

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### THE PARDONS OF MARC RICH AND PINCUS GREEN

**Marc Rich and Pincus Green have a history of illegal and corrupt business dealings contrary to the security interests of the United States.**

- *Rich and Green have had extensive trade with terrorist states and other enemies of the United States.* Despite clear legal restrictions on such trade, Rich and Green have engaged in commodities trading with Iraq, Iran, Cuba, and other rogue states which have sponsored terrorist acts. By engaging in these activities, Marc Rich and Pincus Green demonstrated contempt for American laws, as well as the well-being of Americans who were harmed or threatened by these states.
- *The Central Intelligence Agency provided the following declassified information about Marc Rich to the Committee.*

If President Clinton had checked with the CIA, he would have learned that Marc Rich had been the subject of inquiries by various foreign government liaison services and domestic government agencies regarding their ongoing investigations of criminal activity.

In addition, President Clinton would have received information worthy of his consideration in making his decision on the pardon. This information cannot be declassified.

**Marc Rich and Pincus Green were guilty of serious crimes and showed contempt for the American justice system.**

- *Marc Rich and Pincus Green attempted to obstruct the criminal investigation of them in every way imaginable, including attempting to smuggle subpoenaed documents out of the country.* Rich and Green's tactics resulted in a record-setting contempt fine against them, totaling \$21 million. Despite these tactics, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York was able to indict Marc Rich and Pincus Green on 51 counts of illegal activity, including tax evasion, mail fraud, wire fraud, and racketeering. The evidence against them was overwhelming.
- *Because of the strength of the case against them, Marc Rich and Pincus Green fled the country rather than face trial.* Rich's own lawyer told him that by fleeing the country, Rich had "spit on the American flag" and that "whatever you get, you deserve." For the 17 years leading up to his pardon, Marc Rich was one of America's 10 most wanted international fugitives. Although Jack Quinn, Rich's attorney, argued that Rich did not flee the United States to avoid prosecution, Rich's ex-wife refuted this view, stating that Rich told her that "I'm having tax problems with the government . . . and I think that we are going to have to leave."

- *In order to avoid extradition or apprehension by United States law enforcement, Marc Rich and Pincus Green attempted to renounce their United States citizenship. While this attempt was rejected by the United States, it demonstrated that Rich and Green had no loyalty to the United States, and viewed their citizenship as a liability to be discarded at will.*

**Rich and Green's crimes were so serious that for seventeen years, the U.S. government devoted considerable resources to apprehending them and closing down their business activities.**

- *Rich and Green were such high-profile fugitives that on a number of occasions in the 1980s and 1990s, the United States Marshals Service attempted to arrest them in various foreign countries. A number of countries from the United Kingdom to Russia attempted to assist the United States in these efforts. The pardons of Rich and Green have sent a message that individuals can go from the FBI's most wanted list to a Presidential pardon if they spend money and have the proper connections. This message undermines U.S. efforts to apprehend fugitives abroad.*
- *Rich and Green were such high-profile fugitives that in 1991, the Government Reform Committee, under Democratic leadership, held a number of hearings, and issued two reports about the government's efforts to apprehend Rich and Green. At that time, Democrats and Republicans in Congress took the Bush Administration to task for not being aggressive enough in hunting down Rich and Green, or shutting down their business interests in the U.S.*
- *While Rich and Green were fugitives from justice, the American government took a number of actions against their interests in the U.S. The federal government seized Rich's assets, and shut down his trade in metals and grain with the government.*

**The United States government repeatedly tried to reach a plea agreement with Rich and Green.**

- For a number of years after Rich and Green fled the country, the U.S. government attempted to negotiate a plea bargain to settle the case. The government made a number of concessions in an attempt to reach a deal, but all offers were rebuffed by Rich and Green, who would not agree to any deal that resulted in jail time. While lobbying for a pardon, Jack Quinn and Rich's other lawyers claimed that the Justice Department had not even negotiated with Rich, and therefore, that a pardon was justified. Quinn and the other lawyers were misleading the White House when they made these claims.

**Jack Quinn misled the White House about the Rich case, and attempted to mislead the Committee and the public regarding his work for Marc Rich.**

- *Marc Rich hired Jack Quinn after a recommendation from Eric Holder. After numerous failed attempts to have his case settled, Marc Rich hired Jack Quinn to represent him. Quinn was hired after a recommendation from Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder. Gershon Kekst, who worked for Marc Rich on the pardon matter, asked Holder for a recommendation of how to settle a criminal matter with the Justice Department. Holder recommended that he*

hire a Washington lawyer “who knows the process, he comes to me, and we work it out.” Holder then explicitly recommended the hiring of Jack Quinn. While Holder did not know that Kekst was referring to Marc Rich, it suggests that Holder was favorably disposed to Jack Quinn, and would be very receptive to arguments made by Quinn, no matter how baseless they were.

- *Marc Rich was going to pay Jack Quinn for his work on the pardon.* After the Marc Rich pardon was granted, Jack Quinn claimed that he was not being paid by Rich for his work on the pardon, and that he expected no future payment for his work on the pardon. However, the Committee has uncovered evidence that Robert Fink, a lawyer close to Marc Rich, had discussions with Rich and Quinn about paying Quinn for his work on the Rich pardon. Documents which Quinn and Fink withheld from the Committee for over a year, and which were produced only after a federal judge ordered them produced to a grand jury, shed further light on the contemplated payment of Quinn. These documents indicate that Quinn raised the question of his “status” with Rich, and asked that Rich pay him a \$50,000 per month retainer. The Committee attempted to interview Quinn about these documents, but Quinn refused to meet with Committee staff.
- *Jack Quinn may have been attempting to receive money from Marc Rich after the pardons were granted.* At the Committee’s February 8, 2001, hearing, Quinn pledged that “I will not bill [Rich], and I will not accept any further compensation for work done on the pardon.” This pledge surprised Rich’s lawyer, who expected that Rich would be paying Quinn for his work. Indeed, records just produced to the Committee indicate that Quinn may have been attempting to negotiate some payment from Marc Rich shortly after he pledged that he would not take additional money for his work. A March 5, 2001, e-mail from Quinn to Rich states “If you are agreeable, and I hope you are, I need to fax to you in the next few days a new retainer agreement.” This e-mail raises the possibility that Quinn has been attempting to obtain payments from Rich, in possible violation of his pledge to the Committee. The Committee attempted to interview Quinn about this matter, but he refused.
- *Jack Quinn’s work on the Rich pardon was in apparent violation of Executive Order 12834.* That executive order was enacted as part of President Clinton’s promise to create “the most ethical administration in history,” and it prohibited former executive branch employees from lobbying their former executive branch agencies within five years of their departure. Quinn has claimed that his work on the Rich pardon came within an exception for “communicating . . . with regard to a . . . criminal . . . law enforcement inquiry, investigation or proceeding[.]” However, this exception was clearly intended to apply to appearances before courts, not lobbying the White House for a pardon. The “revolving door” lobbying ban was intended to apply exactly to cases like this, where a former White House Counsel could come back and lobby the President to take an action that had no constitutional limits on it, largely based on the President’s personal trust for that former staffer.
- *The pardon petition compiled by Jack Quinn and the other Marc Rich lawyers was highly misleading.* Most of the arguments used by Jack Quinn to justify the Rich and Green pardons were false and misleading. These arguments could have been completely refuted if anyone in the White House had sought out any of the prosecutors familiar with the Rich case.

