

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 2, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WALKER].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 2, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROBERT S. WALKER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of the 67th Psalm:

"May God be merciful to us and bless us, show us the light of his countenance and come to us.

"Let your ways be known upon earth, your saving health among all nations.

"Let the peoples praise you, O God; let all the peoples praise you.

"Let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for you judge the nations upon earth.

"Let the peoples praise you, O God; let all the peoples praise you.

"The earth has brought forth her increase; may God, our own God, give us his blessing.

"May God give us his blessing, and may all the ends of the earth stand in awe of him."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SOLOMON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mrs. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint Resolution appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress and the day for the counting in Congress of the electoral votes for President and Vice President cast in December 1996.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2183. An act to make technical corrections to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996; and

S. Res. 309. Resolution that the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Gary Lee Sisco of Tennessee as Secretary of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3005), "An Act to amend the Federal securities laws in order to promote efficiency and capital formation in the financial markets, and to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to promote more efficient management of mutual funds, protect investors, and provide more effective and less burdensome regulation."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution on Tuesday, October 1, 1996: H.R. 543, to reauthorize the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes; H.R. 1734, to reauthorize the National Film Preservation Board, and for other purposes; and H.J. Res. 198, appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress and the day for the counting in Congress of the electoral votes for President and Vice President cast in December 1996.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON TODAY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 1996.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on October 1, 1996 at 2:25 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the Second Report to the Congress on the Operation of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF CARIBBEAN BASIN ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby submit the Second Report to the Congress on the Operation of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act. This report is prepared pursuant to the requirements of section 214 of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Expansion Act of 1990 (19 U.S.C. 2702(f)).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 1, 1996.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CONGRATULATIONS IN ORDER TO THE PRESIDENT FOR SPENDING BILL, CONVENING MIDEAST SUMMIT, AND INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION RELATING TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think in the rush to adjourn, the role of President Clinton in ensuring that we have a budget, a budget that reflects his priorities, has been overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the majority for their bipartisanship in reaching this historic bipartisan spending bill agreement. But I think President Clinton deserves enormous credit for avoiding another Government shutdown but also, because of his persistence, the bill that was passed contains \$6.5 billion more primarily for education, for fighting drugs, and antiterrorism measures. His dedicated chief of staff, Leon Panetta, worked for 3 grueling days and nights negotiating with congressional leaders to ensure that the bill would be good for this country by moving toward a balanced budget while not violating our values.

The President worked to increase funding for education which included \$4 billion for Head Start, \$491 million for the Goals 2000 program and \$7.7 billion for compensatory schooling for disadvantaged children. He ensured adequate funding for the National Institutes for Health, disease prevention, substance abuse control, and violence against women initiatives.

The President also fought to ensure there was adequate funding for fire-fighting in the western States and for the victims of Hurricane Fran.

Furthermore, thanks to the President, illegal immigration legislation was approved without the harmful attack on legal immigrants.

The President took out some of the language that denied education to those who are not to blame for illegal immigration and, that is, the children.

At this very time, Mr. Speaker, the President deserves credit for convening a Mideast summit of Arab and Israeli leaders which will hopefully bring about peaceful Middle East negotiations. The President is to be commended for bringing Arafat and Netanyahu into the White House to try to hammer out some personal understandings first, and then to see if there is any way there is a basis for negotia-

tions to start and to get the peace process back on track. It was a courageous move that deserves bipartisan credit and it is critically important in the ensuing days that this bipartisanship that over the years has characterized our foreign policy continue. Sniping and partisan attacks at this time would be very harmful to the national security.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, today I am also introducing a House resolution which expresses the sense of the House that universal telecommunications service can only be met if the needs of Native Americans or our Native Americans and Indians are addressed and policies are implemented with the cooperation of tribal governments.

As the joint Federal-State Board on Universal Service prepares to issue its recommendations, the implementation process of the Telecommunication Act reaches a critical stage. I think it is very important to make it perfectly clear that the intent of Congress can only be fulfilled if the universal service policies or procedures established to implement the act address the telecommunications needs of low income Native Americans, including Alaskan natives. Cost-effective solutions are best developed with the cooperation of tribal governments.

When Congress enacted the Telecommunications Act in February, great emphasis was placed on ensuring the delivery of telecommunications services, including advanced telecommunications and information services, to all regions of the country. The principle of universal service is designed to address the exceptional needs of rural, insular and high-cost areas and make sure those services are available at reasonable and affordable rates.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address the House, number one, to commend the President for his leadership on achieving a bipartisan budget that allowed us to adjourn for the year, reflecting and reinforcing his domestic priorities; commend the President, too, for his peace-making role with the Middle East leaders right at this very moment here in Washington; and, lastly, to announce to the House that I have introduced this resolution which deals with the telecommunications needs of our Native Americans, that they not be forgotten in this Telecommunications Act.

MILITARY INFILTRATION OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago, I was looking at Business Week magazine and I came across an article that caught my eye. It was called "Newt's War Games." It talked

about how the Speaker of the House had asked the Pentagon for military officers to be put in his office to help him assess strategy and tactics for maintaining party unity. That was the quote in the magazine. "Party unity" implies heavy partisan activity.

Obviously this revelation concerned me a lot, because this House has very stringent rules about who can be working in our offices for very good reasons. We say that only fellows, if we have fellows in our office, they must be supported by outside third-party groups. We are not allowed to go solicit volunteers in our office or allow volunteers in our office. And if we want detailees from other agencies, House rules say detailees can only come to a committee and that is only after the committee gets permission from the Committee on House Oversight, and then the agency sending the detailee is to be reimbursed. Well, none of these things have happened in this case. The officers have come over and this has been going on now for a very long time. I guess, as I stated before, the biggest concern is the work that they are doing and partisan activities.

If you go back and look at the record, the Speaker himself was quoted as saying that the 1994 campaign was a theater level campaign plan, or what we often call a TRADOC, a training and doctrine command thing. He said its implementation was just masquerading as a public relations device.

□ 1415

After the 1994 election, he wanted DOD to supply him with these officers to help him pass the Republican agenda. I find it incredible that the Pentagon would comply.

I asked the Pentagon how many people were there, what this was costing, what services were they from, and that was in June. We have still not heard a thing. However, a reporter has told me that when he was talking to one of the staff people in Secretary Perry's office, they said, "Oh, that Schroeder woman. She is retiring, we will just out wait her. We do not have to answer." I find it amazing that even the Pentagon thinks they are above the law.

At the same time all of this was going on, I remind you, this House was doing away with the Caucus on Women's Issues, the Black Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, the Environmental Caucus, and the Democratic Study Group. We were doing away with all of those on the basis we did not want those different bipartisan groups meeting here. But, by golly, in the interim, we have the Pentagon infiltrating this Congress through different offices and working on highly partisan activities.

A lot of people would say, why in the world would the Pentagon do this? The only reason I can see is it has been profitable for them. They ended up

with a Pentagon number that was almost \$12 billion more than the administration had asked for. So there was indeed a great payback.

I got a big kick out of it, because the Armed Forces Journal this month gave me both a congressional dart and a congressional laurel. They said, first of all, my concern about this issue was just too conspiratorial. How in the world could I think that having these military officers deployed to key congressional offices mean that they were going to get increases in their budget?

But then it went on to say they did wish that I would look into which services these different people were from, because it could have fed the inter-service rivalry.

That does not make sense. If it fed the interservice rivalry, it probably also fed the increase in the budget.

Then they went on to give me a laurel, pointing out that I was correct in condemning the Secretary of Defense for not having any way of tracking these. There is no system, he does not know where they went or who they are, or at least that is what we are hearing.

