00
Previous		Line of Crdt :	$.00	Stmt A&H :	$.00
Stmt Bal :	$430.00	Stmt Advances:	$.00	HE Stmt to	
Curr Bal :	$5,693.62	Avail Credit :	$.00	date fees pd :	$.00
Debt Amt :	$646.17	Total Pymts :	$.00	Stmt late chg:	$.00
Cred Amt :	$5,909.79	Prin Amt Due :	$.00	Other credits:	$.00
# of Debt:	2	Curr Loan Bal:	$.00	# days since	
# of Cred:	4	Finance Chg :	$.00	lst pay cycle:	
SAV Acct#:		Avg. Balance :	$.00	Int curr due :	$.00
Int. Paid		Tot Past Due :	$.00	C/L curr due :	$.00
Stmt-to-Date:	$.00	Bal @ lst Adv:	$.00	A&H curr due :	$.00
Int bearing		Finance chg			
Plan Code:	004	Past Due :	$.00		

T R A N S A C T I O N I N F O

Seq	Tran Date	DDA bnk #	DDA brn #	User code	Post Code	Addenda Code	Tran amount	Batch/Seq	Check #	Trans Entry Date	Individual Name
1	07/29/96		30	701	1		$639.79	316 00820		07/29/96	
2	08/06/96		30	811	9		$6.38	306 01170		08/06/96	
3	08/08/96		30	811	9		$639.79	301 00260		08/08/96	
4	08/16/96		30	701	1		$3,000.00	310 03590	9956	08/18/96	
5	08/20/96		30	705	0		$270.00	308 01570		08/20/96	
6	08/20/96		30	701	1		$2,000.00	310 01430	9955	08/20/96	

6

EXHIBIT
106

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. When were you, in fact, paid the total of $10,000, back by Mr. Huang?

Mr. WANG. August 16, 1996.

Mr. BENNETT. You, in fact, received $10,000 in cash back the very same day from Mr. Pan; is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And why is it that you deposited $3,000 into your account and $3,000 into Mr. Wu's account, waited 4 days, and then deposited $2,000 into your account and $2,000 into Mr. Wu's account? What was the reason for the delay of 4 days?

And if you will translate that for me, please, Mr. Liang?

Mr. WANG. The reason is that Pan, he told me don't deposit the money one time, total money one time. So that is why I spread two times for deposit.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Liang, if you could perhaps make sure we got that, if you could translate again and state what your client said?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Mr. Pan instructed me not to deposit the money at one time, in one lump sum, but to spread it out.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, do you have any familiarity with respect to what are called "currency transaction reports" required by the U.S. Government for transactions of $10,000 or more?

If you will translate that for him, Mr. Liang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. And, in fact, I will show exhibits 104 and 105, if I can, on the projector screen, reflecting entries on August 16 in your journal. And then exhibit 105 is August 20 in your journal, with respect to both of those account entries; is that correct, Mr. Wang?

[Exhibits 104 and 105 follow:]

Wednesday

Reminders

15 Thursday

Reminders

A.M.

9

10

11

12

P.M.

1

2

3

4

5

6

NIGHT

7

8

9

16 Friday

Reminders

9

10

11

12 Cash. — Donel wu 34

P.M.

1

2

3

4

5

6

NIGHT

7

8

9

1

18

EXHIBIT

104

19 Monday	20 Tuesday	21 Wednesday
Reminders	Reminders	Reminders
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	A.M. [redacted]	A.M. [redacted]
[redacted]	9 [redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	11 [redacted]	11 [redacted]
[redacted]	12 [redacted]	12 [redacted]
M. [redacted]	P.M. [redacted]	P.M.
[redacted]	3	1
[redacted]	4	2
[redacted]	5	3
[redacted]	6	4
[redacted]		5
[redacted]		6
GHT	NIGHT	NIGHT
	7	7
		8
		9

EXHIBIT
105

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, do you have any knowledge as to where Mr. Pan would have gotten the money and where he would have received the money to pay you back?

Mr. WANG. No, no idea.

Mr. BENNETT. Did he tell you whether or not you should speak to anyone about this transaction?

Mr. WANG. I don't remember he tell me anything—I mean don't tell anybody.

Mr. BENNETT. Don't tell anybody. And again that is from Mr. Pan when he came back, not Mr. Huang; is that correct?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] What Mr. Wang meant was that he does not—I do not recall that Mr. Pan told—instructed me not to mention this to anyone.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sorry, Mr. Liang, you said he recalls Mr. Pan did or did not say that?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] As far as he remembers, he said he does not recall that Mr.——

Mr. WANG. Can you repeat the question again?

Mr. BENNETT. Basically I am asking you—I believe at your deposition, page 48 of your deposition taken on Monday, you indicated to Congressman Waxman and me that Mr. Pan had indicated to you "just don't tell anyone."

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Wang, is there any doubt in your mind that you were visited by two individuals on August 16, 1996, with respect to your contribution to the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, there is a doubt; or yes, you in fact were visited by two individuals?

Mr. WANG. Yes, two persons.

Mr. BENNETT. And with respect to those individuals, is there any doubt in your mind that you were asked to make a payment for which you were going to be reimbursed the same day? Is there any doubt in your mind about that, sir?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Again, I believe the response, Mr. Liang, should be from the witness, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] It should have been no, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Finally, Mr. Wang—I didn't mean to take up my whole time, Mr. Chairman, but I think I am about up—with respect to the identity of those two individuals, to the best of your knowledge and belief, you believe one of those individuals was John Huang and the other was an individual named Antonio Pan. Is that to the best of your recollection and belief?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Just one last question and I will be finished, Mr. Chairman.

When you received the telephone call from an individual whom you believed to be John Huang, did that individual identify himself to you as John Huang in that telephone call?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] He did, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Wang. I have no further questions. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Waxman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wang, good to see you again. I won't go over all of the territory that counsel has just reviewed with you.

As I understand your statement today, it is the same as your statement in the deposition on Monday to the effect that a man you believed to be John Huang and another man you believed to be Antonio Pan came to your place of business in the morning on August 16, 1996, and that they asked you for a contribution, and you wrote out a check for $5,000 from your account, another $5,000 from Mr. Wu's account, and you were told that you would be reimbursed.

You gave the man you believed to be Mr. Huang the checks, and later that same day the man you believed to be Mr. Pan came back to your office with $10,000 in cash.

Is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Wang, after your testimony on Monday, my staff looked into whether John Huang was in Los Angeles on August 16, 1996, and we prepared a report with a number of documents that we have given to you and to your lawyer. We will give them——

Mr. BURTON. For the record, we have not received those documents, but we will look at them right now.

Mr. WAXMAN. You do have them.

In this document, we have dozens of exhibits, including affidavits from eyewitnesses, expense account records, and photographs, all of which place John Huang in New York City, not in Los Angeles.

One exhibit shows John Huang's hotel bill from the Sheraton Hotel in New York which indicates he stayed there from August 10, 1996, through August 18, 1996. This exhibit also contains Mr. Huang's expense record from the Democratic National Committee, which shows him in New York City from August 10, 1996, to August 18, 1996.

We have obtained affidavits from eight eyewitnesses, eight people who were with John Huang in New York City during this period, including from four witnesses who place him in New York City on August 16, 1996.

For example, one of the exhibits is a statement from Erica Payne, who was in charge of the fund-raising for the Democratic National Committee for President Clinton's 50th birthday gala. Her testimony, and I quote, was that "John Huang was continuously physically present in New York City conducting fund-raising for at least 5 days prior to the August 18th celebration."

Mr. SHADEGG. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry. We will not take away from your time. Stop the clock, please.

Mr. SHADEGG. The portion of the affidavit that the ranking member just read from has an introductory phrase which qualifies that rather dramatically.

Mr. WAXMAN. This is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am wondering when I raise the point of order, the fact that that language has been omitted.

Mr. BURTON. The language has been omitted, so the document is not correct; is that what you are saying?

Mr. SHADEGG. From the question, the language was omitted in the affidavit; that is, he read just part of the affidavit, not the qualifying phrase. My question is, when can I raise the question of the propriety of that?

Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman has a full copy of the affidavit.

Mr. FATTAH. So do the counsel and the witness.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman will suspend. We are not going to take away from his time.

Mr. WAXMAN. If I could read it in full——

Mr. BURTON. Wait just 1 second.

Until the questioning starts, our parliamentarian has advised me that it is in order for someone to ask a question like this before questions are put to the witness.

Mr. WAXMAN. I presume that would be if I were willing to yield to him, and I am not willing to yield at this time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman will proceed. He has to yield to you in order for you to be able to respond.

Mr. WAXMAN. I want to read from the affidavit of Erica Payne and draw Mr. Shadegg and everyone else's attention to her statement, "To the best of my recollection, John Huang was continuously physically present in New York City conducting fund-raising for at least 5 days prior to this August 18th celebration."

And then, to complete it, "I worked with and saw him each day during that period, and in fact approximately 2 to 4 days prior to the event."

We have another exhibit from—an affidavit from Ethel Chen.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, what are the rules in the House and in the committee to refer to documents that are mischaracterized, as the gentleman from California is doing? This is not a sworn document. This witness is not before us—there is no notary seal on this document. It does not meet the legal requirements of either testimony or affidavit or under oath; a document simply saying what it would like us to believe it is does not make it so.

I think that there are rules of evidence that we use here that require that in order for something to be an affidavit under oath, or testimony, it has to be sworn to in an official capacity; and evidence thereof has to be either made in this committee or on the face of the document itself, neither of which is present here.

Mr. BURTON. Just 1 second. We will refer to our counsel.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. BURTON. The hearsay rule does not apply, and if it is pertinent to the investigation and questioning, then it will be allowed.

Mr. BARR. Another point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAXMAN. Maybe I can clarify the matter for the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. The Chair rules the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BARR. Further point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON. State your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARR. Are there any rules that pertain in the House or committee thereof, both of which this body consists of, that require that if a document is not an affidavit or sworn to, that it be character-

ized as simply a piece of paper and not something that is actually sworn to or testified to or an affidavit itself?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think I can simplify the matter.

Mr. BURTON. Just 1 second.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. BURTON. I think we will have to look at this as any other document that we are talking about before the committee. This is not a court of law. We will take it at face value, unless it is proven otherwise.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

I understand the discomfort of some of my colleagues on the other side. I would assume we are coming very close to the question of whether this witness may have committed perjury. I would suggest that Mr. Waxman be allowed to complete his examination, and then all of the documents he is using in that examination——

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman is out of order. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The question of perjury has not even be raised and should not be raised at this point.

The gentleman will proceed with his inquiry.

Mr. WAXMAN. Point of personal privilege. This is an affidavit I am referring to by Ethel Chen, which was notarized. We are quibbling over whether it is called an affidavit or simply a statement. We have statements——

Mr. BARR. The document has not been notarized.

Mr. WAXMAN. In this case, it was notarized.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman from California has the time.

Mr. WAXMAN. I will leave it to a court some time to decide whether it is sufficient. But we have statements from these people that say that John Huang was in New York; and Ethel Chen, an Asian-American leader from Queens, met with John Huang on several occasions prior to the President's birthday gala on Sunday, August 18, 1996. According to her statement, and I want to quote from the statement, "One of those meetings took place on the Friday before the event, August 16th."

This morning we received another statement from a gentleman named Tak Luk Cheng, an acquaintance of John Huang, who had lunch with Mr. Huang at a Chinese restaurant in New York, at 2 p.m., on August 16th. The time of this lunch is critical because, according to you, Mr. Wang, John Huang was soliciting your contribution at almost the exact same time, 3,000 miles away in Los Angeles.

Another exhibit we obtained earlier this morning is a letter from John Huang's lawyer, Ty Cobb; this was referred to by Mr. Bennett, and it states his client was in New York, not in Los Angeles, on the days in question.

We also have newspaper articles from Chinese language newspapers which contain photographs of Mr. Huang in New York City's Chinatown between August 15th and August 17th.

My point is clear. We have overwhelming evidence that Mr. Huang was in New York, not Los Angeles, on the day you said you met with him; and I would like to hear what your explanation might be of all of this evidence indicating Mr. Huang could not have been in your place of business on August 16, 1996.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] So far as I recollect, one of the two individuals that went to my office that day, I assumed—I assumed that he was Mr. John Huang.

Mr. WAXMAN. You think you might have confused him for another person?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Sir, so far as I can recollect, it was Mr. John Huang.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the gentleman, if he would yield, to tell how any of this story that he—might be relevant to this question?

Mr. WAXMAN. I don't yield to you.

Mr. HORN. All right.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Wang, it seems hard to believe that it was John Huang, but you felt it was John Huang. You had met Mr. Huang before; is that correct?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] That is correct, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. And how many times had you met him previous?

Mr. CARVIN. In fairness to the witness, I think it is really important to clarify the record of the circumstances of the questioning that is going on now. We have had no opportunity to review the volumes of evidence that you are producing to us. Indeed it was handed to me only after I sat down at counsel table, but I would like to make a couple of points for the record before we pursue this line of questioning, certainly if there is going to be allegations of perjury bandied about.

Mr. WAXMAN. Counsel, first of all, let me interrupt you. I have not made any allegation of perjury. We have a contradiction in testimony, and I haven't asked you a question, and I only have a limited amount of time. I don't want to stop you from making any statement you think is pertinent. I realize you didn't have this information, but your client has testified that John Huang was in his office in Los Angeles on a date when it looks like he wasn't in Los Angeles.

I guess we have no explanation except we have Mr. Wang's belief that John Huang was in his office, and an overwhelming number of others who have given statements to the contrary that Mr. Huang was in New York.

Now, Mr. Wang——

Mr. CARVIN. There may be a difference of recollection, Congressman, but you did state this morning, as I understand it, that Mr. Wang misled the committee. Your staff has handed out statements saying other false statements by David Wang. So to suggest that you are not accusing him of misleading the committee, I would suggest, is disingenuous.

I think in fairness to the witness, he should be given an opportunity to present the context in which these statements were made and to offer some chance of rebuttal. I would like a few minutes to do that. I am sure the chairman would not take it out of your time, and at that point you could obviously pursue any questions you want.

First, as to the question of whether Mr. Wang——

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you want to make a statement now or recess?

Mr. CARVIN. I would like to do it now.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you want a recess now or make a statement now?

Mr. CARVIN. I would like to make a statement now.

Mr. BURTON. The Chair will make sure that the gentleman from California's time is reserved. Counsel for Mr. Wang is recognized to make a statement.

Mr. CARVIN. Thank you.

Mr. FATTAH. Could you identify the gentleman who just spoke?

Mr. CARVIN. My name is Michael Carvin and I represent——

Mr. FATTAH. The gentleman who just spoke?

Mr. CARVIN. That was my associate, Ted Cruz.

First, the notion that Mr. Wang would perjure himself on this question seems to me so facially implausible as not to be seriously entertained.

To say that somebody would falsely say that he was a conduit for John Huang is absurd. I can't think of any person in the world that you would want to associate yourself with less than John Huang.

If Mr. Wang could have possibly said that he didn't know Mr. Huang and had not engaged in illegal transactions with him, I assure you, he would have done so. He would not be here today. He would not be in front of the grand jury, and he would not be in the largest problem he has ever faced.

So you can argue plausibly that he is mistaken. What you cannot do is plausibly assert that he has willingly misled the committee or is otherwise perjuring himself.

No. 2, the notion that he has benefited from the immunity that the committee has granted him is also demonstrably untrue. As you know, Congressman Waxman, Mr. Wang cooperated with congressional investigators before he was granted immunity and told this story.

As I recollect, last week you made a impassioned speech about how unfair it was for the committee to take a person, a recent citizen with limited English proficiency, and run these questions by him without counsel present. Indeed, I think that was the reason that you suggested that immunity should be granted to him, which you subsequently voted for.

Yet today I am handed a document which takes those statements from the investigation that was conducted without counsel present, and you use it to impeach Mr. Wang's integrity and honesty. I am puzzled by that, and, indeed, I think it is somewhat hypocritical.

Third, he wouldn't have needed immunity if he had not implicated John Huang, because the investigators would have left and he would have gone on with his life. So the notion that he was somehow misleading the committee, implicating himself in a scheme with John Huang so he could then garner immunity, is, again, demonstrably untrue.

As to the treatment Mr. Wang is receiving today, I can only say that it has the effect, although I am sure not the purpose, are frustrating uncovering illegal activity in connection with fund-raising activities. Although I know it is not your purpose to cover up illegal activity by the Democratic National Committee, if witnesses are dragged here and berated by the community, are falsely sandbagged with documents and have their integrity impugned, I think

we will all agree it will deter people from voluntarily cooperating and bringing very important information to the light of this committee and the American public.

So I think everyone should weigh their treatment of this witness, as well as their statements generally, before embarking on this very dangerous course.

Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. How much time does Mr. Waxman have remaining, does anybody know?

The CLERK. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman is recognized for the remaining 18 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Counsel, did you want to recess to talk to your client, or did you just want to make that statement?

Mr. CARVIN. Recess for what purpose?

Mr. WAXMAN. I thought you said you wanted a recess and you wanted to make a statement.

Mr. CARVIN. No. I was just suggesting that. I didn't want to cut into your time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you. Counsel, the only thing I would point out is that I am not raising statements by Mr. Wang. I am raising statements by others that indicate that Mr. Huang was not in Los Angeles, but was in fact in New York. This is puzzling.

Mr. Wang, this is not the only statement that you made to committee investigators that I see a conflict in. I would like to introduce as an exhibit the notes from the interviews that committee investigators conducted with you on August 15 of this year. During two interviews with committee investigators, you made other statements that appear to be false.

The first false statement occurred when you originally were approached by the investigators. During your first interview, which lasted 1 hour, you——

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I consider the Member harassing me. None of us have interrupted him in his many times during questioning.

Mr. BARR. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. The Chair will ask the gentleman to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARR. Might I inquire of the Chair as to what the rules of the committee and the House are with regard to reading from a Memorandum of Interview which has not been made public? Does that not require unanimous consent in order to disclose the contents thereof?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, these are committee documents.

Mr. BURTON. The counsel has informed me that the committee protocol allows documents to be utilized during hearings of this type.

Mr. SHAYS. Without unanimous consent?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, without unanimous consent.

Mr. WAXMAN. And during that interview, by our committee's investigators, you told them during that hour period that you were not reimbursed for your contribution. Instead, you stated that the contribution was made with your own money.

We know this was untrue. When the investigators came back a second time on August 15th, you told them you were reimbursed, but the reimbursement occurred in two different installments. You were given $6,000 on August 16, 1996, and $4,000 on August 20, 1996. This is also apparently untrue.

At your deposition you changed your story and you said you received the entire $10,000 at one time on August 16th, not in two installments.

Another contradiction involves the contribution of Daniel Wu. In August you told the committee investigators that you were not involved in the $5,000 contribution that Daniel Wu made to the DNC. At your deposition you admitted you had power of attorney over Mr. Wu's bank account, and that you, in fact, wrote the $5,000 check for Mr. Wu.

Finally, you told investigators that your brother-in-law, John Lu, was present on August 16, 1996, at the meeting with John Huang and Antonio Pan, or the men who were presumably John Huang and presumably Antonio Pan. At your deposition you contradicted yourself and you said that your father, James Wang, not your brother-in-law, was at the August 16th meeting.

In fact, even this statement about your father is suspect. Two of my staff members have recently spoken to your father, and he has denied being at any such meeting with John Huang. I would like to introduce a statement from my staff member's attesting to their conversation with Mr. Wang's father.

I could go on. Additional false statements are described in the minority staff report, and I know you only received that report today, but you did have the report from the investigators in advance.

My point is clear, Mr. Wang. I don't think you have been candid from day-to-day, from day one maybe. Each time we get a different version of what happened.

Do you want to say anything in response to what I just said?

Mr. CARVIN. Since it is not a question, I will try and respond.

Mr. WAXMAN. I asked Mr. Wang if he wants to say something? If he doesn't, it is OK.

Mr. CARVIN. Thank you. I am not going to allow him to answer a compound question with, by my count, 23 sub-parts to it.

Mr. WAXMAN. I understand that. I appreciate that. I accept that.

Mr. CARVIN. OK.

Mr. WAXMAN. My point though, Mr. Wang, is that we have heard different stories from you. Unfortunately, we are faced with a situation that is even more serious than simply what may be false testimony, and that is something that I didn't investigate on my own. It came up in the deposition.

We granted immunity to you, but it appears you may have engaged in a conspiracy to violate our immigration and tax laws. These are criminal violations that are more serious than even conduit payments. They are criminal violations that no one on the Democratic side had any knowledge of when we were asked by the chairman to vote for immunity, and now, because of the grant of immunity, they are criminal violations that Mr. Wang can never be prosecuted for, as I understand it.

Mr. Wang, I want to draw your attention to your own deposition. Counsel, I can refer to the pages, on pages 68 to 77 and 93 to 94, you discussed your relationship with Daniel Wu. I want to ask you some questions about that relationship.

Mr. Wang, maybe you want to pull the microphone closer to you.

Mr. Wu is a green card holder, a legal resident, who has been out of the United States for several years; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. Before we go any further, I would really like to be able to respond to the numerous attacks on his character. First——

Mr. WAXMAN. Counsel, I am going to allow you to do that, but I would like to get these specific questions responded to, and then I will be glad to yield to you.

Mr. CARVIN. I would like to ask the Chair if delegating questions of alleged illegality that have absolutely nothing to do with the jurisdiction of this committee is a proper line of inquiry, particularly since this information was voluntarily disclosed by the witness pursuant to a grant of immunity?

No one would have ever known about any of these activities absent the granting of immunity. So the notion that somehow he is again benefiting from the grant of immunity is demonstrably false. No one would have, as Mr. Waxman points out, known anything about these immigration matters absent the grant of immunity. So if you had not granted him immunity, none of this would have come up. None of it has anything to do with campaign finance, and I ask the Chair to please restrict this line of questioning?

Mr. WAXMAN. The other side of it, counsel, is from our perspective, if the committee had done a more thorough investigation of what was going on, we would have been informed. It just came up in the deposition, but we should have been informed in advance of this, before we went along with the immunity.

Mr. CARVIN. Not if Mr. Wang was represented by legal counsel.

Mr. WAXMAN. It came up by Monday.

Mr. BURTON. Just 1 second. Point of clarification. I will not deduct from your time, but you have been aware of this, as well as the majority, since August.

Mr. WAXMAN. I didn't hear what you said. This matter came up in the deposition on Monday. It was a line of questioning to which counsel did not object at the time of the deposition. The information came out at that time, and I think it is important to pursue. It certainly goes to the credibility of the witness, as well as other matters that concern us as legislators.

Mr. CARVIN. It cannot possibly bear on the credibility of the witness, because, as you just stated, he was the one who voluntarily disclosed this without objection. So it simply can't bear on any credibility. It certainly can't bear on anything relating to campaign finance. It is by definition irrelevant and immaterial.

Mr. WAXMAN. Are you objecting to your client answering these questions?

Mr. CARVIN. Yes, I am.

Mr. WAXMAN. But he did answer these very same questions on Monday. His deposition speaks for itself.

Mr. CARVIN. And I was under the impression pursuant to committee rules that the depositions were to be kept strictly confidential and not shared with the public.

We were also appearing, as you know, at the time in a spirit of good faith to put all facts before the committee so that they could make a judgment. I had no idea at the time, Congressman, that you would parade this deposition in front of the news media as part of a sustained character attack on Mr. Wang, particularly since the week before the information you are now using to defame his character, you properly suggested, raised serious constitutional questions because it was induced by Government agents against a recent citizen without the benefit of counsel.

So that is true. I did proceed in a spirit of good faith to give the committee the information it desired. I did not believe it would be used to later defame my client.

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, there is a character question involved here, and this came out in the deposition itself, which the chairman made public this morning. I don't think that anybody was told the depositions would not ever be made public.

Now, these are questions—I shouldn't say the chairman, this was a unanimous consent this morning.

Mr. BURTON. If the gentleman would yield, there was no indication to me or anybody else on the committee that the depositions should be kept confidential, because we all agreed we would make it public today during the hearing. If there was a misunderstanding, counsel, I apologize for that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Do you feel better, counsel? I shouldn't be sarcastic. I apologize.

Look, we are facing some apparently serious matters, if you were part of a scheme to deceive the INS or the IRS, or part of a conspiracy to defraud the Internal Revenue Service by using two companies. I gather one is called Ji Tai International, and Bao Li Hang International. And they got a tax break for Mr. Wu, even though he didn't actually do any work for them. Is that right, Mr. Wang?

Mr. CARVIN. My objection stands.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, objection has been made about the question I asked.

Mr. BURTON. I am sorry, forgive me, I was talking to counsel. What was the objection, sir?

Mr. CARVIN. That this has nothing to do with campaign finance; that it can't possibly bear on any issue that this——

Mr. BURTON. I cannot, for the life of me, see why you continue to delve into other aspects of this gentleman's character when we are talking about one specific period. If you are trying to criticize his character, I don't think that that is a legitimate line of questioning. If the gentleman chooses to do that, I don't think there is any rule against it. I would just say that I think it is something that should be thought out very thoroughly.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BURTON. One more thing, counsel informed me that the questions must be pertinent to the issue at hand, and it stretches——

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BURTON. Just 1 second.

It stretches one's imagination how some of these questions are relevant to the line of questioning or the issue at hand.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that this is a line of questioning your counsel pursued in the deposition itself, and the deposition is now public, so I guess I can let Mr. Wang's statements speak for themselves. I am simply trying to understand what is going on, when we give immunity for a witness. That court order said David Wang may not refuse to testify and may not refuse to provide other information in proceedings before or ancillary to the committee on the basis of his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. It seems strange that there would be an objection that it is not pertinent when your counsel asked those same questions in the deposition, Mr. Wang's counsel didn't object. They are already on the record.

The fact of the matter is this is an extraordinary and incredibly embarrassing situation. In effect, this committee, I think, has been snookered. We have given Mr. Wang immunity for serious immigration and tax law violations, and we may well have gotten in return false testimony. I don't know whether it is false or not, whether it is misunderstanding or not. I don't know if it is perjury or not. What I do know is that Mr. Wang insists that John Huang was with him in Los Angeles at the same time a number of other people have given clear statements and all other evidence and photographs that indicate that Mr. Huang was in New York City.

I know what it is like to go back and forth. You don't do it on an hour's flight. So I think that, it seems to me, is an inconsistent statement that we received from Mr. Wang, and hard to understand, and we haven't been given an explanation. Mr. Wang maybe doesn't know how to explain it because he evidently believes John Huang was in his offices.

This is still my time, and I will reserve my time.

Mr. CARVIN. I can only repeat, Congressman, it would have made no sense for Mr. Wang to make up this story so he could be dragged in front of this committee and defamed like this. If Mr. Huang wasn't in the office, any rational person would have said he is not in the office. He would be selling cars in Los Angeles today, rather than being called a felon and a perjurer in public. So I don't know who got snookered here, but I assure you, it was not the committee.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think Mr. Fattah brought up the point, the issue here is would we have granted immunity to this witness and would he be important except for the fact that he put John Huang in California as being part of a conspiracy to form a conduit for campaign contributions. If he said John Huang was never there, I would not think this individual would be a pertinent witness to this committee or process, and certainly we would not have given him blanket immunity.

Now that we have given him blanket immunity, and the question raised there, the counsel is asking why would this happen, to get blanket immunity and talk about every criminal violation of law that he may have talked about so he can never be prosecuted on it?

So I think it is very germane to find out what happened here from the staff's standpoint; why didn't we find out about this; why

wasn't it examined in depositions, obviously criminality was discussed, potential serious crimes by the witness; and whether or not this committee should have granted immunity. And I think it all goes back to that very essence, if he had not testified in his prior statements or interviews to the investigators that John Huang was in his office in California on August 16th, there would have been no reason for this committee to issue immunity and call him as a witness.

Mr. WAXMAN. I want to reclaim my time and simply say I am not trying to embarrass Mr. Wang. I am just trying to get to the truth. The purpose of my being here is not Mr. Wang. My purpose of being here as a Member of Congress is to get to the truth. And the statement that we had earlier from witnesses is that they served as conduits, and I don't find it incredible to believe that Mr. Wang also was a conduit for a contribution to the Democratic National Committee, and that he was paid back. But the issue is whether John Huang was in his office and participated in this personally.

There have been a lot of allegations about John Huang. In fact, that is what this whole hearing is about, is an accusation against John Huang. If we are going to have an accusation against John Huang that hurts him, we ought to have the truth of the matter before us, and it appears, from all I can tell, from a whole stack of other people, and other evidence, that John Huang was not in L.A.; he was in New York.

I hope we will find out further what happened. I think that is the dilemma before us.

Mr. BURTON. Does the gentleman yield back his time?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield back my time.

Mr. SHADEGG. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. I understood from the ruling of the parliamentarian that this Memorandum of Interview taken by the committee staff automatically went into evidence, into the record, in this hearing, without being proffered or an offer of unanimous consent; is that correct?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Waxman asked unanimous consent that it be included in the record.

Mr. SHADEGG. He did not do that. We are talking about two different things. There is the affidavit which I said it was a committee record, and I believe the Chair ruled it went in because it is a committee record. There is a huge packet of information which Mr. Waxman has characterized in a thousand different ways as saying it is stock full of sworn affidavits that show Mr. Huang was not in California, he was in New York City. It has photos that prove that. It has a number of people who say that. I mean, he characterized it, we agree with you, it was not a committee record. It was produced by the minority today and given to counsel at counsel table.

My fundamental question, I know Mr. Waxman has not proffered this, he has not asked for unanimous consent to put this huge packet, as he described it, in the record. I am trying to find out if without him seeking unanimous consent to put it in, does it go in automatically?

Mr. BURTON. These documents can only be entered into the record by unanimous consent, but the document that Mr. Waxman was alluding to falls under the rule of the committee protocol, and that is why part of it could be entered into the record. But that information you are talking about cannot be entered——

Mr. SHADEGG. All these sworn affidavits.

Mr. BURTON. It cannot be entered into the record without unanimous consent. He has not sought unanimous consent for those records.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent that it be accepted into the record?

Mr. SHADEGG. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. BURTON. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARR. I object.

Mr. BURTON. Objection is heard. Regular order. The Chair now wants to be heard for 5 minutes, just like everybody else, so I request my time.

Will you put up on the screen exhibit No. 99, please. I hope everybody will take a close look at exhibit No. 99. Can you enlarge the screen a little bit down there?

In that little right-hand corner, you will notice that the DNC contact for this contribution is John Huang, and that is his handwriting. Now, there may be some question among members of this committee whether or not that was John Huang in that office, but there can be no mistake about that. John Huang solicited that contribution and there it is, the DNC contact, in his handwriting. That is No. 1.

Now, would you guys be quiet for just a minute, please? That is a DNC document.

The second thing is, we could learn a lot if John Huang, a friend of the President, a member of the Commerce Department and the DNC, had not taken the fifth amendment. Now, if he wants to come before this committee at any time, I would love to have him here. And I will do whatever I can do to assist him in coming before this committee. Now, they are asking for immunity or partial immunity. We will look into that. But John Huang is the problem. He doesn't want to testify, he has exerted his fifth amendment rights against self-incrimination. And this $5,000 contribution and the other $5,000 was solicited by John Huang, because there it is in writing.

The final thing I want to point out to my colleagues is this: According to the USA Today, the Democratic figures who were interviewed said that they moved in July to limit Huang from fund-raising activities, before this took place. That was 3 months before press reports made Huang a central figure in the Democratic fund-raising controversy.

So the bottom line is we are not talking about some angel here, or some guy we shouldn't be concerned about. John Huang did some things that are very questionable. He should come before this committee and he should testify and not take the fifth amendment against self-incrimination. That is John Huang's handwriting on that DNC form and nobody can change that.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, a point of clarification. You said that it said that John Huang was the solicitor. It does list him as the DNC contact, but it lists apparently Charlie Trie as the solicitor.

Mr. BURTON. It has Charlie Trie on there as well. But the handwriting is John Huang's. There is no question about that.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I merely would like to ask some information, and then make a motion.

Mr. BURTON. Well, the gentleman does not have the time. Does the gentleman seek time?

Mr. LANTOS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, is he alternating?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, but I was the one on our side.

