

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 gentlewoman 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 interservice 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 exposé, 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 its 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 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 Arme (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 of-

ficers 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 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, 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 Chappie)

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 greatest 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 Speakership:

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 ascendancy 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 request 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 Bosnian beyond

that December 20 deadline. The Bosnian tragedy was always and remains mostly a civil war. American foreign policy has never been based on inserting 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