

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

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