- *The “letters of support” in the pardon petition were used in a misleading manner.* Another key element of the Rich pardon petition was a number of letters of support for Rich and Green from prominent Americans and Israelis. Rich and Green used these letters to try to show that their humanitarian activities justified their pardons. However, many of these letters were obtained under false pretenses, and the writers of the letters were not told that they were being used to obtain a Presidential pardon. In addition, a number of individuals who wrote in support of Rich and Green received large amounts of money from them.

**Marc Rich and Pincus Green used a number of different individuals with close personal relationships with President Clinton and his staff to lobby regarding the pardon.**

- *The role of Denise Rich.* Denise Rich played a key role in obtaining the Rich and Green pardons. Denise Rich had a close relationship with President Clinton, which was based in part on her role as a large-scale contributor to Democratic causes and the Clinton library, and in part on her extensive personal contacts with President Clinton. The \$450,000 given by Denise Rich to the Clinton Library was an early and large contribution. Denise Rich used her relationship with President Clinton to lobby for the Marc Rich pardon on a number of occasions. She has refused to cooperate with the Committee, invoking her Fifth Amendment rights rather than answer questions about her role in the pardon.
- *The role of Beth Dozoretz.* Beth Dozoretz, another close friend of President Clinton, played a key role in obtaining the Rich pardon. Like Denise Rich, Beth Dozoretz had a relationship with President Clinton built on personal ties and political fundraising. Dozoretz has raised and contributed millions of dollars for the Democratic party, and has pledged to raise an additional million dollars for the Clinton library. Beth Dozoretz also has close relationships with Denise Rich and Jack Quinn. Dozoretz used her close relationship with President Clinton to lobby for the Rich pardon. Because Dozoretz has invoked her Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination, the Committee is unable to conclude whether or not Dozoretz made any linkage between contributions to the DNC or the Clinton library and the granting of the Rich pardon.
- *The role of Prime Minister Ehud Barak.* Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak spoke to President Clinton three times about the Rich pardon. In his public statements about the Rich pardon, President Clinton has pointed to these conversations with Prime Minister Barak as one of the primary reasons he granted the pardon. However an examination of the transcripts of the calls shows that Barak did not make a particularly impassioned plea for Rich. Therefore, it appears that the President may be attempting to use Prime Minister Barak’s interest in the Rich matter as a cover for his own motivations for granting the Rich pardon.
- *Barak had met with Rich personally, and told Clinton that the Rich pardon “could be important . . . not just financially, but he helped Mossad on more than one case.”* Barak’s statement raises the possibility that either Barak or Clinton acted on the Rich matter because of some promise of future financial return.

**Eric Holder and Jack Quinn worked together to cut the Justice Department out of the decisionmaking process. Holder's decision to support the pardon had a critical impact.**

- *Jack Quinn and Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder worked together to ensure that the Justice Department, especially the prosecutors of the Southern District of New York, did not have an opportunity to express an opinion on the Rich pardon before it was granted. The evidence amassed by the Committee indicates that Holder advised Quinn to file the Rich pardon petition with the White House, and leave the Justice Department out of the process. One e-mail produced to the Committee suggests that Holder told Quinn to “go straight to wh,” and that the “timing is good.” The evidence also indicates that Holder failed to inform the prosecutors under him that the Rich pardon was under consideration, despite the fact that he was aware of the pardon effort for almost two months before it was granted.*
- *Eric Holder's support of the Rich pardon played a critical role in the success of the pardon effort. Holder informed the White House that he was “neutral, leaning towards favorable” on the Rich pardon, even though he knew that Rich was a fugitive from justice, and that Justice Department prosecutors viewed Rich with such contempt that they would no longer meet with his lawyers. Holder has failed to offer any credible justification for his support of the Rich pardon, leading the Committee to believe that Holder had other motivations for his decision, which he has failed to share with the Committee.*
- *Eric Holder was seeking Jack Quinn's support to be appointed as Attorney General in a potential Gore Administration, and this may have affected Holder's judgment in the Rich matter. On several occasions, Holder sought out Quinn's endorsement to be appointed as Attorney General if Al Gore were to win the November 2000 election. Quinn was a Gore confidant whose endorsement would carry great weight. Holder's initial help to Quinn in the Rich matter predated the Supreme Court's decision in *Bush v. Gore*, and accordingly, Holder had some legitimate prospect of being appointed Attorney General when he was helping Quinn keep the Rich matter from the Justice Department's scrutiny. While Holder denies that his desire to be appointed Attorney General had anything to do with his actions in the Rich matter, it provides a much clearer and more believable motivation than any offered by Holder to date.*

**President Clinton made his decision knowing almost nothing about the Rich case, making a number of mistaken assumptions, and reaching false conclusions.**

- *The White House never consulted with the prosecutors in the Southern District of New York regarding the Rich case. As a result, the White House staff was never able to refute the false and misleading arguments made in the Marc Rich pardon petition.*
- *Every White House staff member who was working on the Rich pardon opposed it. However, because they failed to do the necessary background research on the Rich case, they were unable to refute the arguments made by Jack Quinn.*
- *President Clinton was misled by Jack Quinn in their negotiations regarding the Rich pardon. Late in the evening of January 19, 2001, President Clinton and Jack Quinn had a telephone*

discussion regarding the Rich pardon. During this conversation, Quinn repeated his usual misleading arguments about the Rich case. Quinn also offered to make his clients subject to civil liability for their actions. In furtherance of this offer, Quinn agreed to waive all statute of limitations and other defenses, which Rich and Green would have as a result of their fugitivity. President Clinton has cited this waiver as a key factor in his decision to grant the pardons. However, if President Clinton or his staff had done even cursory legal research, they would have understood that this was a hollow, meaningless deal. First, Quinn agreed to waive defenses that Rich and Green did not have. It is basic legal doctrine that fugitivity tolls the statute of limitations. Second, Rich and Green likely do not face any civil liability for their crimes, since those fines were already paid by their companies. Third, Rich and Green had been willing to pay \$100 million to settle their case for years. A fine, even a large one, would have had no impact on Rich and Green, and it would merely stand for the proposition that the U.S. justice system is for sale.