Mr. HORN. OK.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I would merely like some clarification. There are two names there. The contact is indicated as John Huang, and at the bottom it is Charles Trie. Does—the solicitor in this case is Mr. Trie. What does the word "contact" mean? Does that mean he is the person who actually solicited or is the person who solicits the contribution?

Mr. BURTON. Is the questioner asking me that question? I would be happy to answer that.

Mr. LANTOS. I would be very happy to have the chairman answer.

Mr. BURTON. The witness testified when that the phone call was made to him, the man who made the call identified himself as John Huang. That sounds like a solicitation to me.

Mr. LANTOS. Well, we are now relying on the witness' statement. You were a minute ago introducing a document from the DNC as your proof. I am suggesting that the DNC document does not in any sense suggest or certainly does not prove that Mr. Huang solicited this contribution. All you have is the witness' statement. That is all I wanted to clarify.

Now I would like to make a motion that the minority staff report—OK, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. Mr. Cox.

Mr. COX. I thank the chairman. I thank the witness. I apologize to the witness for any badgering that may have gone on.

You may or may not be telling us the truth. I don't know you. As with the preceding panel of witnesses, I hope that you are telling us the truth and your counsel lays out some persuasive reasons that you probably ought to be telling the truth.

I want to recap the bidding, because there has been a question raised about the whereabouts of John Huang on August 16, 1996, when, according to your testimony, he solicited a contribution from you along with Antonio Pan.

What we all agree on, the minority and the majority, as far as we understand the facts, is that you did in fact write two $5,000 checks, one for yourself and one for Mr. Wu; that those $10,000 checks were in fact received by the Democratic National Committee. The document that is up there on the screen, which is shown only in part, is a record of one of those two checks. It is one of the $5,000 checks. It makes it very clear that there was, in fact,

money that went from the Bank of Canton of California and that you were the author of the check; that it went to the Democratic National Committee; that they cashed the check; that they recorded it; that they attributed to a particular event. This is because that is a DNC document which we obtained through discovery.

Further, that the event it was attributed to is the President's birthday party; that the DNC contact for this particular check is John Huang; the committee believes this is John Huang's handwriting, so he is the person stating that he is the DNC contact on both of these checks; and the solicitor is listed as Charlie Trie, according to John Huang.

I believe that to recap the bidding, that everybody agrees that we can stipulate, as the ranking minority member says, to those facts.

So the only fact that is left for us to determine is your credibility on the point of John Huang's physical presence in soliciting this contribution, although apparently John Huang himself says that he is responsible for collecting your check. He may have been responsible from long distance or he may have been responsible from California.

I have gone through the packet of documents that the minority has provided, and nobody can provide us with evidence of the time in question to say that, I was with John Huang at the time that he was allegedly meeting with you. We know the night before he was at an event in New York, according to these things. We know the next day he was in New York. But we don't have anybody who can say that I was there with this person, John Huang, at the time, at all times when he could have been with you. We have someone who said sort of generally I was with him at all times over a period of days, although that is obviously hyperbole, because that is not possible. He is also part of these things at other times. That is only one person. So we have circumstantial evidence on this one point that contradicts your testimony that John Huang was personally with you.

I read through the deposition and the questions put to you in deposition by Mr. Waxman. Right now our only evidence of the date on which you met with Mr. Pan and Mr. Huang is the date on the check. The date on the check is the 16th of August.

Do have any other reason to believe it was the 16th of August?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] From the bank statement, it can be seen that the money was deposited on the 16th, so there can be no question that the check was not written on August 16th.

Mr. COX. I am sorry, can you repeat that answer?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] So there can be no doubt that the check was written on August 16th, because the money was deposited into the bank on the same day, and the bank statement says so. And also a journal book that he keeps.

Mr. COX. I am a Congressman from California, and I travel a lot back and forth. In fact, this week I will have traveled four times across country. When I go out to California, sometimes I go out to make a speech at lunch, but I am still here in Washington in the morning. I can be there well before noon. I can also leave late at night, there are red eyes, all sorts of ways to get back and forth.

Now, by the way, I don't want to rehabilitate you as a witness or anything else, because I don't know if you are telling the truth

or not. I want to ask you whether or not in your experience it is possible to travel back and forth between California and Washington in less than a day?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I'm sorry, sir. I don't know, because I haven't had that kind of experience.

Mr. COX. You are very fortunate.

I see that my time has expired. I just want to point out, at least on the basis of the documents that have been provided by the minority, it is possible to reconcile everybody's stories. We don't have any conclusive proof and that conclusive proof, because you are testifying as an eyewitness to a meeting with Mr. Huang, would be best provided by Mr. Huang himself, as it has been pointed out here.

So I hope that we can get, as the chairman suggests, the testimony from Mr. Huang one way or the other, and I yield back and thank the chairman.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair declares the committee in recess until after this vote. Please come back as quickly as possible so Members can get to their planes or whatever they want to do.

[Recess.]

Mr. BURTON. The committee will come to order. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was interested in the discussion that has taken place as to where Mr. Huang was. I'm not sure where he was, but I would like to suggest that there's one story by a reputable reporter that would claim, based on quotations, also from people in New York, that he was never there at the time. So let me go through this a little bit and lay it out.

This is an article from USA Today, February 19, 1997. It's by—the reporter is Thomas Squitieri. And it's a rather extensive article, and I won't read it all. I'll just read a few key points here.

"The Democratic National Committee had returned $1.2 million raised by Huang because of questions about the origins of the money."

And the, "Democratic National Committee Finance Chairman Marvin Rosen and Finance Director Richard Sullivan made the decision when they reviewed the guest list" for the New York function that they weren't too keen—they didn't stay for the dinner. They just went to the cocktail hour. And they weren't too keen on having him near the President.

So President Clinton did attend. And what is relevant to this is that it notes here, quote, "Many DNC officials were suspicious of Huang when he joined the Democratic National Committee because of his personal links to Clinton operatives from Little Rock."

Huang left his—unquote. "Huang left his Commerce Department job to work as a DNC fund-raiser," all of which you know.

Now, quote, "Huang was never told of the July decision made by Rosen and Sullivan,"—namely to keep him out of there—"but their decision had a quick impact."

Quote, "For example, Huang was a coordinator for the bash August 19th at New York's Radio City Music Hall in honor of Clinton's 50th birthday. But as the event neared, Huang never came

to New York to help with last-minute fund-raising details, which surprised others on the DNC fund-raising team."

So that's the story by a reputable reporter, and that's one aspect.

The other I would like to note is the survey that was done by the accounting firm—let's see. Here we are.

In the spring of this year, this is the Ernst & Young survey, and there are three questions that Mr. Wang answered:

14. "Can you confirm that all the money"—this is exhibit 113, by the way, Mr. Chairman. "Can you confirm that all the money that was used to make this contribution was your money and did not come from some other source or person?" The person that interviewed over the telephone checked yes. Presumably that's the statement from Mr. Wang.

16. "If you can recall, who was the person who asked or solicited you to make this contribution?" The answer written down by the survey team hired by the Democratic National Committee said, "Mr. Huang." That's Mr. Wang's answer.

Now, the 17th was, "May we telephone you to ask any followup information?" And the person interviewing Mr. Wang checked "no." Presumably that was his response at the time.

So all I'm saying is, with that reputable story, it just seems to me that whatever evidence the minority has needs to be double-checked and triple-checked, because this reporter and his sources had no reason to mislead anybody at that point.

I yield back my time.

[Exhibit 113 follows:]

13. What is your social security number?

[redacted]

14. Can you confirm that all the money that was used to make this contribution was your money and did not come from some other source or person?

✓ Yes ____ No

15. If this money was not yours, we need to know whose money it was. Please tell us whose money was given to the DNC and give us his/her name, address and telephone number:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Telephone: _____

16. If you can recall, who was the person who asked or solicited you to make this contribution?

Mr. Huang

17. May we telephone you to ask any follow-up information?

____ Yes ✓ No

18. If so, what number should we call and what is the best time to call you?

Telephone number: _____

Best time to call: _____

If you have any questions, please call me at the number below:

_____

[redacted]

Confidential Information

DNC 1804351

EXHIBIT

113

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. Does anyone seek time on the minority side?

Mr. Kanjorski, the young fellow with gray hair.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Wang, following up, earlier you testified that you knew John Huang, is that correct, John Huang?

Mr. WANG. Yes. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And could you identify him if he walked into this room today?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. All right.

Now, you further testified you didn't know Mr. Trie; is that correct?

Mr. WANG. No, I don't know. I don't know him.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Have you ever talked to him, communicated with him, written to him?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] No, sir.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Are you sure now? Maybe you called him from your place of business or maybe he called you and you talked. Are you sure now? It's very important. I want you to know this is very important.

Mr. WANG. No. But probably—in fact, I—in fact, I didn't know Mr. Trie. And even—probably it's my father sometimes he call. It's my father, not me.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And your father lives where?

Mr. WANG. Also, he lives in Los Angeles.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And does he have the same place of business that you have?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. So you're both in the same business. You work with your father in that business?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Now, Mr. Cox wanted to suggest, I suppose, or give you the opportunity to reconstruct what you've previously testified to insofar as he suggests that you can communte—or transport between New York City and California in about 6, 7 hours. And it's been known for people to fly one way and come back.

Was there any suggestion, when you met with the man whom you identify as John Huang, that he had just flown in from the East and he just arrived?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] There was no sign that he had just flew in from New York, none at least that I could see of.

Mr. KANJORSKI. OK. I'm going to send the photos down. There are two photos. I want you to take your time. I want you to look at them. They're on the screen now. And as you look at the photos, I would like you to look at the person on the left and the person on the right and see if you can identify either one of them.

[The photograph follows:]

Associated Press

EXHIBIT
126
PENGAD-Bayonne, N. J.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I don't know the person on the left. But the person on the right is John Huang.

Mr. KANJORSKI. All right. Now, is that the man that you met with on the 16th of August?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] On the right side?

Mr. KANJORSKI. The gentleman that you can identify on the right, you've identified as John Huang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Is that the gentleman that you met with on August 16th in California?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Without any question in your mind?

Mr. WANG. Yeah.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] To the best of my memory, that's him.

Mr. KANJORSKI. All right. Now, when you met, do you know exactly what time of day you met with him in California on August the 16th?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] It was in the morning. In the morning.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Was it before 9 o'clock? Was it after 9 o'clock? Was it just before noon?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I'm sorry, I don't recall the exact time.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, when you say it was a morning, was it 1 a.m.? Was it dark out?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] It couldn't have been that early, sir.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, could it have been 3 a.m.?

Mr. WANG. No.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] No, sir.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Since there was a check made out and deposits made, was it likely that it was sometime during banking hours?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Yes, sir.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired.

To the recorder, I just want to make sure that that entire exchange is in the record, including the photo.

Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wang, you're not Webster Hubbell. You're not Charlie Trie. In fact, you couldn't identify Charlie Trie. But you could identify John Huang. And neither of them is here.

John Huang has taken the fifth. But he's given information to his lawyer, and our esteamed colleagues on the other side of the aisle felt it very appropriate to allow Mr. Huang, who is taking the fifth, to present his arguments without being under oath, because his—some of the documentation by Ky Cobb—excuse me, by Ty Cobb, the entire statement for Mr. Huang was submitted. And it says, "I am"—in the second paragraph—"I am, however, grateful that you and the Ranking Minority Members have elected to pursue the unfortunate allegation that Mr. Huang was in Los Angeles, California."

So you have basically an agreement on the part of Mr. Huang's attorney to represent his client with the minority on the other side

of the aisle in spite of the fact that Mr. Huang has taken the fifth. That's a real stretch for me.

I would like to say to you that I don't know if you are telling the truth. I don't know if you are mistaken. I don't know if you are simply those two. I don't know if you're telling the truth or not telling the truth, or you're just simply mistaken.

But the one thing I know, you're the only person in this room right now, besides your translator, who is under oath. Your attorney isn't under oath. Mr. Waxman isn't under oath. I'm not under oath. So you have a lot more credibility to me at this point than people who have submitted documentation that was not sworn under oath, that were not affidavits.

But, Mr. Chairman, if no one else does, I'm going to make a motion for unanimous consent to put all the documentation that Mr. Waxman put in into the record at some point before we adjourn; and then I think we should analyze some of that documentation.

But the one thing that troubles me the most——

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman does not want to make that motion at this point?

Mr. SHAYS. Not now, but I will, because I think it should be part of the record. And frankly it is. And I don't know who's right.

I want it part of the record because I don't want it around later on spread around this Capitol and maybe it wasn't part of what he had submitted here. I want everything that he put in the record, because I think some of it is very weak. And some of it is very valid, and I want to know which is which.

I want to focus in on the statement of Kenneth Ballen and Christopher Lu. They basically had a telephone conversation with your father; and according to their statement, their father—your father says he was not present at the meeting you said he was present at.

Now, this is just a piece of paper. It's no different than the piece of paper that Mr. Horn used. But, frankly, Mr. Horn's paper is as valid as this paper. It's not under oath. It's not a sworn affidavit. So I would just like to know if you've seen this documentation or if your attorney has, and if you can speak to this? Because if you have an answer to this, I do think it needs to be put in the record.

Mr. CARVIN. Mr. Chairman, I know Mr. Wang has not seen the statement. I did have an opportunity to review it during the break. Mr. Wang's father, James Wang, contacted me after he was contacted by the counsel for the minority and wanted to clarify his statements to them.

Mr. Ballen and Mr. Lu represent, "James Wang told us that he was neither present at any meetings nor aware of any conversations in which John Huang asked David Wang to make a campaign contribution."

Mr. Wang's father, James Wang, after having this conversation with Mr. Ballen, sent me a letter. I have the handwritten original here in which he states: "I am David Wang's father. I was present at the meeting with my son and John Huang and Mr. Pan on August 16, 1996. At that meeting, John Huang asked for a donation to the Presidential campaign." And it's signed "Jim Wang, 10/4/97."

So the substantive point is that I don't know—I wasn't present at the conversation, so I don't know whether this triple hearsay

that the minority has introduced is accurate or not. I do have a handwritten statement from Mr. Wang directly refuting the substance of it.

My procedural point is that Mr. Ballen waxed very eloquently with me on the phone about how unfair it was for committee investigators to contact recent immigrants with limited English proficiency without counsel present because of the severe constitutional issues that raised and the potential for inaccuracies.

After having that conversation, of course, Mr. Ballen and Mr. Lu, who I think both are attorneys, did contact James Wang, a recent immigrant with limited English proficiency, and engaged in precisely the same behavior. They then faxed to Mr. Wang a statement which basically repeats what is in here.

He did not want to sign that. Then he contacted me. And I have his letter.

And if this material is going into the record, Mr. Chairman, and I'll of course allow whatever objections to be made——

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Shays has the time. If he chooses to ask that be submitted for the record, it shall be.

Mr. SHAYS. I would ask that be submitted for the record, but it doesn't address——

Mr. WAXMAN. I would object.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me say this: I would postpone that because I think we should all have it on, Mr. Waxman, because I think we can have a very interesting dialog about the documents you want to submit.

But let me just conclude by saying, the part that troubles me is the paragraph, which isn't addressed there. It says James Wang also added that he was in Europe from July 23d, 1996 until August 7th, 1996, and I request he fax us two pages from his passport which attest to this fact. And that does note the address.

Mr. CARVIN. If I may, we can confirm he was, indeed, out of the country until August 7, 1996, but all agree that the relevant meeting was August 16th, some 9 days thereafter.

Mr. SHAYS. So that last paragraph is irrelevant.

Mr. CARVIN. It's puzzling.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired. Who seeks time on the minority side?

Mr. Fattah.

Mr. FATTAH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Fattah, will you just yield to me on this very point?

Mr. FATTAH. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Our investigators were doing what they should be doing, trying to find out the accurate information. And they received information from Mr. Wang's father, a statement that he's now changed. But I do want to also indicate to the counsel that Mr. Wang, Sr. was talked to in Chinese as well as English, so there was no language difficulty in his understanding what our investigators were——

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

Mr. FATTAH. I just want to make a couple of statements. One is—and questions. One is that, as I understand it, your client did

take the fifth amendment prior to receiving immunity; is that correct, counselor?

Mr. CARVIN. Well on 4——

Mr. FATTAH. Just a yes or no. Did he take the fifth?

Mr. CARVIN. No. If you want to hear the answer——

Mr. FATTAH. OK. He refused to testify unless he got immunity.

Mr. CARVIN. He talked to congressional investigators——

Mr. FATTAH. And that was very reasonable for him to do.

Mr. CARVIN. If you don't want an answer, then I'll——

Mr. FATTAH. Let me say a couple of things. Your client, unfortunately, I think is just in the middle of a big political drama playing out. He's an unfortunate player in it. Because conduit payments are not—this is not a unique circumstance when we talk about campaign irregularities. In fact, conduit payments are one of the more common features of campaign irregularities.

In today's news, we see a company from my own home State that's paid an $8 million fine because she participated in a scheme to put tens of thousands of dollars into the Dole campaign. Another gentleman paid a similar multimillion-dollar fine, Mr. Fireman, for again running money through a Hong Kong bank into the Dole campaign. And conduit payments, as we've shown on some of the documents that we've given out, the FDC is investigating in numerous instances.

The issue really, the reason why it rises to a point of a congressional investigation, is not the persons who participated in the conduit, but really what the source of the money is. Because the reason why this committee is sitting is because there was some belief that a foreign government was attempting to influence an American election. And what I would like to know is whether your client has any information that you're aware of that he could share with this committee on the reason why we really spent our day here and why your client has had to go through this unfortunate set of circumstances. Whether he has any knowledge that the gentleman that visited him, whether that was John Huang or not, represented any foreign government or had any—any reason to believe that they were agents of a foreign government.

Mr. CARVIN. I'll allow him to answer, but the short answer is that he doesn't know of the source of these funds or where they came from. And I don't think he can bear any light on that question.

Mr. FATTAH. And I appreciate your answer. Because what we have here is we have a circumstance in which, just like the people who testified before your client, they were participants in a conduit scheme. And, again, there is ample evidence on the record that the Dole campaign and the Clinton campaign were victimized by contributions that were made to those campaigns.

And the U.S. attorney spoke in the matter that is publicized today and made it very clear that none of the campaigns involved had any knowledge that the checks that they were receiving—the Democratic National Committee received over 2.7 million individual checks; 130 or so of those checks, like the ones that were offered by your client, have come under significant questioning. But they represent a very small percentage of the old ball checks that were received. And there's no information that President Clinton or

high officials in our Government knew that these checks were, as they were, inappropriate. But that's why conduit schemes take place, is they are an effort to hide the source.

This committee wants to find out the source of those dollars. And I know that, even though there is a lot of partisan back and forth, there would be a lot of bipartisan support if we could get even close to the point of finding that a foreign government was actually trying to influence an American election.

But as it appears, your client really has no information to share with us or that he's just one more of many, many Americans who in their efforts to either do someone a favor or whatever the case may be have written checks to campaigns that really were not of their own inspiration or dollars that they generated themselves.

And I want to thank you for your appearance. And, again, I think that some of what has taken place today has been unfortunate. But I do think that the committee hopefully eventually will get to the point of what it was that the chairman originally brought us together for, which was his impassioned plea that we have a real investigation to make sure that we didn't have foreign influence in an American election. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. Mr. Barr is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania might want to contact the Vice President. I think we have a new defense here that the Vice President hasn't thought of, the small percentage defense.

It reminds me, Mr. Chairman, of a case that I prosecuted when I was U.S. Attorney. We had an individual who appeared before a grand jury. And he was asked a number of questions. After he was indicted, he counted up the number of questions that he was asked by the grand jury. And then he took out, identified the relatively small percentage of those on which he had lied.

Now, he was convicted of lying before the grand jury, but his point to the jury, if not—and the news media, if I recall, was that he told the truth 98 percent of the time. And that would be an A in anybody's book, and he should not be prosecuted because of the small percentage of questions in which he lied.

I really would hesitate to believe that the gentleman from Pennsylvania truly believes that, as long as individuals or people commit a small percentage of crimes, that it's OK.

Mr. FATTAH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. No, sir. We really have very little time.

Mr. FATTAH. Well, since you have mentioned me I just think the gentleman has the courtesy——

Mr. BARR. That doesn't give you—I'm sure somebody on your side will yield you some time.

Mr. FATTAH. Small percentage is a little bit different than the defense of small-mindedness.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman from Georgia has the time.

Mr. BARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FATTAH. Committee protocol, Mr. Chairman, I think is when you mentioned that——

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman from Georgia has the time.

Mr. BARR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania also says that he hopes at some point that we'll have a real investigation. We would hope that people on his side would, indeed, get serious and conduct a real investigation, not bring before us unsworn statements, letters, and so forth by people who do not have the backbone to come before this committee and testify under oath, as Mr. Wang has done.

So I share the gentleman's concern that there is no real investigation on the other side. And at such time as he and his colleagues get serious about this and help us get at the truth by bringing witnesses in and placing them under oath, as Mr. Wang has done, I will be the first to commend them on the other side for finally getting serious and conducting a real investigation.

Mr. Wang, you have been granted immunity to appear here today; is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. OK. And you understand, of course, that, as part of that immunity, you cannot be prosecuted for the subject matters about which we're talking. Do you understand that?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. OK. You do understand that it is now—you understand that it is against U.S. law for persons to make contributions, political contributions in the name of another person. Do you understand that to be a violation of law?

Mr. WANG. Yeah. Today, I do.

Mr. BARR. Let me—thank you. We've talked about a number of things today and then we've gone off on not a small number of tangents. Let me sort of summarize and bring us back down to the focus of where we started when the chairman of this committee laid forth this morning the mission today.

Mr. Pan accompanied Mr. John Huang, then an official, an executive with the DNC, to your car dealership on August 16th last year; is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes. Yes.

Mr. BARR. OK. At that time, and at that location, did John Huang solicit from you a $5,000 contribution to be paid to the DNC?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. And did he also at that time and place solicit from you a second $5,000 contribution from Mr. Daniel Wu?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. And you wrote that check on behalf of Mr. Wu pursuant to the power of attorney.

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. OK. And is it also true that later that same day, August 16, 1996, and again later, Mr. Antonio Pan delivered envelopes of cash to you totaling $10,000?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. And was the purpose of this $10,000 cash delivered in envelopes to you for the purpose of reimbursing you for the two $5,000 checks to the DNC?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. And during those transactions with Mr. Pan, did he admonish you not to tell anybody about what was going on?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. And did he also at that time admonish you not to place all of the money in the bank at the same time?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. But to split it up so that certain reporting requirements that the banks are required to maintain would not be triggered?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know of a clearer case of money laundering and conspiracy to violate the election laws of this country could be made. And I commend the chairman for the work of the committee and the committee investigators for uncovering what the Department of Justice apparently is either unable or unwilling to uncover. And also to state for the record that Mr. Wang, if I'm not mistaken, testified before a grand jury and was not even afforded the opportunity to have a translator present.

Is that correct, Mr. Wang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARR. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. We currently have a vote on the floor. We'll recess until the vote is concluded. Please come back as quickly as possible so we can get this hearing concluded today.

[Recess.]

Mr. BURTON. The committee will reconvene. Mr. Barrett is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know the hour is late, and I just have a couple of comments and a few quick questions.

First, I want to—and I am sorry my good colleague from Georgia, Mr. Barr, is not here, because he was basically stating that these documents that have been submitted in support of the assertion that Mr. Huang was not in Los Angeles on August 16th, that the witnesses somehow lacked the nerve to come before this committee, that if they felt so strongly they would have come before this committee to make these assertions. Of course the reality is they were not asked to come before this committee. This is a pretty exclusive club, and it is by invitation only. And I would not be surprised if some of the people would be willing to come here to state that.

So I don't think we should paint a picture as though they are somehow hiding behind their fear to present what is basically documentary evidence as to what they believe happened or what they assert happened. So I just want to make sure that the record reflects that.

I also want to followup on a couple of questions that my good colleague, Mr. Condit from California, asked Mr. Wang, if I could.

It is my understanding that the committee is paying for your airfare here; is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. Yes. And I also assume that they are paying for your lodging here as well, your hotel bill.

Mr. WANG. Yes. And also the Justice Department.

Mr. BARRETT. The Justice Department.

Mr. WANG. Yeah.

Mr. BARRETT. Your legal fees, are you paying for your legal fees, or are you receiving services for free? May I ask you, who is paying for your legal services? Is the committee reimbursing you for your legal services?

Mr. WANG. I pay by my own.

Mr. BARRETT. Paid by your own. So can you tell us how much you have incurred in terms of legal services?

Mr. WANG. So far about—about 10 something.

Mr. BARRETT. Ten something.

Mr. WANG. Yeah, $10,000.

Mr. BARRETT. That's sort of a big range. $10—$10,000.

Mr. WANG [through Interpreter.] Ten thousand something.

Mr. BARRETT. Ten thousand. So your legal fees, you will be responsible. Those are not being provided for you by someone for free; is that correct?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. Yes. Counselor, I don't mean—I assume you are not providing his services pro bono, or you are not receiving reimbursement from a third-party; is that correct, counselor? Counselor?

Mr. CARVIN. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. So you are not receiving. Just so—I have two questions. You are not providing these services pro bono, correct?

Mr. CARVIN. No.

Mr. BARRETT. And you are not receiving compensation from some other party to provide his services; is that correct, counselor?

Mr. CARVIN. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. Yes. OK. Thank you.

I also think, Mr. Chairman, the record needs to be corrected. Mr. Cox has stated it is impossible to reconcile everyone's theory about what is going on here. Mr. Cox suggests that it is possible for John Huang to have flown from New York to Los Angeles the morning of August 16th and returned to New York on the same day.

What Mr. Cox has ignored is exhibits 10 and 11, which are statements from Bonnie Wong and Yungman Lee. These people were with John Huang in New York until 11 p.m., on Thursday night. Mr. Cox also ignores exhibit 24, the statement from Tak Luk Cheng. In this statement, Mr. Cheng states that he had lunch with John Huang in New York, Chinatown, at 2 p.m., on August 16th. Cheng even names the restaurant that they ate at. We also have exhibit 13, which is a statement from Ethel Chen, who met with John Huang on August 16th.

As Mr. Cox can well attest, it is physically impossible to fly from New York to Los Angeles at about midnight on Thursday night and return in time, at 2 p.m., in Manhattan the next day.

This committee has subpoenaed every record under the sun relating to John Huang. In addition to statements from eight witnesses, we have hotel and plane receipts placing John Huang in New York.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as far as the admissibility of the minority statement, and I hope that it is admitted in the evidence, I think that there has been a good give-and-take between minority and majority Members as to the weight of that evidence, but certainly not to its admissibility.

I would like to yield to Mr. Kanjorski if he has any questions. I am sorry. I didn't see you were there.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Thank you, Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Wang, I just want to make sure that we pin down this time that you saw John Huang. As I recall from testimony when I asked you last that it was in your opinion that it was definitely during banking hours in California that you met with Mr. John Huang?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. OK. And banking hours in California, would they be 9 to 4?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes.

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And, further, as you heard Mr. Barrett, we have a sworn statement from an individual that says at 2 o'clock on August 16th, in New York, they were having lunch with Mr. John Huang. And if I am correct, that would be 11 o'clock Pacific time. So that we have direct contradiction between yourself and the sworn statements of these other individuals placed——

Mr. SHADEGG. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Is it permissible to repeatedly refer to a document that does not on its face claim to be sworn as a sworn document?

Mr. BURTON. Do you want to refer to that as a sworn document?

Mr. KANJORSKI. We have a statement that can be sworn.

Mr. SHADEGG. I have got it right here.

Mr. BURTON. Is it a sworn document?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I am not familiar.

Mr. SHADEGG. What I am holding here, it is not sworn.

Mr. BURTON. Just 1 second.

Mr. SHADEGG. It doesn't claim to be sworn.

Mr. BURTON. As far as the Chairs knows, it is not a sworn document. So if you will refer to it as a document.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, we have one sworn statement that—of that date that is sworn to, and the other statement is an unsworn statement. But——

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KANJORSKI [continuing]. It is unimportant whether they are sworn to or unsworn.

Mr. SHADEGG. If we are going to argue this point, he said the statement of Mr. Cheng about lunch was a sworn statement.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I did not mention Mr. Cheng.

Mr. SHADEGG. The only copy that the minority has given us is this copy, and it is not sworn.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, now, are you talking about Ethel Chen?

Mr. SHADEGG. You referred to the luncheon that he had at approximately 2 o'clock on Friday, August 16. That is in the statement of Tak Luk Cheng, C-H-E-N-G. I do not know the pronunciation.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I will make the point——

Mr. SHADEGG. The copy we have does not say——

Mr. KANJORSKI. Let's not argue on my time. Are we on my time, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BURTON. Well, your time has expired, but I am going to give you a little latitude to get this clarified.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That would not—now, Mr. Chairman, I would resist that from the standpoint this is a parliamentary inquiry. And from the point of the parliamentary inquiry, my time should survive.

Mr. BURTON. Your time had expired at that point anyhow, but go ahead.

Mr. KANJORSKI. OK.

To respond, a statement made to a congressional investigator is taken with the full knowledge of the respondent that it is the equivalent of being under oath and subject to perjury and all other material.

So that if that statement made by the individuals said they had lunch with Mr. John Huang is incorrect, they would subject themselves to perjury. There isn't any question about that. Now, technically, whether we have an affidavit on it really doesn't matter, because the criminal law would apply one way or the other.

Now, what I want to know from you, Mr. Wang, so the record is very clear, you are stating that, clearly, you, during banking hours, were in California and met with Mr. John Huang, and these other two statements say that Mr. John Huang at that precise time of 11 o'clock Pacific time, within a 2-hour frame when you were supposed to meet with him at your place of business, that, in fact, they say he was in New York. You say you identified the photograph, and he was in California; is that correct?

Mr. CARVIN. Are you asking the witness whether or not he knows the contents of the other statements, because I don't believe he does. Or are you——

Mr. KANJORSKI. I can't hear you. Would you speak up?

Mr. CARVIN. I am sorry. The question referred to some other documents that I don't believe the witness has seen. Was that the intent of your question?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No. The intent is—we got off it. We have two statements taken by congressional investigators. One states that they were having lunch with Mr. John Huang at 2 o'clock Eastern standard time in New York, which would be equivalent 11 o'clock Pacific time on August 16th.

The other statement is that they worked with Mr. John Huang during the day in—of August 16th in New York and were aware of his presence there. And now that seems to me that we are talking about it would take 6 to 7 hours to fly one way or the other——

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KANJORSKI [continuing]. And that we have excluded that possibility——

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman will state——

Mr. BARR. Do we have rules to pertain to Members continually and deliberately misstating evidence?

Mr. BURTON. If it is proven——

Mr. BARR. There were no congressional investigators that have done what this, what the gentleman is saying. He is talking about other people who are not congressional investigators who claim to have been in one restaurant or another at a particular period of

time. And I am inquiring as to whether we have any rules to discipline Members or address Members deliberately and repeatedly mischaracterizing evidence?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond?

Mr. BURTON. Well——

Mr. KANJORSKI. These statements were taken——

Mr. BURTON. I have given the gentleman a great deal of extension on his time. If he wants to respond, make it quickly and we will get on to the next one.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I will respond now to finish my examination. Mr. Barr seems it fit, every time we get on a course of conduct of examination here, that he is going to interpose some thought of his. I wish he would hold back. He has all the time in the world to take time from his side.

Mr. BURTON. Your time has expired. Do you want to respond or not?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, I would like to finish my question.

Mr. BURTON. Well, your time has expired. Mr. Shadegg.

Mr. SHADEGG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There has been a great deal made today of the evidence as stated in the minority's staff report dated today, which, and there were—establishes that the meeting with Mr. Wang—that Mr. Wang testified about could not have occurred, could not have occurred.

I simply want to walk through that so-called evidence. The first document is a DNC document that says Mr. Huang was reimbursed $30 a day for a time period that includes this. It is beyond me how that proves that he was physically in New York.

The second document is a hotel bill for a hotel which does establish that he paid for a hotel. That does not establish that he was physically present.

He—the next document is a statement from Mr. Huang's American Express card, which shows that he paid for a hotel room and it is kind of an interesting document because it shows he paid $8.73 for 10—I am sorry, for 9 nights. That's a good rate. I would like to get that at a hotel in New York that Mr. Wang would stay at.