If we have military officers, which cost us a lot, that are trained to do military things, that are deployed around, and they do not know where they are and they do not know what they are doing, that truly is astounding. So the Armed Forces Journal gave me a laurel for that. The bottom line is, a couple weeks ago I filed a freedom of information request, and we are continuing to try to get to the bottom of this.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is up, but I would like to include for the RECORD the articles around this to make this issue even clearer. I certainly hope this Congress gets to the bottom of this mess and stops the violation of our laws.

Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago a small story in Business Week caught my eye. Entitled "Newt's War Games," the story revealed that the Speaker of the House had asked the Pentagon for military officers to help him assess strategy and tactics for maintaining party unity.

This revelation raised, in my mind, several concerns. First, the officers working for the Speaker violate House rules governing fellows and detailees.

Fellows are supposed to be sponsored by a third-party sponsoring organization. Congressional offices cannot solicit or recruit volunteers. That is clearly not the case with the military officers working in the Speaker's office. The military officers are volunteers, not fellows, and the Speaker has recruited them.

Detailees can only be requested by committees, and then only following strict guidelines. Among the strict guidelines is that the requesting committee obtain approval from the House Committee on Oversight and that the committee reimburse the executive branch agency for the cost of the detailee. None of these rules are being followed by the Speaker's office.

Even more outrageous, the military officers are working on partisan, political activities in

the Speaker's office, which is a violation of DOD regulations.

The Speaker himself is quoted at a meeting of military officers as saying that the 1994 campaign was "a TRADOC [Training and Doctrine Command] theater-level campaign plan." He described the Contract With America as a "training, implementation document masquerading as a public relations device." After the 1994 election, he requested DOD to supply him with officers to help him pass the Republican agenda in the 104th Congress. Incredibly, the Pentagon happily obliged.

Some of you may recall that when the Republicans took over the House following the 1994 elections they moved quickly to abolish the caucuses that represented women, Blacks, Hispanics, and environmentalists. They even eliminated the venerable Democratic Study Group, a research entity so respected that even Republicans belonged to it.

But the Republican leadership could not tolerate dissent, could not tolerate differing opinions.

But, at the same time, unbeknownst to the public until now, the newly elected Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, was making arrangements to install a secret team of military officers in his office to help him strategize and pass the Contract With America.

What did the Pentagon get out of this deal? It's hard to tell, because everything has been so secret, but clearly the Pentagon is happy when it makes Members of Congress happy. When it can make the Speaker of the House happy, well, that approaches ecstasy in military circles.

You may have noticed that the House passed a DOD authorization bill giving the Pentagon almost \$12 billion more than the administration requested. That's not a bad return on DOD's investment in the Speaker's office.

Earlier this year, the Speaker issued orders to pump millions of dollars into California in hopes of influencing the elections out there. Were the Speaker's secret military team involved in those efforts—identifying military installations to receive additional moneys?

Ever since that July 1 article in Business Week, I have been trying to get the Pentagon to provide me with documents about its secret arrangement with the House Speaker. The Secretary of Defense has refused to answer the letters.

Fortunately, Roll Call, via the Freedom of Information Act, is beginning to uncover the facts. The September 30 issue carried a long, detailed expose', with more to come.

I would like to reprint the Roll Call article, along with some other related clippings, and my correspondence, as yet unanswered, with the Pentagon.

[From the Armed Forces Journal, Oct. 1996]

In August, Rep. Pat. Schroeder (D-CO) inserted a statement in the Congressional Record noting that there were numerous military servicepeople working in congressional offices. Schroeder attributed the Pentagon's willingness to provide detailees to his thirst for increased appropriations. It's true that the high command is usually very willing to provide detailees. But it was wrong to attribute the prevalence of detailees to some of nefarious conspiracy. Most of the people detailed to Congress are very professional people. Congress benefits from their military

experience and knowledge, while they gain valuable insight into the political process. It's no conspiracy. However, if Schroeder's genuinely interested in pursuing this subject, she should ask to what degree the detailees pay out inter-service rivalries.

Although Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-CO), gets an AFJI Dart for her August statement on military detailees to Congress (she observed that the Office of the Secretary of Defense has no system for tracking which servicepeople go to which offices), she also gets a Laurel. These should be such a system. If, as she alleged, there have been ethical lapses, they should be investigated. Schroeder did a service by discovering an element of the civil-military relationship that needs to be examined, systematized and, where needed, purified.

[From Business Week, July 1, 1996]

NEWT'S WAR GAMES

Newt Gingrich is calling in the military to quell rebellions by conservative Republican freshmen. The Speaker has asked three officers on loan from the Pentagon to help assess strategy and tactics for maintaining party unity. The most recent brush with disaster came on June 13 when a mutiny by 15 frosh nearly sank Gingrich's 1997 budget blueprint. The Georgian, a former Army brat who never served, is an avid student of military history.

[From Roll Call, July 1, 1996]

GENERAL GINGRICH?

Is House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga) improperly using military officers and facilities for political work? That's the question raised by a spate of recent stories. Gingrich himself has been silent on the subject; it's time he spoke up.

The flap began when Business Week reported that Gingrich had asked three officers on loan from the Pentagon to assess the GOP leadership's strategy and tactics for maintaining party unity. This led Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-Colo) to demand an explanation from Defense Secretary William Perry. Gingrich's press secretary, Tony Blankley, then said not to worry, the officers are Congressional fellows working in Gingrich's office "to learn the culture of the Congressional decision-making process."

But then, Roll Call learned that several military officers were participating in a military-style "after action review" on how the GOP leadership nearly lost a fight over its own budget earlier this month. And the Wall Street Journal reported that Gingrich has sent GOP leaders and their aides to US Army Training and Doctrine Command facilities to learn how the military conducts such "after action reviews" This surely would cross the line of using government facilities for partisan political work. When he was asked about all this, House Majority Leader Dick Army (R-Texas) last week defended the Speaker with faint praise, saying that Gingrich "has a keen mind" and is fascinated with military thinking. Gingrich needs to explain for himself.

[From the Washington Times, July 8, 1996]

DO MILITARY OFFICERS AND POLITICS MIX?

(By Rick Maze)

To House Speaker Newt Gingrich of Georgia, the proposition must have seemed clear. He wanted a military-style, after-action report to show why the Republicans nearly lost a June vote on their balanced budget plan.

So he turned to four military officers, on loan to his office as part of a one-year congressional fellowship program, to provide one.

Gingrich's order to the four officers, one from each service, has opened questions about the purpose and value of loaning military officers for nonmilitary duties.

Rep. Patricia Schroeder, D-Colo., a senior member of the House National Security Committee, complained that the "use of military officers for partisan political activity is, in my view, totally improper."

So now Schroeder wants the Department of Defense to explain how and why there are military officers working for Congress.

Gingrich spokesman Tony Blankley defended the assignment, however, insisting the officers, assigned to the speaker's office since March, are not involved in partisan politics.

The four officers are Navy Cmdr. William Luti, Marine Lt. Col. Drew Bennett, Air Force Maj. William Bruner III and Army Maj. Mike Barron. All four declined to be interviewed for this article.

Gingrich's aides said they saw nothing wrong with the assignments. The whole idea of the fellowship is to provide some military members with an education in the legislative process, they said.

Reconstructing why the Republican leadership only won a June 12 vote on the 1997 budget resolution by a narrow 216-211 margin was a learning process for the officers, and also helped Republicans learn where they failed.

"This program, like other fellowship programs, is designed to mutually benefit the fellow and the office in which he or she serves," Blankley said. "The fellows are here to learn the culture of the congressional decision-making process, while the office benefits from the perspective the fellow brings from his or her profession outside the legislative process."

Congressional fellowships, involving a one-year assignment to a congressional office, are not new. But the practice is growing, according to defense officials and congressional aides.