- *When the White House did finally provide the names of Marc Rich and Pincus Green for a Justice Department background check in the middle of the night on January 19, 2001, the check turned up new, troubling information which was disregarded by President Clinton. When the White House requested the Justice Department to perform a computer background check on Rich and Green prior to granting the pardons, the check came back with information that they were wanted for “arms trading.” This was new information for all of the White House staff, and it raised serious questions among them as to whether the pardons should be granted. However, the only step the White House took to check on this allegation was to call Jack Quinn. Quinn predictably denied that his clients were involved in arms trading. Faced with this conflicting information about Rich and Green, President Clinton instructed his staff to “take Jack’s word,” and issue the pardons.*

**President Clinton has failed to offer a full accounting for his decision to issue the Marc Rich and Pincus Green pardons.**

- *President Clinton has failed to answer any questions about the Rich and Green pardons. The few statements that he has issued have been misleading, incomplete, and raised more questions than they answered. Given his complete failure to explain the pardons, the Committee is left with serious unanswered questions regarding President Clinton’s motives.*

**ROGER CLINTON’S EFFORTS TO LOBBY FOR EXECUTIVE CLEMENCY**

**Roger Clinton engaged in a systematic effort to trade on his brother’s name during the Clinton Administration.**

- *President Clinton encouraged Roger Clinton to capitalize on their relationship. At the beginning of his second term, President Clinton instructed Roger Clinton to use his connections to the Administration to gain financial advantage. According to the lawyer for former Arkansas State Senator George Locke: “Roger related that Bill Clinton had instructed him that since this was his last term in office, Roger should find a way to make a living and use his relationship with the President to his advantage.” By suggesting that Roger Clinton*

exploit his name, Bill Clinton encouraged the conduct described in this chapter. Roger Clinton apparently took this advice to heart, telling one person from whom he solicited money that he and the President “had only four years to get things done” and that they did not care “about ethics or what appearances were.”

- *Roger Clinton received substantial sums of money from foreign governments solely because he was the President's brother.* When the FBI interviewed him, Roger Clinton admitted that since the beginning of the Clinton Administration, he had received substantial sums of money from foreign governments. Clinton told the FBI that “he knows he receives these invitations [to make paid appearances in foreign countries] strictly because he is the First Brother of the President of the United States.” Clinton also informed the FBI that in addition to receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars for musical performances from foreign governments, he also received money for President Clinton from foreign governments. Roger Clinton told the FBI that he had to be instructed repeatedly by the President or White House staff that the President was not permitted to receive cash from foreign governments.
- *Roger Clinton received at least \$335,000 in unexplained travelers checks, many of which were purchased overseas and likely imported illegally.* The Committee uncovered at least \$335,000 in travelers checks deposited in Roger Clinton's bank account. Most of these travelers checks originated overseas, largely from Taiwan, South Korea, and Venezuela. The travelers checks were not restrictively endorsed by the purchaser but were instead given to Roger Clinton blank. This method of transferring large sums of money to Roger Clinton appears designed to conceal the fact that the funds originated overseas and probably violated criminal statutes requiring reports of the importation of monetary instruments. Roger Clinton has refused to provide the Committee with any explanation of why he received these funds. These suspicious transactions require a complete and thorough investigation by law enforcement authorities, especially in light of his admissions to the FBI about receiving money from foreign governments.
- *Roger Clinton likely violated federal law by failing to register as required under the Lobbying Disclosure Act.* One company paid Roger Clinton \$30,000 to lobby President Clinton and others to loosen government restrictions on travel to Cuba. Although his activity appears to meet the criteria outlined in the statute for those required to disclose their contacts with covered executive branch officials, Roger Clinton did not register as a lobbyist and did not disclose his paid lobbying contacts with his brother. His failure to register, therefore, needs to be investigated carefully and completely by the Department of Justice.
- *Roger Clinton participated in a plot to obtain a \$35,000 per month contract in exchange for delivering a cabinet secretary to a speaking event.* The FBI briefly investigated Roger Clinton's involvement in a scheme with Arkansas lawyer Larry Wallace to pressure John Katopodis, promoter of an Alabama airport project. Clinton and Wallace attempted to obtain a \$35,000 per month contract in exchange for Clinton's promise to ensure that Secretary of Transportation Rodney Slater would speak at a conference sponsored by Katopodis' organization of local governments. When Katopodis refused to pay and Slater subsequently refused to acknowledge the invitation, Katopodis suspected that Clinton and Wallace were to

blame. Wallace had told him that his project would remain at a standstill until Katopodis “showed him the money.”

**Roger Clinton lobbied for the release from prison of Rosario Gambino, a notorious heroin dealer and organized crime figure.**

- *Rosario Gambino was a major drug trafficker.* Rosario Gambino has been convicted in the United States and Italy of heroin trafficking. Before being sentenced to 45 years in federal prison, Gambino associated with known members of organized crime both in Italy and the United States. His associates have described him as a member of the Sicilian Mafia. When his brothers were convicted of racketeering, murder, illegal gambling, loan sharking, and heroin trafficking in 1994, witnesses described them as “the main link between Mafia heroin traffickers in Sicily and the American Mafia.”
- *Roger Clinton received at least \$50,000 from the Gambino family, and he expected to receive more if he succeeded in getting Rosario Gambino out of prison.* Tommaso “Tommy” Gambino, the son of Rosario Gambino, approached Roger Clinton to help win the release of Rosario Gambino from prison. Tommy Gambino promised Roger Clinton a substantial financial reward if he was successful. Even though he never was successful, Tommy Gambino provided Roger Clinton with \$50,000, a gold Rolex watch, and an undisclosed amount of “expense money.”
- *Roger Clinton attempted to use his relationship to the President to influence the decisionmaking of the United States Parole Commission (“USPC”).* Roger Clinton lobbied the Parole Commission to grant parole to Gambino. While lobbying Parole Commission staff, Roger Clinton informed them that President Clinton was aware of his efforts on behalf of Rosario Gambino and that the President had suggested that he contact the Parole Commission members directly. Although the Commission staff tried to insulate the Commissioners from undue influence, Roger Clinton clearly attempted to use his relationship to the President to influence the Commission improperly and win Gambino’s release.
- *The Chief of Staff of the Parole Commission hindered the FBI’s investigation.* In 1998, the FBI began investigating Roger Clinton’s contacts with the Parole Commission. However, it met resistance from Marie Raghianti, the Chief of Staff of the Parole Commission. Raghianti, who had participated in meetings with Roger Clinton on the Gambino case, objected to the FBI investigation and successfully halted an FBI plan to have an undercover agent meet with Clinton posing as a Parole Commission staffer. She also attempted to keep the FBI from recording a meeting between Roger Clinton and a Parole Commission staffer. Raghianti’s efforts may have kept the FBI from reaching a full understanding of Roger Clinton’s involvement in the Gambino case.
- *Roger Clinton lied to FBI agents investigating his contacts with the Parole Commission and his relationship with the Gambino family.* When interviewed by the FBI in 1999, Roger Clinton said that he had never represented to anyone at the Parole Commission that the President was aware of his contacts with the Commission on behalf of Rosario Gambino. This self-serving claim is contradicted by contemporaneous, written memoranda detailing