The next is a document—Huang. Excuse me. The next is a Democratic National Committee travel request form. What that establishes is beyond me, but how it establishes Mr. Huang's physical presence in New York is also beyond me.

We next have a Worldwide Travel itinerary, which shows that Mr. Huang flew from Washington to New York and back during this period of time. I still don't get how that shows he was physically present in New York on the 16th, 1 day that fell in between there.

I have this funny notion that I could fly to New York today and 8 days later I could fly to Phoenix and I could fly back to New York and still fly from Washington—from New York back down to Washington. What this proves, I don't know.

We then have the bill for that, and actually we have had a great deal of righteous indignation about how this proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that the gentleman who is our witness is, in fact, a perjurer is what has been presented here today. This is a bill that

says the ticket I just talked about was paid for. I am glad it was paid for. The DNC paid for it.

This is a newspaper article that says Mr. Huang flew to New York sometime in a 2-week time period. I am glad we have a newspaper article that says that. It sure doesn't prove he was physically there on the 16th.

This is a series of newspaper articles, Chinese newspaper articles, which actually prove nothing beyond the fact that Mr. Huang had his picture taken in New York sometime prior to the 16th. As a matter of fact, they were all—three of the four of them or four of the four of them were published on the 16th. Now, I know the newspaper business is good, but it is tough to take a picture today and print it in the newspaper today.

So these four proved that the picture was taken sometime before the 16th. They sure don't prove where he was on the 16th.

This one was published on the 19th, which proves it was taken sometime before the 19th, but it sure doesn't prove where he was on the 16th. By the way, none of these have captions that say, picture taken on the 16th.

This is a lovely one. This is a self-serving letter from Mr. Huang's attorney at Hogan & Hartson, who is righteously indignant that his client is being accused of improper conduct and who says that while he has other evidence, exculpatory evidence, he says, and I quote, "I am not free to add that information to the existing and overwhelming proof that John Huang was in New York."

Well, I wish he were free. He is, in point, in fact free. He could come here tomorrow.

Then we get to the sworn affidavits. The sworn affidavits are kind of interesting. We have three of them—imagine, we are told at the beginning of this hearing that there were four sworn affidavits that establish he was in New York on the 16th.

Well, the first three of those, Mr.—Bonnie Gail Wong says, no, he was in New York on the 15th and she spoke to him on the 16th. She doesn't even claim to have spoken to him in New York. She says, I spoke to him. I am glad she did, but she didn't even claim that he was there on the 16th.

The next one is Yungman Lee's. He says that Mr. Huang was there on the 15th also. I am glad he was there on the 15th. Here is another one. He was there on the 15th.

Then we have kind of a fun one. We have a statement from a lawyer that says he has talked to a person who said Huang—who says she recalls Huang was there.

You know, this is hearsay on hearsay on hearsay, but the witness who said that is in Honolulu and headed for East Asia. That's kind of interesting.

We then have a sworn affidavit from an official at the DNC who says, in paragraph 5, this is exhibit 15–2, while I cannot tell when Mr. Huang actually received each check from the contributors, he goes on to say, it would appear that he was in New York City throughout this period. So we are impeaching a witness on what somebody else says it would appear. That's a pretty far stretch.

Now, we get down to what might be established in all of this. In the law in the United States, it is nice to have a witness to cross-examine. There are a couple—there is at least one affidavit here

I would like to put up at the table, Mr. Chairman, to cross-examine. We first have an affidavit from Erica Payne.

We had a great deal of discussion—we had an actual representation of this affidavit to the committee early in this hearing. It was specifically read to the committee. It was read to the committee and the quote begins, paragraph 6, I hope people will look at it, it said—it was held up. I have a sworn affidavit that says, quote, "John Huang was continuously physically present in New York City conducting fund-raising for at least 5 days prior to the August 18th celebration."

Well, I had some problem with that quote because it is qualified by the phrase, "to the best of my recollection." It, by the way, is not notarized.

We then have the statement that we were just discussing, the statement of Tak Luk Cheng. The statement of Tak Luk Cheng does not have—I don't know what the rules of the House are, but in the real life world, I doubt if Mr. Cheng was warned, you are under perjury, because all he says is, "I recall that I had this lunch." He doesn't even purport to swear to it, and it has no notary and it doesn't even say, I swear. He wasn't even asked to swear from the surface of this document.

And now, to give credit where credit is due, we have in this great grand pile of documents that prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that we are listening to a witness who is a perjurer, one, count it, one affidavit that purports to say he was in New York on the 16th, and it is sworn to by penalty of perjury.

I happen to live in Phoenix, AZ. I know there is a 3-hour time difference from New York to Phoenix, AZ; a 3-hour time difference from New York to California. I can easily and have on many occasions gotten on a plane in Washington, DC, at 6 a.m., and been in Phoenix, AZ, at about 9:30 a.m., spent the entire day there and flown back that night. Quite frankly, I think Mr. Huang could have been in the hotel that night.

We have made a lot out of very little. I yield back my time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired.

I would like to at this point ask unanimous consent that all the documents referred to us today, and other pertinent supplementary material, be included in the record. And in addition to that but included in that number, I would like to submit for the record the pictures referred to by Mr. Kanjorski, of Mr. Trie and Mr. Huang, of which the witness clearly identified Mr. Huang.

And I would like to also have the counsel give me the handwritten note from Mr. Wang's father that we can also add as an exhibit, along with all the others.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Shays reserves the right to object. Would you hand me that handwritten note?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve the right to object.

Mr. BURTON. OK.

Mr. SHAYS. I just want to know if it will include the letter that was written by——

Mr. CARVIN. It will——

Mr. SHAYS. Excuse me. I just want to know if it will include the letter that was written by Jim Wang or James Wang, the father of David Wang?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, that's included.

Mr. SHAYS. Also, I want to know if it will include the statement of James Wang, that he never signed, that was submitted by Kenneth Ballen and Christopher Lu, a statement of James Wang that said, "I am David Wang's father. I was not present at any meeting in August 1996 in which John Huang asked my son David to make a financial contribution for a fund-raiser for President Clinton," which James Wang refused to sign.

Is that going to also be included?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, and also the statement of Ken Ballen and Christopher P. Lu will also be included.

Mr. SHAYS. OK. Then I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman from Georgia is next reserving his right to object.

Mr. BARR. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, reserving my right to object, if I might inquire of the chairman if the chairman's unanimous consent request will include the documentation entitled, quote, Evidence that John Huang was in New York City on October 15th, 16th, 17th and 18th, closed quote, that the gentleman from Arizona so eloquently demolished the credibility of just a few moments ago? Is that—will that be included?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, that will be included as well.

Mr. BARR. OK. And might I also inquire, of course, that the gentleman from Arizona's eloquent demolition of those documents, including blowing through the pretense that this somehow proves anything at all, will be included in the record as well?

Mr. BURTON. It will.

Mr. BARR. Thank you. I reserve—I remove my objection.

Mr. MICA. I reserve an objection.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object pending a decision whether or not would be included in the record some of the background—a statement relating to some of the background of folks who have been contacted by the majority—I am sorry, the minority to provide information about the discussions here today:

Fran Wakem, a DNC employee who may be involved with accepting Jorge Cabrera's drug money; Erica Payne, a DNC employee who may be involved with Johnny Chung's donations and Vice President Gore's phone calls from the White House; Ethel Chen, a democratic district leader at large who may have been involved with Mr. John Huang in the Woman's Leadership Forum, problems that are being looked at.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection, they will be added to the list. Does anybody——

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Does the Chair hear an objection?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Kanjorski.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I would like to have added to the list Section 1001 of the Criminal Code, which sets forth that "whoever, in any

matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative or judicial branch of the government of the United States knowingly and willfully makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to be"—I am sorry, the word is out—"materially false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry shall be fined and subject to a 5-year imprisonment."

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I would like that section put in the record.

Mr. BURTON. I am not going to object to any part of the code being put in the record.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARR. The chairman just echoed my sentiments.

Mr. KANJORSKI. What? I am sorry.

Mr. BURTON. We have no objection to any part of the code being put in the record.

Does the Chair hear objection? If not, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

EVIDENCE THAT JOHN HUANG
WAS IN NEW YORK CITY ON AUGUST 15, 16, 17, and 18

Minority Staff Report
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
October 9, 1997

David Wang testified under oath in a deposition on October 6, 1997, that he met with John Huang in Los Angeles on August 16, 1996. According to Mr. Wang's testimony, John Huang and another man, Antonio Pan, asked Mr. Wang for a $5,000 contribution to the DNC and promised to reimburse Mr. Wang for the contribution. Mr. Wang testified that he gave John Huang a check for $5,000 and later on August 16, 1996, received reimbursement from Mr. Pan. Excerpts from the relevant passages of the deposition are attached as Exhibit 1.

Evidence collected by the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight since Mr. Wang's testimony establishes that the meeting that Mr. Wang testified about could not have occurred because John Huang was in New York City -- not Los Angeles -- from at least August 15, 1996, through at least August 18, 1996, the day of the President's 50th Birthday gala. [Exhibit 2] This evidence, which is summarized below, includes John Huang's hotel receipts, eyewitness statements, and news reports.

I. Hotel and other Expense Receipts

According to the bill he submitted to the DNC for reimbursement, John Huang checked into the Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers in Manhattan on August 10, and checked out August 19. [Ex. 5] Mr. Huang's American Express statement for the months of August and September 1996 shows the same information. [Ex. 6]

John Huang's travel records also place him in New York City between August 10 and 19. Mr. Huang's DNC travel request for the President's 50th Birthday event included a receipt for plane tickets in his name from Washington National to LaGuardia on August 10 at 4 pm, and from LaGuardia to Washington National on August 19 at 12 noon. [Ex. 7]

II. Eyewitness Statements

A number of eyewitnesses have provided statements and affidavits detailing their meetings, contacts, and interactions with John Huang during the week leading up to the President's 50th Birthday Celebration at Radio City Music Hall. In particular, these witnesses place John Huang in New York City on each day from August 15 to 18.

Several of these eyewitnesses, including Erica Payne, Bonnie Wong, Ethel Chen, and Fran Wakem, worked with John Huang on selling tickets to the President's 50th Birthday gala fundraising event at Radio City Music Hall on August 18, 1996. According to the New York

Times, "Huang went to New York about a week or two before the event at the request of Marvin Rosen, then the Democrats' finance chairman." [Ex. 8, at p. 4] Erica Payne, who "coordinated and supervised all DNC staff fundraisers in New York working on the celebration, including John Huang," states that John Huang "was continuously physically present in New York City conducting fundraising for at least five days prior to the August 18 celebration" and that she "worked with and saw him each day during that period." [Ex. 9]

A. August 15

Bonnie Wong states that she "spent a large part of the day and evening of August 15, 1996 with Mr. Huang in New York City." The afternoon of the 15th, John Huang met with members of Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association in Chinatown. In her statement, Bonnie Wong recounts that she attended the meeting and saw John Huang there. Ms. Wong recalls that a photographer took pictures at the meeting, and that two newspapers ran the photographs on August 16. [Ex. 10] Yungman Lee was also present and saw Mr. Huang at the event. [Ex. 11]

After the meeting of the Benevolent Association, Bonnie Wong and John Huang attended an event sponsored by the DNC at the law firm of Skadden Arps in Manhattan. The event consisted of a pre-reception meeting with Don Fowler, followed by a reception that began at 7 pm, and ended between 8:30 and 9 pm. Ms. Wong recalls that "Mr. Huang and Mr. Fowler both spoke at this reception." [Ex. 10] In her statement, Linda SooHoo, an attorney at Skadden Arps who helped plan the event, states that "John Huang attended the entire event." Ms. SooHoo recalls "having a brief conversation with Mr. Huang at the end of the reception." [Ex. 12] The event was also attended by Yungman Lee, who recalls seeing Mr. Huang there. [Ex. 11]

After the reception, a group including Bonnie Wong, John Huang and his wife Jane, Yungman Lee, and Bill Chong went to dinner at the nearby Chiam Chinese Restaurant. The group left the restaurant together at about 11 pm. [Exs. 10, 11, 12] Mr. Lee paid for the dinner with his American Express card, and has provided a copy of the receipt. [Ex. 11, at p. 2]

B. August 16

Tak Luk Cheng, an acquaintance of John Huang who lives in New York City, states that he had lunch with John Huang at the Jing Fung restaurant on Elizabeth Street at approximately 2 pm on Friday, August 16. [Ex. 24]

Ethel Chen, an Asian-American leader in Queens, states that she personally delivered checks, "mostly from members of the business community in Queens," to John Huang at the DNC offices in midtown Manhattan on two occasions prior to the President's 50th Birthday gala. She specifically recalls that "[o]ne of those meetings took place on the Friday before the event, August 16." Her statement is supported by an entry on her calendar for that day. [Ex. 13]

Fran Wakem, a senior DNC fundraiser who worked with John Huang to raise money in connection with the President's 50th Birthday gala, "specifically recalls that John Huang was in New York on the Friday . . . before the August 1996 gala." [Ex. 14]

John Huang was also spotted eating lunch in Chinatown on August 16. In her statement, Bonnie Wong recalls that "Yvonne Louie, a friend, told me that she saw Mr. Huang eating lunch at a restaurant in Chinatown, New York City on August 16." Ms. Wong also recalls speaking with John Huang at the DNC offices in New York City on August 16. [Ex. 10]

C. August 17

Bonnie Wong recalls speaking with John Huang at the DNC offices in New York on August 17. [Ex. 10]

D. August 18

Ethel Chen and Fran Wakem state that they saw John Huang at the Radio City Music Hall event. [Exs. 13, 14]

III. Newspaper Photographs

The August 16 editions of three Chinese language newspapers in New York City include reports on John Huang's activities on August 15, two with accompanying photographs. The China Press (*Qiao Bao*) carried an article about John Huang's meeting with the Chinese American Chamber of Commerce and Chinese American Bankers Association. The caption for the accompanying photograph of Mr. Huang addressing the group states that the meeting occurred on August 15. [Ex. 17] A similar article in the Singdao Daily (*Xing Dao Er Bao*) included a photograph of Mr. Huang speaking before the group. [Ex. 20] The World Journal (*Shi Jie Er Bao*) carried two articles: one about the Skadden Arps reception with Don Fowler on August 15, noting that Mr. Huang spoke at the event; and another about Mr. Huang's speech before the Chinese American Bankers Association. [Exs. 18, 19]

The Chinese language press also ran a photograph of Mr. Huang in New York City on August 18, the day of the gala. The August 19 edition of the China Press (*Qiao Bao*) ran a story stating that on August 18, Mr. Huang had accepted a painting given by the Wen-Zhou Association in honor of President Clinton's 50th birthday celebration in Manhattan. The story is accompanied by a photograph of Mr. Huang with members of the Association. [Ex. 16]

IV. Letter from John Huang's Counsel

In a letter received October 9, 1997, John Huang's attorney Ty Cobb also states that John Huang was in New York from August 10 through August 19. [Ex. 21] This letter details a range of other evidence already within the possession of the Committee, or easily available for

verification. For example, Mr. Cobb states that Jackie Chan was also present in the restaurant at which Mr. Huang dined on August 15, 1996. Mr. Cobb also states that "[t]he following two days, August 16 and 17, Mr. Huang worked at the DNC site and had business meetings in Chinatown, including a business lunch at Kam Fong Restaurant, also known as Jing Fung, on Elizabeth Street." Consistent with phone records obtained by the Committee [Ex. 22], Mr. Cobb also notes that "on the morning of the 17th of August one of Mr. and Mrs. Huang's children attempted to reach his parents by calling the DNC number in New York City from their home in Glendale, California." [Ex. 21]

V. Other False Statements by David Wang

David Wang's false testimony about meeting with John Huang is not the only instance of false information provided by Mr. Wang to this Committee.

When Mr. Wang was first interviewed by this Committee's investigators in August of this year, he made several statements that were later contradicted by his deposition testimony. The investigators' Memorandum of Interview is attached as Exhibit 23.

1. During Mr. Wang's first interview with Committee investigators, which lasted one hour, Mr. Wang did not say anything about being reimbursed for his contribution. He stated that the contribution was made with his money. [Ex. 23, at ¶ 4] Only when the investigators returned a second time did Mr. Wang change his story to include a reimbursement. [Ex. 23, at ¶ 6]

2. Mr. Wang told the investigators that his brother in law, John Liu, was present at an August 16 meeting with John Huang and Antonio Pan. [Ex. 23, at ¶ 6] At his deposition, Mr. Wang stated that it was his father, James Wang, not his brother-in-law who was at the meeting.

> *(From Wang Deposition, Page 67)*
> *Q: Was your father present when you met with John Huang and Antonio Pan on August 16, 1996?*
> *A: Yes.*
>
> *(From Wang Deposition, Pages 91-92)*
> *Q: Were you surprised when John Huang asked to meet with you on August 16?*
> *A: Yes. A little surprised and happy.*
>
> * * *
>
> *Q: Who did he meet with? You testified, I believe, your father, yourself, Mr. Pan, and John Huang?*
> *A: Yes.*

3. In August, Mr. Wang told the Committee investigators that he knew little about the $5,000 contribution that Daniel Wu made to the DNC. [Ex. 23, at ¶ 8] At his deposition, however, Mr. Wang admitted that he had power of attorney over Mr. Wu's bank account and Mr.

Wang himself wrote the $5,000 check for Mr. Wu.

> *(From Wang Deposition, Pages 70-71)*
> *Q: Because you had this power of attorney [over Mr. Wu's account] . . . you were able to write out the $5,000 check and then put the money back into his account when you were reimbursed the same day?*
> *A: Yes.*

4. Mr. Wang told the Committee investigators in August that he was reimbursed on two different days. [Ex. 23, at ¶ 7] He told the investigators that he was given $6,000 on August 16, 1996 and $4,000 on August 20, 1996. At his deposition, however, Mr. Wang stated that he had received the entire $10,000 amount at one time.

> *(From Wang Deposition, Pages 46-47)*
> *Q: Mr. Pan came back in the afternoon.*
> *A: Yes.*
> *Q: How much money did he give you at that time.*
> *A: A total of 10,000.*
>
> * * *
>
> *Q: . . . He came one time and gave you $10,000?*
> *A: Yes.*

EXCERPTS FROM DAVID WANG'S DEPOSITION
(October 6, 1997)

Page 17

Mr. Waxman. I take it that John Huang picked up the check to the DNC on August 16, 1996, the same day you wrote the check; is that right?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Waxman. The check is dated August 16. Did he pick it up that same day?
The Witness. Yes.

* * *

Mr. Waxman. So he asked you to write the check on that date, you wrote the check, and then he took the check?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Waxman. And that was on August 16, the day the check was written?
The Witness. Yes.

Pages 20-21

Mr. Waxman. Let me see if I understand everything. John Huang and Mr. Pan together asked you and your father for a contribution?
The Witness. Yes, in the morning.
Mr. Waxman. And then you wrote a check and they took it that morning, yes?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Waxman. That afternoon, the same day, Mr. Pan came in and gave you $10,000?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Waxman. Was that August 16, the same day that you wrote the check?
The Witness. Yes.

Page 38

Mr. Bennett. Directing your attention to August 16, 1996, as you indicated to Congressman Waxman earlier, there was a discussion about your writing a check and then being reimbursed for the money; is that correct?
The Witness. Yes.

Pages 43-44

Mr. Bennett. To refresh your recollection, the $5,000 check was written on August 16, 1996, correct?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Bennett. And in response to questions from Congressman Waxman you indicated that you were told by Mr. Huang and Mr. Pan, one of the two said to you that you would be reimbursed?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Bennett. Is that correct?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Bennett. And the other who did not speak sat there while the other person who did speak told you that?
The Witness. Yes.

Page 49

Mr. Bennett. And it would have either been Mr. Huang or Mr. Pan and you are not sure which one?
The Witness. No, I am not sure.
Mr. Bennett. But whichever one said it, was the other then present when the first person spoke?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. Can I just clarify?
Mr. Bennett. Absolutely. Go right ahead.
Mr. Ballen. And when did that occur, sir.
The Witness. August 16.
Mr. Ballen. That was the morning meeting at your office.
The Witness. Yes.

Page 67

Mr. Bennett. Was your father present when you met with John Huang and Antonio Pan on August 16, 1996?
The Witness. Yes.

Page 88

Mr. Bennett. Directing your attention, sir, to August 16, 1996, do you recall how long -- you testified, I believe, that you received a phone call from John Huang before he came to your place of business on August 16?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Bennett. How long before August 16?

* * *

The Witness. I think not too long. I think within an hour. Within one hour of his phone call, he came to my office.

Page 88-89

Mr. Ballen. John Huang called you on August 16, then, the same day he came?
The Witness. Yes, the same day, after the phone call and after, not over one hour, then he came here.
Mr. Ballen. Came to where, sir?
The Witness. To the office.

Page 91

Mr. Ballen. Were you surprised when John Huang asked to meet with you on August 16?
The Witness. Yes. A little surprised and happy.

* * *

Mr. Ballen. He came within an hour of the phone call?
The Witness. Yes. It was within an hour.
Mr. Ballen. Who did he meet with? You testified, I believe, your father, yourself, Mr. Pan, and John Huang?
The Witness. Yes.

Pages 83-85

Mr. Ballen. First, did you understand the questions that were posed to you today by both Mr. Waxman, Mr. Bennett, and myself and your own counsel?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. If there was ever a point when you did not understand the questions, did you consult with the translator who is sitting next to yourself?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. I think the record should reflect that, and I do not know whether the court reporter indicated it or not, every time you consulted with the translator, but I believe all counsel would agree with me that it was frequent throughout the deposition. Is that correct? You did frequently consult with him on questions and answers?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. So that you feel you had the opportunity to understand each question and each answer that you gave here today?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. And you had the opportunity throughout this deposition to consult with the translator sitting by your left?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. Have you understood the translator at all times?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. And you understand here that you are under oath today?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. I notice the translator actually translated that question for you. Does the translator speak the same dialect of Chinese that you speak?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. And you already stated that you understand your answers are under oath and that they must be truthful?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. And you have given truthful answers here today, sir?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Ballen. And you have understood both the questions and the answers and the nature of the answers you have given?
The Witness. Yes.

Page 97

Mr. Bennett. Mr. Wang, when you were first interviewed on August 16, and it was paragraph 4 that was read to you by Mr. Ballen, the first paragraph, you at first were not truthful with the agents and then were honest with them when they came back the second time; isn't that correct?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Bennett. And the second time they came back for further inquiry, then you told them the truthful story?
The Witness. Yes.
Mr. Bennett. Thank you.
Mr. Ballen. I just have one follow-up question. Today you're telling us the truthful story; is that correct?
The Witness. Yes.

WIN IN '96 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Donald L. Fowler, *National Chair* • Christopher J. Dodd, *General Chair*

You are cordially invited to attend
the Nationwide Celebration
of

President Clinton's 50th Birthday

on
Sunday, August 18, 1996
at 6:00 pm

via satellite from Radio City Music Hall in New York City
and featuring live entertainment by

Comedian Al Franken

and

Jazz Legend Betty Carter

also appearances by Senior Clinton Administration Guests
in Washington, D.C.

The Kennedy-Warren Ballroom
3133 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Tickets: $100.00 per person
$1,000 Steering Committee

Inquiries and checks should be directed to: "Birthday Victory Fund"
c/o Kimberly Scott, Democratic National Committee
499 South Capitol Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 314-2244

The Kennedy-Warren Ballroom is a short walk from the Cleveland Park Metro Station.
Parking is available on the street and at the National Zoo.

Contributions to this committee are not deductible for federal income tax purposes. Paid for by Birthday Victory Fund, a joint fundraising Committee authorized by the Democratic National Committee and the 50 State Democratic Party Central Committees. Contributions that meet the prohibitions and limitations of the federal election law will be divided between your state Democratic Central Committee ("SDCC") and the Democratic National Committee ("DNC"). Contributions that do not meet the prohibitions and limitations of the federal election law shall be allocated to the Democratic National Committee.

Individuals and Federal PACs: Your contributions to the Birthday Victory Fund Federal Account is for use in connection with federal elections and is subject to the prohibitions and limitations of the Federal Election Campaign Act. Make check payable to the "Birthday Victory Fund Federal Account." Corporate and Union Checks: Contributions to the Birthday Victory Fund Non-Federal Account will be used in connection with state and local elections. Make checks payable to the "Birthday Victory Fund Non-Federal Account."

Democratic Party Headquarters • 430 South Capitol Street, S.E. • Washington, D.C. 20003 • 202.863.8000 • FAX: 202.863.8174

Democratic National Committee Contributions to the Democratic National Committee are not tax deductible.

Ex. 2

C 0000243
CONFIDENTIAL

DNC EXPENSE REPORT

(10)

Name: JOHN HUANG | Dept: NAT'L FINANCE | Date Submitted: 10/20/96 | Date of Trip | From: 8/10/96 | To: 8/19/96

Address

Purpose of Travel: PRESIDENTIAL 50TH BIRTHDAY NEW YORK

DATE	Transportation: Air, Rail, Bus, Etc	Transportation: Car Rental, Etc	Automobile Expenses ***	Local Taxi, Tolls, Etc	Lodging	Meals (Actual): Breakfast	Meals (Actual): Lunch	Meals (Actual): Dinner	Per Diem ***	Miscellaneous ***	TOTAL
	6610	6650		6660	6630		7000		6640	6600	
SUN 8/10/96									$30.00		$30.00
SUN 8/11/96									30.00		30.00
MON 8/12/96									30.00		30.00
TUE 8/13/96									30.00		30.00
TUE 8/14/96									30.00		30.00
WED 8/15/96									30.00		30.00
THU 8/16/96									30.00		30.00
THU 8/17/96									30.00		30.00
FRI 8/18/96									30.00		30.00
SAT										TOTAL 8.73	8.73
TOTAL									$270.00	$8.73	$278.73

Trip Origination: WASH DC | Destination: NYC

Return: NYC | Destination: WASH

APPROVAL

Employee Signature: [signature] 10/20/96

Date

Division Director Signature

Date

Chief of Staff Signature

Date

EXPENSE SUMMARY

TOTAL EXPENSES REPORTED	278.73
LESS CASH ADVANCE	—
TOTAL DUE EMPLOYEE/EMPLOYER	278.73

INSTRUCTIONS

Deduct From My Advance

Mail To: 2100 RIMCREST DR GLENDALE, CA 91207

D 0000087
CONFIDENTIAL

Ex. 5-1



Sheraton
New York & Manhattan
HOTELS
NEW YORK CITY
ITT Sheraton

SHERATON NEW YORK HOTEL & TOWERS
811 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019
Tel.: 212-581-1000 Fax: 212-262-4411

G Mr. John Huang
U Democratic National Committ
E [illegible] South Capitol Street, S
S [illegible]ington, DC 20003
T United States

ROOM 3703
RATE
NO PERS 1
FOLIO 153722 A
PAGE 1
ARRIVE 10-AUG-96 18:01
DEPART 19-AUG-96 09:14
PAYMENT CX

DATE	REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DEBIT CREDIT
10-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
10-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
10-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
10-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
10-AUG-96	0058	301-681-5583 18:13 0003	5.73
11-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
11-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
11-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
11-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
12-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
12-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
12-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
12-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
12-AUG-96	0710	718-439-3719 20:40 0008	1.00
13-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
13-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
13-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
13-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
14-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
14-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
14-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
14-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
15-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
15-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
15-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
15-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
16-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
16-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
16-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
16-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
17-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
17-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72

** continued on the next page **

ITT Sheraton

Mr. John Huang		ROOM	DEPART	AGENT	Sheraton New York
FOLIO 153722	10-AUG-96	3703	19-AUG-96	MRADWANE	Tel: 212-581-1000

24 HOUR CUSTOMER SERVICE SHERATON NEW YORK MANHATTAN 800-538-5556

Printed on Recycled Paper

Ex. 5-2

0 0000088
CONFIDENTIAL

Sheraton
New York & Manhattan
HOTELS
NEW YORK CITY
ITT Sheraton

SHERATON NEW YORK HOTEL & TOWERS
811 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019
Tel: 212-581-1000 Fax: 212-262-4410

G: John Huang
U: Democratic National Committ
E: 430 South Capitol Street, S
S: Washington DC 20003
T: United States

ROOM 3703
RATE
NO PERS. 1
FOLIO 353720 A
PAGE 2
ARRIVE 10-AUG-96 18:01
DEPART 19-AUG-96 09:14
PAYMENT CV

DATE	REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DEBIT CREDIT
17-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
17-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
18-AUG-96	RT3703	Room-Special Disc.	142.00
18-AUG-96	RT3703	Sales & Use Tax-8.25%	11.72
18-AUG-96	RT3703	City Tax-5%	7.10
18-AUG-96	RT3703	Occupancy Tax-$2.00	2.00
18-AUG-96	0874	718-439-3719 13:24 0006	1.00
18-AUG-96	1037	718-478-0388 16:05 0002	[illegible]
19-AUG-96	AX	American Express	8.73-

For Authorization Purposes Only
xxxxxxxxxxxx2006 HUANG,J

Auth Date	Code	Authorized
10-AUG-96	38	1500.00
10-AUG-96	55	50.00

Total-Due 1465.38

** continued on the next page **

ITT Sheraton

Mr. John Huang		ROOM	DEPART	AGENT	Sheraton New York
FOLIO: 353720	10-AUG-96	3703	19-AUG-96	MRADWANE	Tel: 212-581-1000

24 HOUR CUSTOMER SERVICE SHERATON NEW YORK MANHATTAN 800-538-5555

Printed on Recycled Paper

Ex. 5-3

0 0000089
CONFIDENTIAL

DUPLICATE COPY

Personal Card Statement of Account

Prepared For
JOHN HUANG

Closing Date
September 27, 1996 [redacted]

Previous Card Balance $	Card Payments/Credits $	New Card Charges $	New Card Balance $
579.14	-579.14	1,152.71	1,152.71

Statement includes payments and charges received by September 27, 1996.
* Indicates posting date

Welcome to your new American Express statement. Please look on the back of each page for important information. The payment coupon is at the bottom of this page.

Terms - Payment due in full. Please pay by 10/13/96.

Please refer to page 4 for important information regarding your Card Account

For fast balance and payment information, call our automated service line at 1-800-292-2639 using a touch tone phone. Please have your account number ready. If you have a question about your account, call 1-800-528-4800 (24 hours/7 days).

Card Detail	Amount $
Card Payments	
September 11, 1996* PAYMENT RECEIVED - THANK YOU	-579.14
Total of Card Payments	**-579.14**
Card Transactions for JOHN HUANG Card 3720-159526-52006	
August 19, 1996 SHERATON NY TOWERS NEW YORK NY; Arrival Date 08/10/96; Departure Date 08/19/96; No of Nights 9; LODGING; Reference: 5000731690	8.73
August 28, 1996 CREDIT CARD REGISTRY (800)227-2639; 1 YR MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL; Reference: NRP96C928	15.00

Continued on reverse

Please fold on the perforation below, detach and return with your payment

Payment Coupon

[redacted]

Please Pay By: **October 13, 1996**

Total Amount Due **$1,152.71**

JOHN HUANG
2100 RIMCREST DR
GLENDALE CA 91207-1057

Please enter account number on all checks and correspondence. Payable in U.S. Dollars upon receipt with a check drawn on a bank in the U.S. or money order, processable through the U.S. banking system.

Check here if address or telephone number has changed. Note changes on reverse side.

Mail Payment to: AMERICAN EXPRESS TRS
SUITE 0001
CHICAGO IL 60679-0001

2016962850 001152710001152717

Ex. 6

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE'S TRAVEL REQUEST FORM

NAME: John Huang DEPT: Victory '96

ADDRESS:

DATE OF TRAVEL: LEAVE 8/10 RETURN 8/19

DESTINATION: FROM DC TO NY TO DC

PURPOSE OF TRAVEL: Asian Community fundraiser for gala

YOUR REQUESTED FARE:	1 223.55
2 WEEK ADVANCE/SATURDAY STAY, OR LOWEST AVAILABLE FARE	2 ( )
Extra cost to the DNC (your fare minus lowest available fare) *Attach a memo with explanation if amount is greater than $0.00.)*	3
HOTEL: (ASK FOR CORPORATE RATE) No. of Days ____ @ $ ____ =	4
AUTO RENTAL No. of Days ____ @ $ ____ =	5
PER DIEM No. of Days ____ @ $ 30 =	6
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE FOR THIS TRIP *(add lines 1, 4-6 for total)*	7 223.55

DIVISION DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: _____ DATE

NUMBER OF PEOPLE YOU ARE SENDING FROM THE DEPARTMENT: _____

BUDGET OFFICE APPROVAL: _____ DATE

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: _____ DATE

Call World Wide Travel Service (Jacque or Cheryl 1-800-643-3788) for travel assistance. Submit this form to Chris Walton fully completed except for the final two signatures. You will be called when your tickets arrive.