Although defense officials and congressional aides said no one keeps count of how many officers are given fellowships each year, they estimate there are hundreds of military officers participating in a loose-knit fellowship program.

"No one has a good handle on how many people. It isn't that kind of program," said a Senate Democratic aide who asked not to be identified. By contrast, the White House has a formal fellowship program for military officers in which people apply for assignments, are screened and selected, the aide said.

WHO GETS THE JOBS

For congressional fellowships, it is usually a member of Congress who asks that the military detail an officer to the staff, the aide said.

Sometimes, this is done by name, sometimes by what kind of expertise is sought and sometimes by just a general request, the aide said.

Fellowships are a benefit to politicians because they get an additional staff member at no cost.

The military benefits by keeping a potentially supportive politician happy and, perhaps, by gaining a pipeline into congressional dealings.

Indeed that pipeline has been a problem at times. The Senate Armed Services Committee has at various times banned such officers from attending closed-door executive sessions where defense policy is made, precisely because of leaks that were reaching the services or defense agencies from which the officers came, aides said. Congressional fellows

are now allowed to attend closed meetings on behalf of their sponsoring senator, however. "It was a problem with just one or two people," said a long-time aide.

HAZARDOUS DUTY

The hazards of outside-the-military assignments were made clear in the Iran-Contra arms-for-hostages scandal of the 1980s, when Marine Corps Lt. Col. Oliver North faced scrutiny for his work on the National Security Council.

In a new case, Army civilian Anthony Marceca is in the middle of a controversy involving an assignment to the White House that ended in 1994.

Marceca, who now works in an Army criminal fraud unit, was called to testify before Congress about FBI background reports he requested and screened while on loan to the White House security office. This wasn't his first detail outside the Army. In 1989, he spent nine months on loan to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs as a special investigator.

But congressional aides said Marceca and North don't represent the typical experience.

Said one Senate aide: "Our biggest problem with fellowships is that, as the number increases, it is taking more officers away from military duties at the same time the services have gotten smaller."

[From the Air Force Times, July 15, 1996]

FELLOWSHIPS DRAW POLITICAL HEAT—SCHROEDER COMPLAINS THAT MILITARY IS USED IN PARTISAN ACTIVITIES

(By Rick Maze)

To House Speaker Newt Gingrich of Georgia, the proposition must have seemed clear. He wanted a military-style, after-action report to show why the Republicans nearly lost a June vote on their balanced-budget plan.

So he turned to four military officers, on loan to his office as part of a one-year congressional fellowship program, to provide one.

Gingrich's order to the four officers, one from each service, has opened questions about the purpose and value of loaning military officers for nonmilitary duties.

Rep. Patricia Schroeder, D-Colo., a senior member of the House National Security Committee, complained that the "use of military officers for partisan political activity is, in my view, totally improper."

Schroeder wants the Department of Defense to explain how and why there are military officers working for Congress.

Gingrich spokesman Tony Blankley defended the assignment, saying the officers assigned to the speaker's office since March are not involved in partisan politics.

The four officers are Air Force Maj. William Bruner II, Marine Lt. Col. Drew Bennett, Army Maj. Mike Barron and Navy Cmdr. William Luti. They declined to be interviewed for this article, referring questions to Gingrich's press office.

The whole idea of the fellowship is to provide some military members with an education in the legislative process. Reconstructing why the Republican leadership won a June 12 vote on the 1997 budget resolution by a narrow 216-211 ratio was a learning process for the officers while it helped Republicans learn where they failed, leadership aides said.

"This program, like other fellowship programs, is designed to mutually benefit the fellow and the office in which he or she serves," Blankley said. "The fellows are here to learn the culture of the congressional decision-making process, while the office bene-

fits from the perspective the fellow brings from his or her profession outside the legislative process."

Congressional fellowships, involving a one-year assignment to a congressional office, are not new, although the practice is growing, according to defense officials and congressional aides.

Gingrich is not the only member of Congress to have military officers working for him. Although defense officials and congressional aides said no one has kept count, they estimate there are hundreds of military officers participating in a loosely knit fellowship program.

"No one has a good handle on how many people. It isn't that kind of program," said a Senate Democratic aide who asked not to be identified. The White House has a formal fellowship program for military officers in which people apply for assignments, are screened and selected, the aide said.

For congressional fellowships, it is usually a member of Congress who asks that the military detail an officer to the staff, the aide said. Sometimes this is done by name, sometimes by what kind of expertise is sought and sometimes by just a general request, the aide said.

Fellowships are a benefit to politicians because they get an additional staff member at no cost, according to congressional aides who asked not to be identified. The military benefits by keeping a potentially supportive politician happy. The services may also get a pipeline into congressional dealings, aides said.

With many senators sponsoring congressional fellows, the Senate Armed Services Committee has at various times banned military officers on congressional staffs from attending closed-door executive sessions where defense policy is made because word was leaking back to the services or defense agencies from which the officers came, aides said.

"It was a problem and with just one or two people," said a longtime aide, who noted congressional fellows are now allowed to attend closed meetings on behalf of their sponsoring senator.

The attention brought to Bennett, Luti, Bruner and Barron sends a new warning to potential fellows, whether service member or civilians working for the military, and civilian, about the risks of temporary assignments.

The hazards of outside-the-military assignments were made clear in the Iran-Contra arms-for-hostages scandal of the 1980s, when Marine Lt. Col. Oliver North faced scrutiny for his work on the National Security Council.

In a new case, Army civilian Anthony Marceca is in the middle of a controversy involving an assignment to the White House that ended in 1994.

Marceca, who now works for an Army criminal fraud unit, was called to testify before Congress about FBI background reports he requested and screened while on loan to the White House security office.

This was not his first detail outside the Army. In 1989, he spent nine months on loan to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs as a special investigator.

[From Roll Call, Sept. 30, 1996]

GENERAL GINGRICH ICES THE 104TH CONGRESS—SPEAKER DEPLOYED ART OF WAR IN HIS PLAN FOR THE HOUSE

(By Damon Chapple)

At the US Army's Fort Monroe, where onlookers once watched the Civil War clash between the Monitor and the Merrimack, the

trading of war stories by some of the military's finest strategists is a daily occurrence.

But on a warm spring day last year, generals and colonels gather to hear tales from a different sort of commander, House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga), fresh off his great-victory.

"The 1994 campaign was a TRADOC, theater-level campaign plan, executed by building small-unit cohesion, delegating throughout with mission-type orders, and designed to have real-time capability to respond to an opponent that was changing, period. I know it was. I have lived it," Gingrich declared to the assembled officers.

What's a TRADOC? It's Army-speak for the Training and Doctrine Command, headquartered at Fort Monroe, Va., where officers come to learn about fighting the modern war. In Gingrich-speak, it's the place to go to learn about fighting the modern political war.

And as Gingrich, the stepson of a career Army combat officer who never served in the military himself, candidly admitted, "Almost every major thing I have done for over a decade has been directly shaped by TRADOC."

In numerous trips to Fort Monroe and other Army installations across the country since he was elected to Congress in 1978, Gingrich learned lessons that, he told the senior officers last year, "changed my entire life."

The Speaker has had a well-publicized fascination with other management theories, borrowing heavily from the likes of such corporate gurus as W. Edwards Deming. But, as documented in Army memos and tape-recordings obtained by Roll Call, it has been military inspiration that has guided Gingrich's generalship of the House Republican revolution.

Gingrich himself explained this in a series of freewheeling discussions with the senior officers who developed the modern Army's tactics. Those conversations, during visits by the speaker to Fort Monroe in 1993 and 1995, were recorded on nearly ten hours of audio-tape by the Army and obtained by Roll Call under the Freedom of Information Act.

And if the contract was basic training, Gingrich has introduced other military concepts to the House throughout his Speaker-ship.