Clinton's contacts as well as by the vivid and credible recollections of Parole Commission staff. Clinton also lied about the purpose of a \$50,000 check from the Gambinos, which he deposited on the day of the FBI's interview. While it is unclear whether he deposited the check before or after the interview, Clinton told the agents that Tommy Gambino had offered to loan him money for a down payment on his house. He repeated this explanation to the media when news of the money became public in 2001. However, after reviewing both Clinton's and Gambino's bank records, the Committee has found no evidence that Clinton used the \$50,000 for a down payment or that he ever repaid any of the money. Accordingly, his claim to the FBI that the money was merely a loan is false. During his interview, Clinton also told the FBI agents three separate and contradictory stories in response to questions about his receipt of a Rolex watch from Tommy Gambino before finally producing a Rolex to the agents and claiming he had bought it in Tijuana, Mexico.

- *Roger Clinton apparently lobbied the White House to grant a commutation to Rosario Gambino.* In the last days of the Clinton Administration — after Roger Clinton had failed to win parole for Rosario Gambino and after he had received a Rolex watch and \$50,000 from the Gambino family — the White House received a petition for commutation for Rosario Gambino. Documents indicate that the White House lawyer responsible for clemency matters requested a criminal background check on Gambino, which is normally done when some serious consideration is being given to a grant of clemency. The obvious and logical inference that explains how the Gambino petition garnered that level of attention at the White House is that Roger Clinton was pushing for it. Because key Clinton White House staff have refused to answer questions about this matter, it is unknown whether Roger Clinton hand-delivered the Gambino petition as he did with others or whether he brought it to the attention of the White House some other way. Although the President did not ultimately grant clemency to Gambino, the circumstances surrounding the consideration of his petition are nevertheless suspect. The fact that granting clemency to a mobster and confirmed criminal like Gambino was considered at all is disturbing enough, but the reason it was considered is even more offensive. The Gambino family was apparently able to purchase access to the parole and clemency processes with cash payments and expensive gifts to the brother of the President of the United States. Moreover, despite an FBI investigation of the matter, the Justice Department has, to date, been unwilling or unable to prosecute Clinton for any of his activities.

**Roger Clinton received a substantial portion of \$225,000 that was swindled from the Lincecum family in Clinton's name with the promise of a pardon that never came.**

- *The Lincecum family paid \$225,000 to obtain a pardon for Garland Lincecum.* In 1998, Garland Lincecum, a convicted felon, was informed that he could purchase a presidential pardon for \$300,000. Lincecum was told that Arkansas businessmen Dickey Morton and George Locke, who had a close relationship with Roger Clinton, could obtain the pardon. Lincecum borrowed \$225,000 from his mother and brother and claims that a business associate paid another \$70,000 to Morton and Locke for his pardon. The money he borrowed from his family constituted their life savings and means of support in retirement.

- *Roger Clinton received at least \$43,500 in proceeds from the Lincecums' payments to Morton and Locke.* Dickey Morton, George Locke, and Roger Clinton divided the funds among themselves with Roger Clinton receiving a total of \$25,500 in checks and \$18,000 in cash. The Lincecums paid the checks to a company called CLM, which they were told stands for Clinton, Locke, and Morton. Dickey Morton then disbursed the funds from the company's bank account to Clinton, Locke, and himself. Roger Clinton has falsely denied any relationship with CLM while offering no explanation of why he received this substantial share of an elderly woman's retirement savings through CLM.
- *Roger Clinton may have been involved in a scheme to defraud the Lincecums.* Garland Lincecum never received a pardon, and there is no evidence that Dickey Morton, George Locke, or Roger Clinton ever submitted Lincecum's name to the Justice Department or White House for consideration for a pardon. Therefore, it appears that the Lincecums were the victims of a scam perpetrated by Morton, Locke, and perhaps Roger Clinton as well.

**Roger Clinton may have been involved in lobbying for as many as 13 other pardons and commutations.**

- *Roger Clinton publicly admitted involvement in six clemency efforts, but the evidence connects him to many more.* Roger Clinton told the media that he had asked for pardons for approximately six close friends and that he did so because of concern for them and not for any personal gain. For example, Roger Clinton lobbied for pardons for George Locke and Dan Lasater, two associates from Arkansas who were convicted of drug offenses together with Clinton himself in the 1980s. However, the Committee has obtained evidence connecting Clinton to many more pardon seekers. Some of the cases involve people who were not his personal friends and some involve solicitations or offers of money and lucrative business opportunities in exchange for his ability to place a clemency petition in front of the President.
- *Roger Clinton was asked to lobby for a pardon for horse breeder J.T. Lundy in exchange for secretly sharing profits in a lucrative business venture.* Lundy promised Clinton a share of the profits from a Venezuelan coal deal in exchange for Clinton's help in obtaining a pardon for him. Lundy suggested a scheme whereby the payments to Clinton could be concealed by placing his share of the profits in Dan Lasater's name. Lasater, who owned a 20 percent interest in the venture, discussed the possibility of a pardon for Lundy with Roger Clinton.
- *Roger Clinton delivered the pardon petition of former Reagan EPA official Rita Lavelle to the White House.* According to Lavelle, an intermediary for Roger Clinton asked her for a \$30,000 fee for him to hand-carry her petition to the President. Lavelle responded that she could not afford to pay any money, but she said Clinton agreed to deliver the petition anyway. On the last night of the Clinton presidency, Roger Clinton asked Lavelle "do you have \$100,000 to get this through?" Being bankrupt, however, Lavelle laughed at the question. She did not pay Clinton any money and did not receive a pardon.
- *Roger Clinton was asked to lobby for a pardon for Houston Real Estate Developer John Ballis, and Ballis' petition was seriously considered at the White House.* After being