Ex. 7-1

D 0000726
CONFIDENTIAL

430 S CAPITOL STREET S.W.
CHRIS WALTON
WASHINGTON, DC 20003

WORLD WIDE TRAVEL

ACCT NO.	DATE	PAGE	INVOICE
DNCFINC	9 AUG 96	1	210 462

NOTE: It is not necessary to purchase a new ticket when your plans change provide. Apply the value of this ticket toward a refunded one.

DNC FINANCE-EVENTS
430 SO. CAPITOL ST. S.E.
WASHINGTON, DC 20003
CHRIS WALTON

DEMOCRATIC NATL COMMITTEE
430 S CAPITOL ST
THIRD FLOOR RECEPTION
CHRIS WALTON 202 [illegible]-712

PLEASE PAY BY INVOICE. Payment is due within 7 days. Late payment will be subject to service charge

DATE	CITY-AIRPORT	TIME	AIRLINE	FLT/CL	SEAT	MEAL	COST
10AUG SAT	LV WASHINGTON NATL	400P	USAIR	6490 U		S	72S
	AR NEW YORK LGA	452P					
			SERVICE OPERATED BY Q				
12AUG MON	LV NEW YORK LGA	1200P	USAIR	6451 U		S	72S
	AR WASHINGTON NATL	1252P					
			SERVICE OPERATED BY Q				
1996T THU	MISCELLANEOUS SERVICE		THANK YOU FOR USING WORLD WIDE				

HUANG/JOHN
DNCFINC

TKT # 0[illegible] $ 225.55

TOTAL $ 225.55

229

Caution: Tickets have value. Unused tickets must be returned for any credit or refund.

Ex. 7-2

0 0000745
CONFIDENTIAL

WORLD WIDE TRAVEL

A Global Partner of Woodside Travel Trust

SALES REP: [illegible] ITINERARY INVOICE NO. [illegible] DATE: [illegible]
CUSTOMER NBR: 310DNCFINE SVDSCC PAGE: 01

TO: DEMOCRATIC NATL COMMITTEE
430 S CAPITOL SE
THIRD FLOOR RECEPTION
WASHINGTON DC 20003
CHRIS WALTON 202-863-7120

WORLD WIDE TRAVEL SERVICE
8228 COTTONDALE LANE
LITTLE ROCK AR 72202

NAME: HUANG JOHN REF: DNCFINE

[illegible] 26 - SATURDAY
AIR USAIR FLT:6490 SNACK [illegible]
WASHINGTON NATL-NEW YORK LGA OPERATED BY USAIR SHUTTLE
LV WASHINGTON NATL 400P ECO: [illegible]
AR NEW YORK LGA 459P NON-STOP

[illegible] AUG 26 - MONDAY
AIR USAIR FLT:6451 SNACK [illegible]
NEW YORK LGA-WASHINGTON NATL OPERATED BY USAIR SHUTTLE
LV NEW YORK LGA 1200N ECO: [illegible]
AR WASHINGTON NATL 1259P NON-STOP

19 SEP 96 - THURSDAY
OTHER LITTLE ROCK
THANK YOU FOR USING WORLD WIDE

AIR TICKET US1308590988 HUANG JOHN [illegible]

SUB TOTAL [illegible]

TOTAL AMOUNT DUE [illegible]

THANK YOU AND HAVE A PLEASANT TRIP.

[illegible]-333

Thank you for calling World Wide Travel Service, Inc.

0 0000761
CONFIDENTIAL

Ex. 7-3

July 2, 1997

Fund-Raiser's Moment of Triumph Seems Part of Pattern of Suspicious Gifts

By DON *VAN NATTA* Jr. and CHRISTOPHER *DREW*

Related Articles

- Political Fund-Raising Index

On the morning of President Clinton's 50th birthday party at Radio City Music Hall last August, Charlie Trie bounded into the Democratic Party's office in Manhattan and delivered an envelope stuffed with $100,000 in political contributions.

Trie, a former Arkansas restaurant owner who is a longtime friend of Clinton, had rounded up the checks in just a few days to help John Huang, a Democratic fund-raiser, meet his goal for the glitzy event. That was a feat for Trie, whose full name is Yah Lin Trie, because he had only a few connections in the New York City area.

"Charlie was proud he had come up with the $100,000," said a former top Democratic official who saw the 15 or so checks when they were delivered. "He was just kind of proud of himself."

But some of the people whose signatures are on the checks cannot be located. In addition, just 12 days before the birthday party, a powerful Macao businessman, Ng Lap Seng, wired $200,000 from a Bank of China account in Macao to an account in Washington that he shared with Trie, a business partner.

The timing of the transfer has provoked the curiosity of investigators in the Senate and in the FBI who are looking into whether foreign money was illegally funneled into the Democratic Party's coffers as part of its huge push to bankroll Clinton's re-election. Their inquiries are now focusing more intensely on Trie.

Questions about Trie's fund raising first surfaced last fall, when Clinton's personal legal defense fund revealed that it had returned more than $600,000 in donations, most delivered by Trie.

But his delivery of the money for the Democratic Party at the birthday celebration, which has never been described publicly, and the coincidence of the transfers from Ng sharpens the issue of whether Trie was a conduit for foreign money into the political campaign.

For Senate investigators, scheduled to begin hearings on Democratic fund raising next week, Trie's activities go to the heart of their inquiry: Did foreign business interests illegally pour money into the Democratic Party through fronts?

Ex. 8-1

As a result, investigators are also examining more closely the relationship between Trie and Huang, who has been linked to some contributions from foreign sources. Interviews and records show that Trie played a greater role in helping Huang raise money for the Democrats than had been previously known.

Trie's lawyer, Reid Weingarten, declined to answer any questions about Trie's fund raising. Ng's lawyer, Samuel Rosenthal, did not return telephone calls seeking comment.

Trie, a U.S. citizen who lives in China now, has refused to testify before the Senate committee, saying he would assert his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination. In an interview in Shanghai with NBC-TV last week, Trie adamantly denied any wrongdoing, adding that he had no plans to return to the United States and might even stay in Asia for 10 years. "They'll never find me," he said.

The Senate Government Affairs Committee is set to start its hearings on Democratic fund raising next week, and the timing of Ng's transfers to his account with Trie will probably be discussed. Ng, a real estate developer born in China, lives in Macao and has invested with Trie in projects in the United States. Last year, he wired a total of $470,000 in six transfers into the joint account, which was at the Riggs National Bank.

Late last week, the Senate committee voted to give limited immunity from prosecution to two women who have said that Ng arranged for them to give $25,000 to the Democratic National Committee for a fund-raiser Feb. 19, 1996, at the Hay-Adams hotel in Washington.

Both women, who are homemakers in Gaithersburg, Md., are related to an employee of a trading company owned by Ng and Trie. The source of the $25,000 is unclear, but the committee is considering whether any of it came from a $150,000 transfer made five days before the fund-raiser.

The Democratic committee has returned the $25,000 and at least half of the $100,000 that Trie raised for the president's birthday dinner because officials could not confirm that the donations had come from the people listed on the checks.

Federal election law generally bans political contributions from foreigners who are not legal residents of the United States. The law also requires donors to identify themselves and prohibits the reimbursement of contributions by third parties.

Since questions about Democratic fund raising first emerged last fall, the exact nature of Trie's role has eluded investigators. In the 1980s, Trie, a native of Taiwan, ran several Chinese restaurants in Little Rock, Ark., including one that was a favorite of Clinton, then governor.

After Clinton became president in 1993, Trie tried to capitalize on his relationship with the president by becoming an international trade consultant doing business in China and Taiwan.

Since 1994, Trie and his wife, Wang Mei Trie, have given more than $200,000 of their own money to the Democrats. Trie also opened an office in Washington. By the end of 1995, he had begun to work closely with Huang, raising money for the party.

Ex. 8-2

Huang, a former Commerce Department official, joined the Democratic committee in December 1995 as its chief fund-raiser soliciting Asian-Americans. Between them, Trie and Huang raised nearly $4 million from Asian-Americans. The Democrats have since returned $1.6 million that Huang raised and $645,000 that Trie donated or raised.

In the spring of 1996, the White House appointed Trie to a presidential advisory board, the Commission on U.S.-Pacific Trade and Investment Policy. The White House has denied that there was any connection between Trie's fund raising and his appointment.

In Washington, Trie represented several U.S. companies in China, where he was close to several government officials. In another controversial move, Trie arranged for Wang Jun, the chairman of the board of Polytechnologies, China's most prominent arms company, to attend a White House coffee in February 1996.

One of the biggest questions now facing investigators is whether some of the $470,000 that Ng sent to his account with Trie ended up financing any contributions to the Democrats.

For the February 1996 dinner, attended by Clinton, the two Maryland women donated $25,000 at the request of Ng, who was prohibited from contributing because he is not a legal U.S. resident. At least one of the women has told Senate investigators that the women were reimbursed for their gifts.

The women, Yue F. Chu and Xi Ping Wang, are the spouse and cousin of Ming Chen, who works for Ng and Trie.

Investigators say the reimbursement plan was first discussed at a 1996 Chinese New Year's celebration at Ms. Chu's house. Both women "were solicited to front money for Ng Lap Seng," a Senate investigative memorandum says, and Ms. Chu told investigators that she had participated "in the scheme as a favor to her husband's boss."

But Trie also longed to help his old friend of 20 years, the president, who had racked up more than $1 million in legal bills defending himself in the Whitewater investigation and other matters.

In late March of 1996, Trie arrived at the Washington office of the Presidential Legal Expense Trust with $460,000 in contributions. He carried two large manila envelopes that contained several hundred checks and money orders of up to $1,000 each, many of them from members of a Taiwanese Buddhist sect with temples in the United States.

The fund's directors returned all the money within two months because many donors had failed to list their addresses or were students or waiters of modest means. Some donations also came through money orders with identical handwriting.

Meanwhile, Trie continued to help Huang raise money. In May 1996, Trie helped bring in a $325,000 contribution from Yogesh K. Gandhi, a great-grandnephew of Mohandas K. Gandhi. The Democrats later gave the money back because they did not believe that Gandhi had enough money to make such a donation himself.

Ex. 8-3

Trie also helped Huang with a gala for Asian-Americans in Los Angeles last July 22. "I've heard that the event was just laden with Chinese nationals, just tens of them," one former party official said.

The president's New York birthday party, featuring a concert at Radio City Music Hall and a dinner, came about a month later. For party officials and investigators, that fund-raiser has come to embody how Trie and Huang worked together and how they came to leave such a long trail of questions in their wake.

Huang went to New York about a week or two before the event at the request of Marvin Rosen, then the Democrats' finance chairman.

But Huang was worried that even though he had once worked for a bank in New York, he did not have many contacts left there. So he asked Asian-Americans there to route any concert or dinner tickets they sold through him.

One of them, Ethel Chen of Queens, said Huang had told her that it was only by consolidating their donations that Asian-Americans would get the kind of political clout that Jewish groups have. Ms. Chen and others handed about $10,000 in checks to Huang, most of it raised through sales of $250 concert tickets to Asian-American lawyers and business owners.

Huang also asked Trie for help. And that led to the largest, and still most mysterious. contributions.

Early last Aug. 19, the president's birthday, Trie rushed over to a rented party office in the Bear, Stearns building on Park Avenue to hand over the 15 checks to a group of party officials who included Rosen. Party officials who were there recall that they had been "dead tired and groggy" but that the checks had given everybody a lift.

But since then, Democratic Party investigators have been unable to find some of the people whose names are on those checks. Some of the biggest checks for the New York dinner came from people listing addresses in Ohio and California.

For instance, Kun-Cheng Yeh, who donated $10,000 through Trie, listed the address of an electronics company in a Los Angeles suburb. But an employee there said Yeh lived in China and had not been to the United States for several years.

Trie also solicited a $3,000 check drawn on the New York City bank account of a Michele Lima. Democratic Party officials previously said that Ms. Lima had died years ago, but they said more recently that the donation might have come from another Michele Lima who lives in Queens. But her phone number has been disconnected, and relatives have refused to tell reporters how to locate her. Party officials cannot explain why Ms. Lima's check was written in the same handwriting as that of another person who gave $4,000.

At the hearing scheduled to begin July 8, the senators plan to explore questions about how much the White House and the Democratic committee knew about the questionable fund-raising practices of Trie and Huang.

Harold M. Ickes, then the White House deputy chief of staff, has acknowledged that he knew Trie had brought in questionable donations for the legal defense

fund in early April of 1996. Yet Trie continued to raise money for the Democrats because Ickes never told party officials about the problems with him.

"Had we been informed earlier, we would have looked into those concerns and taken appropriate action," said Steve Langdon, a spokesman for the Democratic committee.

Now the Senate plans to zero in on Ickes in an effort to pin partial responsibility for Trie's fund-raising practices on the White House. One investigator said, "The warnings that the White House had that Trie was out of control are very fertile territory."

Copyright 1997 The New York Times Company

AFFIDAVIT OF ERICA PAYNE

Being duly sworn, I, Erica Payne, state the following to be true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief:

1. From February 1993 to January 1997, I worked in the Finance Division of the Democratic National Committee (hereinafter "DNC"). I served in succession as Regional Finance Coordinator, Regional Finance Director and Deputy Finance Director.

2. As part of my job responsibilities, I was in charge of fundraising for President Clinton's 50th birthday celebration at Radio City Music Hall in New York City on Sunday, August 18, 1996 (hereinafter "the celebration").

3. In connection with these responsibilities, I was stationed in New York City for approximately one month prior to the celebration and was in New York City continuously from August 10, 1996 until after the celebration took place on August 18, 1996.

4. As a further part of my job responsibilities, I coordinated and supervised all DNC staff fundraisers in New York working on the celebration, including John Huang.

5. As a colleague at and fellow fundraiser for the DNC, I had known John Huang throughout 1996.

6. To the best of my recollection, John Huang was continuously physically present in New York City conducting fundraising for at least five days prior to the August 18 celebration; I worked with and saw him each day during that period; and in fact, approximately two to four days prior to the event (August 14 - 17), I recall joking with

John Huang at the fundraising offices in Manhattan about the difficulty in selling some of the seats at the celebration.

Signed under penalties of perjury this 8th day of October, 1997.

Erica Payne

Ex. 9-2

Statement of Bonnie Gail Wong

My name is Bonnie Gail Wong. I am currently the executive director of a non-profit organization in New York City, Asian Women in Business.

I helped John Huang sell some tickets to a fundraiser at Radio City Music Hall on August 18, 1996, in honor of President Clinton's 50th birthday. I understood Mr. Huang to be in town for the entire week leading up to the event at Radio City on the 18th.

Mr. Huang, Charles Wang, Linda Soohoo, Dr. David Hung and I had dinner on August 13.

I spent a large part of the day and evening of August 15, 1996 with Mr. Huang in New York City. I attended a meeting between Mr. Huang and members of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association on Mott Street, New York, New York, in the afternoon. My calendar indicates the meeting began at 2 p.m. I came to the event closer to 3 p.m. Shortly thereafter, a photographer took pictures of some of the attendees. Two local newspapers dated August 16 contain pictures of Mr. Huang attending the event.

Mr. Huang & I also attended a reception sponsored by the Democratic National Committee (DNC) at the law firm of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, on 919 Third Avenue, New York, New York. A pre-reception meeting with Don Fowler was scheduled to start at 6:00 p.m. but actually began later at about 6:30 p.m. The reception took place from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. Mr. Huang and Mr. Fowler both spoke at this reception.

After the reception, I went with John Huang, his wife Jane, Yungman Lee and Bill Chong to a nearby restaurant called Chiam. We had drinks at the bar and then sat down at a table and ate dinner. Dinner ended at about 11 p.m. Mr. Huang remained with the group at the restaurant until we all left together at about 11 p.m.

While in New York City, Mr. Huang gave me his number at the DNC in New York where I could reach him during the week of August 12, 1996 through August 18, 1996. I believe that we spoke on both August 16 and August 17

Yvonne Louie, a friend, told me that she saw Mr. Huang eating lunch at a restaurant in Chinatown, New York City on August 16.

Bonnie Gail Wong
October 8, 1996

Ex. 10

STATEMENT OF YUNGMAN LEE

I, Yungman Lee, declare the following to be true to the best of my recollection and belief:

1. I am President of United Orient Bank, located in New York City.

2. As an Asian-American Democrat and an active member and former President of the Chinese-American Bankers Association, I have known John Huang for some time.

3. On August 15, 1996, I had a late dinner with John Huang at the ChiAm Chinese Restaurant in New York City. Joining us at the dinner were Jane Huang, Bonnie Wong and Bill Chong. We arrived at ChiAm at approximately 9 p.m. We sat at the bar for some time, waiting for a table to open. We ate and all departed the restaurant together at approximately 11 p.m. I paid for this dinner with my American Express card and have attached a copy of my receipt from American Express to this statement.

4. Before the dinner, I saw John Huang at two different events. One event was a meeting of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of Chinatown on the afternoon of August 15. The second event was a gathering of leaders of the Asian American community at the law offices of Skadden Arps in Manhattan later that day. The purpose of the Skadden meeting was to discuss ways to get Asian Americans involved in the Democratic campaigns of 1996. DNC Chairman Don Fowler gave a nice speech encouraging Asian American participation in the political process.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury.

Yungman Lee

Dated this 8th day of October, 1997.

Ex. 11-1

ITEM 5 $255.00
CHIAM CHINESE RSTR NEW YORK NY

Cardmember Account No.	Date of Charge	Reference Code	Approval Code
	08/15/96	000549170	55

Service Establishment and Location
CHIAM CHINESE RSTR NEW YORK NY

Nature of Charge

FOOD AND BEVERAGE

TIP $42.65

S/E # 6311379366

TOTAL CHARGE AMOUNT $255.00

ITEM 7 $80.75
CAFE NEW TERRITORIESNEW YORK NY

Cardmember Account No.	Date of Charge	Reference Code	Approval Code
	08/12/96	078045977	01

Service Establishment and Location

Account number redacted

Ex. 11-2

TOTAL P.02
10-08-97 03:33PM P002 #43

1 212 2276200

Statement of Linda SooHoo

My name is Linda SooHoo, and I am an attorney in New York at the law firm of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP.

On August 15, 1996, I helped host a reception for Donald Fowler at the New York offices of Skadden, Arps. The reception provided an opportunity for members of New York's Asian American community to meet Mr. Fowler and hear him speak. The reception started at approximately 7 p.m. and ended at approximately 8:30 p.m. John Huang attended the entire event. I recall having a brief conversation with Mr. Huang at the end of the reception. It was my understanding that Mr. Huang was going out to dinner with Bonnie Wong and others after the reception.

Linda SooHoo
October 8, 1996

Ex. 12

STATE OF NEW YORK

AFFIDAVIT

of

ETHEL CHEN

I, Ethel Chen, state as follows:

1. I live in Queens, New York. I am a former supervising librarian at the New York Public Library. I currently serve as a Democratic District Leader At-Large in Queens, New York. I served as a Delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1996.

2. In August 1996, I worked with John Huang to sell tickets to the President's 50th Birthday fundraiser at Radio City Music Hall in Manhattan. The event took place on August 18, 1996.

3. On at least two occasions during the week before the event, I delivered checks to John Huang, and received tickets for the event in return. These checks were mostly from members of the business community in Queens. On those occasions, I called John Huang at the DNC office in midtown Manhattan, and then visited him personally there. One of those meetings took place on the Friday before the event, August 16.

4. I also saw John Huang earlier that week at either the Sheraton or Hilton Hotel in Manhattan, and at the Radio City Music Hall event itself.

Signed under penalty of perjury this 8th day of October, 1997,

Ethel Chen

Ethel Chen

MICHAEL NORMAN NIEBAUER
COMMISSIONER OF DEEDS
City of New York - No 4-5110
Certificate Filed in Queens County
Commission Expires: 6-28-98
Michael N. Niebauer

Ex. I

LEVINE PIERSON SULLIVAN & KOCH, L.L.P.
1155 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036
(202) 508-6650
FACSIMILE (202) 508-6699

LEE LEVINE
STUART F. PIERSON
MICHAEL Q. SULLIVAN
ELIZABETH C. KOCH
JAMES E. CROSSBERG
CELESTE PHILLIPS*

SETH D. BERLIN
JAY WARD BROWN
RAYMOND KU

*ADMITTED AND ACTIVE IN CALIFORNIA ONLY

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL:
202/508-1113

October 8, 1997

Kenneth Ballen, Esq.
Chief Investigative Counsel
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Government
Reform and Oversight
511 Ford Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Re: Fran Wakem

Dear Mr. Ballen:

This will confirm my advice to you this morning.

I have reached Fran Wakem in Honolulu. She will shortly be out of touch in East Asia.

Fran specifically recalls that John Huang was in New York on the Friday and Saturday before the August 1996 gala, and he was present at the gala on Sunday, as well.

We regret that Ms. Wakem is not available to confirm this directly. Of course, when she returns to Washington later this month she can do so.

Very truly yours,

LEVINE PIERSON SULLIVAN & KOCH, L.L.P.

By _____
Stuart F. Pierson

SFP:KGH

Ex. 14

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

Sworn Statement of Teressa Stirk

Teressa Stirk being first duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

1. I was formerly employed at the Democratic National Committee as Operations Manager to the Finance Department. My employment at the DNC began on April 12, 1996 and lasted until my resignation on May 1, 1997.

2. As part of my duties as Operations Manager, it was my responsibility to make sure that all necessary information was available as to contributor checks. This information was set forth on a form that accompanied the contribution known as the check tracking form. I would normally receive the check and the check tracking form from the fundraisers in the course of, or in the aftermath of, a fundraising event. I would then add additional information to the check tracking form, including the date I received checks from the fundraisers, the

revenue code, the fundraiser code and the source code. Checks were then forwarded on to the Accounting Department for posting and deposit.

3. It is my recollection that in August of 1996, John Huang, a fundraiser in the Finance Department of the DNC, was assigned to the DNC fundraiser known as the Presidential Birthday Celebration, which was held in New York on August 18, 1996. It is also my recollection that Mr. Huang worked on the event in New York City for a period of time prior to the August 18, 1996 event.

4. I have had the opportunity to review a number of checks received by Mr. Huang in the course of his duties as a fundraiser for the August 18, 1996 event. I have also reviewed the check tracking forms filled out by him which accompany the contribution checks. I note that on those check tracking forms the date of receipt of the checks is placed on the form. I recall that it was the usual practice to send checks and check tracking forms by UPS to me or the Finance Director. I note that the first date of receipt by me is August 16, 1996. I note that I received other contributions from him on August 20, 1996 and some on August 31, 1996.

5. While I cannot tell when Mr. Huang actually received each check from the contributors, because of the correlation between the dates on the checks and the receipt by me of the checks and the accompanying check tracking forms, it would

appear that he was in New York City throughout this period of time.

Teressa Stirk

District of :
: ss
Columbia :

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of October 1997.

Notary Public
My Commission Expires July 31, 2000

1) The China Press (*Qiao Bao*) August 19, 1996

Headline: Support Clinton's Re-election; Wen-Zhou Association
Gives Clinton Painting to Celebrate Birthday

The article states that the Wen-Zhou Association presented President Clinton with a painting in honor of his 50th birthday celebration in Manhattan. The gift is a symbol of support for Clinton, and in hopes that he will strengthen relations between the Chinese community and the US.

Photo Caption: Representing President Clinton to accept the painting is John Huang (fourth from the left), along with the Association President, and others.

僑報

支持克林頓競選連任

温州同鄉會贈畫賀壽

（本報紐約訊）温州同鄉會負責人向克林頓總統將於昨（十八日）晚在曼哈頓舉行的克林頓五十歲生日慶祝活動，該同鄉會表示支持克林頓競選連任，認為克林頓對華民族比較友好，在政治上也發出了鼓勵的信息。

八月十八日是克林頓總統的五十歲生日，温州同鄉會除十七日舉行了向克林頓將軍的贈畫儀式，由華埠商業部理事胡瑞祥、民主黨金融委員會財政委員會副主席黃建南代表贈送給。黃建南祖籍温州。

據温州同鄉會中國法律顧問等表示，由大陸來美投資者組織（簡稱「僑資會」）以提倡「尊重國家、以鄉愛家」為宗旨。温州同鄉會希望克林頓總統連任，進一步加強移民社區的利益，以鼓勵海外僑胞。

出席贈送儀式的有温州同鄉會會長胡瑞昆和其他主要負責人員等。胡瑞昆、胡瑞祥、胡瑞泰、陳時雄、胡瑞清、胡瑞清、胡瑞清

2) The China Press (*Qiao Bao*) Friday, August 16, 1996

Headline: Democratic Party Official Visits Chinatown; Urges Chinese Unity In Order to Develop Greater Strength

The article states that Huang visits Chinese Chamber of Commerce and said that successful Chinese should support the Democratic Party. Huang was introduced by Chinese Banking Association President Lee Yong-ming, who lauded Huang's merits and noted that Huang started the Chinese Banking Association.

Ex. 17

1996年8月16日（星期五） 僑報

民主黨要員黃建南訪華埠
籲華人團結發揮更大力量

【本報記者陳素華報導】「已經過了河的華人，應該幫助那些正在過河或準備過河的華人。」民主黨總部全國執經委員會副主席黃建南於昨（十五）日訪問中華公所時，發表了上述的精話。

他呼籲華人聯合起來，在美國發揮更大的影響力。

民主黨將於十八日在紐約市慶祝克林頓總統五十歲生日，並同時為他舉行籌款晚會。黃建南在前來紐約為他舉行籌款晚會時，抽空訪問了中華公所，並與公所十多個議員進行交談。紐約市華資銀行公會會長會利勇民在介紹黃建南時表示，黃在擔任民主黨總部財經委員會副主席的高職位之前，已是著名的銀行家；他曾在紐約生活過幾年，紐約華資銀行公會就是由他一手創辦的。

在中華公所主席陳炳基對雙方進行了交談。黃建南表示歡迎之後，賓主雙方進行了交談。黃建南表示，老一輩的華人為華裔在美國立足作出了重要的貢獻，他希望在座的朋輩繼續集合僑社的力量，多做承前啟後的工作。他強調，「已經過河的人要幫助正在過河及未過河的人，老移民要幫助那些迫切需要支持幫助的新移民。」

他提到目前大約有百分之七十的華人仍處在背水面戰的新移民階段，只有百分之三十的華人是移民美國時間較長或在美國出生的。他希望這兩種華人聯合起來，取長補短，在美國社會創造更大的影響力。

黃建南提到，今天中國國際地位日益提高，華人對美國主流社會的貢獻也將越來越大。他提到華人的家庭觀念，對教育的注重，以及在科技方面的人才，將對主流社會有很大的幫助。

黃建南表示，多年以來，他努力打開通往主流社會的大門，每打開了一道門，就享受到一種成就感。但是後來他覺悟，那些門開了一道又一道，開來開去卻開不完，心裡難免產生挫折感。後來，他明白了要把大家組織起來，如果每個人都去開門，共同掃除通往主流社會的阻障，效果將會更好。

黃建南在會上表示，華人和猶太人一樣，在美國所佔人口比例較少，但既然猶太人在政治經濟方面對美國有較大的影響力，只要華人團結起來，也會像猶太人一樣對社會產生影響力。

他說影響力大小與四個因素有關，那就是選票、經濟能力、人才以及與政界的關係。他提到因華人的人數關係，選票並不多，但集中起來也有一定影響力。至於人才方面則非常輝盛，全美有十二萬科技人才，其中約有四萬人是華人。另外，從商的華人也不少，在經濟上有一定實力。在與政界關係方面，則需加強。

參加當天座談的有李文彬、煙俊征、發碧輝、李能國、許耀宇、鄧廣倫、張毅文、何漢、李玉坤、陳道英、黃崇儒等。

▲ 黃建南（右三）十五日訪問中華公所，呼籲華人積極參政。（本報記者陳素華攝）

Photo Caption: John Huang (third from the right) visited on the 15th with the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, urging Chinese to participate in politics.

世界日報
FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 1996

亞太裔民主黨員為柯林頓助選有佳績

黃建南稱七個月內已募款五百萬

【本報紙約翰】民主黨全國委員會主席唐納德（Donald L. Fowler）昨晚在紐約與亞裔民主黨人士舉行近百位組織者出席了酒會。

民主黨全國委員會副主席黃建南在會中宣布，美國空太窗在過去七個月內已為柯林頓競選募款五百萬元，為前所未有的好成績。

黃建南表在會上說，本屆選舉大華、民主黨和共和黨之間在競選資本上相距之遠，為他生平所未見，但此次大選意義重大，他希望世紀對決，也呼籲亞太裔人士催此關鍵時刻，出錢出力，全力支持贊同美國多元化的柯林頓總統競選連任。

黃建南指出，柯林頓對美國和世界的未來具有遠見卓識，理解並贊同美國社會的多元化，而且堅定為人，對自選個年輕一代和新的美國人包括移民的需要，相反的，以迎為代表的共和黨，則要縮減移民的需要，就個別地一個人與人之間「互相對立，互不信任」的社會。

黃建南說，民主黨本大大超差老必得，希望紐約亞裔民主黨人在未來距大選所的十一個零五天之內，全力動員，出錢出票，支持柯林頓連任，為二十一世紀的美國奠定基礎。

昨天會上還宣布成立紐約的亞太裔民主黨動員委員會，共有十二名委員，陳雄英、王昭、黃穗曉和 Yung Ho Tsai 四名亞人擔任委員。

王雄英表示，過去一兩共和黨召開全國大會，對柯林頓是開玩笑，為社會造勢，使社會陷入混亂。民主黨對此並不過著，但現在共和黨大會結束，柯林頓的競選即將展開，紐約亞太裔民主黨將繼續展開一系列活動，為柯林頓募款拉票。

負責募款事務的黃穗曉則稱，本星期日是柯林頓總統五十歲生日，民主黨總在全美五十州舉辦多場慶祝募款會，紐約市民主黨也在舉辦慶祝募款會。

3) The World Journal (*Shi Jie Er Bao*) Friday, August 16, 1996

Headline: Chinese Community Supports Clinton, John Huang
Indicates That $5 Million was Raised Already in July

The article states that Democratic National Committee Chairman Donald Fowler visited nearly one hundred New York Asian-American Democrats yesterday. Also present was Vice-Chairman John Huang, who said that Asian-Americans had contributed $5 million in July alone.

Ex. 18

4) The World Journal *(Shi Jie Ri Bao)* Friday, August 16, 1996

Headline: Democratic Vice-Chairman John Huang Visits Chinese Business Association; Calls on Asian Organization to Unite for the Next Century

The article states that John Huang visited the New York Chinese Business Association on the 15th. It goes on to give a summary of his background.