Gingrich bolstered his staff with four military fellows, one from each of the four services, an unprecedented step for a sitting Speaker.

"The Speaker has for a long time been impressed with the methodologies often employed in the military in order to better understand and improve their own operation," said House Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-Texas) after news stories appeared this summer about the military fellows in the Speaker's office. "We were going to raise a tremendous amount of anger, therefore, what we ought to do is go ahead and get to a balanced budget so there was an upside to the downside. Because otherwise we would cut spending just enough to piss everybody off but not enough to achieve anything. And there was no way to avoid cutting spending. * * * And so, I began just casually saying the week after the election, we're going to get to a balanced budget by 2002."

House Budget Chairman John Kasich (R-Ohio) and Senate Budget Chairman Pete Domenici (R-NM) resisted at first but finally relented. "What I was trying to do was create a core of a paradigmatic breakthrough" that was designed to outflank then-Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan).

If a balanced budget by 2002 was the accepted standard, Dole "sure as hell wasn't going to be to my left," Gingrich said.

Gingrich, in his discussions at TRADOC, offered many of his own ideas on military policy, freely giving his advice on how the Army could improve its work. In addition to stressing that the Army should seek to expand and integrate its futuristic doctrine to the other service branches, the Speaker called for a new emphasis on fighting "small wars" and the establishment of a unified command to combat terrorism.

But Gingrich readily acknowledged that "I've learned more out of this place than it's learned from me. So I'm doing pretty well. So far, the balance of trade looks pretty good. * * *

At Fort Leavenworth, in Kansas, Gingrich said he had to relearn his thinking about "small unit cohesion" because "I wasn't doing it right." But eventually, he got it right and used the concept to ensure victory after victory in the first months of the new Congress.

Along with hundreds of pages of additional documents obtained under FOIA, the tapes provide new insights into the deep fascination and symbiotic relationship that Gingrich has developed with the military.

Most striking is the explicit way in which the Speaker has sought to adapt the Army's war-fighting concepts to his own political battles—from Gingrich's early days at GOPAC, his Republican training center, to his command these past two years of House Republicans during victories on welfare reform and spending cuts and a decisive defeat in the balanced budget battle.

From the most theoretical discussion of military doctrine—featuring terms like "digitized battlelabs," "center of gravity," "operational art," and "commander's intent"—to the very practical use of the Army's standard field manual, Gingrich, ever the history professor, is the most eager of students, the tapes and other documents show.

One military-style lesson, Gingrich told the TRADOC senior officers in May 1995, was applied in the much-touted "Contract with America," which the Speaker said was not a political public-relations effort as much as a basic training document.

"Nobody fully understands this," he confided to the generals and other officers, "but if you think of the 'Contract with America,' it was, in fact, a training implementation document masquerading as a public relations device which allowed us—and it was designed for this purpose—it was designed, because we felt we were in control. It was designed as a training implementation document so the freshmen when they arrived and the brand new chairmen could not be normal."

"It guaranteed that from Election Day through April, early April, that the House Republican party would have to behave in a deviant manner from what it would normally be expected to do. The theory being is that if you could get them through the first 100 days being deviant, that the deviancy would become normal," Gingrich said.

Gingrich bolstered his staff with four military fellows, one from each of the four services, an unprecedented step for a sitting Speaker.

At the Pentagon, according to a source who declined to be identified, the fellows working in Gingrich's office were called "Shali's interns," referring to the favor by Gen. John Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs, who sent up the fellows to Gingrich.

One of the Army fellows, Gingrich said in the tapes, is "in any meeting I have that he wants to be and he is working directly with my staff in understanding the rhythm of what we're doing."

Military-style "after-action reviews," assessing the performance of an operation, were conducted on the battles over the 1995 spending bills and the razor-thin vote this year on the budget. Another after-action review, GOP sources said, is being contemplated by the leadership to assess this session.

Gingrich ordered the GOP leadership staff as well as junior Members to attend training seminars at Fort Monroe and other bases around the country.

The project, led by Rep. Pete Hoekstra (R-Mich), "represents Speaker Gingrich's-Majority Planning Group that the Speaker wants to act as a TRADOC," according to an Army memo.

The group, which attended sessions on the "operational art of war," included Reps. Chris Shays (R-Conn), J.D. Hayworth (R-Ariz), Sue Myrick (R-NC), and James Talent (R-Mo). Gingrich, according to Army documents, wanted to train the Members to the level of "a good captain."

"He is always fascinated with questions of methodology, technique, style, and it is his belief that using and learning the methods often employed in the military as management tools can be beneficial to us."

The study of military strategy, said Tony Blankley, Gingrich's spokesman, "is an important part of his life."

In the tapes, Gingrich says that his relationship with the Army's doctrine center took off in 1979, his first year in Congress, but even then, he had a general's long-term view of a military campaign. "I first came down here as a freshman in 1979 because I figured it would take a generation," he said last year.

"He's been coming down here for 15 or 20 years," said Joel Hedenstrom of TRADOC's Congressional liaison office. "Newt has had a great interest in TRADOC for many, many years. He has steeped himself in military doctrine. I think it stems from his being a historian and a military brat."

In 1993, as he prepared for the final drive that routed the Democrats from their entrenched position as the House majority, Gingrich told the TRADOC senior officers that "my interest in what you're doing is at a passionate level of the user. You talked earlier about being able to provide assets to people who are sent to combat environments. I am in combat every day, so I have a real user desire to figure what's the state of the art on training, what is the state of the art on doctrine, the state of the art on technology, because I will literally take that back and transfer it back into the civilian system as rapidly as I can figure out how to do it."

And Gingrich has been true to his plan. Not only the contract, but also nearly every significant event of this Congress has been framed by the Speaker in military terms.

Gingrich, in the tapes, said he studied the battles of Arthur Wellesley, the Duke of Wellington, "because I think our budget fight is a lot like the Peninsular Campaign," a campaign in Portugal and Spain in the early 1800s that eventually led to Wellington's ascendance and Napoleon's abdication.

In another "quick war story" for the officers, Gingrich described how he pushed his GOP Congressional allies to accept the idea of balancing the budget by 2002.

At Fort Leavenworth, in Kansas, Gingrich said he had to relearn his thinking about

"small unit cohesion" because "I wasn't doing it right." But eventually, he got it right and used the concept to ensure victory after victory in the first months of the new Congress.

And Gingrich ordered his troops about like the most seasoned of generals. He told GOP Whip Tom DeLay (Texas), who had just beaten Gingrich's best friend, Rep. Bob Walker (R-Pa.), for the job, that "it's not your job to count votes. It's your job to ensure victory."

The strategy, Gingrich recalled, had worked.

"Just one quick war story. The Whip wanted a huge office space in the Capitol. I mean, it was the Taj Mahal of all of our [office space]. And I looked at him, and he said, 'I've got to have this much space because I don't have enough money, and I'm going to convince each of my deputy whips that they have a little office in the Capitol if they will then assign one of their staff from their personal office, so we can have this massive vote-counting system.'

"And I said, 'Understand this. I will have your ass if we lose a vote.' And he looked at me, he said—he got a big grin, and he said, 'Deal.' And so I gave him the things. And we came a couple of times close, I just stared at him when we had a couple of very close votes.

"And I said, 'I am watching you.' He said, 'We are going to win.'"

For Gingrich, it was a demonstration that the "ultimate responsibility of the commander" is to define victory.

"And he shouldn't accept the command if he can't get to a definition of victory or success that he believes—it is professionally irresponsible."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 21, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM PERRY,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PERRY: I am extremely troubled by the disclosure in the current issue of Business Week that Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich "has asked three officers on loan from the Pentagon to help assess strategy and tactics for maintaining party unity."