convicted of S&L fraud, Ballis married a former employee of Dan Lasater and friend of Roger Clinton. Through his wife's connection, Ballis sought Roger Clinton's help. Clinton first lobbied for Ballis before the U.S. Parole Commission, sometimes during the same meetings in which he lobbied for mobster Rosario Gambino. Ballis credited Clinton with helping him obtain early release and sought his help in obtaining a presidential pardon to eliminate his parole supervision and restitution payments. While he was not granted any form of clemency, the President reviewed his petition, and a White House lawyer called Ballis' lawyer two nights before inauguration day to ask if Ballis would accept a grant of clemency that left intact his obligation to pay restitution.

- *Roger Clinton lobbied his brother to grant clemency to Steven Griggs, the son of the chief of an unrecognized American Indian tribe, who was in prison on drug charges.* Like Ballis, Steven Griggs was not a close friend of Roger Clinton's but merely someone who knew someone who knew him. Griggs also did not receive clemency, but Roger Clinton helped ensure that Griggs' petition was brought to the attention of the President even though Griggs had been a fugitive for a year before being sentenced. Griggs argued in his petition that he had received an unusually harsh sentence but failed to mention that he had fled after his conviction. It is not clear what motivated Roger Clinton to assist Griggs, but some evidence suggests that the tribe may have planned to open a casino when and if it were to become recognized by the federal government.
- According to his former lawyer, Arkansas restaurant operator Phillip Young was approached with an offer to obtain a pardon through Roger Clinton for \$30,000. While Young denied to Committee staff that he was actually approached by anyone with such a proposal, his denial is not as credible as his former attorney's version of events.

**Both the White House and the Justice Department hindered the Committee's investigation of Roger Clinton by improperly refusing to produce key documents.**

- *For months, the Bush White House prevented the National Archives from producing even non-deliberative, clemency-related records from the Clinton administration.* The Committee did not learn that President Clinton had been considering a clemency petition from notorious mobster Rosario Gambino until after Archives personnel "inadvertently" produced documents that President Bush's Counsel had sought to withhold. The accidental production also included documents relating to three other previously unknown individuals who had sought clemency through Roger Clinton. The Bush Administration did manage to retain four additional deliberative Gambino documents from the files of the Clinton White House, refusing to produce the records even though they were not subject to any executive privilege claim.
- *The Ashcroft Justice Department produced certain Gambino-related records, but inexplicably withheld others.* After producing sensitive documents such as U.S. Parole Commission files related to Rosario Gambino and a summary of an FBI interview with Roger Clinton, the Justice Department ceased producing additional documents, claiming they were related to an ongoing criminal investigation, even though the Clinton-Gambino matter had reportedly been closed in 2000.

## **HUGH RODHAM'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE VIGNALI COMMUTATION**

### **Vignali's clemency petition was false and misleading.**

- *Carlos Vignali lied in his clemency petition.* First, he continued to maintain his innocence, despite overwhelming evidence of his involvement in selling a substantial amount of cocaine across state lines and a specific finding by the sentencing judge that he lied at trial about his involvement in a large drug distribution network. Second, Vignali claimed that he was a first-time offender, despite the fact that he had a prior criminal record. By not accepting responsibility for his crime and lying about his background, he should not have been eligible for executive clemency.

### **Vignali's supporters provided letters of support which were false and misleading.**

- *A key element of the campaign by Carlos Vignali and his father Horacio Vignali, was a series of letters on Carlos' behalf from prominent Los Angeles politicians.* A number of these letters contained misleading statements calculated to create the impression that Carlos Vignali was innocent. The officials who submitted letters included Representative Xavier Becerra, Representative Esteban Torres, State Assembly Speaker Robert Hertzberg, State Assembly member Antonio Villaraigosa, State Senator Richard Polanco, Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina, Los Angeles City Councilmember Mike Hernandez, and Cardinal Roger Mahony, Archbishop of Los Angeles.

### **Los Angeles County Sheriff Lee Baca provided critical support for the Vignali commutation, which was inappropriate, given his position.**

- *Sheriff Baca had a close relationship with Horacio Vignali which was based on Vignali's political and financial support for Baca.* Sheriff Baca has known Horacio Vignali since 1991, and Vignali has been a key political supporter of Baca, giving him at least \$11,000 in contributions, and raising between \$60,000-\$70,000 more.
- *Sheriff Baca spoke with the White House in support of the Vignali commutation.* In January 2001, Baca received a telephone call from Hugh Rodham in which Rodham told Baca that he would get a call from the White House about Horacio Vignali. Shortly thereafter, Baca received a call from White House staff, and spoke in support of Horacio Vignali. Based on Baca's statements in this telephone call, White House staff clearly and justifiably concluded that Baca supported the commutation of Carlos Vignali's sentence.
- *Sheriff Baca continues to claim, without any basis, that he did not support the Vignali commutation.* Rather than express regret for his role in the Vignali commutation, Sheriff Baca maintains that he opposed the Vignali commutation, and did nothing that could have been interpreted as support for the commutation. However, Sheriff Baca's supposed opposition to the Vignali commutation does not square with the fact that: (1) he drafted a letter which he believed Horacio Vignali would use in the clemency effort; and (2) when he was asked squarely by the White House if the President should commute Vignali's prison

sentence, he stated that it was “the President’s decision to make,” rather than express his opposition. These facts, and others outlined in this report indicate that Sheriff Baca wanted to support the Vignali commutation, but was afraid of creating a paper record which would clearly indicate his support.

- *Sheriff Baca’s efforts on behalf of the Vignalis are even more inappropriate given that there were extensive allegations that Horacio Vignali, Carlos’ father, was also involved in illegal drug trafficking.* It is inappropriate enough for a senior law enforcement official like Baca to support a grant of clemency for an unrepentant, large-scale drug dealer like Carlos Vignali. However, when coupled with credible allegations indicating that Horacio Vignali was a drug dealer, and in fact was the source of cocaine supply for his son, Baca’s support of Horacio and Carlos Vignali is even more inappropriate.