世界日報 FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 1996

民主黨財委會副主席黃建南拜會中華公所

呼籲僑社團結自強迎接下個世紀來臨

[本報紐約訊] 民主黨全國委員會財務委員會副主席黃建南十五日由多名民主黨籍人士陪同拜會中華公所，與中華公所四位前後任主席及董事會中華公所董事長陳紹唐、黃鑑雄、王新中等人士舉行會談。黃建南在會中強調，僑社團結自強，迎接下個世紀來臨。

黃建南表示，美國華人的貢獻也必須有美國華人的政治地位作為後盾，在二十一世紀，美國華人能與美國政治家同享世紀的榮譽力量。

黃建南說，美國華人在美國各方面特別是政界的影響力，但是美國人還有的觀念，美國華人人口不比華人多很多，美國華人還有的觀念。

黃建南說，美國華人還有的觀念，美國華人還有的觀念。

黃建南說，美國華人還有的觀念，美國華人還有的觀念。

黃建南說，美國華人還有的觀念

星島日報

一九九六年八月十六日 星期五

美政黨華裔精英昨首訪中華會所

民主黨財委會副主席黃建南

籲華人團結打入美主流社會

（本報紐約訊）民主黨全國財政委員會副主席黃建南指出中國人的家庭觀念和在教育與科技方面的成就是美國主流社會所需要的東西，在廿一世紀這個與健博弈點，希望華人能效法猶太人打入主流社會所賦予的力量來為彰顯己力量。

這位在美國政黨擔任高職的黃建南昨日抵達紐約中華公所時向歡迎他的僑界以上表示。黃建南駐中華公所時，受到陳炳基主席與多位中華常務董事友好歡迎。陳炳基主席致歡迎詞說，對在民主黨任全國財委會副主席的黃建南來訪感到非常高興，陳主席向黃建南簡介中華公所有一百一十三年歷史，設有三千多名的會員，六百人的英文班和二百多人的幼稚園兒童班是僑中心。

黃建南曾著孫中山的遺說，孫中山主張民主救中國。民主的中國沒有基礎的支持是不可能實現的。他共特別中華公所是僑社的支柱，扮演了不少新移民，發揮了承先啓後傳授知識的作用。希望能團結更多華人在政治上作更大的努力，早日打入美國主流社會。民主黨代表陳道英表示，民主黨的政治理念與對移民的政策都對華人較有利，希望華人能區別共和黨的政治出路出力支持。來賓建南很有超群能力，曾在東亞銀行總裁利若民稱讚黃建南很有超群能力，曾在東亞銀行副董事長任內幫助成立華資銀行公會，向時他與克林頓總統關係密切而使克林頓總統在各政府部門中委任了二百九十多位華裔官員。

出席歡迎會的僑領有鍾國征、李文彬、許冠宇、國辰信、何添、張行南、李雅國、張樹文、李主席、黃翠嫦等。

民主黨全國財政委員會副主席黃建南在中華公所時發表演講。

5) The Singdao Daily (*Xing Dao Er Bao*) Friday, August 16, 1996

Headline: Chinese Democratic Official John Huang Visits New York Business Association, Urges Unity to Enter American Mainstream

The article summarizes Huang's ideas for ways Chinese Americans can enter the political mainstream by the 21st century.

Photo Caption: Democratic National Committee Vice-Chairman for Finance John Huang visits the Chinese Business Association to deliver a talk.

Ex. 20

88

HOGAN & HARTSON

COLUMBIA SQUARE
555 THIRTEENTH STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004-1109
(202) 637-5600

BRUSSELS
LONDON
PARIS
PRAGUE
WARSAW
BALTIMORE, MD
BETHESDA, MD
DENVER, CO
McLEAN, VA

TY COBB
PARTNER
DIRECT DIAL (202) 637-6437

October 8, 1997

BY TELECOPIER AND HAND DELIVERY

Kenneth N. Ballen, Esq.
Chief Investigative Counsel, Minority Staff
Committee on Government Reform and
Oversight
2157 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6143

Dear Mr. Ballen:

Thank you for your letter of October 7, 1997. I do, in fact, represent John Huang. As we discussed earlier today, and as I am sure you can appreciate, although Mr. Huang would welcome the opportunity to personally provide the information you have requested as well as to respond to the many unfounded allegations to which he has been unfairly subjected over the past year, Mr. Huang is not presently in a position to respond directly to your request for information.

I am, however, grateful that you and the Ranking Minority Member have elected to pursue the unfortunate allegation that Mr. Huang was in Los Angeles, California on both the morning and afternoon of August 16, 1996, and I welcome the opportunity to facilitate your efforts to fully develop the actual facts. In that regard, and despite the short time available in which to investigate your inquiry, it appears that certain information already in the possession of the Committee clearly establishes that Mr. Huang was in New York City from August 10, 1996 until August 19, 1996 working diligently in connection with the August 18, 1996 Gala in honor of President Clinton's birthday. Specifically, the Committee already has in its possession expense records submitted by Mr. Huang to the Democratic National Committee ("DNC") for that period and the related hotel bill at the Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers which confirms Mr. Huang's physical presence in New York during that period.

Moreover, and conclusive though those records are, easily available for

Ex. 21-1

FAX: (202) 637-5910 TELEX: 248370(RCA), 892797(WU) CABLE: HOGANDER WASHINGTON

either the Majority or the Minority with regard to August 16, 1996, are a multitude of witnesses who were with Mr. Huang in New York in connection with his DNC duties on each day that he was in New York, and specifically on August 15, 1996 and August 16, 1996. In fact, Mr. Huang's photograph appears in the August 16, 1996 edition of a local Chinese newspaper. That picture, as the caption indicates, was taken on the 15th at a Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association event. Mr. Huang also attended and addressed an Asian-American community reception at the law firm of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom in New York on the evening of August 15 at which Chairman Don Fowler and several other prominent DNC officials, and others, were present. Subsequent to the reception, Mr. and Mrs. Huang dined with Mr. Yungman Lee, President of the United Orient Bank, Ms. Bonnie Wong, and Mr. Bill Chang at Chaim Restaurant, where, as it turned out, the prominent Asian-American actor, Jackie Chan, was also dining. Afterwards, the Huangs returned to their hotel sometime around midnight.

The following two days, August 16 and 17, Mr. Huang worked at the DNC site and had business meetings in Chinatown, including a business lunch at Kam Fong Restaurant, also known as Jing Fung, on Elizabeth Street. I also would note that on the morning of the 17th of August one of Mr. and Mrs. Huang's children attempted to reach his parents by calling the DNC number in New York City from their home in Glendale, California.

While I am in possession of certain other exculpatory evidence, under the present circumstances I am not free to add that information to the existing and overwhelming proof that John Huang was in New York City from August 10, 1996 until August 19, 1996. I believe, however, that many DNC officials, and others, are in a position to verify that Mr. Huang was in New York throughout this period should that still be necessary in light of the dispositive evidence demonstrating just that. In addition, given the resources available to Congress, I am confident that, to the extent additional facts are of interest, the individuals mentioned above are easily accessible as are the extensive records and photographs related to the events described herein.

I also believe that, given the blatant unfairness of presenting false testimony that Mr. Huang was anywhere other than New York City on August 16, 1996, or the several days before and after, when the easily obtainable facts conclusively demonstrate otherwise, any such testimony should be referred to the Justice Department--especially where the witness involved has duped Congress into accepting false testimony in exchange for immunity from serious offenses.

Ex. 21-2

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Kenneth N. Ballen, Esq.
October 8, 1997
Page 3

Thank you for the opportunity to address the issues raised in your letter. I hope you find this brief assimilation of certain of the relevant evidence useful. I am grateful for the commitment you and the Ranking Minority Member have demonstrated to attempting to use the upcoming hearings as a truth seeking process.

Very truly yours,

Ty Cobb

Ty Cobb

TC:sjg

cc: John C. Keeney, Jr., Esq.
Peter Spivack, Esq.

Ex. 21-3

Customer Service 1 800 222-0300
Text Phone (TTY): 1 800 833-3232

Aug 15-Sep 14, 1996
Account [redacted]
Page 4 of 6

AT&T True Savings® calls

Description		Amount
Calls eligible for discount at 30% on	$50.91	35.64

Total AT&T True Savings® calls after savings.....$35.64

This month you saved $15.27 with AT&T True Savings®.

When you call between 11pm and 8am on weeknights, and all day Saturday and Sunday until 5pm, you're getting AT&T's lowest rates.

Calls eligible for discount

Direct dialed calls

Date	Number called	Where	Time	Rate	Type	Min	Amount before savings
Aug 17	212 681-6424	New York NY	9:31am	night	direct	2	32

Additional calls redacted

Ex. 22

001573

Recycled paper

MEMORANDUM OF INTERVIEW

Re: House of Representatives Investigation

Date: August 15, 1997

Time: 1:00 pm

Place: C. H. Auto Sales
7821/7825 E. Garvey Avenue, Rosemead, CA

Present: David Wang, Witness
John Liu, Witness's Brother-in-Law
James McFadden, Special Agent
Paul Herbert, Special Agent

1. We introduced ourselves to Wang and asked him if we could ask him questions pertaining to an investigation of fundraising by the House of Representatives. We explained that we were independent congressional investigators, and that whatever information we obtained would be shared by both the Democrats and the Republicans on the congressional committee. Wang agreed to answer our questions. The interview with Wang actually consisted of two parts-we returned immediately (within five minutes) after terminating the first part of the interview to ask some follow up questions. Wang's brother-in-law, John Liu initially sat in for the first part of the interview, but left shortly after the interview started without giving any explanation and did not return. Lui did not attend any of the second part of the interview. Wang provided the following information in reply to our questions, during the first part of the interview:

2. Wang (SSN: 624-18-0119) resides at 803 S. Manley Drive, San Gabriel, California 91776, home phone- (818) 300-0956, was born in Taiwan on February 11, 1963 and moved to The United States in December 1988. Wang has been a salesman at C. H. Auto Sales (phone: 818-571-2288, address: 7821/7825 E. Garvey Avenue, Rosemead, CA) since 1989. Wang's father owns the dealership, and Wang's sister (Diana Wang) is married to John Liu.

3. Wang met John Huang through a friend, N.K. Chen, who worked as the manager at the AIB Bank. Wang and John Liu socialized with John Huang a couple times at the "888 Seafood Restaurant" in the San Gabriel valley.

4. Wang stated that in about August 1996, John Huang asked Wang and Liu to make a donation to the DNC for a fundraising party at a downtown Los Angeles hotel. Huang suggested the amount of $5,000 and Wang and Liu agreed since Wang and Liu figured that was an amount they could afford. For making the donation, Wang and Liu got a formal written invitation to the party. Wang and Liu were happy to oblige Huang's request because: 1) it was a favor to Huang, 2) it was a chance to assist the Asian

MINORITY EX. 1

community, and 3) it was a chance to be close to, and possibly meet President Clinton. Neither Wang nor Liu got any money in return or reimbursement for their donation. Liu's wife gave her brother David Wang $2,500 in cash for Liu's part of the donation. Wang and Liu stated that they had to pay the money after agreeing to make the donation to Huang. The donation bought Wang and Liu two seats at the party. Wang and Liu attended the party, but did not get to meet President Clinton. Wang and Liu both stated they would not have been invited to the party if they had not made the donation.

5. The first part of the interview terminated at about 2:00 pm. When we returned, Wang agreed again to answer questions. Wang provided the following information in reply to our questions, during the second part of the interview:

6. In a meeting between John Huang, Wang and Liu, Huang asked Wang to make a donation to the DNC of $5,000 and advised Wang that he would be repaid for the donation. Huang and a "Mr. Pan or Pen" picked up the $5,000 check from Wang at C.H. Auto Sales. Wang described Huang's repayment arrangement offer as "secret". Although Wang felt "funny" about the arrangement and thought it "very curious", he did not ask Huang for an explanation for the donation and repayment in this manner. Wang paid the $5,000 and identified his signature on check #178 to the DNC of 8/16/96. Wang knew at the time he wrote the check to the DNC for $5,000 that he would be repaid the $5,000, but Wang did not know when or how he would be repaid.

7. Within a week of making the donation, Mr. Pan or Mr. Pen (40-50 years old) repaid the money by making two hand deliveries totaling $5,000 to Wang of $100 bills in 8" by 10" envelopes at the sales office of C. H. Auto Sales. The envelopes were folded to wrap around the cash, and Wang does not recall any writing or identifying marks on the envelopes. Wang does not recall any letters or notes attached to, or inside the envelopes. The first payment of $3,000 was the same day as the donation-8/16/96; the second and last repayment for the remaining $2,000 was delivered two to four days later. Wang does not believe anyone saw him taking the money from Mr. Pan/Pen. Mr. Pan/Pen did not explain why he was alone and did not explain why he, rather than John Huang was making the repayment of the donation. Pan/Pen asked Wang not to tell anyone about the repayment. Wang does not recognize the name "Antonio Pan". At the time of the first repayment, Pan/Pen told Wang that the remainder would be paid later. Wang did not ask, and Pan/Pen did not offer any explanation or reason why the repayment was broken up into two amounts rather than paid at one time. Further, Mr. Pan/Pen did not give any reason why the repayment was in cash, or why he (Pan/Pen) rather than Huang delivered the repayments. Wang does not know the source of the money used in making the cash repayments. Wang kept the cash in his desk until depositing it either later the day of receipt, or the next day, into his checking account at China Trust Bank.

8. Daniel Wu also made a donation to the DNC, which was reimbursed to him. Wu and Wang discussed their donations and reimbursements with each other. Wang saw Wu at the DNC fundraising party, but they did not drive to the party together. Wang did not

originally know the amount of Wu's check to the DNC, but Wang assumed it was also $5,000. Wu's repayments were deposited by Wang to Wu's account at the Bank of Canton. Wu asked Wang to deposit the money as a favor because their banks are located close to each other and Wu knew that Wang was going to his (Wang's) bank. For the first deposit of Wu's money, Wu gave the cash to Wang to deposit. The cash for Wu's second deposit was given directly by Mr. Pan/Pen to Wang at the same time that Pan/Pen gave Wang his $2,000 cash repayment. Wang does not recall if the cash payments of $2,000 each from Pan/Pen for Wu and Wang were in one envelope or two. Mr. Wang was to give the cash to Wu, but Wu asked Wang, during a phone conversation, to deposit the money to Wu's bank account.

9. We asked Wang if he had a 1996 calendar which he could use to try to reconstruct the dates of the repayments. Wang went to his office and returned with his 1996 journal which notes cash to Wang and Wu of $3,000 each on August 16, 1996, and cash to Wang and Wu of $2,000 each on August 20, 1996. Wang stated these were the repayments of the DNC "donations". The recordings in the journal represent the dates of receipt of the cash by Wang; the check marks next to the recordings represent the deposit of the money. After looking at the journal, Wang stated that he received the first repayment the same day he wrote the $5,000 check to the DNC. We then asked Wang if he had his bank account statement from August 1996. Wang went into his office and returned with his August and September 1996 China Trust Bank account statements which show deposits of $3,000 on August 16, 1996 and $2,000 on August 20, 1996. Wang identified these as the deposits of the DNC "donation". Wang agreed to our request to let us hold onto the journal and bank statements.

10. Neither Wang nor Liu know where Daniel Wu is, but they both believe Wu is in Taiwan. Wu frequently traveled between Taiwan and Los Angeles and stayed at hotels when he was in Los Angeles. Wu used the C.H. Auto dealership as his address in Los Angeles. Neither Wang nor Liu recall ever meeting Julian Liu or Charlie Trie.

I prepared this memorandum on August 15, 1997, after refreshing my memory from notes taken during the interview of David Wang.

Paul N. Herbert

This memorandum contains an accurate account of the interview of David Wang.

James McFadden

STATEMENT OF TAK LUK CHENG

My name is Tak Luk Cheng. I am the owner of a Chinese restaurant in New York City. In addition, I am an officer of the New York City Chinatown Fukienese Association, a cultural group with over 1000 members.

I recall that on Friday, August 16, 1996, I personally had lunch (dim sum) at approximately 2 p.m. with Mr. John Huang and a group of Fukienese community leaders at the Jing Fung Restaurant in Manhattan's Chinatown. That was the first time I had met John Huang. At that lunch, we discussed the possibility of a presidential visit to the New York City Fukienese community. Mr. Huang told myself and the others that he would check the President's schedule and get back to us, but never did.

10/8/97
Date

Tak Luk Cheng

Ex. 24

I am David Wang father I was present at the meeting with my son and John Hung and Mr pan on August 16-1996. at that meeting John Hung asked for a Donation To The presidential campaign

Jr Wang
JAMES WANG
10-4-97

EXHIBIT
127

STATEMENT OF KENNETH M. BALLEN AND CHRISTOPHER P. LU

At approximately 6 p.m. on Friday, October 3, 1997, we telephoned James Wang, the father of David Wang, at his place of business. We called him to find out what, if anything, he knew about any meetings or conversations that David Wang has had with John Huang. Our telephone interview with James Wang lasted approximately 20 minutes and was conducted in both English and Chinese.

James Wang told us that he was neither present at any meetings nor aware of any conversations in which John Huang asked David Wang to make a campaign contribution. We specifically asked him whether he knew about a meeting that his son had had with John Huang on August 16, 1996, and he replied that he knew nothing about such a meeting.

James Wang also added that he was in Europe from July 23, 1996 until August 7, 1996. At our request, he faxed us two pages from his passport which attest to this fact.

Kenneth M. Ballen
Chief Investigative Counsel

Christopher P. Lu
Counsel

Dated: October 8, 1997

STATEMENT OF JAMES WANG

I am David Wang's father. I was not present at any meeting in August 1996 in which John Huang asked my son, David, to make a financial contribution for a fundraiser for President Clinton.

_____
James Wang

_____
Date



§ 1001. Statements or entries generally

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully—

(1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact;

(2) makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or

(3) makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry;

shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to a party to a judicial proceeding, or that party's counsel, for statements, representations, writings or documents submitted by such party or counsel to a judge or magistrate in that proceeding.

(c) With respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of the legislative branch, subsection (a) shall apply only to—

(1) administrative matters, including a claim for payment, a matter related to the procurement of property or services, personnel or employment practices, or support services, or a document required by law, rule, or regulation to be submitted to the Congress or any office or officer within the legislative branch; or

(2) any investigation or review, conducted pursuant to the authority of any committee, subcommittee, commission or office of the Congress, consistent with applicable rules of the House or Senate.

(As amended Sept. 13, 1994, Pub.L. 103-322, Title XXXIII, § 330016(1)(L), 108 Stat. 2147; Oct. 11, 1996, Pub.L. 104-292, § 2, 110 Stat. 3459.)

Mr. BURTON. Is there further discussion?

The gentleman from California is recognized. Pardon me. One second.

Mr. HORN. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. I want to go to the Democratic side. Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman, Mr. Fattah.

Mr. FATTAH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I just wanted to, first of all—I know that the gentleman from—the gentleman spoke he had some concerns about the small percentage defense that was offered earlier, and I understand the enthusiasm of both sides on this issue, but small-mindedness is not something that should be associated with any Member of the Congress. I know the gentleman would have wanted to yield to me since he pointed me out verbally, and it is a courtesy of the Congress that Members be yielded to in those circumstances. So I just think in our passion we should be careful not to do damage, further damage, to the reputation of this committee.

But I do want to get back to the point at hand, which is that the reason that this committee is interested in conduit payments, the reason why we are interested in the election itself, was this notion, this theory, this thought, that there were foreign dollars, orchestrated by a foreign government, to influence elections. And there are a number of instances in which foreign entities did make contributions in the last election, that the committee up to now has not looked into.

We have a situation of a Mr. Kramer who is a German national who donated—who was fined some $300,000 by the FEC for making illegal contributions. This was the largest fine ever imposed on an individual. And he donated over $400,000 to Federal, State elections. And also the Florida Republican party was fined for $82,000. They had to return $95,000 of contributions from this foreign national. So if we want to look in the direction of foreigners involved in this election, that's one place we might look.

We had a British-owned company that gave a $1,013,000; $1,006,000 of that to the Republican party in the 1994 election cycle, which the committee might at some point want to look into it. That is Brown & Williamson Tobacco. We had a firearms company, that's a Dutch entity that was fined $90,000 for funneling money, including money into the campaign of the Speaker of this House.

Now, again, in all of these cases, as is the case in almost every conduit election investigation, the candidates themselves had no knowledge of the activities of the people who were participating in having illegal contributions made to their campaigns.

And I want to ask the witness whether or not he has any reason to believe that the President or the Vice President had knowledge that he was reimbursed, in cash, for a check that he wrote to someone who he believes to be John Huang on August the 16th?

Mr. WANG. I don't know.

Mr. FATTAH. It is clear that the witness that we have spent a large part of our day talking to has no knowledge about any foreign government trying to put money into the American election in the last cycle. Nor does he have any knowledge that the candidates

who received this contribution had any knowledge of it. And yet he is before us.

And I would hope that as we go forward, if we just want to look at conduit schemes, that this gentleman not be singled out; that there are plenty of other people who we can bring in here, who have been involved in these types of activities, and believe it or not, they have not just written checks to the Democratic party. They have written checks, in fact, almost $15 million in fines, directly associated with the Dole campaign which took place in 1996.

We had Haley Barbour testify under oath in the U.S. Senate before the Thompson Committee that he went to a foreign land, sat in a yacht and arranged a multimillion-dollar contribution that eventually helped fund Republican campaigns in some targeted races in the 1994 election.

So if our search is for foreign money, if our search is for money in which people are trying to cover over the original source thereof, there is ample reason for this committee to exist, for our investigation to go forward, and I have no problem rooting out any wrongdoings by the Democratic party, but I think that we should be fair-minded about it, and I would hope that as we go forward that we move away from the personality attacks.

I have nothing against the gentleman from Georgia or anyone else in this committee. I just think that we should be fair and we should be forthright. If what we are chasing is foreign money, then let's get after it and not pick out what is essentially almost a moving violation in terms of violation of the campaign election law. There are hundreds of cases of conduits——

Mr. KANJORSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH [continuing]. Of payments to campaigns. I will be glad to yield. It's not my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KANJORSKI. May I just add to the gentleman's statement that yesterday the fine of $8 million to the Empire Landfill, $80,000 of that was conduit money to the Dole campaign of 1996; and the treasurer of Dole campaign's corporation was fined $6 million as a conduit operation to the Dole campaign.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield back.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. The gentleman from California, Mr. Horn.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have listened with interest to where might John Huang be on August 16th, and I assume in the record you have placed the personal statement of account on his American Express card and also the—I don't know if you have placed in the telephone bill. I would like to refer to the telephone bill, and if it isn't in, I would like it put in.

Mr. BURTON. If it isn't in, without objection, we will include it. So ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

WHERE WAS JOHN HUANG ON AUGUST 16, 1996?

One of today's witnesses, David Wang, has testified in depositions and interviews that John Huang visited Wang's used car dealership in Los Angeles, California, on August 16, 1996, and solicited Wang's $5,000 contribution to the DNC. In contradiction of Wang's sworn testimony, the Committee Minority and John Huang's attorney claim that John Huang was not in Los Angeles, California on August 16. They claim that John Huang was in New York City in anticipation of the President's Birthday Party Fund-raiser.

The facts are these:

1. David Wang had met John Huang at least two times prior to Huang's solicitation of Wang. Wang knew what John Huang looked like and has testified under oath that Huang did in fact solicit a contribution from him.

2. John Huang's American Express card bill indicates that he reserved a room at the Sheraton New York Towers from August 10, 1996 through August 19, 1996. While John Huang was had the room for a block of nine days and definitely was in New York for the August 18th Birthday Party, there is no evidence that John Huang stayed at the Hotel for the entire nine days of his reservation. Strangely enough, the amount charged to Huang's American Express card was $8.73. The American Express bill shows no transactions from August 11 through August 19. It is entirely possible that John Huang was in Los Angeles during that period.

3. On August 17, 1996, a telephone call was placed from John Huang's residence in Glendale, California, to (212) 681-6424, a New York City telephone number. When that number is now called, a recording states:

> "The number you have reached, 681-6424 in area code 212 has been changed. The new number is area code (202) 863-8000."

The number to which the caller is referred, (202) 863-8000, is the telephone number of the Democratic National Committee in Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT
130

DUPLICATE COPY

Personal Card Statement of Account

Prepared For
JOHN HUANG

Closing Date
September 27, 1996

Account Number
3720-169628-52006

Previous Card Balance $	Card Payments/Credits $	New Card Charges $	New Card Balance $
579.14	-579.14	1,152.71	1,152.71

Statement includes payments and charges received by September 27, 1996.
* Indicates posting date.

Welcome to your new American Express statement. Please look on the back of each page for important information. The payment coupon is at the bottom of this page.

Terms - Payment due in full. Please pay by 10/13/96.

Please refer to page 4 for important information regarding your Card Account

For fast balance and payment information, call our automated service line at 1-800-292-2639 using a touch tone phone. Please have your account number ready. If you have a question about your account, call 1-800-528-4800 (24 hours/7 days).

Card Detail	Amount $
Card Payments	
September 11, 1996* PAYMENT RECEIVED - THANK YOU	-579.14
Total of Card Payments	**-579.14**
Card Transactions for JOHN HUANG Card 3720-169628-52006	
August 19, 1996 SHERATON NY TOWERS NEW YORK NY Arrival Date 08/10/96 — Departure Date 08/19/96 — No of Nights 9 LODGING Reference: 000073690	8.73
August 28, 1996 CREDIT CARD REGISTRY (800)227-2639 1 YR MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL Reference: NRPM40828	15.00

Continued on reverse

Please fold on the perforation below, detach and return with your payment

Payment Coupon

Account Number
3720-169628-52006

Please Pay By:
October 13, 1996

Total Amount Due
$1,152.71

JOHN HUANG
2100 RINCREST DR
GLENDALE CA 91207-1057

Please enter account number on all checks and correspondence. Payable in U.S. Dollars upon receipt with a check drawn on a bank in the U.S. or money order, processable through the U.S. banking system.

Check here if address or telephone number has changed. Note changes on reverse side.

Mail Payment to:

AMERICAN EXPRESS TRS
SUITE 0001
CHICAGO IL 60679-0001

2016962850 00115271000115271 7

DUPLICATE COPY

Card Detail Continued	Amount $	Page 2 of 3
August 10, 1996 SEVEN SEAS CHINESE RROCKVILLE MD 608101119 FOOD/BEVERAGE	39.57	
August 19, 1996 GREYHOUND LINES #153NEW YORK NY TRANSPORTATION SERVICES Reference: 522291704	52.00	
August 20, 1996 THE WHITE HSE CONNECTION WASHINGTON DC FOOD AND BEVERAGE TIP $4.00 Reference: 608058622	31.23	
August 22, 1996 UNITED AIRLINES ELEC TICKET CO From: To: Carrier: Class: WASHINGTON DC LOS ANGELES CA UA V5 WASHINGTON DC UA V5 Ticket Number: 01621012275550 Date of Departure: 08/31 Passenger Name: HUANG/JOHN Document Type: PASSENGER TICKET	159.00	In case of an emergency while travelling, call Global Assist at 1-800-554-2639.
August 23, 1996 STAR OF SIAM ROSSLYN VA FOOD/BEVERAGE FOOD/BEV 20.34 TIP 3.00 Reference: 608231322	23.34	
Total for JOHN HUANG New Charges 579.14 New Credits 0.00	**579.14**	
Total of Card Activity	New Card Charges 579.14 New Card Payments/Credits -871.15	

Continued on next page

Change of Address
If correct on front
do not use

Name

Company Name

Street Address

City State

Zip Code

Area Code and Home Phone Number

Area Code and Work Phone Number

Customer Service 1 800 222-0300
Text Phone (TTY). 1 800 833-3232

Aug 15-Sep 14 1996
Account 818 244-5089

AT&T True Savings® calls

Description		Amount
Calls eligible for discount at 30% on	$50.91	35.64

Total AT&T True Savings® calls after savings $35.64

This month you saved $15.27 with AT&T True Savings®.

When you call between 11pm and 8am on weeknights, and all day Saturday and Sunday until 5pm, you're getting AT&T's lowest rates.

Calls eligible for discount

Direct dialed calls

	Date	Number called	Where	Time	Rate	Type	Min	Amount before savings
1	Aug 17	212 581-6424	New York,NY	8 31am	night	direct	2	.32
2	Aug 20	301 681-5583	Silver Spg,MD	5 48pm	eve	direct	2	36
3	Aug 31	202 488-5079	Washington,DC	3 01pm	night	direct	18	2.88
4	Sep 1	703 971-5440	Alexandria,VA	8 30pm	eve	direct	2	36
5	Sep 2	301 681-5583	Silver Spg,MD	9 00am	eve	direct	4	72
6	Sep 4	202 314-2288	Washington,DC	6 47am	night	direct	1	16
7	Sep 7	301 681-5583	Silver Spg,MD	9 38am	night	direct	1	16
8	Sep 7	301 681-5583	Silver Spg,MD	10 00am	night	direct	1	16
9	Sep 8	301 681-5583	Silver Spg,MD	6 24am	night	direct	14	2 24
10	Sep 10	202 337-5670	Washington,DC	7 10am	night	direct	1	16
11	Sep 10	916 424-4638	Sacramento,CA	7 50am	night	direct	10	1 05
	Call continued at next rate							
12	Sep 10	916 424-4638	Sacramento,CA	8 00am	day	direct	9	1.26
	Call continued from previous rate							
13	Sep 10	916 498-0494	Sacramento,CA	8 35am	day	direct	1	15
14	Sep 10	916 498-0494	Sacramento,CA	8 47am	day	direct	2	29
15	Sep 10	202 488-5079	Washington,DC	8 57am	day	direct	1	30
16	Sep 10	916 498-0494	Sacramento,CA	9 15am	day	direct	5	71
17	Sep 10	202 488-5079	Washington,DC	10 41am	day	direct	6	1 80
18	Sep 10	202 337-5970	Washington,DC	10 54am	day	direct	5	1.50
19	Sep 10	202 225-8220	Washington,DC	11 15am	day	direct	3	90
20	Sep 10	415 431-2158	San Fran,CA	11 26am	day	direct	8	1 13
21	Sep 10	202 456-5161	Washington,DC	12 24pm	day	direct	1	30
22	Sep 10	202 225-7163	Washington,DC	1 14pm	day	direct	1	30
23	Sep 10	202 479-5115	Washington,DC	1 23pm	day	direct	9	2.70
24	Sep 10	202 863-7187	Washington,DC	1 32pm	day	direct	2	60
25	Sep 10	501 372-3000	LittleRock,AR	1 34pm	day	direct	2	58
26	Sep 10	516 661-0085	Babylon,NY	1 56pm	day	direct	3	90
27	Sep 10	202 456-5293	Washington,DC	2 19pm	day	direct	6	1 80
28	Sep 10	301 983-2514	Rockville,MD	4 44pm	day	direct	11	3 30
29	Sep 11	510 490-3008	Fremntnwrk,CA	9 07am	day	direct	2	29
30	Sep 11	202 496-4867	Washington,DC	12 27pm	day	direct	1	30
31	Sep 11	202 863-7174	Washington,DC	12 41pm	day	direct	1	30
32	Sep 11	202 863-7187	Washington,DC	12 42pm	day	direct	8	2 40
33	Sep 11	202 479-5115	Washington,DC	12 54pm	day	direct	3	90
34	Sep 11	202 456-7021	Washington,DC	4 11pm	day	direct	2	60
35	Sep 11	202 488-5079	Washington,DC	4 14pm	day	direct	7	2 10
36	Sep 11	916 498-0494	Sacramento,CA	4 25pm	day	direct	6	65
37	Sep 11	415 554-6668	San Fran,CA	4 50pm	day	direct	1	15
38	Sep 11	916 424-4638	Sacramento,CA	6 37pm	eve	direct	9	1 00
39	Sep 11	202 479-5115	Washington,DC	5 47pm	eve	direct	1	18

001573

Recycled paper

Mr. HORN. It is fascinating in the sense that Mr. Wang, who has patiently sat here and listened to a lot of harassment, doubting his word, he has testified in depositions and interviews that John Huang visited his used car dealership in Los Angeles on August 16, 1996, and solicited Wang's $5,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee.

Now, in contradiction of Wang's testimony, the committee's minority and John Huang's attorney claim that John Huang was not in Los Angeles, CA, on the 16th. They claim he was in New York.

Well, where is the evidence? I read earlier into the record a story by a respectable reporter that learned from Democratic officials that he never went to New York and they were surprised that he had.

Well, there are a few other things. David Wang had met John Huang at least two times prior to Huang's solicitation of Wang. Wang knew what John Huang looked like and has testified under oath that Huang did, in fact, solicit a contribution from him. And that other item that I referred to, he had said it on the survey of the Democratic National Committee when they were going around checking large contributions.

Now, Huang's America Express card bill indicates that he reserved a room at the Sheraton New York Towers from August 10, 1996, through August 19, 1996. Whether one is in town 1 day or 1 hour, I don't find that unusual.

What I have found in American politics, on the Republican side as well as the Democratic side, is staff or people that are facilitators on getting money, often take this suite of rooms, which takes away from the net you would like to have in people's campaigns, and they live high on the hog. Or they send the kids there or they send mama and the kids there, as the case may be.