Would you be so kind as to tell me (1) why the Pentagon is detailing officers to the Speaker; (2) how many officers have been detailed; (3) what duties the officers have been given by the Speaker; and (4) what are the estimated annual salaries of these officers.

Second, I request copies of any and all communications between the Pentagon and Speaker Gingrich concerning this arrangement. I also request copies of any written communications, memoranda, etc., on the aforementioned "party unity" project.

Third, I would like to know, for the record, whether it is a legitimate use of taxpayer funds for military personnel to be providing advice on "maintaining party unity," which is clearly a partisan objective.

Please respond at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

PAT SCHROEDER,
Congresswoman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM PERRY,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PERRY: On June 21 I wrote to you concerning a report in Business

Week that the Pentagon has loaned House Speaker Newt Gingrich several military officers "To help assess strategy and tactics for maintaining party unity." On Friday, according to the Associated Press, the Speaker's press aide confirmed that four officers are assigned to his office, but denied that they have any "responsibilities in connection with achieving 'party unity.'"

That denial notwithstanding, Roll Call reports in today's edition that Speaker Gingrich "has ordered a military-style review to help the House leadership determine how they nearly lost this month's budget vote." Assisting in the review, the story continues, are "several military officers on loan to the Speaker's office from the Pentagon." The officers' involvement was confirmed by several Members of Congress and GOP staff, according to Roll Call.

The use of military officers for partisan political activity is, in my view, totally improper.

I would like an answer by COB Thursday, June 27, to the questions I raised in my June 21 letter.

Sincerely,

PAT SCHROEDER,
Congresswoman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 25, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM PERRY,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reference to my inquiries of June 21 and 24 concerning the military officers detailed to the office of Speaker Newt Gingrich, I would like to bring to your attention an article, "General Newt," that prepared in the Wall Street Journal on December 18, 1995.

According to the Journal story, the "U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command has the mission of helping develop a force to fight the battles of the next century. It is also helping Speaker Newt Gingrich fight the political battles of today."

The story details how "members of the Republican leadership and their staff" have been studying "military planning and training methods" at the "Tra-Doc" centers at Fort Monroe and Fort Leavenworth. More significantly in light of the disclosures of the past week, the story quotes a Lt. Col. David Perkins, who was at the time working out of Speaker Gingrich's office "helping the leadership run military-style 'after-action reviews' to identify lessons learned from the handling of major bills."

The Journal story indicates that the use of military officers by the Speaker has much deeper and more complex roots than simply the odd officer who happened to wander onto Capitol Hill to brush up on a civics lesson. Needless to say, I reiterate my serious concerns about the appropriateness of using military officers to assist in the partisan activities of the leadership of the house.

I would like to add to my requests of June 21 and 24 that you provide me with the requested information for the entire period of Mr. Gingrich's speakership. I would also like to have copies of any and all "after-action review" memoranda or reports written by the military officers.

Sincerely,

PAT SCHROEDER,
Congresswoman.

SCHROEDER FILES FOIA REQUEST ON
MILITARY FELLOWS

Representative Pat Schroeder (D-CO) today filed a Freedom of Information Act re-

quest for copies of all documents pertaining to the military personnel on loan to members of the House and the Senate.

Schroeder has questioned the use of military personnel by members of Congress after reports that the Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich had used officers on loan from the Pentagon to study how to maintain Republican party unity. Schroeder filed the FOIA request after three letters to Secretary of Defense, William Perry sent last June went unanswered.

"Assigning military personnel to work in Congressional offices raises some serious conflicts of interest. Moreover, the Pentagon has no idea how many people are over here, or what they are doing," Schroeder said. She added, "this lack of accountability is ridiculous and is costing the taxpayers millions."

The letter, which appears below, was sent to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act I hereby request copies of any and all documents including, but not limited to, letters, memoranda, and e-mail, for the period January 1993 to date between members of congress (both House and Senate) and [DOD/Army/Navy/Air Force/Joint Chiefs] concerning the assignment of interns, fellows, or detailees to congressional offices. The request includes any documents between [DOD/Army/Navy/Air Force/Joint Chiefs] officials in reference to congressional requests for such assignments.

"I also request copies of any and all [DOD/Army/Navy/Air Force/Joint Chiefs] regulations on the subject of interns, fellows, and detailees."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 28, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM PERRY,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PERRY: The disclosure in the September 30 Roll Call that military personnel and facilities have been and are continuing to be used for partisan political purposes is extremely troubling. These activities are no doubt a violation of DoD and House regulations, not to mention federal law.

But instead of taking action to do something about this scandal, you have ignored it.

As you are well aware, I asked you for information about these activities last June, three months ago. Not only have you not answered my letters, I haven't even received the courtesy of an acknowledgement. As a result, six weeks ago I filed a series of Freedom of Information Act requests. I am sure your staff is doing its best to bury these requests. In fact, one of your staff members recently told a reporter—"oh, she's retiring, we'll just wait her out."

Your stonewalling on my inquiries into the use of military personnel comes in the wake of a string of troubling disclosures involving the defense department: the abandonment of POW's in North Korea; the bungling of the investigation into the Gulf War syndrome; the negligence in Saudi Arabia that resulted in the deaths of 19 Americans; and the discovery of certain U.S. army training manuals that advocated torture, blackmail, and other illegal, immoral activities.

I would like a full report about the use of military personnel in the Congress and I would like it now.

Sincerely,

PAT SCHROEDER,
Congresswoman.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of 2 U.S.C. 154, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 102-246, the Chair appoints the following member on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board:

Mr. Edwin L. Cox, Dallas, TX, to fill the unexpired term of Mrs. Marguerite S. Roll.

IT'S OFFICIAL: CLINTON BREAKS PROMISE ON BOSNIA DEADLINE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I had come over here to talk about something that was very alarming to me, and certainly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALKER, about the Clinton administration's shielding a report that is critical of the Clinton administration on antidrug policy, particularly using executive privilege to bury politically damaging information, which talks about a lack of leadership in the fight against drugs. That, to me, is alarming, considering the seriousness of the situation. But on the way over, I happened to be approached by others who pointed out something even more alarming.

Mr. Speaker, it has just come to me that President Clinton is going to try to keep our troops in Bosnia longer than he told the American people. What many of us have been predicting all year long was confirmed yesterday by Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon when he reported that 5,000 new, and I repeat new, troops were being deployed to Bosnia from Germany and would stay there until mid-March, way beyond the December 20 deadline for bringing our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are certainly capable of recalling that last year, when President Clinton ordered this ludicrous mission, he told us all that our troops would be home by December 20. It was not believable then, and the mid-March deadline is not believable now. I am afraid this thing is going to turn into another Vietnam, going on and on and on.

Mark my words: If President Clinton is reelected, he will immediately move to extend this new deadline, further exposing our troops to harm, and further squandering our precious military resources that are defense budgeted and which the American taxpayer can ill-afford.

Mr. Speaker, American troops have no business being in Bosnia beyond that December 20 deadline. The Bosnian tragedy was always and remains mostly a civil war. American foreign policy has never been based on insert-

ing our own military personnel into the middle of these civil war situations, until the Clinton administration took office. Rather, our policy has always been preserving peace through strength by maintaining our alliances, our treaties with other countries, and only deploying troops when sovereign allies were under external attack or vital American interests were at stake; in other words, when other countries were being invaded by another country, like in Kuwait, that was reason for us to defend our treaty allies. This certainly is not. Bosnia does not meet this test, and it never did.

Mr. Speaker, we must bring those troops home, as the President promised.

PARTING REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this will probably be my last presentation in the House of Representatives, as I am not returning for the 105th Congress. I would like to kind of wrap up my career and put a few things straight on the RECORD.