**U.S. Attorney Alejandro Mayorkas provided critical support for the Vignali commutation, which was inappropriate, given his position.**

- *U.S. Attorney Alejandro Mayorkas called the White House in support of the Vignali commutation.* Mayorkas, the top federal prosecutor in Los Angeles, was asked by Horacio Vignali to call the White House in support of his son’s clemency petition. Mayorkas then called the White House about the Vignali commutation. While Mayorkas does not recall the details of his conversation, he now concedes that his call conveyed support for the Vignali commutation.
- *Mayorkas supported the Vignali commutation despite his ignorance of the facts of the case and his knowledge that the prosecutors responsible for the Vignali case opposed clemency.* Before he called the White House, Mayorkas had spoken twice with Todd Jones, the U.S. Attorney responsible for the Vignali case. Jones told Mayorkas that Vignali was a “major player” in drug trafficking, that he was “bad news” and that Mayorkas should not “go there” when it came to Vignali. Despite these warnings from a prosecutor who was intimately familiar with the Vignali case, Mayorkas still called the White House in support of the Vignali commutation.
- *Mayorkas’ support for the Vignali commutation was inappropriate.* Mayorkas knew little about the Vignali case. What he did know indicated that Carlos Vignali was an unrepentant large-scale criminal. These facts alone make his support for the commutation, as a senior federal prosecutor, totally inappropriate.

**There are a number of allegations that both Horacio and Carlos Vignali were involved in illegal drug trafficking.**

- *There are allegations that, in addition to his son, Horacio Vignali was involved in illegal drug trafficking, and that Carlos Vignali was involved in drug trafficking far beyond the conduct which led to his conviction in Minnesota.* DEA reports documenting these allegations include the following statements:

“[Horacio Vignali] negotiated with ATF agents to sell a machine gun and stated to them that he had also smuggled heroin into the United States utilizing automobiles.”

“[Redacted] has also purchased cocaine from Carlos Vignali Jr. of Los Angeles ... Vignali’s father Carlos Vignali aka “pops” owns a body shop, at 1260 Figueroa and is the source of supply for his son.”

“Carlos Horatio Vignali’s role in [George Torres’ drug dealing] organization is relatively unknown at this time. It is believed that Vignali functions as a financial partner in the organization.”

- *These DEA reports are corroborated by law enforcement personnel who indicate that they had received information indicating that both Horacio and Carlos Vignali were involved in large-scale drug trafficking. These charges have never been formally made in court, or substantiated by physical evidence. However, the mere existence of such allegations should have precluded senior law enforcement and political officials from supporting a commutation for Carlos Vignali on the strength of his father’s reputation. However, it appears that no one checked with the DEA prior to granting the commutation.*

**Hugh Rodham provided false and misleading information to the White House in support of the Vignali commutation.**

- *Hugh Rodham was paid \$204,200 for his work on the Vignali commutation. It appears that in return for this money, he worked part-time for two months gathering materials in support of Vignali’s case and making telephone calls to White House staff. It appears that Rodham’s payment in the Vignali matter was contingent upon his success, as he received the \$200,000 payment on January 24, 2001, after President Clinton granted clemency to Vignali.*
- *Rodham repeatedly provided false information during his communications with the White House. First, and most importantly, Rodham told Bruce Lindsey that the trial attorney who prosecuted Vignali supported the commutation. This was completely false. Second, Rodham told Lindsey that Vignali was a first-time offender, when in fact, he had two prior convictions and two other arrests. Rodham also told Lindsey that Vignali “did not play a major role in the offense,” when in fact, Vignali was a major source of cocaine for the Minnesota drug-dealing ring at issue in his case.*

**Hugh Rodham told the White House that First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was aware of his lobbying efforts and that the Vignali commutation was “very important” to her.**

- *Hugh Rodham told White House staff that the Vignali commutation was “very important to him and the First Lady as well as others.” This statement is confirmed by the independent recollection of the White House staffer who spoke to Rodham as well as the note which she took contemporaneously. Rodham’s statement raises two possibilities: first, that the First Lady was aware of, and approved of Hugh Rodham’s lobbying efforts; or second, that Hugh Rodham was lying to White House staff regarding the First Lady’s knowledge of his efforts.*

**The White House sought the opinion of powerful Los Angeles political figures, but failed to consult with the prosecutors or judge who understood the Vignali case.**

- *White House staff engaged in telephone conversations with a number of outside individuals regarding the Vignali case – Hugh Rodham, Lee Baca, and Alejandro Mayorkas, none of whom knew very much about the Vignali case. It appears that key White House staff gave great weight to the input provided by Rodham, Baca, and Mayorkas, even though they knew little about the case and had mixed motives.*
- *White House staff failed to reach out to the prosecutors who had convicted Vignali, or the judge who sentenced him. White House staff justified their failure to take this simple action by concluding that they knew that the prosecutors and judge would object, so there was no need to speak to them. However, if the White House had spoken to Todd Jones, Denise Reilly, Andrew Dunne, or Judge David Doty, they would have learned that Carlos Vignali: (1) was not a small-time drug dealer; (2) was unrepentant about his criminal activity; and (3) never cooperated with law enforcement by telling them who supplied him cocaine.*

**The White House ignored the strenuous objections to the Vignali commutation which were lodged by the Pardon Attorney.**

- The Pardon Attorney provided the White House with a report that contained his recommendation against granting the Vignali commutation. This report contained a number of powerful arguments against the commutation, which were apparently ignored by the White House. The existence of the Pardon Attorney's report means that the White House cannot claim that it was totally unaware that Vignali's arguments were completely false. The White House knew that the Vignali clemency petition had no merit, yet decided to grant the commutation anyway. President Clinton's decision raises questions about why the Vignali commutation was granted.

**Rodham has apparently misled the public about returning to the Vignalis those fees he received in connection with the clemency and ignored former President and Senator Clinton's request that he do so.**

- On February 21, 2001, at the request of former President Clinton and Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, Rodham promised to return to Horacio Vignali the legal fees he received in connection with the Vignali clemency. But, as of June 2001, Rodham had apparently returned only about \$50,000 of the money that Horacio Vignali paid him. Rodham's attorney has confirmed to Committee staff that Rodham has not returned any additional amounts and has no plans to return the remaining \$154,000.