Now, we don't know, and there is no evidence in the record, that he stayed at the hotel for the entire 9 days of his reservation; if he even stayed 1 day, 1 night, or had a hotel up the street for all we know. Strangely enough, the amount charged to Huang's American Express card, as was noted earlier, I believe, was $8.73, not exactly a big deal in New York.

That would help some of the homeless there but that is about it.

The American Express bill shows no transactions from August 11th through August 19th. It is entirely possible that John Huang was in Los Angeles during that period, as David Wang has patiently testified.

On August 17, 1996, a telephone call was placed from John Huang's residence in Glendale, CA, to area code (212) 681–6424, a New York City telephone number. When that number is now called, a recording states, quote, "the number you have reached, 681–6424 in area code 212 has been changed. The new number is the area code (202) 863–8000."

Now, the number to which the caller is referred, (202) 863–8000, is the telephone number of the Democratic National Committee in Washington, DC.

Now, what could have happened is, if somebody made that call from the home of John Huang, I look at the bill and it is down for 2 minutes at 32 cents. That is sort of General Services Administration rates. It is a pretty reasonable telephone call.

Now, who was in the home and who was at the other end, it is hard to say. If he didn't go to New York, he was in the home and wanting to talk to one of the buddies in what was obviously the fund-raising suite or the fund-raising office which was arranging all of these things in New York. But he realized, as the story in USA Today says, that he was increasingly on the outs with the key leaders for finance of the Democratic National Committee. They sort of had their fill of him and didn't like what he was doing.

So he was getting the icy shoulder and the cold freeze and all the rest of it.

Now, the other thing is, if he wasn't in the home, maybe his wife was at home and just calling a friend in New York, if she met some that was with the Democratic National Committee, because it must have obviously been one of their facilities. Or he could have had a parakeet that just tried to dial the number and see what happens.

Well, all I can say is, I haven't heard any evidence on the other side that is worth much, and I thought I would add that to the record.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HORN. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The pictures, it is my understanding that one of these pictures was taken on the 15th. I mean, you were explaining that.

Mr. HORN. No, I don't have that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. You don't have the pictures?

Mr. HORN. No. I just get old numbers and telephone bills and things like that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. OK. All right. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Does the gentleman yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. HORN. Yes, I do.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time.

Is there further discussion? Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. I have a couple of questions for Mr. Wang.

Did—and I don't know if he answered to this before. I may have missed it on a time-out from the committee proceedings. But did Mr. Huang call you before he was coming to visit you?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. MICA. And he visited you at your residence or your business?

Mr. WANG. Office.

Mr. MICA. At your office?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. MICA. Did anyone else see him there, a secretary or anyone else? Or did he just come directly to you? Would there be someone else who could document that for us?

Mr. WANG. My father.

Mr. MICA. I am sorry?

Mr. WANG. My father was there.

Mr. MICA. Your father. Was there anyone else there besides your father, any other employees? How many employees do you have?

Mr. WANG. During that time, in fact, only the——

Mr. MICA. Secretary, or?

Mr. WANG. On that date, there was a secretary there.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] During the daytime, there is a secretary there.

Mr. MICA. So there might have been someone else who could also verify, if our committee goes back to look at this?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I don't believe the secretary saw him because she works in another office.

Mr. MICA. But he called you before. Did he tell you where he was? Was he in Los Angeles or New York? You don't remember?

Mr. WANG. No.

Mr. MICA. He didn't say.

You did get a call from the Democratic National Committee, I guess in December, December 6, 1996, that they had contacted you or there was an inquiry by this accounting firm, Ernst & Young, and you answered some questions over the phone. Do you recall answering questions about your donation to the DNC?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] Sir?

Mr. MICA. Yes.

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I forgot about the telephone call in the beginning, but after they showed me the phone bill, the statement that is there, I recall that there was a phone call.

Mr. MICA. So you did admit at another point that you had given money in the fashion that was described in this interview?

Mr. WANG. Yes.

Mr. MICA. Is there any possibility that it might not have been a Friday; that it could have been Thursday, possibly a day before, as I think your—we have no record of—I mean, I have gone through and Mr. Shadegg did a great job of reviewing where Mr. Huang was, and we know he flew to New York on the 10th and we know he left on the 19th. We have these affidavits or statements by people who, in my opinion, are not very credible, from the 15th or 16th to the 18th or 19th, and we have the 10th and we have the last call from his room on the 13th.

Is it possible that he could have been there on Thursday or Wednesday, maybe you—are you sure it was a Friday?

Mr. WANG [through interpreter.] I am sure it was on Friday, August the 16th.

Mr. MICA. You are sure. OK. Well, I thank you for those comments.

Just in closing, Mr. Chairman, some statements have been made on the other side about this hearing, and this hearing today is the beginning of trying to get at a long money trail. You are just a small part of it; Mrs. Foung and the other witness today are a small part of it. We maybe account for $50 or $60, maybe $70,000; we found $200,000 that came from the Bank of China, and we know that there were—there was $900,000 that came.

And we have heard cited today from the other side the Florida case, which I am familiar with—I am from Florida—and people have been fined and penalized and the system worked. The landfill situation, people have been fined, penalized, and the system works.

What we have here is the beginning of a situation where hundreds of thousands of dollars and people have given money at the beginning of the trail. We are trying to find where the money came from and link that to what Mr. Fattah is talking about, or where

it went. And we do know the money went into the Halls of Congress.

Roll Call printed March 6, 1997, this printout. We didn't do it; they did it. There were three Republicans named. The balance are all Democrats, dozens and dozens. And of the Republicans, there is one error, I found out since that was not a Republican, it was Brian Bilbray's brother who is a Democrat. So this is—this is what we are trying to find and uncover.

We appreciate your cooperation. We appreciate your honesty in coming before this committee.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman's time has expired. Does the gentleman from California wish to inquire?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes. I have one other document to ask unanimous consent to put in the record. It is the annual report 1996, the Bank of China.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection, so ordered.

[The report referred to follows:]

中國銀行
BANK OF CHINA

ANNUAL REPORT 1996


Annual Report 1996

CONTENTS

Financial Highlights 3

Mission Statement 4

Honorary Chairperson 5

Message from the Chairman 7

Top Management 10

Organization Chart of Head Office 11

Business Review 14

The Bank of China in Hong Kong and Macao 28

Financial Report and Statements 33

Main Offices and Branches in China and Abroad 49

FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS

	1996	1995
Operating Results (million USD)		
Profit before tax	1,395	1,252
Interest income	14,663	14,832
Interest expense	12,643	12,559
Non-interest income	2,275	2,039
Non-interest expense	2,900	3,060
Assets/Liabilities (million USD)		
Total assets	253,914	239,860
Bills discounted, remittances bought and loans	133,637	120,159
Total liabilities	241,362	228,427
Deposits	150,849	135,761
Bonds issued	2,474	2,876
Net worth	12,552	11,432
Capital & surplus	8,907	7,921
Profit after tax	628	563
Reserves	3,017	2,947
Indicative Ratios (%)		
Total capital/ total risk assets	16.42	15.50
Tier 1 capital / total risk assets	12.47	11.50
Profit before tax / total assets	0.55	0.52
Profit before tax / capital	22.26	20.03
Profit of overseas branches / Profit of the entire BOC	31.69	30.88
Interest income / total income	86.57	87.91
Interest expense / total expense	81.34	80.41
RMB assets / total assets	35.42	30.95
Assets of overseas branches / total assets	21.45	23.56

Note: In the above figures, the subsidiary banks and companies are excluded.

Our Mission

Through the prudence, flair and quality of our operations we aim to become one of the world's leading international banks.

Through the creation of an increasingly customer-driven corporate culture we intend to meet the needs of our clients and enhance our profitability.

Through the constant upgrading of our banking technology and information system we aim to ensure our competitive advantage.

Through the closer interlinking of our domestic and international operations we intend to play an even more important role in the economic development of China and its financial relations with the rest of the world.

HONORARY CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD

Chen Muhua

With the establishment of the Bank of China International in London, we now have a truly international investment bank in our network. This enables us to take a further step toward becoming a first-class global bank.

CHAIRMAN & PRESIDENT

Wang Xiaoma

In 1996, we achieved record levels, reflecting the success of our strategy that is aimed at making us the best Chinese bank, not the biggest. We are committed, therefore, to enhancing continually both our services and the quality of our assets, but not rapidly extending the operations of the Bank.

The year 1996 witnessed steady growth in the world economy. Preliminary figures suggest global GDP rose by over 3 , led by stronger growth in the emerging markets of Asia, and with world trade increasing by some 5%. Inflation remained subdued at around 2.5%, possibly slightly down on the previous year.

In China, economic growth remained strong, at just under 10%, while inflation was brought down sharply to 6%. Trade grew in a modest, balanced way. Exports rose by 1.5% and imports by 5% to USD 151 billion and USD 139 billion respectively.

Direct foreign investment continued to flow into China at record levels, with an increase of over 12% bringing the annual total to USD 42 billion. China's foreign exchange reserves now top USD 105 billion, making them second only to those of Japan. Throughout the year the Renminbi remained strong.

To facilitate long-term sustainable growth, the Chinese government continued with its twin-track policies of reforming state-owned enterprises and developing interest rates that are set by financial markets, both of which are closely linked with the overall commercialisation of Chinese banking. At the beginning of the year the Central Bank (i.e. the People's Bank of China) started China's interbank market, began open-market operations and twice lowered base rates. The growth of the financial markets was further helped by the considerable expansion of the T-bond market, with the Ministry of Finance issuing some USD 24 billion equivalent of bonds. For its part, the Bank of China contracted to sell USD 1.4 billion of state bonds during the year and handled the first sale of policy financial bonds, which represented the turning over of a new leaf in Chinese financial history.

Against this background, the Bank of China, including its wholly-owned subsidiaries, generated in US dollar terms record pre-tax profits of USD 2.3 billion, up 23% on the previous year, with assets also rising 7.4% to reach a record USD 293 billion.

We continue to produce strong results in the highly competitive market overseas. Pre-tax profits there, including those of all our overseas subsidiaries, rose 18% to USD 1.8 billion, USD 1.6 billion of which came from our branches and subsidiaries in Hong Kong and Macao. After local taxes these overseas profits amounted to USD 1.3 billion. The assets of our overseas branches and all overseas subsidiaries rose by 1.8% to USD 155 billion. Apart from overseas subsidiaries, our overseas branches at present account for 31.7% of our total pre-tax profits and 21.5% of our total assets.

In China, the Bank (not including domestic subsidiaries) generated pre-tax profits of USD 953 million. Domestic assets increased by 8.8% to USD 199 billion. The outstanding balance of Renminbi loans at the end of the year was equivalent to USD 5

billion. Foreign currency loans amounted to USD 60 billion.

These figures reflect, I believe, both our strength and our commitment to change. In my message last year I reported that the Board was convinced that our future success would depend on the quality of our bank, not its size. Since then we have begun taking some of the tough decisions to implement this strategy. In this year of reform, which will be the first of many, we have started restructuring the Bank, improving risk management, tightening internal controls and devoting much effort to longer-term business planning. To facilitate this process we have sought advice from leading international accounting and consultancy firms. More details of what we have been doing are given on page 21 of the Business Review.

One of the Board's key decisions is to take rigorous steps to improve the quality of our assets. At home and abroad we have been willing to forego business even if it meant that the overall volume of our business or our market share would decline in a particular sector.

These reforms and consolidation are important as in the year ahead, there will be further significant changes in China's financial markets. The government aims to reduce inflation further to below 6%, and economic growth to a more sustainable longer-term rate of 8-9% p.a. In parallel, the Central Bank will strengthen its macroeconomic control over the financial markets. At the same time, the government and the banks will continue exploring ways to deal with restructuring the finances of state-owned enterprises.

In China, we shall face more intense competition from Chinese and foreign banks. The Board firmly believes, therefore, that the Bank must give full play to its strengths. We see ourselves remaining a bank closely linked with international trade and finance. More of our business, however, will be done directly with the successful state-owned enterprises, trading corporations and foreign-funded enterprises (to which we channelled 80% of our new loans last year). We are already looking more closely at the needs of these customers, segmenting them accordingly and providing them with carefully-tailored services.

Overseas, we have been prudently expanding our international network and considerably upgrading the services we are offering through it. In 1995, *Euromoney* rated us the best domestic bank in China. In 1996, *Euromoney* rated the Bank the biggest bank in Asia (excluding Japan) in terms of captial, reflecting our straight in the region as a whole. The future development of our global network is driven by the Board's assessment that China will become more closely involved in the world economy. As the Renminbi becomes increasingly convertible over the next few years, we expect that

much more foreign capital will flow into China through the Chinese securities markets and through fund-raising by Chinese enterprises abroad.

A key element in the overall expansion of the Bank's operations at home and abroad will, the Board believes, be the development of a strong investment banking capability. It was this consideration that led the Board to decide to establish a very new-style bank as part of its network--the Bank of China International. This is a truly international investment bank that is incorporated in London, where it is staffed by an international team of bankers and capital market specialists. The Board is committed to the prudent and successful growth of its operations.

With the approaching return of Hong Kong to Chinese sovereignty in July 1997, I would like to reiterate the Bank's great confidence in the future of the territory. This judgement is based on Hong Kong's fundamental strength and the great stake China has in its continued success. We have no doubt about the determination and ability of the territory's government and supervisory authorities to maintain the stability and to promote the growth of its financial markets. Indeed, the Board expects that Hong Kong will play a much greater role in funding the development of China in the years ahead, both because of its ever growing importance as a major international financial centre and because of its deep and realistic understanding of the opportunities in China.

In the past twelve months there have been a few changes in our top management team. Mr Yang Huiqiu has given up his executive responsibilities but remains with us as Vice Chairman of the Board and we are pleased to be joined by Mr Gao Dezhu and Mme Bai Shizhen.

Thanks to the efforts of staff at home and abroad we achieved particularly good results in 1996 at the same time as we began implementing several important reforms. On behalf of the Board, I extend our sincere appreciation to them all for the commitment they have shown to the Bank.

Wang Xuebing

Chairman and President

TOP MANAGEMENT



WANG XUEBING
Chairman & President
(front left)

JIANG ZUQI
V.Chairman & E.V. President
(front second from left)

YANG HUIQIU
V.Chairman
(front second from right)

ZHANG GUOWEN
E.V. President
(front right)

ZHAO ANGE
E.V. President
(back left)

PING YUE
Managing Director
(back second from left)

GAO DEZHU
E.V. President
(back third from left)

YANG JILIN
V.Chairman & Chief Executive of BOC Hong Kong-Macao Regional Office
(back third from right)

HUA QINGSHAN
Assistant President
(back second from right)

BAI SHIZHEN
Assistant President
(back right)

ORGANIZATION CHART OF HEAD OFFICE



The Bank's success is rooted in its 85 years of experience.



Trade Finance

In 1996, China's foreign trade increased by a modest 5.2% to a record USD 290 billion. Exports rose by 1.5% and imports by 5% to USD 151 billion and USD 139 billion respectively. China remained the world's 11th most important trading nation, with Japan, the United States, Hong Kong and the European Union as its top trading partners.

Until 1994 the Bank had a monopoly of international trade finance. Since then, it has been facing intense competition from both domestic and foreign banks. In the past year it has been making rigorous efforts to improve the quality of its loan portfolio. This is the main reason for the decline in the Bank's share in some aspects of this business.

International settlements

The Bank's domestic branches handled import and export payments with a combined value of USD 119 billion, accounting for 41% of the market. These figures represent a decrease of over 13% in value and 9% in market share respectively.



Trade Settlements

International settlements have been speeded up by linking our domestic and overseas outlets to our correspondent banks. Our international settlement network, based on the SWIFT system, has expanded by nearly one time in the past year. It now links Head Office and 162 key domestic branches and those we have overseas with over 3,700 correspondent banking partners around the world.

In the foreign exchange markets, the Bank continued to be the pre-eminent Chinese institution. It handled the purchase of the equivalent of USD 73 billion and the sale of USD 46 billion of foreign currencies, representing over 63% and over 41% of all such business respectively.

Credit to Chinese importers and exporters

During the year, the Bank extended loans totalling the equivalent of USD 41 billion as working capital to Chinese import and export enterprises. The outstanding balance of loans totalled the equivalent of USD 27 billion, down 38% on 1995.

The Bank actively supports Chinese exporters of goods and services in winning major business overseas. It provides export credits to them and buyer's credits to importers in foreign countries. Over the past year we have provided over USD 1 billion in these forms of export finance. Much of it went to help the export of such major items as ships, power generation, aircraft, telecoms. In 1996, the Bank continued to be involved in the financing of the Tehran subway and a fertilizer plant in Peru. It has also begun financing the sales of a power station and Chinese aircrafts to Pakistan, and that of a deadweight bulk-carrier to the United States.

Letters of guarantee

The Bank has also been introducing new types of letters of guarantee to help those involved in using foreign capital, importing modern technology, high priority infrastructure projects, exporting and overseas labour projects. This not only includes the traditional import payment letter of guarantee, but also bidding guarantees, performance bonds, prepayment guarantees, loan guarantees, overdraft guarantees, leasing guarantees, tariff payment guarantees, maritime liabilities, bills payment, to name just a few. In 1996, it issued over 6,500 such letters, with a combined value of nearly USD 25 billion.

Project Finance

In keeping with government priorities, the Bank has over the past 17 years provided some USD 79 billion (mainly in hard currency) for project finance. Approximately, half of this sum has gone into the

upgrading of technology in state-owned enterprises, a quarter into the strengthening of China's infrastructure and basic industries, and the remaining quarter into developing foreign-funded enterprises.

New technology

The amount of new loans extended by the Bank to support the continued introduction of new technology to Chinese industry in 1996 totalled about USD 4.6 billion. The loans were used mainly by large and medium-sized state-owned enterprises and foreign-funded enterprises producing light industrial products, textiles, autos, chemicals, machinery and electronics. At the end of the year, the outstanding balance of such loans amounted to USD 19.2 billion in foreign exchange and the equivalent of USD 2.4 billion in Renminbi.

Infrastructure and basic industries

During the year the Bank has channelled USD 3.3 billion in loans and credits for the development of China's infrastructure. New buyer's credits totalled USD 1.7 billion (bringing the outstanding balance to USD 9.8 billion), foreign government loans USD 200 million (outstanding balance USD 2.7 billion), commercial loans USD 540 million (outstanding balance USD 4.5 billion) and mixed loans USD 61 million (outstanding balance USD 1.7 billion). These loans were concentrated on projects in the key energy, transportation, telecoms and raw material sectors.

Foreign-funded enterprises

The Bank is closely involved in this rapidly expanding sector. In 1996, the inflow of direct foreign investment increased by 12% to USD 42 billion, thus bringing the total for the past five years to USD 152 billion. Foreign-funded enterprises now account for nearly 50% of China's total foreign trade and contribute nearly a quarter of total industrial production.

There are approximately 270,000 foreign-funded enterprises in China, of which 140,000 now have accounts with the Bank. Major multinational companies are involved in many of these enterprises.

Last year the Bank loaned the equivalent of USD 15.8 billion (including USD 4.5 billion in foreign currency) for working capital and fixed asset investment. This brought the accumulated total of loans to date to the equivalent of USD 21.9 billion. At the end of 1996 the Bank accounted for 51% in RMB and 81% in foreign currency of China's outstanding loans to foreign-funded enterprises.

An increasing proportion of these loans has gone to such large foreign-funded projects as the Daya Bay nuclear power plant in Guangdong, the Mawan power station in Shenzhen, the Hitachi colour TV tube joint-venture plant in Shenzhen and the Motorola electronics joint-venture in Tianjin.

Fund-raising abroad

The Bank continues to be active in the international capital markets raising funds to assist China's economic development.

In 1996 the Bank concluded arrangements with the Japanese Export-Import Bank for a USD 2.35 billion loan. The Bank also made other special arrangements that raised USD 1.[illegible] billion for energy and infrastructure related loans. In addition, the Bank issued HK$ 4 billion (USD 520 million) floating deposit notes, the largest Hong Kong dollar denominated issue that it has ever undertaken. With the approval of the Central Bank, the Bank is preparing to issue a sizeable volume of bonds in 1997.



Deposits
(USD 100m)
(including overseas branches)

Domestic deposits

The Bank has been very successful in continuing to attract deposits. During the year deposits in both local and foreign currencies rose by 23%, with a large part of the increase coming from enterprises.

Renminbi deposits again rose strongly, by the equivalent of USD12

We have an unrivalled network that links the world's main business centres with those in China.

中国银行
BANK OF CHINA



Turnover of BOC Great Wall Card (USD 100m)

billion to USD 59 billion, up 26%. Some 43% of deposits are available on demand, with the remaining 57% being time deposits. Corporate and personal savings account for 37% and 63% of the total respectively. Foreign currency deposits rose a further 19% to over USD 32 billion. These resluts give the Bank almost a 7% market share of all RMB deposits and just over 46% of all foreign currency deposits.

We now have 1,900 ATMs (700 of which are on-line) in 28 major business cities. As a result, our card and other electronic banking services have been expanding rapidly. We now provide a comprehensive range of Great Wall cards -- both debit cards and credit cards -- for use in China and abroad.

In 1996, which coincided with the 10th anniversary of the issuing of the first Great Wall card, the number of customers with cards soared from 2.5 million to 4.7 million. The number of shops and businesses accepting these cards rose by some 6% to over 53,000. The turnover on local currency Great Wall Credit Cards was the equivalent of USD 35 billion. The outstanding RMB credit balance was the equivalent of USD 2.5 billion.



The Bank handled foreign credit card transactions totalling USD 856 million in 1996 on behalf of Mastercard, Visa, Diners Club and American Express. We retained a 70% share of this market which grew by more than 150% in 1996.

Restructuring and Reform of Operations

The many different aspects of restructuring are aimed at focusing the efforts of the Bank on the changing needs of customers. In parallel, we have been tightening Head Office's control over the branch operations. This is to enhance our ability to manage risk as our operations become completely commercialised and to enable the Bank to make better use of its funds, to speed up loan procedures and to provide a more coordinated service to our customers.

Recent events in Japan, Korea and Thailand have underscored the importance of carefully and continuously monitoring the quality of assets. To this end, we have separated the responsibility for processing loans from that of managing our overall credit risk. The new asset-liability management system is being introduced throughout the Bank. We have reinforced these measures by centralising in Head Office the auditing of our main branches in China and our overseas operations. We are the first Chinese bank to do so.

Information technology is beginning to improve our operations by speeding up transactions and converting information into knowledge. At present our network links Head Office with 70% of all the main urban branches and in the coastal belt we have integrated networks within each of the main cities. This network, backed up by a satellite link, is being developed into the information super-highway for the Bank's operations world-wide. The system, which is customer-oriented, deals with retail and wholesale banking, loans, settlements and accounts.

Service to Clients

With the establishment of our international investment bank in London at the end of 1996, the Bank of China International, we are now able to offer an even greater range of services to our customers.

The Bank of China International is an independently managed subsidiary, staffed by a top team of international investment bankers and capital market specialists, which concentrates on corporate finance (advisory and international primary listings), structured finance, capital market operations (including secondary debt and equity sales, trading and distribution) and the structuring of funds for direct investment in China. The Bank of China International works closely with the Bank's branches in London, Hong Kong, New York, Tokyo and, of course, those in China itself.

The introduction of new banking technology has considerably enhanced the range and speed of services we provide in trade finance and foreign exchange transfers, the use of credit cards and the granting of loans. For example:

- our international settlement network, based on the SWIFT system, now links Head Office and 162 key domestic branches and those we have overseas with our 3,700 correspondent banking partners around the world;

- our electronic payments system now provides real-time payments and settlements for almost 1,000 offices in the main business areas in China. Through this system foreign exchange payments from around the world are cleared within one business day;

- holders of cards issued by the Bank of China Group in Hong Kong and Macao can now draw cash and make transfer payments at 700 ATMs in 16 major cities in China. This network expanded by almost 50% in the past year;

- we are the first Chinese bank to join Visa ATM Plus and this service, which is already in use in Guangzhou and Tianjin, will soon be available in other major cities;

- requests for loans in China can now be processed more quickly following the introduction of the new IT system;

- the Bank offers a more extensive range of letters of guarantee than any other bank in China and these can be processed rapidly through our branch network.

For customers with special requirements we provide IT links directly with their head office so as to facilitate the handling of their various banking needs. We can also arrange for staff to visit the offices or homes of our customers if they prefer.

The addresses and telephone fax numbers of our main branches in China and those abroad are given on pages 49-55. To help our international clients we have staff in each branch who speak English well (and often other major languages). We are always pleased to talk to customers or potential customers about their needs and encourage them to visit our branches to examine the range of services we can offer.

Overseas Operations

The international operations of the Bank and its subsidiaries continued to produce good results in 1996, with pre-tax profits rising by 18% to USD 1.8 billion, of which 1.6 billion came from our operations in Hong Kong and Macao.

Total overseas assets, including those of all overseas subsidiaries, now amount to USD 155 billion. In keeping with the Bank's policy of consolidation, these assets only grew by 1.8% in 1996. This was significantly below the average for the past 5 years.

Our assets in Hong Kong and Macao totalled USD 120 billion, up 3.3% on 1995

We have created a new corporate culture that will ensure our future strength.





and accounted [illegible] of those overseas. Our overseas assets elsewhere totalled USD 35 billion, a [illegible] decline on the previous year.

Overseas deposits grew by 14% in 1996 to a total of USD 9[illegible] billion, 85% of which were made in Hong Kong and Macao. The growth in these deposits reflected the efforts the Bank and its subsidiaries have made to meet the needs of their clients.

At the end of 1996, the total outstanding balance of loans and credit was USD 49 billion, a [illegible] increase on 1995. Within this figure, syndicated loans rose by 19% to a total of USD 4.6 billion. Loans made to Chinese companies overseas rose by 10% to USD 5.[illegible] billion.

The Bank of China continued to be active in the international interbank market, where its total trading amounted to USD 48 billion, which was almost the same as in 1995 (USD 49 billion). The volume of bonds and securities bought during the year declined by [illegible] to USD 10.6 billion.

With the establishment of the Bank of China International at the end of 1996, the Bank made a significant entry into international investment banking business, as is explained on page 22. Prior to beginning business in January 1997, the Bank of China International was actively working with several of the recent batch of major Chinese state-owned enterprises that have been approved for overseas listing.

In addition to the opening of its new investment bank in London, the Bank also

expanded its operations in Thailand and Vietnam: the Bangkok branch has been granted a wholesale banking licence and our branch in Ho Chi Minh City is already in operation. Preparations are continuing to open additional branches in Malaysia, Zambia (our first in Africa) and Italy. The Bank now has a total of 533 branches overseas (including BOC Group in HK & Macao and its subsidiaries), 8 more than last year.

In keeping with the expansion of its international activities, the Bank was closely involved in an increasing number of international meetings and conferences. In April the Chairman and President of the Bank, Mr Wang Xuebing, hosted the Asia-Pacific Bankers' Club Annual Meeting in Beijing for delegates from 61 major banks. It was the first time that it had been held in China. In October, Mr Wang attended the annual IMF/World Bank meeting, in which the Bank has for many years participated.

Overseas Branches & Subsidiaries

The number of high-level visitors to our Head Office continued to increase. Many of these were the heads of top international banks with which we cooperate closely. Over twenty of them were received by Chinese leaders, including President Jiang Zemin, Premier Li Peng, Chairman of the National People's Congress Qiao Shi and Vice Premier Zhu Rongji.

Hong Kong has pride of place in the international network of the Bank of China. In this highly competitive trading and financial centre the Bank has, over the years, gradually expanded its share in the rapidly growing banking market and now takes a quarter of all deposits and provides a fifth of all Hong Kong dollar loans. Some 90% of its loans are for clients in Hong Kong, with a further 7% in China. Through this close involvement in Hong Kong the Bank has played an important part in promoting its success.

In Hong Kong and Macao the Bank operates through the Bank of China Group, which comprises 14 member banks and a number of subsidiary companies with close links to particular segments of the market or providing specialist services. The Group is deeply rooted both in Hong Kong, where the Bank of China opened its first branch 80 years ago, and in Macao. It is one of the pillars of their respective financial establishments. It is the second largest group in Hong Kong and the largest in Macao. Some 98% of staff are local. Moreover, as a responsible member of the community, the Group actively supports many local charities, cultural events and educational programmes.

In 1996, the Group had another very good year. Its assets, including those of its subsidiaries, amounted to USD 119.5 billion, up over 3.3%, with pretax profits up by just over 20%. The Group's deposits totalled USD 76.4 billion and loans USD 43 billion, up 12.6% and 14% respectively on the previous year. The ratio of loans to deposits was a conservative 56%.

In October 1996, the Bank issued USD 520 million (HK$ 4 billion) of floating interest rate certificates. Over 60 Hong Kong-based financial institutions participated in this issue, which was 3.6 times oversubscribed compared with the planned issue amount of HK$ 2 billion. This was the largest 5-year CD issue ever undertaken in Hong Kong.

The Group is closely involved in financing major local infrastructure projects. These include the new Hong Kong airport and related projects, the Route 3 Highway (Country Park) and the huge property developments at the Taikoktsui and Central stations on the new airport railway. The Group has also been investing on its own account in Hong Kong through direct investments, equity investments and real estate.

Continued success in Hong Kong's sophisticated and competitive market has required the Group to be highly innovative in providing new services and products. It was one of the first to introduce telephone banking, 24-hour self-service banking centres and Visa Cash smart cards. The Group is exploring the feasibility of "home banking". The Group's network of nearly 400 branches, the largest in Hong Kong, also provides distribution channels for a wide-range of banking and non-banking products. The Group now ranks amongst the top ten institutions in Hong Kong dealing with securities, credit cards and insurance.



In the light of the problems banks have faced in other countries the Group has been strengthening the management and control in keeping with the best modern practices. Like other banks it is paying increasing attention to the credit worthiness of its borrowers and the viability of the projects in which they wish to invest, be they loans for use in Hong Kong or anywhere abroad.

The Bank of China started to issue Hong Kong Dollar banknotes in May 1994 and Macao Pataca banknotes in October 1995. The notes issued by the Bank accounted for 11% of those in circulation in Hong Kong and 50% of those in Macao by the end of 1996.

Throughout 1996, the Bank of China chaired the Hong Kong Association of Banks. The Association worked very effectively to facilitate the operation and long-term development of Hong Kong's banking sector. Among others, the Association and its member banks worked closely with the Hong Kong Monetary Authority in the successful introduction of the Real Time Gross Settlement mechanism by the end of 1996.

The Group firmly believes that its success is closely linked to the overall success of Hong Kong. It has, therefore, committed itself to continuing heavy investments in Hong Kong to grow its business there and so help its local customers to grow theirs.

We aim to flourish and be a first-class global bank.