I have learned a lot and gained a lot of knowledge. I am a product of public education. I was born in Central Los Angeles back in 1932, and it was a tough town then in 1932, as it is now. I was always taught to believe that you will be responsible for things you do and things you do to one another, and you have to pay the consequences when you have violated somebody else's either personal or private rights.

This country has changed a great deal since 1932, all the way through the thirties and forties and fifties, until today you do not have a right to retaliate in any way, manner, shape or form, no matter how many people cast disparaging remarks upon you, insult you, even go as far as trying to spit on you today.

I was reminded, and I have made a lot of press lately for using a gesture to the Sierra Club, and one of my Congress friends here reminded me that before Nelson Rockefeller became Vice President of the United States, he used the same gesture one time in his frustration.

I am from a different time and I am in a different place, and I would like to go back to the old days when people were responsible for their reactions and paid the consequences when they tread upon another individual's rights.

I came to Congress with a very interesting background. I spent most of my private life in the corporate world. I am, as I said before, a product of public education. I went off in 1952 during the Korean conflict, I was a Special Forces

agent in the 10th and the 77th Special Forces and Airborne, and got out and went, through the GI bill, through El Camino College and eventually to Southern Cal and graduated.

I never believed I was going to Congress, I never wanted to be a politician. I think I probably still have the same thought today as I did when I was growing up, that politicians have a real difficult time relating to the real world they live in.

I am a firm believer in term limitations. I think term limitations are necessary in order to reform this system we have here. Not that the system is bad, but when you are out of touch with the real world, you get distorted a little bit.

I am a firm believer about the process we go through here. We talk about Republicans and Democrats. I am not sure that there is such a thing as a Republican or a Democrat, except after the first vote in the House of Congress and the U.S. Senate, which determines who is going to lead this body and who is going to run the committees.

I think what we do is, we really are either conservatives or we are liberals, and of course we have some people in the middle who have no conviction whatsoever and just go with whatever way they think is to their advantage.

I think the conservative Members of Congress we have are more Jeffersonians than anybody else and really truly believe in small government, less government, more responsibility back to the States and individuals; and I think the liberal aspect of Congress is more in the vein of, let us say, Roosevelt and others who believe in the large central government, that government, big central bureaucracies know best and can control you better than you can control yourself at the Federal level.

People do not understand the code of CFF'S. Literally we pass laws that basically control every single thing you do in your life. We just do not enforce all of them. If we did, we would have major protests, so we just let that go.

The problem is, is that government has passed intrusive laws, punitive laws, laws that control and restrict us. If we look in the old Webster's dictionary, not the new, if we look up the word "law," the first word in the dictionary says "harmony." I do not think our laws have created harmony in this Congress or any Congress preceding this one.

We have developed an attitude here that we are going to help you, if you like it or not, and we are also going to control you, whether you like it or not.

I leave Congress, though, with a lot of good thoughts. Our Speaker here spoke on the very last day before we adjourned about how our Founding Fathers developed this system in such a way as to make sure that no dictator ever could take over control of this

country, and that is why it is complicated and has the intricate parts working in it. Well, I agree with him, and I believe that we need to turn this country back to our basic constitutional principles.

But I also want to remind the Speaker and the people listening here today that through the evolution, through 9 individuals that make up the Supreme Court, we have reinterpreted the original meaning of the Constitution. And we have a lot of things today that make the original Founding Fathers I think probably turn over, as they say, in their graves to see what has happened to the Constitution and what has happened to this country through interpretation by individuals, 9 individuals to be exact, and how this country is managed and run today.

I think we should stick to our charter. I think we should stick to the Constitution, and we are not really basically doing that in many cases.

Getting back to the Constitution, I am a firm believer in the Constitution. I am even a firm believer in the First Amendment, which is freedom of speech. But I think that we have allowed the freedom of speech process to go way beyond what our Founding Fathers really thought of the first amendment. The area we have allowed that to exceed is the area of media or communications.

The media today, other than talk radio, has an open blanket. They can say anything they want to about any individuals without ever any reprisal whatsoever. They have actually adopted a very good tactic by a very infamous individual, Joseph Goebbels. Hitler learned a long, long time ago that if you control the media, you control the minds and the thought of the people. And they did a very, very good job.

What has happened over the evolution of time is the American media has developed some of the same tactics. If you tell a lie long enough and frequent enough, believe it or not, people start to believe it, if it is true or not. And if you try to stop the lie, you end up in court, they keep running it. And then if you win, they run a retraction. And they run a retraction and always kid about running it on the back page in 7-point type, and that is pretty much what happens in this country.

People wonder why the media is looked at with a lot less confidence. The media makes news, they do not report the news anymore. We have very few publications in this country that are very, very conservative, that really try to report the news objectively. It is always slanted in one way or another, depending on what political spectrum you come from.

□ 1430

It is a sad state of affairs. We see newspapers going out of business, and rightfully so. People are really kind of

tired of it in a way and we see the popularity of talk radio. Under talk radio what happens is you have the ability to call in and challenge the one who is making the statements and try to get some kind of a dialogue going back and forth in order to change that.

Overall, I would say that the 104th Congress has accomplished a great deal, and I think this is a historical Congress. You heard earlier on, if you heard some of the earlier speakers, some of the things that were discontinued in the Congress. These different entities that were discontinued by the 104th Congress were really paid for by taxpayers, using your money for special interest groups. We did not just discontinue them, we just said we are not going to fund them any longer, and I think we have done that all down the road.

I was sad to see I was one of the 36 to vote against the continuing resolution last week because I do not believe we should have spent, and there is an argument, some were saying \$6.5 billion, now I hear \$7 billion more than we proposed to spend. I want to tell you that we are already \$22 billion over budget and now we are \$7 billion or \$6.5, whatever you want to believe, over budget. So that means we are about \$28 billion.

If we continue this trend, by the year 2002 we will be \$6 trillion and not \$5 trillion in debt, and this balanced budget amendment is going to go down just like the Gramm-Rudman and everything else. The American public cannot afford this kind of a debt load.

Remember that we almost have a billion dollars a day in interest only. We could do a lot with a billion dollars. If you are socially inclined, just think of what we could do to help education, people on the street, the homeless, and those people who really need help if we had an extra billion dollars a day to spend on these efforts.

In Congress many people have opinions about me. Some of them are very good, and of course some of them are very bad. I will take a quotation out of Kennedy's old book, and I believe that this is very true, that you forgive your enemies but you never forget their names. And I think that is a good policy to follow through.

I know the public, the way it has been characterized that the public has looked upon the 104th Congress, in the media at least, that we have not accomplished anything, we have done a great deal to hurt everything and that, therefore, we should not be deserving to come back again. I want to tell you that the leadership, the Republicans, good or bad, deserve to come back.

We need to carry on what we are trying to do. Even though we have not accomplished everything we wanted to do, I think we have went a long way toward that accomplishment. If nothing else, we have at least added to the debate and made the American public

aware of what is happening as far as their finances are concerned, as far as welfare is concerned, as far as Medicare is concerned, and some of the other social issues that are very important to the American public.

I think in this body you really do not have, quote-unquote, enemies. You really have people who have different philosophical opinions. And I think those that are very, very far to one way or the other, everybody respects those people. Probably the people in the middle, which I call the middle-of-the-roads, the get-along, go-alongs, they have no opinions about anything, just whoever is leading the charge, they jump into it. It is kind of sad that we have people like that in Congress because I think we should all be standing up to be counted, and sometimes that does not happen.

In closing, I want to say that I think the toughest thing on Congress people, individuals, both the male and the female in Congress, is spouses. It is very, very tough on the spouse. We work long hours. We spend a lot of time here and do not spend a lot of time at home, and it is really a sacrifice. I will be glad to get back to my little house and my home and my little ranch in Oregon after spending 2 years here.