## **HUGH RODHAM'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE BRASWELL PARDON**

**Glenn Braswell was under investigation by multiple federal agencies and several state attorneys general when the pardon was granted.**

- Over the past two decades, Braswell has created a dietary supplement empire using false advertising to mislead consumers. After serving time in prison for mail fraud and tax evasion in 1983, Braswell has continued to defraud consumers about the benefits of his herbal remedies. In addition to facing numerous lawsuits, Braswell's companies have been investigated by the Internal Revenue Service, Federal Trade Commission, Food and Drug Administration, and Better Business Bureau.
- Unsurprisingly, Braswell was under another criminal investigation by federal prosecutors for a massive tax evasion and money-laundering scheme when he was pardoned. Braswell's petition bypassed the traditional route through the Justice Department and went directly to the White House. If the FBI had conducted a background investigation instead of the White House, Braswell's petition would have been rejected quickly.

**Braswell paid Hugh Rodham \$230,000 for successfully obtaining the pardon.**

- Braswell hired Rodham to support his pardon petition for \$230,000. For this price, Rodham claims he forwarded a letter of support for Braswell to the White House Counsel's Office, and he made a follow-up inquiry. According to Rodham, these two actions were the extent of his role in the Braswell pardon. Rodham refunded the \$230,000 to Braswell after facing widespread criticism from the media and members of both political parties.

## **HUGH RODHAM'S EFFORTS TO LOBBY FOR CLEMENCY FOR THE LUMS**

**Gene and Nora Lum, prominent Democratic contributors and fundraisers, were convicted of making illegal conduit contributions and tax offenses.**

- *In 1997, the Lums pleaded guilty to making \$50,000 in illegal conduit contributions to the DNC.* They were sentenced to home detention, confinement in a halfway house and a \$30,000 fine. In August 1998, Gene Lum pleaded guilty to tax fraud for filing tax returns claiming more than \$7.1 million in false deductions and was sentenced to two years imprisonment.

**The Lums attempted to obtain executive clemency through Hugh Rodham.**

- *Hugh Rodham lobbied the White House as part of the Lums' efforts but failed to secure them a grant of clemency.* In December 2000, Nora Lum called one of her husband's criminal attorneys and asked him to send various documents to Hugh Rodham at the White House. He did so. In early January 2001, Rodham called Gene Lum's attorney again and asked him to resend those documents directly to, among others, Meredith Cabe, an associate White House counsel responsible for clemency matters. Subsequently, Rodham telephoned Cabe and discussed the merits of the Lums' pardon request. Cabe then told White House Counsel

Beth Nolan and Deputy White House Counsel Bruce Lindsey about her discussion with Rodham. Both told Cabe that the Lums were not going to receive clemency.

**The Lums and Hugh Rodham have refused to cooperate with the Committee's investigation.**

- *Gene and Nora Lum have refused to cooperate with the Committee's investigation.* The Lums' daughter, Nicole (with whom Hugh Rodham apparently had some sort of business relationship), has likewise declined to be interviewed by the Committee. Hugh Rodham has also refused to cooperate with the Committee's request for an interview. Therefore, the Committee is unable to obtain a full understanding of the Lums' efforts to obtain executive clemency and Rodham's role in those efforts.

**TONY RODHAM'S EFFORTS TO LOBBY FOR EXECUTIVE CLEMENCY**

**Tony Rodham's Role in the Case of Edgar and Vonna Jo Gregory**

- *Tony Rodham lobbied President Clinton to grant pardons to Edgar and Vonna Jo Gregory while he was receiving substantial sums of money from the Gregorlys.* Rodham received \$244,769 in salary from the Gregorlys over two and a half years and also received another \$79,000 in loans from the Gregorlys. The Gregorlys claim that they paid Rodham this large sum of money for various consulting services that Rodham provided to the Gregorlys. However, the Gregorlys do not have any documentation reflecting work performed for them by Rodham.
- *Given the fact that the Gregorlys do not have any documentary evidence reflecting the \$244,769 of work performed for them by Rodham, substantial questions are raised as to what Rodham actually did for the Gregorlys that was so valuable.* The most valuable thing that Rodham did for the Gregorlys was to obtain presidential pardons. Therefore, there is a substantial question as to whether the Gregorlys paid Rodham for his efforts to obtain presidential pardons for them.
- *If Rodham was paid to obtain presidential pardons for the Gregorlys, it creates the strong appearance of impropriety.* The prospect of financial benefit for Rodham would taint Rodham's actions in lobbying for the pardon. Also, if President Clinton knew about Rodham's financial arrangement, it would taint his actions in granting the pardons.
- *Compounding the appearance of impropriety in the Gregory case is the fact that the pardons were opposed by the Justice Department, the prosecutors responsible for the case, and also the Gregorlys' sentencing judge.* Apparently, the only people in the Clinton Administration who felt that the Gregorlys deserved pardons were President Clinton and Deputy White House Counsel Bruce Lindsey, both of whom knew of Tony Rodham's involvement in the matter.

## **Tony Rodham's Role in the Case of Fernando Fuentes Coba**

- *Tony Rodham offered to help Vivian Mannerud obtain a pardon for her father, Fernando Fuentes Coba, in exchange for \$50,000.* When Rodham learned in late 2000 that Mannerud was seeking a pardon for her elderly father, he met with Mannerud and told her that he could help obtain the pardon if she paid him a \$50,000 consulting fee. Rodham told Mannerud that he had successfully obtained pardons before and showed her the Gregorys' pardon petition to support his claim.
- *Rodham attempted to convince Mannerud to hire him by making a number of false representations to her.* Rodham told Mannerud that he was close personal friends with the Pardon Attorney, Roger Adams. Rodham also told Mannerud that he would use the \$50,000 to hire a law firm to handle her case, and that Roger Adams' wife worked at the law firm, which would help her case be treated favorably. All of these representations were completely false and were apparently made to mislead Mannerud as to the purpose of the payment to Rodham.
- *Mannerud rejected Rodham's offer.* Mannerud was concerned that Rodham could not guarantee that he could obtain a pardon in exchange for the \$50,000. She was also concerned about becoming embroiled in a scandal. Therefore, she rejected Rodham's offer.
- *After Mannerud rejected Rodham's offer, an associate of Rodham came back to Mannerud with another offer.* According to Mannerud, a month after she rejected Tony Rodham's proposal, Marilyn Parker, a mutual friend of Rodham's and Mannerud's who attended the initial meeting between them, came back to Mannerud and told her that Rodham now wanted only \$30,000 to help her obtain a pardon for her father. Mannerud was still concerned about the nature of Rodham's proposal and rejected it.
- *The actions taken by Rodham and Parker may have been illegal.* Rodham, and maybe Parker as well, engaged in an effort to defraud Mannerud. While the effort was unsuccessful, it may have constituted criminal conduct. The Committee recommends that the Justice Department investigate these allegations.