MAIN OPERATION INDICATORS



FINANCIAL REPORT AND STATEMENTS

Bank of China Balance Sheet 34

Bank of China Profit and Loss Statement 36

Consolidated Balance Sheet of the Bank and Its Wholly-owned Subsidiaries

Consolidated Profit and Loss Statement of the Bank and Its Wholly-owned

Accounting Policies 41

Verification Statement for the 1996 Final Accounts of Bank of China 43

Financial Review of the Unconsolidated Financial Statements 44

Bank of China Balance Sheet

Asset Items	31 December, 1996	31 December, 1995	31 December, 1994
Assets			
Cash	1,239	1,365	1,296
Due from Central Bank	13,764	11,754	9,247
Due from banks	65,470	68,621	62,182
Bills discounted and remittances bought	5,625	4,887	4,019
Loans and overdrafts	128,011	115,272	103,004
Securities	19,990	17,087	20,698
Investments	3,258	3,520	3,466
Fixed assets	3,089	2,767	2,007
Receivables	7,320	6,673	5,994
Other assets	6,148	7,914	5,616
Total	**253,914**	**239,860**	**217,529**
Contracts and contingent assets			
Receivables under forward contracts	15,629	15,652	21,537
Collections receivable for customers	11,846	13,371	14,291
Customers' liabilities under letters of credit and guarantee	41,581	41,952	40,572
Trust assets	13,004	11,748	11,397
Total	**82,060**	**82,723**	**87,797**

IN USD MILLION

Liability Items	31 December, 1996	31 December, 1995	31 December, 1994
Liabilities			
Due to Central Bank	22,639	22,270	22,848
Due to banks	50,853	52,958	41,753
Deposits	150,849	135,761	127,215
Remittances	3,109	3,333	4,293
Payables	8,948	5,779	5,974
Bonds issued	2,474	2,876	3,311
Other liabilities	2,490	2,450	1,515
Total	**241,362**	**228,427**	**207,909**
Net worth			
Capital	6,266	6,252	3,551
Surplus	2,641	1,670	3,153
Reserves	3,017	2,948	2,274
Profit after tax	628	563	642
Total net worth	12,552	11,433	9,620
Total liabilities and net worth	**253,914**	**239,860**	**217,529**
Contracts and contingent liabilities			
Payables under forward contracts	15,629	15,652	21,537
Collections for customers	11,846	13,371	14,291
Letters of credit and guarantee	41,581	41,952	40,572
Trust liabilities	13,004	11,748	11,397
Total	**82,060**	**82,723**	**87,797**

Bank of China Profit and Loss Statement

January 1-December 31

IN USD MILLION

	1996	1995	1994
Income			
Interest income	14,663	14,832	11,715
Commissions & other income	2,275	2,039	2,013
Total	**16,938**	**16,871**	**13,728**
Expense			
Interest expenses	12,643	12,559	9,835
Commissions & other expenses	1,605	1,890	1,508
Administrative expenses	1,295	1,170	958
Total	**15,543**	**15,619**	**12,301**
Profit before tax	1,395	1,252	1,427
Income tax	767	689	785
Profit after tax	628	563	642

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1-1 Currency composition of deposits(unconsolidated, %)

	31 Dec. 1996	31 Dec. 1995	31 Dec. 1994
RMB	40.5	43.9	35.1
Foreign currency	59.5	56.1	64.9

1-2 Deposits in terms of maturity (unconsolidated, %)

	31 Dec. 1996	31 Dec. 1995	31 Dec. 1994
Demand deposits	42.8	48.6	49.5
Time deposits	57.2	51.4	50.5
less than 1 year	27.6	26.5	20.2
1 year or longer	29.6	24.9	30.3

1-3 Depositor composition(unconsolidated, %)

	31 Dec. 1996	31 Dec. 1995	31 Dec. 1994
Individuals	41.1	38.8	32.8
Enterprises	37.8	38.3	40.2
Administrative entities	21.1	22.9	27.0

2-1 Lendings in terms of maturity (unconsolidated, %)

	31 Dec. 1996	31 Dec. 1995	31 Dec. 1994
Less than 1 year	59.9	59.2	58.4
1-3 year (not including 3 year)	15.3	15.1	13.9
3-5 year (not including 5 year)	7.0	7.3	7.5
5 year or longer	17.8	18.4	20.2

2-2 Currency composition of lendings (unconsolidated, %)

	31 Dec. 1996	31 Dec. 1995	31 Dec. 1994
RMB	44.8	43.5	44.6
USD	39.8	41.9	38.4
JPY	5.9	6.3	7.9
Other	9.5	8.3	9.1

2-3Geographical structure of lendings (unconsolidated, %)

	31 Dec. 1996	31 Dec. 1995	31 Dec. 1994
Domestic	89.6	89.6	89.5
Overseas	10.4	10.4	10.5

3-1 Changes in bad loan provisions (principal) (unconsolidated, USD million)

	31 Dec. 1996	31 Dec. 1995	31 Dec. 1994
Provisions			
balance at beginning of term	2402	1,789	1,413
provisions made during the term	547	795	549
balance at term end	2464	2,396	1,761
Write-offs	485	188	201

Note: The difference between the term-end balance of the previous year and balance at the beginning of the current year is the result of the different exchange rates.

Consolidated Balance Sheet of the Bank and Its Wholly-Owned Subsidiaries

Asset Items	31 December, 1996	31 December, 1995	31 December, 1994
Assets			
Cash	1,372	1,487	1,408
Due from Central Bank	13,897	11,794	9,291
Due from banks	81,435	80,764	75,176
Bills discounted and remittances bought	8,747	7,883	6,293
Loans and overdrafts	145,479	131,079	116,273
Securities	23,110	20,117	22,022
Investments	650	682	703
Fixed assets	3,456	3,110	2,299
Receivables	8,116	7,528	6,428
Other assets	6,292	8,009	5,778
Total	292,554	272,453	245,671
Contracts and contingent assets			
Receivables under forward contracts	26,042	23,938	34,685
Collections receivable for customers	13,936	14,772	15,364
Customers' liabilities under letters of credit and guarantee	46,672	47,760	46,121
Trust assets	15,070	14,143	14,011
Total	**101,720**	**100,613**	**110,181**

IN USD MILLION

Liability Items	31 December, 1996	31 December, 1995	31 December, 1994
Liabilities			
Due to Central Bank	22,656	22,285	20,865
Due to banks	56,316	55,283	44,078
Deposits	181,278	163,468	151,266
Remittances	3,129	3,355	4,309
Payables	10,039	9,896	9,600
Bonds issued	2,478	2,884	3,311
Other liabilities	2,921	2,920	1,763
Total	278,817	260,091	235,192
Net worth			
Capital	6,266	6,252	3,551
Surplus	2,641	1,670	3,153
Reserves	3,763	3,568	2,784
Profit after tax	1,067	872	991
Total net worth	13,737	12,362	10,479
Total liabilities and net worth	292,554	272,453	245,671
Contracts and contingent liabilities			
Payables under forward contracts	26,042	23,938	34,685
Collections for customers	13,936	14,772	15,364
Letters of credit and guarantee	46,672	47,760	46,121
Trust liabilities	15,070	14,143	14,011
Total	101,720	100,613	110,181

Consolidated Profit and Loss Statement of the Bank and Its Wholly-owned subsidiaries

January 1-December 31 — IN USD MILLION

	1996	1995	1994
Income			
Interest income	17,684	16,965	13,242
Commissions & other income	2,732	2,436	2,374
Total	**20,416**	**19,401**	**15,616**
Expense			
Interest expenses	14,593	13,794	10,703
Commissions & other expenses	1,890	2,264	1,731
Administrative expenses	1,650	1,484	1,238
Total	**18,133**	**17,542**	**13,672**
Profit before tax	2,283	1,859	1,944
Income tax	1,216	987	953
Profit after tax	1,067	872	991

Accounting Policies

The principal accounting policies adopted in the preparation of the financial statements are set out below.

(a) Basis of preparation

The financial statements of the Bank of China are prepared on an historical cost basis and in accordance with the relevant laws and regulations of the People's Republic of China, including the P.R.C.'s Accounting Law, Enterprise Accounting Norms, General Accounting Procedures of Enterprises and Regulations Regarding Financial Activities of Financial and Insurance Enterprises.

Accounting records are maintained on an accrual basis.

The financial statements of Bank of China (the parent company) represent the aggregated profit and loss accounts and balance sheets of the head office and its domestic and foreign branches, after eliminating all internal accounts and transactions.

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of the parent company and its wholly-owned subsidiaries: Bank of China Trust and Consultancy Company, Bank of China (Luxembourg),China Development Finance Co. (H.K.), Ltd., Yien Yieh Commercial Bank Ltd., China & South Sea Bank Ltd., Kincheng Banking Corp., China State Bank Ltd., National Commercial Bank Ltd., Sin Hua Bank Ltd., Bank of China (Russia), Bank of China (Kazakhstan) and Bank of China (Canada). The income and expenses and assets and liabilities of all such subsidiaries are included in the relevant captions in the consolidated financial statements after eliminating all inter-company accounts and transactions. The accounting year runs from January 1 to December 31.

(b) Fixed assets

Fixed assets are stated at cost, less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation is calculated on a straight-line basis using rates laid down by the Ministry of Finance.

(c) Loans and overdrafts

Loans and overdrafts are stated at the amount of principal outstanding.

Provisions are set aside against possible credit losses, based on a year-end appraisal of loans and related commitments to extend further credit. Changes in the amount of the provision are charged against the profit and loss account for the year.

Loans are scheduled to be written off against the provision when it is considered that there is no realistic prospect of recovery of some or all of the loan.

Non-performing loans are classified as doubtful loans and bad loans. Loans are classified as doubtful when any principal repayments are past due or when a borrower ceases production or an underlying project is stopped. Bad loans are those with no prospect of repayment and which will be written off in full.

The provision for credit losses is not deducted from loans and overdrafts in the balance sheet, but is reported as a component of net worth.

(d) Securities

Securities which are held as long-term

investments are stated at cost.

(e) Investments in subsidiaries

Investments in subsidiary undertakings are stated in the balance sheet of the parent company at cost.

(f) Foreign currency translation

Assets and liabilities denominated in foreign currencies are translated into the reporting currency (RMB) using year-end exchange rates. Forward foreign exchange positions are valued at the prevailing market rates and any gains or losses thereon are included in the revenue or expenditure for the current year.

Assets, liabilities and results of operations of foreign branches and subsidiaries are recorded on the basis of the functional currency of each entity, usually the relevant local currency. For consolidation purposes, the assets, liabilities and results of operations are translated into RMB at year-end rates of exchange.

Exchange rates are set by the State Administration of Foreign Exchange.

Exchange rates for RMB against the US Dollar have been:

31/12/96 US$1 = RMB¥8.2982

31/12/95 US$1 = RMB¥8.3179

31/12/94 US$1 = RMB¥8.4491

(g)Income tax

In 1996, the income tax rate set by the government for the Bank and other state-owned commercial banks was 55%.

(h) Commitments and contingent liabilities

Commitments representing forward contracts entered into by the parent company or its subsidiaries, together with commitments and contingent liabilities arising out of transactions carried out for customers (principally letters of credit, guarantees and collections) where there is an off-setting claim on those customers or another counterparty, are shown directly under the balance sheet.

VERIFICATION STATEMENT FOR THE 1996 FINAL ACCOUNTS OF BANK OF CHINA

(MARCH 25, 1997)

We have carefully examined all the financial statements and the notes of the 1996 final accounts of Bank of China and the relevant account books and found all the figures in them genuine and correct, accurately indicating the Bank's financial position at the end of 1996 and the results of the Bank's operation in the year.

Board of Supervisors

Bank of China

FINANCIAL REVIEW OF THE UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

I. Overview of results

The year 1996 witnessed a steady growth in the profits of the Bank, making it the leading domestic bank for the fourth consecutive year. The pre-tax profit was US$ 1,395 million, an increase of US$ 143 million over 1995. The pre-tax profit contribution of domestic operations accounted for US$ 953 million, an annual increase of US$ 55 million; overseas operations contributed US$ 442 million, growing by US$ 55 million over the previous year.

In 1996, the Bank further strengthened its internal controls and asset quality, while at the same time reducing costs and raising efficiency so as to boost profits. The growth in fixed assets was effectively controlled. Expenditure only increased in line with inflation. With a 5.6% growth in total assets, good profit growth of 11.2% was achieved.

II. Profit and loss

Interest income and expenses

Interest income comprises interest earned on loans, overdrafts, bills discounted, negotiable documents, due from other banks and positive interest margins arising from interbank transactions.

Interest expense comprises interest paid on deposits, borrowings, bonds issued and inter-bank transactions.

	1996 (US$ million)	1995 (US$ million)	Increase(decrease) (US$ million)	(%)
Interest income	14,663	14,832	-169	-1.1
Interest expenses	12,643	12,559	84	0.7
Net interest income	2,020	2,273	-253	-11
Average interest rates:	%	%		
On interest bearing assets	7.1	7.8		
On interest bearing liabilities	5.7	6.1		
Interest margin	1.4	1.7		

Commissions, other income and expenses

Commissions and other income include all commissions received and earnings from foreign currency exchange, financial contracts and interest options, returns on investment and non-operational income.

Commissions and other expenses include commissions paid, depreciation of fixed assets, provisions for credit-related losses, losses on foreign currency exchange, operations tax and surtax, premiums paid on financial contracts and interest options as well as non-operational expenses.

(See box below)

Administrative expenses

Administrative expenses include salary and pension benefits to staff, expenses on training and education, office supplies, amortisation of intangible assets and expenditure on business travel, equipment maintenance and advertising.

Administrative expenses were US$ 1,295 million, US$ 125 million up from 1995, an increase of 10.7%. This was the lowest in four years and reflected the Bank's successful control over administrative costs.

	1996 (US$ million)	1995 (US$ million)	Increase(decrease) (US$ million)	(%)
Commissions received	459	456	3	0.7
Gain on exchange	623	288	335	116
Investment profits	1,095	1,065	30	2.8
Other	98	230	-132	-57.4
Total commission and other income	2,275	2,039	236	11.6
Commission expense	222	169	33	19.5
loss on exchange	228	240	-12	-5
Operations tax	450	408	42	10.3
Other	725	1,073	-348	-32.4
Total commission and other expense	1,605	1,890	-285	-15
Net commission and other income	670	149	521	349.7

III Assets and liabilities

1. Assets

Due from Central Bank

At Dec. 31, 1996, the Bank had US$ 13,764 million of deposits and placements at the Central Bank, an increase of 17% over the previous year. This rise was mainly due to the growth of deposits placed with the Bank by domestic customers, which in turn increased the requirement for deposits to be placed with the Central Bank.

Balances placed with foreign central banks are included in the balance sheet caption 'Due from banks'.

Loans and overdrafts

At the end of 1996, the outstanding loans and overdrafts of the Bank were US$ 128,011 million, 11% more than in previous year, reflecting a similar growth rate to 1995. The total outstanding loans to the domestic market was US$ 114,755 million, an annual growth of 11% over 1995, which was within the credit limits administered by the Central Bank.

The loan portfolio of the Bank (before provisions) for 1996 is as follows (in million USD):

Geographical:	
Domestic Loans	114,749
Overseas Loans	13,262
	128,011

Currency:	
USD	50,897
JPY	7,591
Others	12,136
RMB	57,387
	128,011
Maturity:	
Up to 1 year	76,628
From 1 year to 3 years	19,624
From 3 years to 5 years	8,999
Over 5 years	22,760
	128,011
Asset Quality:	
Normal Loans	116,479
Overdue Loans	9,128
Doubtful Loans	2,064
Bad Loans	340
	128,011

At the end of 1996, the total amount of non-performing loans was US$ 2,404 million (including doubtful loans US$ 2,064 million and bad loans US$ 340 million), accounted for 1.9% of the outstanding loans and overdrafts.

Movements in loan loss provisions (included in Reserves in the balance sheet) in 1996 were as

follows (US$ million):

Amount at the beginning of the year	2,402
Charge to profit and loss account	547
Write off	485
At end of the year	2,464

Provisions for bad loans at US$ 2,464 million represent 1.9% of the total amount of loans and overdrafts, 0.15% lower than at the end of 1995. This represents 103% of the total amount of non-performing loans.

Of the total of US$ 2,464 million in provisions for bad loans, US$ 1,857 million was for domestic operations, all of which was general provisions (as the country's current accounting system does not permit specific provisions); the remaining US$ 607 million was for overseas operations, of which general provisions accounted for US$ 231 million and specific provisions, US$ 376 million.

Securities and investment

Securities purchased by the Bank include bonds issued by Government agencies, international organisations and large corporations. Investments of the Bank refer to the Bank's equity interest in its subsidiary undertakings. At the end of 1996, the Bank's portfolio of securities amounted to US$ 19,990 million, an increase of 17% over the amount in 1995. This increase was due to the Bank's recent purchase of US$ 1,000 million of US dollar bonds and also its purchase of large quantities of treasury bonds in the domestic market near the year end. The Bank's outstanding holdings of investments totalled US$ 3,258 million, decreasing 7.4% from the previous year.

Fixed assets

The net book value of fixed assets at the end of 1996 stood at US$ 3,089 million, US$ 322 million over that of the previous year, marking an increase of 11.6%. However this increase was lower than the 26.3% growth rate of 1995, it was also the lowest growth rate since 1993. The net book value of domestic fixed assets stood at US$ 2,269 million, 16.3% more than in the previous year, while the net book value of the fixed assets abroad was US$ 820 million, decreasing by US$ 2.4 million from 1995. This marked the success of the Bank's strict control on capital expenditure, the reduction of fixed asset investment plans, and reduced involvement in new construction projects.

Other assets

The Bank's other assets stood at US$ 6,148 million at the end of 1996, US$ 1,754 million less than in the previous year, a decrease of 22.3%.

2. Liabilities and equity

Due to Central Bank

The balance due to Central Bank at the end of 1996 stood at US$ 22,639 million, US$ 369 million more than 1995.

Balances due to foreign central banks are included in the balance sheet caption 'Due to banks'.

Due to banks

At the end of 1996, deposits from other banks were US$ 52,853 million, US$ 2,125 million less, or 4% lower than in 1995. This was mainly attributable to the decrease in deposits at the Bank's overseas branches.

Deposits

At Dec. 31, 1996, customer deposits amounted to US$ 150,849 million, increasing by US$ 15,255 million, or 11% over the figure for 1995. The structure of deposits is as follows (figures in US$ million):

Currency:	
Foreign currency	89,710
RMB	61,139
	150,849
Maturity:	
Current Deposits	64,548
Term Deposits	86,301
Within 1 year	41,649
Over 1 year	44,652
	150,849
Customers:	
Individual Deposits	61,969
Corporate Deposits	57,051
Institutional Deposit	31,829
	150,849

Bonds issued

At the end of 1996, bonds issued totalled US$ 2,474 million, US$ 402 million less than in 1995, mainly due to the redemption of maturing bonds exceeding the issue of new bonds.

Other liabilities

Other liabilities stood at US$ 2,490 million at the end of 1996, an increase of 1.6% over 1995.

Capital and surplus

At Dec. 31, 1996, the Bank's issued share capital was US$ 6,266 million, unchanged in RMB from the previous year, while the surplus stood at US$2,641 million increasing by US$971 million over 1995. The major reasons for this increase were, firstly, the Bank, as required by the Ministry of Finance, has set aside surplus reserves and a public welfare fund; secondly, the reserves of the Bank's overseas establishments were increased.

Reserves

By the end of 1996, the Bank's provisions (including provisions for doubtful loans and bad loans, see Loans and overdrafts) were US$ 3,017 million, US$ 69 million or 2.3% more than in 1995.

Contingent assets and liabilities

As of Dec. 31, 1996, the outstanding contingent assets and contingent liabilities were US$ 82,060 million, US$ 663 million less than in 1995, or 0.8% lower. Receivables under forward contracts and payables under forward contracts stood at US$ 15,629 million, 0.1% less than in 1995; at the end of the year, collections receivable for customers were US$ 11,846 million, 11.4% lower than in the previous year. These were largely due to the decrease in the volume of collection business of domestic branches. Customers liabilities under letters of credit and guarantee was US$ 41,581 million, 0.9% lower than in 1995. Total outstanding trust assets/trust liabilities by year-end was US$ 13,004 million growing 10.7% from the previous years.

IV Capital and liquidity

Capital ratio

The Bank has developed its own systems for risk weighting its assets and off-balance sheet exposures. At the end of 1996 total weighted risk assets (including off-balance sheet amounts) totalled US$ 76,454 million. When compared with equity (after deducting reserves) of US$ 9,535 million this produces a risk weighted capital ratio of 12.5% up from 11.5% at the end of 1995.

Liquidity

The aggregate balance of cash, deposits and placements with the Central Bank and other banks was US$ 80,473 million, US$ 1,267 million less than in 1995. Liquid assets at the end of 1996 amounted to 31.7% of total assets, 2.4% lower than in the previous year, and represented 125% of customers' current account deposits, slightly higher than in the previous year. These figures reflected the adequate liquidity of the Bank.

V Financial control and risk management

The Bank is pursuing a programme aimed at the development of integrated management control which emphasises the strengthening of internal control, minimising financial risks, and optimising the quality of assets. This has entailed the formalisation of ten basic principles:

(1) The percentage of overdue loans shall not exceed 8% of total loans; doubtful loans shall not exceed 5% of total loans; and bad loans shall not exceed 2% of total loans.

(2) Loans shall not exceed 75% of deposits, and foreign currency loans shall not exceed 85% of foreign currency deposits.

(3) Loans in RMB with a maturity of one year or more shall not exceed 120% of RMB deposits with a similar maturity, and loans in foreign currency with a maturity of one year or more shall not exceed 60% of foreign currency deposits.

(4) The aggregate amount of loans to a single customer shall not exceed 12% of the total net worth of the Bank, and the aggregate of all loans to the ten biggest customers shall not exceed 50% of the Bank's net worth.

(5) Assets in RMB with residual maturity of 30 days or less shall not be less than 25% of liabilities in RMB of a similar maturity, and the same ratio for foreign currency assets to foreign currency liabilities shall not be below 40%.

(6) The ratio of liquid assets to liquid liabilities shall not be lower than 25%, and the ratio of liquid assets in foreign currency to liquid liabilities in foreign currency shall not be less than 60%.

(7) Interbank borrowing shall not exceed 4% of total deposits; and interbank lending shall be no more than 8% of total deposits.

(8) RMB deposits and placements with the Central Bank and cash shall not be lower than 5% of deposits; and foreign currency deposits and placements with other banks and foreign currency

cash shall not fall below 5% of foreign currency deposits.

(9) The average maturity of securities purchased shall not exceed 5 years and those securities with a maturity greater than 5 years shall not exceed 30% of the aggregate of all securities. (In this connection, domestic securities must be bonds issued by the Government or large domestic banks, and foreign securities must be issued by the G-7 countries and have a credit rating of AA or better).

(10) Foreign branches cannot raise more than US$10 million with a maturity of more than one year without permission from the Bank's Board of Directors.

The Bank has continued to develop its information technology systems. Its Electronic Interbank System is already operational in 1,592 offices at or above county level for RMB payments. The Foreign Exchange Payment and Clearing System started operating between the Head Office and four major branches in the year and the new generation Core Accounting System was successful in its trial operation in Beijing. Other management information systems developments are continuing. These improvements will contribute to the strengthening of the Bank's operational management, risk control, asset-liability management and also to the general improvement of the quality of its services.

Control has been improved by the separation of front-office and back-office operations in foreign exchange dealing. The back-office settlement function was removed from the Foreign Exchange Department and assigned to the Accounting Department, thus further strengthening the control and monitoring of foreign exchange dealing and foreign exchange risk.

A new credit management system has been established based on the principle of a hierarchy of credit approval and clear demarcation of responsibility. The credit department was reorganised into a Credit Business Department and a Credit Management Department, providing separation between approval and monitoring functions and enhancing effective credit management. The revision of internal policies, operational procedures, and the clarification of the responsibilities of staff members at different levels, have all contributed to improved credit risk forecasts and a more reliable control system.

Further improvements over the conduct of letter of guarantee business was achieved through more effective recovery of advances, and a general tightening of policies and guidelines in this area.

The Bank implemented the Commercial Banking Law of the People's Republic of China concerning the comprehensive examination and classification of assets. It also converted the investment and trust subsidiaries of its branches into departments of those branches and the company directly owned by Head Office into a department of the Head Office. Management of project financing was strengthened as were systems to ensure all fees are claimed and trust property is safeguarded.

Capital investment was directed to those branches with good returns; where management was considered to have under-performed they were either closed or merged. Resources were directed to customer service activities rather than the purchase of fixed assets.

VI Branches, offices and employees

At the end of 1996, the Bank of China operated from 15,337 locations (excluding subsidiaries) inside the country. Apart from Head Office this comprised: 341 branches; 1,465 sub-branches; 1,719 business offices; 3,412 processing centres; and 8,399 deposit offices. Some offices were upgraded in the year and in addition the Bank opened 7 sub-branches, 1 business office and 50 processing centres. Overall, there was a net reduction taking into account the closure and merger of existing offices. Total staff numbers grew by 3,113 giving, as of Dec. 31, 1996, a total work force of 197,079.

The Bank's overseas operations expanded further during 1996. Significant progress was made with the Bank's application to open institutions in Malaysia, Milan and Zambia. The Bank of China in Bangkok received a full banking license and a fully-owned merchant banking subsidiary, BOC Holdings International, was officially registered in London. At the end of 1996, there were 97 overseas locations, 4 more than in the previous year, a result of the establishment of sub-branches under the Bank of China's Singapore Branch, Hong Kong Branch, and Macao Branch. In contrast, the number of overseas employees decreased by 108 to 4,703, primarily due to reductions in Hong Kong, Macao and Tokyo Branches.

Main Offices & Branches at Home & Abroad

Branches and sub-branches authorized to handle international business

HEAD OFFICE

[illegible] FUCHENGMEN NEI DAJIE,
BEIJING [illegible], CHINA
TLX: 22254 BCHO CN
TEL: (0086-01)6601[illegible]
FAX: (0086-01)0-6601[illegible]
POSTCODE: 100818

ANHUI PROVINCE

ANHUI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WU FUWU

313 CHANGJIANG ROAD, HEFEI
230061, ANHUI PROV., CHINA
TLX: 99026 BOCHF CN
TEL: (0086-0551-)264154[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0551-)264175[illegible]
POSTCODE: 230061

WUHU BRANCH

233 JIU HUA SHAN ROAD
WUHU 241000
ANHUI PROV. CHINA
TLX: 91129 WHBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0553-)3077[illegible]8
FAX: (0086-0553-)3052135
POSTCODE: 241000

MA'ANSHAN BRANCH

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE BUILDING,
HUAXI ROAD, MA'ANSHAN, CHINA
TLX: 90514 BCMB CN
TEL: (0086-0555-)2350191
FAX: (0086-0555-)2321261
POSTCODE: 243011

BEIJING CITY

BEIJING BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
XIU ZHONGGUANG

5 YABAO LU, CHAOYANG DISTRICT,
BEIJING [illegible]20, CHINA
TLX: 210245 BOCCB CN
TEL: (0086-01)65[illegible]011[illegible]
FAX: (0086-01)65[illegible]
POSTCODE: [illegible]20

CHONGQING CITY

CHONGQING BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
HUANG YUNXIU

218 ZHONG SHAN YI ROAD, YU
ZHONG DISTRICT
CHONGQING 630013, CHINA
TLX: 62172 CQBOC CN
TEL: (0086-023-)6[illegible]8[illegible]28
FAX: (0086-023-)6[illegible]
POSTCODE: 630013

FUJIAN PROVINCE

FUJIAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
LIN ZHENMIN

278 BEI LU ST., FUZHOU [illegible],
FUJIAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 92109 BOC FUJIAN
TEL: (0086-0591-)75[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0591-)75[illegible]
POSTCODE: 350001

XIAMEN BRANCH

[illegible] GENERAL MANAGER
[illegible] ZHONG

BANK OF CHINA BUILDING,
[illegible] 8TH HUBIN ROAD
XIAMEN 361012, FUJIAN PROV.
CHINA
TLX: [illegible]12 XMBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0592-)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0592-)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 361012

FUZHOU BRANCH

27 GUTIAN ROAD, FUZHOU
350[illegible] FUJIAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 24034 BOCFT CN
TEL: (0086-0591-)3[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0591-)3321[illegible]
POSTCODE: 350005

FUQING SUB-BRANCH

[illegible] DONGMEN ROAD, FUQING
35[illegible] FUJIAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 24036 BOCFQ CN
TEL: (0086-0591-)521[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0591-)522[illegible]
POSTCODE: 350300

PUTIAN BRANCH

[illegible] WENXIAN WEST ROAD,
PUTIAN 351100
FUJIAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 24034 CHKPT CN
TEL: (0086-0594-)2[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0594-)2[illegible]
POSTCODE: 351100

QUANZHOU BRANCH

LIHU YI ROAD, QUANZHOU
362[illegible] FUJIAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: [illegible]67 BCHQZ CN
TEL: (0086-0595-)22[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0595-)21[illegible]
POSTCODE: 362000

ZHANGZHOU BRANCH

[illegible] ZHONG HEI LU, ZHANGZHOU
[illegible] FUJIAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 29011 BOCZH CN
TEL: (0086-0596-)202[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0596-)202[illegible]
POSTCODE: 363000

GANSU PROVINCE

GANSU BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
QI ZHANFU

[illegible] DONG HANG ROAD, LANZHOU
73[illegible] GANSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: 72128 LZBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0931-)84[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0931-)84[illegible]
POSTCODE: 730030

GUANGDONG PROVINCE

GUANGDONG BRANCH

[illegible] GENERAL MANAGER
[illegible] ZHANGEN

[illegible] DONGFENG XI LU,
GUANGZHOU 510[illegible]
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: [illegible]42 GZBOC CN
TEL: (0086-020-)8335[illegible]
FAX: (0086-020-)835[illegible]
POSTCODE: 510130

GUANGZHOU BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
DONG RONGSHEN

[illegible] CHANG DI ROAD, GUANGZHOU
510[illegible] GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TLX: [illegible]12 ZIBOC CN
TEL: (0086-020-)834[illegible]
FAX: (0086-020-)834[illegible]
POSTCODE: 510120

SHENZHEN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WANG TIAN

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
BUILDING, 23 TIANSHE ROAD,
SHENZHEN 518[illegible],
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 42[illegible] BOCSZ CN
TEL: (0086-0755-)2268[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0755-)2239[illegible]
POSTCODE: 518001

ZHUHAI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
ZOU GUORONG

YUEHAI EAST ROAD, GONGBEI,
ZHUHAI 519020, GUANGDONG
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 456228 ZUBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0756-)888[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0756-)888[illegible]
POSTCODE: 519020

SHANTOU BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
CHAO XUMIN

JIN SHA DONG ROAD, SHANTOU
515041, GUANGDONG PROV.,
CHINA
TLX: 45[illegible]42 STBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0754-)82[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0754-)82[illegible]
POSTCODE: 515041

CHAOZHOU BRANCH

HUXI BEI ROAD, CHAOZHOU
515000, GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 45[illegible]20 CZBOC CN
TEL: (0086-096-)226[illegible]
FAX: (0086-096-)226[illegible]
POSTCODE: 521011

FOSHAN BRANCH

[illegible] REN MIN XI ROAD, FOSHAN
528000, GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 425011 FSBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0757-)2225[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0757-)2221[illegible]
POSTCODE: 52[illegible]

GUANGZHOU K.F.Q. BRANCH

19 DONGYUAN 2 STREET,
GUANGZHOU ECONOMIC AND
TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT ZONE,
GUANGZHOU 510[illegible],
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 44812 GDZXG CN
TEL: (0086-020-)22112[illegible]
FAX: (0086-020-)22127[illegible]
POSTCODE: 51[illegible]

HUIZHOU BRANCH

22 MAI DI ROAD, HUIZHOU
516001, GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 42[illegible] HZBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0752-)227[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0752-)227[illegible]
POSTCODE: 51[illegible]

JIANGMEN BRANCH

22 GANGKOU ROAD, JIANGMEN
529051, GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 450018 BOCJM CN
TEL: (0086-0750-)337[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0750-)3351[illegible]
POSTCODE: 529051

MAOMING BRANCH

2 YOUCHENG WU LU,
MAOMING 525000
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 455016 MMBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0668-)22[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0668-)22[illegible]
POSTCODE: 525000

MEIZHOU BRANCH

53 MEIHANG YI ROAD, MEIZHOU
514021, GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 42008 BOCMZ CN
TEL: (0086-0753-)226[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0753-)226[illegible]
POSTCODE: 514021

SHAOGUAN BRANCH

158 JIEFANG ROAD, SHAOGUAN
512000, GUANGDONG PROV.,
CHINA

TLX: 458225 BOCSG CN
TEL: (0086-0751-)8888[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0751-)888[illegible]
POSTCODE: 512000

YANGJIANG BRANCH

29 DONGFENG YI LU, YANGJIANG
529500, GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 450018 BOCYJ CN
TEL: (0086-0662-)52[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0662-)422[illegible]
POSTCODE: 529500

ZHANJIANG BRANCH
NO.50 RENMIN DA[illegible] ZHONG
ZHANJIANG 52[illegible]22, GUANGDONG
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 452[illegible] GZIOC CN
TEL: (0086-0750)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0750)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 52[illegible]22

ZHAOQING BRANCH
3 DUAN ZHOU LIU ROAD,
ZHAOQING 526020, GUANGDONG
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 42826 BOCZQ CN
TEL: (0086-0758-2)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0758-2)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 526020