At one time I spent about 6 months and only talked to my wife on the phone, which is not very pleasant, especially at my age. I also want to tell you that their support is very necessary in making sure that you have some kind of stability because otherwise you really start doubting yourself; am I really doing what I should be doing, am I really serving the constituents, am I voting for what my people sent me here for.

A lot of people in Congress do not realize this, but I am an employee. The people of the Second District of Oregon hired me to come here and represent them, and, therefore, as an employee, I should be doing whatever I can do to benefit them, trying to pass laws, making sure they are not overtaxed, to benefit them and make sure their lives are better for me being here than they were before I came.

Sometimes that is difficult. As you know, a lot of us vote against legislation and you wonder why. Because part of the legislation is good and it is lumped in with things that are not so good. I would very much prefer to see every bill stand on its own and not be lumped together so, therefore, you could really be accountable. But a lot of times we vote for things because there are three or four good pieces of legislation and there is a couple we do not agree with, but you go ahead and vote for it because you want the good and so, therefore, you have to accept the bad.

We have been taught and told here and you have been taught and told

yourself that politics is an art of compromise. Well, I think we have compromised ourselves into \$5 trillion worth of debt. We have compromised ourselves into a way of life where people have lost the work ethic. I think we have compromised ourselves into a way of life where people believe someone, quote-unquote, the government, owes them something or should give them something and they are not responsible for themselves. That is what we have done in the art of compromise.

There is no such thing as the government. You are the government. It is not a third entity. So every time you see a social program and you say, "gee, isn't that nice," remember you are paying for it. And if you are willing to do that, that is fine, but Congress, the Senate, and the administration should be willing to tell you the facts, and a lot of times we really do not. And you do not get the facts from the media because the media has a different agenda as well.

So you need to make sure the people you send to Congress are accountable to you and you know where they stand on issues and you evaluate them before you hire them to come here and represent you.

In closing, I want to thank not only my wife for her support but for the people on the floor here that supported me and some really good Americans I think that are really here. I listened to the gentleman from California, Congressman DORNAN, the other night talk about the military. We have a lot of people, but nobody talks about the military as eloquently as Congressman DORNAN does, really a good American and understands what the Constitution is about and what our responsibilities really are. But he has been criticized very deeply for this, not only by the media, by the executive branch, but even by people in his own party, the more moderate part of the party.

I have a great staff of people who have dedicated and stuck by me through a lot of tough times. We have had about 6 months of living hell and my chief of staff, Brian MacDonald, the guy who runs my office; Brian Hard, my legal man; David Spooner; Doug Badger, natural resources; Chris Matthews. Chris handles PR and also our press releases. Jason Vaillancourt. Jason is kind of a handyman in the office. And Merrick Munday, who handles all of our computer work.

Out in Medford we have Duane Bales, who runs the office; Terry Haines handling our GI stuff and the VA stuff; Ryan Beckley and Teri Thornburg.

These kids, and I say kids because to me they are young people, they are in their thirties really, really will make you feel good about America. And in fact all the people working here on both sides of the aisle in the way of staff, these are really dedicated, bright young people. When you look at them,

no matter what you hear in the media or what you read in the papers about children graduating and cannot read and write and really are not set up for the labor market, you look at the young people who come to Congress, and maybe they are the brightest we have, but I will tell you, they are really sharp and they need a lot of praise and they need a lot of nourishment and encouragement. And I think we are doing that here because I think those will be the leaders in the future of this country, and I think we are probably leaving it in some pretty good hands.

You will hear in the next 40 some odd days, what we have running in the Presidential debates, a lot of things. I think you need to really make sure you weigh those things out and understand what is coming, who is saying what about whom and where we are really headed and what we want to try to do.

One of the most critical things in this country I think today is to make sure that we do not leave a huge debt for our children and our grandchildren. And I think that was one of the primary objectives of this 104th Congress, and hopefully it will be of the 105th Congress. We cannot continuously spend more than we bring in. The debt load will literally cut down and shut down the economic value of this country and destroy it. And I think this is the main focus. I think the 104th has done a good job on this. I think the 105th will as well.

So in parting from Congress, I want to say basically I came here not as a politician, but I came here hopefully to learn something, to participate in the legislative process. I have done that. I have been here. I am sad to leave this year, but everything worked out probably best for everybody. I think that we need to have term limits. I think we need to bring more people into the system to understand it.

No one has ever captured Congress in the written word. I have read every book anyone has written recently on Congress. They have never really captured Congress. I am not sure anybody totally understands this process. It is complicated, it is very decisive, there is a lot of things that go on that people do not know about, not even we in Congress know about, that come up out of the ground, and it is pretty tough sometimes to be able to perceive all these things going on.

It is the best system in the world. Our Founding Fathers did a pretty good job of setting it up. We have messed it up a little bit through the Supreme Court decisions, but I think that all in all we have a pretty good country. I am very, very concerned about the lack of support by many, many people in this country of what is happening to them personally, how the laws have been, like I said before, more punitive than encouraging. We should be passing laws that benefit people and

not laws that restrict them and prohibit them from doing what they can do best in the free enterprise system.

So, Mr. Speaker, it has been a great time, I have enjoyed it.

CALLING FOR A COMPLETE INVESTIGATION OF JUDGE REINHARDT'S CHARGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is reallocated the remainder of the majority leader's hour.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend and colleague from Oregon, he is someone who I very much have enjoyed working with, someone who truly has stood tall for the Constitution and sometimes has been alone or nearly alone in taking those positions, and I always found him to be a very reliable voting Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, both here on the floor and in committees, where he has served both in the Committee on Agriculture and in the Committee on Resources, where he could always be counted upon to stand for the interests of the American people no matter what the power of any given special interest that might be arrayed against him on any given issue. So I say to my friend that you will be missed, and I wish you and your wife well in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment upon a couple of items that were brought to my attention, and it was sufficiently late in the session, I regret, that I have not been able to fully act upon this information, but I thought I would set the stage today for later on in the year or in the first part of next year.

I had provided to me an article from the San Francisco Daily Journal, dated July 18, 1996, entitled "Reinhardt's Lament," by Michael Rushford, president of the Criminal Justice Legal Foundation.

This article examines a speech that Judge Reinhardt delivered on June 4 to the Beverly Hills Bar Association at a luncheon honoring the justices of the California Supreme Court.

□ 1445

The article in the San Francisco Daily Journal dated July 18, 1996, by Michael Rushford is subtitled "Did Federal Jurist's Speech Impugn the Integrity of Other Judges?"

Mr. Speaker, Judge Reinhardt gave, I thought, some very disturbing remarks, one portion of which, or the central portion of which I am now going to quote from. Keep in mind, this speech was given before a body containing many distinguished lawyers and judges at the highest levels from throughout the State of California.

In this speech Judge Reinhardt attacked the habeas corpus law—which

was enacted during the 104th Congress and which was called the Effective Death Penalty Act. This law basically made dramatic reforms which will affect the length of time between arrest and execution upon conviction for a capital offense. It will result in a much quicker handling of matters such as Richard Allen Davis, the brutal murderer of little Polly Klaas out in California. As the Speaker may know, the average time between arrest and carrying out of the sentence has been about 7 years. Actually in California the average has been 11 years because we were afflicted with a very liberal court appointed by former Governor Jerry Brown, and they used every contrivance possible to drag out the imposition of the death penalty.

So this reform that we enacted is a very important one. It certainly upholds the 10th amendment and gives due deference to the decisions of State courts in death penalty matters, while allowing for legitimate exceptions where there is clearly a case in which the Constitution was violated. But it will not allow Federal judges with life terms to step in and manipulate for political purposes these sentences handed down by juries and judges throughout the country.

Whether one is liberal or conservative—and Judge Reinhardt is a self-avowed liberal and makes no bones about it—the judge's statement is not very liberal to say the least. In fact, it stands really in a class by itself. Let me just quote that statement.