## **PRESIDENT CLINTON'S GRANT OF CLEMENCY TO DRUG MONEY LAUNDERER HARVEY WEINIG**

**Weinig was properly imprisoned for conspiring to launder millions of dollars in drug money and concealing and furthering an extortion-by-kidnapping scheme.**

- *Weinig, a former Manhattan attorney, conspired to launder about \$19 million dollars in drug proceeds through a Swiss bank for the Cali cartel.* Members of the money laundering organization, of which Weinig was a part, boasted that they successfully laundered more than \$70 million for the cartel. In addition to conducting banking transactions for the organization, Weinig consulted with co-conspirators in furtherance of the organization's activities and stored the drug proceeds in his New York City apartment.

- *Weinig and other co-conspirators at his law firm stole from the Cali cartel about \$2.5 million they were supposed to have laundered. This theft exposed Weinig's family to a risk of being harmed by those drug dealers. In the course of investigating the organization's money laundering activities, authorities intervened when they learned that the drug dealers sent a hit man to kill one of Weinig's co-conspirators.*
- *Weinig learned that one of his co-conspirators kidnapped an individual as part of a scheme to extort money from the victim's family. Rather than report the kidnapping, Weinig made his office available as a meeting place where the ransom could be delivered and directed his associates at the firm to execute transfer agreements.*

**Weinig's lawyer, a prominent Washington attorney with close connections to the Clinton Administration, lobbied the White House in support of Weinig's clemency petition.**

- *Weinig's wife, Alice Morey, retained Reid Weingarten, who was close to the Clinton White House, to lobby for the commutation. In April 2000, Weingarten filed a clemency petition on Weinig's behalf with the Justice Department and the White House. Knowing that the Justice Department would advise the President to reject the Weinig commutation petition, Weingarten lobbied the White House directly, approaching White House Counsel Beth Nolan, Deputy White House Counsel Bruce Lindsey and Chief of Staff John Podesta.*
- *Weingarten chose not to familiarize himself with the facts of Weinig's underlying conviction. Accordingly, he was unable to convey to those he lobbied a full, accurate factual basis of the merits of Weinig's petition.*

**Two former Clinton Administration officials, David Dreyer and Harold Ickes, lobbied the White House on Weinig's behalf.**

- *Alice Morey enlisted the assistance of her cousin, former White House Deputy Communications Director David Dreyer. Dreyer repeatedly raised the Weinig commutation with John Podesta. Ultimately, Podesta recommended that the President grant the Weinig commutation. Dreyer has invoked his Fifth Amendment rights rather than cooperate with the Committee's investigation.*
- *Morey also obtained support for Weinig's commutation from former Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes, whose children attended the same school as did her sons. Ickes discussed the Weinig case with President Clinton twice, and recommended the commutation of Weinig's sentence.*

**The Justice Department repeatedly and adamantly recommended against the commutation of Weinig's sentence.**

- *On several occasions, U.S. Attorney Mary Jo White, whose office convicted Weinig, objected to any reduction of Weinig's sentence. Ultimately, in a report to President Clinton, the Pardon Attorney and Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder voiced their strong opposition to a commutation of Weinig's sentence.*

- *Pardon Attorney Roger Adams submitted a report to the President advising against the Weinig commutation.* Adams pointed out that Weinig “was a well-respected lawyer who used his professional skills to assist in laundering millions of dollars that he knew constituted the proceeds of a huge narcotics trafficking enterprise. He was involved in this activity for an extended period of time, and he admits that he engaged in it purely out of greed.” Adams also informed the President that Weinig “aided and abetted the extortion of money from an individual he knew had been kidnapped at the direction of a co-defendant in order to coerce the production of a ransom.”

**After an apparently cursory review, the White House set aside the Justice Department’s negative recommendation and granted Weinig clemency.**

- *Support for Weinig’s petition from John Podesta and Beth Nolan appears to have been critical.* The Associate White House counsels responsible for clemency matters did not support the petition. However, setting aside the negative recommendations of not only the Justice Department but also staff at the White House Counsel’s Office, Nolan and Lindsey, who were lobbied by Weingarten, recommended Weinig’s clemency to President Clinton. John Podesta, who was lobbied by Weingarten and Dreyer, also recommended to the President that Weinig’s sentence be commuted.

**The White House was unjustified in commuting Weinig’s sentence.**

- *None of the arguments made by Weinig entitle him to executive clemency.* In his petition, Weinig stated three main reasons why his sentence should have been commuted: (1) his sentence was disproportionate and excessive; (2) his contributions to society justified his early release from prison; and (3) one of his children was suffering emotional difficulties as a result of his imprisonment and needed him to return home. The first reason is simply not true. Weinig’s sentence was comparable to those received by other co-conspirators who were directly responsible for laundering large amounts of drug money and declined to cooperate with authorities. Weinig’s sentence was also comparable to those received by co-defendants who participated in the extortion-by-kidnapping scheme, which Weinig concealed and facilitated. The other two reasons fail to distinguish Weinig from the vast number of other similarly situated felons, who were properly sentenced but whose families have suffered because of their imprisonment.

**President Clinton’s commutation of Weinig’s sentence has sent out the wrong message about the United States’ commitment to fighting drug trafficking.**

- *President Clinton’s decision conveyed an appearance of granting special consideration to wealthy, politically well connected criminals and their relatives.* Pardon Attorney Roger Adams foresaw the message sent by the Weinig commutation, warning President Clinton that “[t]o commute [Weinig’s] prison term to the five years he proposes would denigrate the seriousness of his criminal misconduct, undermine the government’s legitimate interest in encouraging prompt guilty pleas and truthful cooperation from criminal defendants, and could give the appearance of granting special consideration to economically advantaged, white-collar offenders.”

- *The Weinig commutation undermines the nation's efforts to fight the illegal drug trade.* Complaints are frequently made that U.S. drug laws punish low-level drug criminals too severely, yet do not punish high-level drug distributors enough. When a large-scale drug money launderer like Harvey Weinig receives executive clemency after serving five years of an eleven-year sentence, it sends the message that the U.S. is not serious about prosecuting the high-level criminals who make the drug trade possible.
- *The Weinig commutation has eroded the United States' moral authority to press other countries to fight the drug trade within their own borders.* The Weinig commutation could harm the efforts of the U.S. government to extradite drug traffickers and money launderers from Latin America. Newspapers in Latin American countries have accused the U.S. of hypocrisy in the Weinig case. For example, in Colombia's leading daily, former Colombian attorney general Gustavo De Greiff, in an op-ed entitled "The Morality of the Strongest," labeled President Clinton's clemency decision "monstrous."