ZHONGSHAN BRANCH
18 ZHONG SHAN THIRD ROAD,
ZHONGSHAN 52[illegible]
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 42[illegible] ZSBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0760)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0760)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 52[illegible]

HESHAN SUB-BRANCH
7 WENMING ROAD, SHAPING,
HESHAN 529700, GUANGDONG PROV.
CHINA
TEL: (0086-0750)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0750)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 529700

KAIPING SUB-BRANCH
15 KAIHUA LU, CHANGSHA ZHEN,
KAIPING 529300,
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 450[illegible] BOCKT CN
TEL: (0086-0750-22)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0750-2822)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 529300

NANHAI SUB-BRANCH
5 FOPING ROAD, FOSHAN 528200
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 425[illegible] FNBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0757)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0757)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 528200

SANSHUI SUB-BRANCH
4 WEN FENG ZHONG ROAD, XINAN
TOWN, SANSHUI 528300
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 425[illegible] BOCSS CN
TEL: (0086-0757-773)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0757-773)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 528300

SHEKOU SUB-BRANCH
32 TAI ZI ROAD,
SHEKOU INDUSTRIAL ZONE,
SHENZHEN 518067
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 420245 BOCSK CN
TEL: (0086-0755)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0755)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 518067

SHUNDE SUB-BRANCH
[illegible] SHAN XI LU, LEJIANG
SHUNDE 528300
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 42[illegible] BOSND CN
TEL: (0086-0757-222)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0757-222)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 528300

TAISHAN SUB-BRANCH
[illegible] QIAO HU LU, TAICHENG TOWN,
TAISHAN 529200,
GUANGDONG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 4[illegible] TSBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0750-552624)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0750-552624)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 529200

XINHUI SUB-BRANCH
[illegible] ZHU ZI ROAD, HUICHENG TOWN
XINHUI 529[illegible], GUANGDONG
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 4[illegible] XHBKT CN
TEL: (0086-750)[illegible]
FAX: (0086-750)[illegible]
POSTCODE: 529100

GUANGXI ZHUANG*

GUANGXI BRANCH
GENERAL MANAGER
XIA HAOFANG
[illegible] GUCHENG ROAD,
NANNING 530022,
GUANGXI ZHUANG*, CHINA
TLX: 48122 BOCNG CN
TEL: (0086-0771)-5252424
FAX: (0086-0771)-5861146*
POSTCODE: 530022

BEIHAI BRANCH
INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL
BUILDING, BEIHAI STREET, BEIHAI
536000, GUANGXI ZHUANG*,
CHINA
TLX: 4[illegible] BCBH CN
TEL: (0086-0779)-[illegible]112
FAX: (0086-0779)-[illegible]112
POSTCODE: 536000

FANGCHENGGANG BRANCH
[illegible] HUYI STREET, FANGCHENG
[illegible]
GUANGXI ZHUANG*, CHINA
TLX: 48[illegible] BOCFG CN
TEL: (0086-0770)-2822552
FAX: (0086-0770)-2822552
POSTCODE: 538001

GUILIN BRANCH
[illegible] SHAN HUBEI ROAD, GUILIN 541001,
GUANGXI ZHUANG*, CHINA
TLX: 4[illegible] GLBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0773)-282481[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0773)-282481[illegible]
POSTCODE: 541001

LIUZHOU BRANCH
[illegible] PING SHAN AVENUE
LIUZHOU 545[illegible]
GUANGXI ZHUANG*, CHINA
TLX: 48579 BOCLZ CN
TEL: (0086-0772)-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0772)-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 545006

WUZHOU BRANCH
[illegible] XINXING YI ROAD,
WUZHOU 543002,
GUANGXI ZHUANG*, CHINA
TLX: 48080 WZBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0774)-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0774)-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 543002

YULIN BRANCH
[illegible] XIANQIAN ROAD, YULIN
537000, GUANGXI ZHUANG*, CHINA
TLX: 48454 BOCYL CN
TEL: (0086-0775)-282[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0775)-282[illegible]
POSTCODE: 537000

GUIZHOU PROVINCE

GUIZHOU BRANCH
PRO-GENERAL MANAGER
CHAO QI
[illegible] DUSI ROAD, GUIYANG 550001,
GUIZHOU PROV., CHINA
TLX: 46011 BOGZB CN
TEL: (0086-0851)-5825751
FAX: (0086-0851)-5825773
POSTCODE: 550002

HAINAN PROVINCE

HAINAN BRANCH
PRO-GENERAL MANAGER
WANG LIMING
[illegible] DATONG ROAD, HAIKOU [illegible]
HAINAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 49017[illegible] HAIBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0898-6[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0898-6[illegible]
POSTCODE: 570102

SANYA BRANCH
[illegible] JIEFANG FOUR ROAD, SANYA
572[illegible]
HAINAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 49086 SYBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0898)-2[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0898)-2[illegible]
POSTCODE: 572000

HEBEI PROVINCE

HEBEI BRANCH
GENERAL MANAGER
FAN YONGMAO
[illegible] XINHUA ROAD, SHIJIAZHUANG
050000, HEBEI PROV., CHINA
TLX: 26216 IZBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0311-)705[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0311-)705[illegible]
POSTCODE: 050000

QINHUANGDAO BRANCH
[illegible] YUNHAI ROAD,
QINHUANGDAO [illegible]
HEBEI PROV., CHINA
TLX: 272[illegible] QHBOC CN
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: [illegible]

SHIJIAZHUANG BRANCH
168 YUHUA EAST ROAD,
SHIJIAZHUANG 050011, HEBEI
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 2[illegible] BOCHB CN
TEL: (0086-0311)-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0311)-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 050011

TANGSHAN BRANCH
[illegible] XINHUA EAST ROAD,
TANGSHAN 063000, HEBEI
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 272[illegible] TSBOC CN
TEL: (0086-0315-)2[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0315-)2[illegible]
POSTCODE: [illegible]

HEILONGJIANG PROVINCE

HEILONGJIANG BRANCH
GENERAL MANAGER
FAN ZUNLUE
[illegible] CHONGJUN STREET, NAN GANG
DISTRICT, HARBIN 150001,
HEILONGJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 87[illegible] BCHB CN
TEL: (0086-0451)-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0451)-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 150001

HARBIN BRANCH
GENERAL MANAGER
GAO HANYING
[illegible] ZHAOLIN STREET,
DAO LI DISTRICT, HARBIN 150010,
HEILONGJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 87122 BOCHB CN
TEL: (0086-0451)-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0451)-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 150010

DAQING BRANCH
[illegible] XIBIN ROAD, RANG HULU DISTRICT,
DAQING 163453
HEILONGJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 87342 BCDQ CN
TEL: (0086-0459)-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0459)-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 163453

HEIHE BRANCH
[illegible] XING AN STREET, HEIHE 164300
HEILONGJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 87236 BOCHH CN
TEL: (0086-0456)-225469
FAX: (0086-0456)-222094
POSTCODE: 164300

JIAMUSI BRANCH

[illegible] XING EN ROAD, JIAMUSI 154002
HEILONGJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 88[illegible] BCIMS CN
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: 154002

MUDANJIANG BRANCH

90 GUANGHUA STREET,
MUDANJIANG 157000,
HEILONGJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 88[illegible] MSDOC CN
TEL: (0086) 0453-22[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 0453-2230[illegible]
POSTCODE: 157000

QIQIHAR BRANCH

NO 3 BUKUI SOUTH STREET,
LONGSHA DISTRICT,
QIQIHAR 161005, HEILONGJIANG
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 86[illegible]12 QQBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 0452-2[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 0452-2[illegible]
POSTCODE: 161005

HENAN PROVINCE

HENAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
ZHAO BINGSHEN

40 HUA YUAN ROAD, ZHENGZHOU
450003, HENAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 404[illegible]5 ZHBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 03[illegible]1-5[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 03[illegible]1-5[illegible]
POSTCODE: 450003

HUBEI PROVINCE

HUBEI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
CHEN JIANGXU

[illegible] HUANGSHI ROAD, HANKOU WU
HAN 430014, HUBEI PROV., CHINA
TLX: [illegible] HBBOC CN
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: 430014

WUHAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
XU DUNQING

[illegible]21 ZHONGSHAN AVENUE,
HANKOU WUHAN 430021, HUBEI
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 40[illegible] BCBRH CN
TEL: (0086) 027-2841[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 027-2841[illegible]
POSTCODE: 430021

HUNAN PROVINCE

HUNAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
QIU WEIFA

[illegible] WENJI ROAD EAST, CHANGSHA
410001, HUNAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 98[illegible] HNBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 0731-2290033
FAX: (0086) 0731-2290814
POSTCODE: 410001

CHANGDE BRANCH

138 DONGTING ROAD,
CHANGDE 415000, HUNAN PROV.,
CHINA
TLX: 0[illegible] CDZGH CN
TEL: (0086) [illegible]
FAX: (0086) [illegible]
POSTCODE: 415000

CHENZHOU BRANCH

4 JIANKANG ROAD, CHENZHOU
423000, HUNAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 09[illegible] BOCZZ CN
TEL: (0086) 735-222102
FAX: (0086) 735-2[illegible]
POSTCODE: 423000

HENGYANG BRANCH

551 HUAN CHENG ROAD SOUTH,
HENGYANG 421001, HUNAN PROV.,
CHINA
TLX: 0924[illegible] HYBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 734-8257302
FAX: (0086) 734-8227039
POSTCODE: 421001

XIANGTAN BRANCH

249 JIANSHE NORTH ROAD,
XIANGTAN 411100,
HUNAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 9[illegible] XTBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 732-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 732-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 411100

YUEYANG BRANCH

DONGFANG LING ROAD, YUEYANG
414000, HUNAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 0[illegible] BOCYY CN
TEL: (0086) 730-8221160
FAX: (0086) 730-8231097
POSTCODE: 414000

ZHUZHOU BRANCH

95 XIN HUA WEST ROAD,
ZHUZHOU 412000, HUNAN PROV.,
CHINA
TLX: 0[illegible] ZZRBH CN
TEL: (0086) 733-8102972
FAX: (0086) 733-8102431
POSTCODE: 412000

INNER MONGOLIA

INNER MONGOLIA BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
[illegible]ANG ZHENHUA

[illegible] SOUTH ROAD, HOHHOT 010050,
INNER MONGOLIA, CHINA
TLX: 8[illegible]08 BOCHB CN
TEL: (0086) 04[illegible]-692[illegible]919
FAX: (0086) 04[illegible]-692[illegible]919, 692[illegible]702
POSTCODE: 010050

BAOTOU BRANCH

THE FINANCE BUILDING, GANG
TIE DAJIE, QINGSHAN QU, BAO TOU
[illegible]010, INNER MONGOLIA, CHINA
TLX: 8[illegible]08 BOCHT CN
TEL: (0086) 04[illegible]2-512[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 04[illegible]2-5151[illegible]
POSTCODE: 014010

DONG SHENG BRANCH

[illegible] ERDUO SI WEST STREET, DONG
SHENG 017000, INNER MONGOLIA,
AUTONOMOUS REGION, CHINA
TLX: 8[illegible]04 BOCDS CN
TEL: (0086) 04[illegible]-43[illegible]024
FAX: (0086) 04[illegible]-32[illegible]
POSTCODE: 017000

HAILAR BRANCH

SHENG LI SAN LU, HEDONG,
HAILAR 021000, INNER
MONGOLIA, CHINA
TLX: 85[illegible]25 BOCHALSB CN
TEL: (0086) 04[illegible]70-8221105
FAX: (0086) 04[illegible]70-8223105
POSTCODE: 021000

MANZHOULI SUB-BRANCH

[illegible] ERDAO JIE, MANZHOULI 021400,
INNER MONGOLIA, CHINA
TLX: 85[illegible]60 ZHMZH CN
TEL: (0086) 04[illegible]70-6225[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 04[illegible]70-6225[illegible]
POSTCODE: 021400

JIANGSU PROVINCE

JIANGSU BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
[illegible] MAOSHENG

[illegible] ZHONG SHAN NAN LU,
NANJING 210005, JIANGSU PROV.,
CHINA
TLX: 34116 BOCJS CN
TEL: (0086) 025-4417[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 025-44[illegible]
POSTCODE: 210005

NANJING BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
[illegible] RUI

[illegible] ZHONGSHAN DONG LU, NANJING
210[illegible]05, JIANGSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: 34[illegible]8 BOCNJ CN
TEL: (0086) 025-44[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 025-44[illegible]
POSTCODE: 210005

CHANGZHOU BRANCH

[illegible] JIANLING WEST R[illegible]
CHANGZHOU 21[illegible] JIANGSU
PROV., CHINA
TLX: [illegible] BOCCZ CN
TEL: (0086) 519-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 519-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 213003

LIANYUNGANG BRANCH

1-9 MIDDLE HAIJIAN ROAD, XIN
PU, LIANYUNGANG 222[illegible]2
JIANGSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: 8[illegible]3 BOCLY CN
TEL: (0086) 0518-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 0518-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 222002

NANTONG BRANCH

[illegible] QINGNIAN NI ROAD, NANTONG
22[illegible] JIANGSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: 8[illegible]18 BOCNT CN
TEL: (0086) 513-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 513-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 226001

SUZHOU BRANCH

[illegible] RENMIN ROAD, SUZHOU
215[illegible] JIANGSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: [illegible] BOCSU CN
TEL: (0086) 512-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 512-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 215005

WUXI BRANCH

2 JIANGNING ROAD, WUXI 214001,
JIANGSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: 86[illegible]00 WXBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 510-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 510-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 214001

YANGZHOU BRANCH

QIONGHUA ROAD, YANGZHOU
225[illegible] JIANGSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: [illegible] YZBOC CN
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: 225002

ZHENJIANG BRANCH

245 ZHONG SHAN DONG ROAD,
ZHENJIANG 212001, JIANGSU PROV.,
CHINA
TLX: 8[illegible]20 BOCZJ CN
TEL: (0086) 0511-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 0511-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 212001

ZHANGJIAGANG SUB-BRANCH

QINGNIAN MIDDLE ROAD,
YANGSHE TOWN, ZHANGJIAGANG
215[illegible] JIANGSU PROV., CHINA
TLX: 8[illegible]25 ZGBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 0512-[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 0512-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 215600

JIANGXI PROVINCE

JIANGXI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
TIAN XIAOREN

1 ZHANQIAN ROAD(W)
NANCHANG 330002
JIANGXI PROV. CHINA
TLX: 95014 BOCNC CN
TEL: (0086-10)701-6222*27
FAX: (0086-10)701-6200641
POSTCODE: 330002

JINGDEZHEN SUB-BRANCH

501 CHINA METROPOLIS AVENUE,
JINGDEZHEN 333000, JIANGXI
PROV. CHINA
TLX: 95207 BOCJD CN
TEL: (0086-10)708-5250646
FAX: (0086-10)708-5250646
POSTCODE: 333000

JILIN PROVINCE

JILIN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
LI YOUMING

14 XINMIN DAJIE, YINMAO DASHA
1-9 LOU, CHANGCHUN 130021,
JILIN PROV. CHINA
TLX: 85006 CCBOC CN
TEL: (0086-431)-5615576
FAX: (0086-431)-5615430
POSTCODE: 130021

CHANGCHUN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
ZHANG PING

1 TONGZHI STREET, CHANGCHUN
130061, JILIN PROV. CHINA
TLX: 88124 ICBOC CN
TEL: (0086-431)-8930867
FAX: (0086-431)-8930877
POSTCODE: 130061

JILIN CITY BRANCH

177 SONG JIANG ROAD, JILIN
132011, JILIN PROV. CHINA
TLX: 86010 BYCOL CN
TEL: (0086-432)-4686063
FAX: (0086-432)-4686064
POSTCODE: 132011

YANJI SUB-BRANCH

107 REN MIN LU,
YANJI 133000, JILIN PROV. CHINA
TLX: 842109 YI BOC
TEL: (0086-433)-2536654
FAX: (0086-433)-2531087
POSTCODE: 133000

LIAONING PROVINCE

LIAONING BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WANG QINGHO

9 ZHONGSHAN GUANGCHANG,
DALIAN 116001, LIAONING PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 86063 CDB CN
TEL: (0086-411)-2639902
FAX: (0086-411)-2639608
POSTCODE: 116001

DALIAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
ZHANG BAOXI

1 YANAN ROAD, DALIAN 116001,
LIAONING PROV. CHINA
TLX: 86059 DCBOC CN
TEL: (0086-411)-2638355
FAX: (0086-411)-2637634
POSTCODE: 116001

SHENYANG BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
LI ZUCHENG

253 SHIFU ROAD, SHENHE
DISTRICT, SHENYANG 110013,
LIAONING PROV. CHINA
TLX: 80058 BOCSH CN
TEL: (0086-024)-2557622
FAX: (0086-024)-2557622
POSTCODE: 110013

ANSHAN BRANCH

NO. 4, 219 ROAD TIEDONG QU,
ANSHAN 114002, LIAONING PROV.
CHINA
TLX: 80044 BOCAS CN
TEL: (0086-0412)-2221552
FAX: (0086-0412)-2232227
POSTCODE: 114001

DALIAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE BRANCH (DALIAN K.F.Q.BRANCH)

BANK OF CHINA TOWER,
CHANGCHUN ROAD, DALIAN
ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL
DEVELOPMENT ZONE,
DALIAN 116600, LIAONING
PROV. CHINA
TLX: 86060 BOCDK CN
TEL: (0086-411)-7615113
FAX: (0086-411)-7612564
POSTCODE: 116600

DANDONG SUB-BRANCH

6 CHINSHAN DAJIE, DANDONG
118000, LIAONING PROV. CHINA
TLX: 812-28 BOCTD CN
TEL: (0086-0415)-2122366
FAX: (0086-0415)-2122197
POSTCODE: 118000

JINZHOU SUB-BRANCH

25 SECTIONS 5, HEFANG ROAD,
LINGHEQU, JINZHOU 121000,
LIAONING PROV. CHINA
TLX: 813040 BOCJZGH CN
TEL: (0086-0416)-4141278
FAX: (0086-0416)-4141278
POSTCODE: 121000

YINGKOU SUB-BRANCH

NO. 5 TIYU LI, TIYU ST., ZHANQIAN
DISTRICT, YINGKOU 115000,
LIAONING PROV. CHINA
TLX: 814010 BOCYK CN
TEL: (0086-0417)-2543284
FAX: (0086-0417)-2543000
POSTCODE: 115000

NINGXIA HUI*

NINGXIA BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WANG SHUCHEN

2 HEFANG XI STREET, YINCHUAN
750001, NINGXIA HUI*, CHINA
TLX: 75003 BOCYC CN
TEL: (0086-0951)-5[illegible]71
FAX: (0086-0951)-5[illegible]71
POSTCODE: 750001

QINGHAI PROVINCE

QINGHAI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
TANG KANGNIAN

25 DONGGUAN STREET, XINING
810000, QINGHAI PROV. CHINA
TLX: 77019 BOCXN CN
TEL: (0086-097)1-6[illegible]
FAX: (0086-097)1-6[illegible]92
POSTCODE: 810000

SHAANXI PROVINCE

SHAANXI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WANG WENPING

[illegible] HUA YUAN, XI'AN 710[illegible]
SHAANXI PROV. CHINA
TLX: 70128 BOCXA CN
TEL: (0086-029)-72[illegible]
FAX: (0086-029)-72[illegible]
POSTCODE: 710001

XI'AN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
ZHANG EKKE

[illegible] HUA YUAN STREET,
XI'AN 710001,
SHAANXI PROV. CHINA
TLX: 70124 BOCXT CN
TEL: (0086-029)-72[illegible]
FAX: (0086-029)-72[illegible]
POSTCODE: 710001

SHANDONG PROVINCE

SHANDONG BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WANG HUANHANG

72 ZHONG SHAN ROAD, QINGDAO
266001, SHANDONG PROV. CHINA
TLX: 32235 BOCQD CN
TEL: (0086-0532)-2[illegible]742
FAX: (0086-0532)-2[illegible]742
POSTCODE: 266001

QINGDAO BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
[illegible] BINGWEN

[illegible] ZHONGSHAN ROAD, QINGDAO
266001,
SHANDONG PROV. CHINA
TLX: 32121 BOCHQCN
TEL: (0086-0532)-2[illegible]
FAX: (0086-0532)-2[illegible]
POSTCODE: 266001

JINAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
GUOQIN [illegible]

39 HEHE [illegible] AN XILU, JINAN 250011,
SHANDONG PROV. CHINA
TLX: [illegible] CIN CN
TEL: (0086-531)-6[illegible]
FAX: (0086-531)-6[illegible]
POSTCODE: 250011

RIZHAO BRANCH

24 HUANGHAI LU,
RIZHAO 276826, SHANDONG
PROV. CHINA
TLX: 52[illegible] BOCRZ CN
TEL: (0086-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 276826

SHIDAO BRANCH

15 HUANGHAI NAN LU, SHIDAO
ZHENRONG CHENG 264899
SHANDONG PROV. CHINA
TLX: 327[illegible] BOCSD CN
TEL: (0086-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 264899

WEIHAI BRANCH

38 XINWEN ROAD, WEIHAI 264200
SHANDONG PROV. CHINA
TLX: 327222 BOCWH CN
TEL: (0086-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 264200

YANTAI BRANCH

166 JIE FANG ROAD, YANTAI 264001,
SHANDONG PROV. CHINA
TLX: 42513 BOCYT CN
TEL: (0086-[illegible]
FAX: (0086-[illegible]
POSTCODE: 264001

SHANGHAI CITY

SHANGHAI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
HU JINBAI

23 ZHONGSHAN ROAD (E 1),
SHANGHAI 200002, CHINA
TLX: 33[illegible] BOSH CN
TEL: (0086-21)-63[illegible]
FAX: (0086-21)-63[illegible]
POSTCODE: 200002

PUDONG BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
SU DEHSIN

887 DONGFANG ROAD,
SHANGHAI 200122, CHINA
TLX: [illegible]
FAX: (0086-21)-58[illegible]
POSTCODE: 200122

SHANXI PROVINCE

SHANXI BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WANG YIKAI

258 YINGZE DAJIE, TAIYUAN
030001, SHANXI PROV., CHINA
TLX: 28004 BOCTB CN
TEL: (0086) 0351-040856
FAX: (0086) 0351-040304
POSTCODE: 030001

TAIYUAN BRANCH

65 GULOU STREET,
TAIYUAN 030002,
SHANXI PROV., CHINA
TLX: 28208 BOCTY CN
TEL: (0086) 0351-044425
FAX: (0086) 0351-044425
POSTCODE: 030002

PINGSHUO SUB-BRANCH

PINGSHUO LIVING AREA,
P.O. BOX NO.1, SHUOZHOU 036506,
SHANXI PROV., CHINA
TLX: 29100 BOCPS CN
TEL: (0086) 0349-202218
FAX: (0086) 0349-2052622
POSTCODE: 036506

SICHUAN PROVINCE

SICHUAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
QIU FAZONG

BANKING BUILDING SHUDU DA
DAO, CHENGDU 610016, SICHUAN
PROV., CHINA
TLX: 60145 BOCCD CN
TEL: (0086) 028-6662747
FAX: (0086) 028-6663711
POSTCODE: 610016

CHENGDU BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
KUANG LICHENG

143 DONG CHENG GEN JIE,
CHENGDU 610015,
SICHUAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 60149 BOCCD CN
TEL: (0086) 028-6646907
FAX: (0086) 028-6646929
POSTCODE: 610015

TIANJIN CITY

TIANJIN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
ZHANG YULAN

50 BEFANG BEI LU,
TIANJIN 300040, CHINA
TLX: 23233 TJBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 022-2431295
FAX: (0086) 022-2411601
POSTCODE: 300040

TANGGU BRANCH

29 DONG TING LU, ECONOMIC AND
TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT
AREA, TIANJIN 300457, CHINA
TLX: 23719 BOCTG CN
TEL: (0086) 022-5321445
FAX: (0086) 022-5321445
POSTCODE: 300457

TIBET*

TIBET BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
QIONG ZHUOMA

25 LIN KUO XI LU, LHASA 850000,
TIBET*, CHINA
TLX: 56008 LSBOC CN
TEL: (0086) 0891-6445078
FAX: (0086) 0891-6332908
POSTCODE: 850000

XINJIANG UIGUR*

XINJIANG BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
KANG MEI

443 BEFANG NAN LU,
URUMQI 830002,
XINJIANG UIGUR*, CHINA
TLX: 79170 BOCXJ CN
TEL: (0086) 0991-2829619
FAX: (0086) 0991-2829619
POSTCODE: 830002

KASHI SUB-BRANCH

56 RENMIN XILU, KASHI 844000,
XINJIANG UIGUR*, CHINA
TLX: 71215 BOCKS CN
TEL: (0086) 0998-2228545
FAX: (0086) 0998-2228545
POSTCODE: 844000

YUNNAN PROVINCE

YUNNAN BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
LI YONGXONG

148 BEIJING ROAD,
KUNMING 650051,
YUNNAN PROV., CHINA
TLX: 64054 KMBNK CN
TEL: (0086) 0871-3175555
FAX: (0086) 0871-3188976
POSTCODE: 650051

ZHEJIANG PROVINCE

ZHEJIANG BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
SHEN [illegible]

320 YANAN ROAD [illegible]ZHOU
310006, ZHEJIANG [illegible] CHINA
TLX: 35[illegible] BOCHZ [illegible]
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: 310006

NINGBO BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
ZHUANG TIANWEN

175 JIE FANG NAN [illegible]AD, NINGBO
315010, ZHEJIANG [illegible] CHINA
TLX: 37[illegible] NBBOC [illegible]
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: 315010

HANGZHOU BRANCH

GENERAL MANAGER
WANG BINNAN

5 XIAO NU ROAD, HANGZHOU
310006, ZHEJIANG [illegible] CHINA
TLX: 35[illegible] BOCHW [illegible]
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: 310006

SHAOXING BRANCH

92 RENMIN ROAD WEST, SHAOXING
312000, ZHEJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 37129 BOCSX CN
TEL: (0086) 0575-5[illegible]
FAX: (0086) 0575-5[illegible]
POSTCODE: 312000

WENZHOU BRANCH

113 CHAN STREET, WENZHOU 325000,
ZHEJIANG PROV., CHINA
TLX: 37110 WZBOC CN
TEL: [illegible]
FAX: [illegible]
POSTCODE: 325[illegible]

* REFERS TO AUTONOMOUS REGION

Major members of BOC Group in Hong Kong and Macau

BANK OF CHINA HONG KONG-MACAU REGIONAL OFFICE
CHIEF EXECUTIVE
YANG ZIJIN
14 F. BOC TOWER, 1 GARDEN RD., HONG KONG
TEL: (852) 2526111
FAX: (852) 2577 0966

BANK OF CHINA HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
YANG ZIJIN
FIRST DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER
LIANG MAOTING
BOC TOWER, 1 GARDEN RD., HK
TLX: 75772 BKCHI HX
TEL: (852) 2526988
FAX: (852) 2105963

BANK OF CHINA MACAU BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
WANG ZHEN JUN
BANK OF CHINA BUILDING, AVENIDA DOUTOR MARIO SOARES, MACAU
TLX: 88251 BKCHI OM
TEL: (853) 751828
FAX: (853) 751833

NANYANG COMMERCIAL BANK LTD.
GENERAL MANAGER
LI JIWEN
151, DES VOEUX RD. CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 73412 NANHO HX
TEL: (852) 28520888
FAX: (852) 28153333

KWANGTUNG PROVINCIAL BANK HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
ZHENG BAILIN
EURO TRADE CENTRE 13-14 CONNAUGHT RD. CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 83654 PROVL HX
TEL: (852) 2541040
FAX: (852) 2545032

SIN HUA BANK LTD. HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
WU JUNSHENG
134-136, DES VOEUX RD CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 75436 SINHU HX
TEL: (852) 2636388
FAX: (852) 2634 2506

CHINA & SOUTH SEA BANK LTD.HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
NG LEUNGSING
22-26 BONHAM STRAND EAST, HK
TLX: 75354 CASH HX
TEL: (852) 2542929
FAX: (852) 2541024 2

KINCHENG BANKING CORP. HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
SUN HONGKAY
55, DES VOEUX RD., CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 73405 KCBK HX
TEL: (852) 2843222
FAX: (852) 2845016

CHINA STATE BANK LTD. HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
CHEN SHUBIAO
CHINA STATE BANK BLDG. 39-41 DES VOEUX RD. CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 73410 KHWAB HX
TEL: (852) 2841933
FAX: (852) 2845084

NATIONAL COMMERCIAL BANK LTD. HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
LIN MING LIANG
1-5, WYNDHAM ST. CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 83491 HX
TEL: (852) 2843888
FAX: (852) 2810634

YIEN YIEH COMMERCIAL BANK LTD. HK BR
GENERAL MANAGER
WU GUO RUI
242-252, DES VOEUX RD., CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 83542 YCB HX
TEL: (852) 2541001
FAX: (852) 2541037

PO SANG BANK LTD.
GENERAL MANAGER
GAO JILU
71, DES VOEUX RD.,CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 75104 PSB HX
TEL: (852) 2845011
FAX: (852) 2810112

HUA CHIAO COMMERCIAL BANK LTD.
GENERAL MANAGER
SO YUEN HING
88-98, DES VOEUX RDCENTRAL, HK
TLX: 83502 HCCB HX
TEL: (852) 2542888
FAX: (852) 2543035

CHIYU BANKING CORP LTD.
GENERAL MANAGER
NG MAN KUNG
78, DES VOEUX RD. CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 83468 CHIYU HX
TEL: (852) 2845011
FAX: (852) 2810620

BANK OF COMMUNICATIONS HK BR.
GENERAL MANAGER
YANG LIANKUI
2, PEDDER STREET, CENTRAL, HK
TLX: 73401 COMBK HX
TEL: (852) 2841611
FAX: (852) 2810093

Major Overseas Networks

ASIA-PACIFIC REGION
Hong Kong

SINGAPORE BRANCH
GENERAL MANAGER
ZHOU ZHIGONG
9 BATTERY ROAD, SINGAPORE 049908
TLX: RS 23040 BKCHINA
TEL: (65) 5352411
FAX: (65) 5343401

SOUTH SUB-BRANCH
20 MAXWELL ROAD #01-02 MAXWELL HOUSE, SINGAPORE 069113
TEL: (65) 2234600
FAX: (65) 2236601

NORTH SUB-BRANCH
112 MIDDLE ROAD #01-00 MIDLAND HOUSE, SINGAPORE 188970
TEL: (65) 3382595
FAX: (65) 3382165

KATONG SUB-BRANCH
288-290 EAST COAST ROAD SINGAPORE 428894
TEL: (65) 4402440
FAX: (65) 3440735

SYDNEY BRANCH
GENERAL MANAGER
CHEN FUGEN
LEVEL 12, 39-41 YORK STREET, SYDNEY N.S.W. 2000 AUSTRALIA
TLX: 177033 BOCSYD AA
TEL: (612) 9267 5188
FAX: (612) 9267 1794

HAYMARKET BRANCH
66-1 GEORGE STREET SYDNEY N.S.W. 2000 AUSTRALIA
TLX: 177033 BOCSYD AA
TEL: (612) 2128777
FAX: (612) 2128962

MELBOURNE BRANCH
27 QUEEN STREET MELBOURNE VIC 3000 AUSTRALIA
TLX: 30062 BOCMLB
TEL: (613) 9602 3655
FAX: (612) 9602 3883

TOKYO BRANCH
GENERAL MANAGER
MENG QINGFU
BOC BLDG 3-4-1AKASAKA MINATO-KU TOKYO 107, JAPAN
TLX: 02522076 BOCTKJ
TEL: (813) 35058018
FAX: (813) 35058066

OSAKA BRANCH
BOC BLDG 1-1-55 KITAHORIE NISHI-KU, OSAKA 550 JAPAN
TLX: 05222568 BOCOSJ
TEL: (816) 5309666
FAX: (816) 5381177

Mr. BURTON. I want to end this hearing by thanking Mr. Wang. It has been a long day for you and for your counsel. We really appreciate your hard work in coming out here and your patience. And I want to also thank your interpreter, your translator, and your other counsel as well. Thank you very much. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 6:50 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]