Reinhardt announced:

I have spoken with judges who must stand for election, and I have heard them say that they cannot afford to reverse capital convictions in cases that engender heated community passions.

Let me quote Mr. Rushford, who I think very effectively comments upon what Judge Reinhardt is saying. Mr. Rushford wrote in this July 18 article:

In making this statement, Judge Reinhardt admitted personal knowledge of the most serious form of judicial misconduct: condemning an unjustly convicted defendant to death because of political pressure.

Considering the magnitude of such disclosures, one wonders why Judge Reinhardt did not immediately report the judges who made them to the State authorities charged with judicial discipline rather than discussing them at a luncheon. In any event, in order to protect hundreds of elected State appellate and Supreme Court justices from falling under suspicion, the names of the judges he has implicated and the improperly decided cases should be made public.

Mr. Speaker, this is of grave concern to me, where you have a Federal judge of the second highest court in the United States who makes this kind of a statement and basically is admitting personal knowledge of judges who have countenanced people going to their death because they were not willing to stand up for the Constitution and the law of this land and stand up for that which is right.

I think Judge Reinhardt owes us an explanation. I think he needs to give the proper authorities the names of those judges of whom he has personal knowledge. I think this is absolutely outrageous that we can have a high judge who is basically telling us, people are going to their deaths who are innocent, and that these things are happening because State judges are intimidated by the very electorate they will have to face.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the chairman of our House Committee on the Judiciary about this. I will be sending the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, a letter, and I will send such a letter to Senator ORRIN HATCH, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I am going to include these articles, and I am going to ask for their investigation.

I do not think we can tolerate this kind of gross judicial misconduct in the United States. I call for a complete investigation of Judge Reinhardt's charges and of the underlying information that he has supporting those charges.

I think it is time to restore justice and integrity to our system. I am not so sure Judge Reinhardt is right, but in order to tell you that he is wrong, then we are going to have to have either an admission from him that he overstated the case or we are going to have to have the names of the corrupt, spineless, immoral, anticonstitutional judges that he was referring to so we can get the records and look into this matter immediately. In a country that makes justice and the equal protection of the law and holds sacred life and liberty, we can do no less.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the articles to which I referred: [From the San Francisco Daily Journal, July 18, 1996]

REINHARDT'S LAMENT—DID FEDERAL JURIST'S SPEECH IMPUGN THE INTEGRITY OF OTHER JUDGES?

(By Michael Rushford)

Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Stephen Reinhardt was back in the news recently. In a June 4 luncheon address to the Beverly Hills Bar Association, Reinhardt found serious fault with a host of evils that have limited the authority of federal judges and tarnished the image of lawyers generally.

It was not surprising that Reinhardt, who has been characterized in the press as a "crusading liberal judge," would complain about the arbitration industry, cuts in federal funding for poverty lawyers and "intemperate and inexcusable attacks" on judicial independence by politicians (see "Fall From Grace," Forum, June 6). His criticism of O.J. Simpson prosecutors Marcia Clark and Christopher Darden, while a cheap shot, simply added his name to the scores of other pundits who have never prosecuted a celebrity on national television.

But Reinhardt's lament about the impact of newly enacted limits on federal habeas corpus went somewhat beyond bombast. While asserting that the new rules will "prevent federal courts from overturning uncon-

stitutional state convictions," Reinhardt announced, "I have spoken with judges who must stand for election, and I have heard them say that they cannot afford to reserve capital convictions in cases that engender heated community passions."

In making this statement, Judge Reinhardt admitted personal knowledge of the most serious knowledge of the most serious form of judicial misconduct condemning an unjustly convicted defendant to death because of political pressure.

Considering the magnitude of such disclosures, one wonders why Judge Reinhardt did not immediately report the judges who made them to the state authorities charged with judicial discipline rather than discussing them at a luncheon. In any event, in order to protect hundreds of elected state appellate and Supreme Court justices from falling under suspicion, the names of the judges he has implicated and the improperly decided cases should be made public.

By not doing so, Judge Reinhardt leads one to believe that either he values the confidence of these unnamed judges more than the Constitution he has sworn to uphold or he has fabricated the whole thing to advance his own political agendas.

In reality, elected state judges, particularly on the appellate courts, have demonstrated time and again that political consideration do not influence their decisions. Examples include the 1992 case of State v. Middlebrooks, where the Tennessee Supreme Court overturned the state's felony murder rule, initially on federal grounds. Later, when the U.S. Supreme Court seemed poised to reverse, the Tennessee court reconsidered, insulating its holding on independent state grounds.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court went way out on a limb to anger voters with its 1992 decision to overturn that state's hate crime law (State v. Mitchell). In 1995 Montana's law prohibiting the use of voluntary intoxication as a defense to murder was (incorrectly) found to violate federal due process by the state supreme court (State v. Egelhoff).

Political pressure certainly didn't play a role in the California Supreme Court's recent decision to void the mandatory sentencing provision of the "Three strikes and you're out" law in People v. Superior Court (Romero).

Examples like these may not matter to Judge Reinhardt. In the interest of elevating the "public standing and reputation" of the courts, he has, in both his written opinions and public statements, attacked the motives and integrity of the U.S. Supreme Court, the state courts, the other branches of government, the electorate and any law or legal precedent with which he does not agree.

In doing so he has shown the public that some federal judges, who are appointed by politicians and serve life terms, feel free to exercise their judicial power to further their political views. Apparently the irony of this is lost on him.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills, and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 543. An act to reauthorize the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1734. An act to reauthorize the National Film Preservation Board, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2579. An act to establish the National Tourism Board and the National Tourism Organization to promote international travel and tourism to the United States; and

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress and the day for the counting in Congress of the electoral votes for President and Vice President cast in December 1996.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 640. An act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 811. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies regarding the desalination of water and water reuse, and for other purposes;

S. 1044. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to consolidate and reauthorize provisions relating to health centers, and for other purposes;

S. 1467. An act to authorize the construction of the Fort Peck Rural County Water Supply System, to authorize assistance to the Fort Peck Rural County Water District, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, for the planning, design, and construction of the water supply system, and for other purposes;

S. 1505. An act to reduce risk to public safety and the environment associated with pipeline transportation of natural gas and hazardous liquids, and for other purposes;

S. 1711. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for a study of the Federal programs for veterans, and for other purposes;

S. 1965. An act to prevent the illegal manufacturing and use of methamphetamine;

S. 1973. An act to provide for the settlement of the Navajo-Hopi land dispute, and for other purposes; and

S. 2153. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located in Brewer, Maine, as the "Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain Post Office Building", and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 3, 1996, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5409. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on the status of the public ports of the United States for calendar years 1994-95, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 308(c); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5410. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Importation of Fruit Trees from France [Docket No. 94-102-3] received October 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Standards for First Aid at Metal and Nonmetal Mines (RIN: 1219-AA97) received October 1, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

5412. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Protection of Human Subjects; Informed Consent (RIN: 0910-AA60) received October 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5413. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting

the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List [ID #96-005] received October 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5414. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the third annual report on the impact of the Andean Trade Preference Act on U.S. industries and consumers and on drug crop eradication and crop substitution, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 3204; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2740. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

H.R. 2923. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

H.R. 2976. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Government Reform and Oversight for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

H.R. 4012. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. MILLER of California) introduced a resolution (H. Res. 556.) expressing the intentions of the House of Representatives concerning the universal service provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as they relate to telecommunications services to native Americans, including Alaskan Natives; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2651: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 2734: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2900: Mr. FUNDERBURK.

H.R. 3466: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 3837: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 4072: Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 4092: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 4105: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 4170: Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 4274: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 4305: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 4334: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 510: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 555: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NEY, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. WAXMAN.