

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I just thought that it would be apropos for us to take a look at what the accomplishments of this particular Congress and the changes in the world are bringing to the American people. Today I hope that those people who are reading these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and those people who are watching on C-SPAN recognize that over the past 2 years we have indeed seen a revolution in Washington, DC.

The word "revolution" really means a turnaround. It means not necessarily that great strides have taken place going in one direction or the other but, instead, that the direction has changed. Over these last 2 years, we have changed the direction of Government in the United States of America. I am very proud to have been part of NEWT GINGRICH's team, the new team in the House of Representatives, and what we have done to try to bring control to the uncontrolled increase in taxation and spending that threatened the very well-being of the American people. We have also come to grips with other issues that in the past have been unattended when the other party controlled the House of Representatives.

One of the issues that is of most concern to me, Mr. Speaker, and of most concern to Californians is the flood of immigration, especially illegal immigration, that is flowing into California that is destroying some of our basic institutions and our social infrastructure.

Today in California, many Americans who have spent their entire life paying their taxes, living honestly, trying to raise their family, trying to be good citizens in their community, are finding that the social infrastructure that they have come to rely upon is being destroyed because people from other countries are coming to our State illegally and flooding into the schools, into our hospitals, they are crowding our jails and preventing the judicial system from functioning and the other social services systems from functioning as they were set up.

For the first time Congress has come to grips with this problem. I am very proud that although the President of the United States, who claimed that he was going to try to do everything he could to help us with this flood of immigration, that the President of the United States instead did everything he could to drag his feet and to prevent us from passing a meaningful immigration bill, but despite this, we were able to pass an immigration bill that turned the country around.

There is still very much to do, and next year we will accomplish more on the issue of immigration reform. But we can be proud that instead of aiming at policies that made the situation worse, we have now turned this Government toward solving the problem and confronting the challenge to the American people.

One area of concern to me, and I believe that our people should be alerted to this, is that this year this administration decided to speed up the process of naturalization of people who are in this country legally. However, many of those people who have been sworn in and become citizens of the United States were people who entered the United States illegally and were granted amnesty back in 1986. What we have had in the last year is a speedup of the naturalization process so that 1.3 million legal immigrants now have basically become citizens. That is three times the number that were naturalized just 2 years ago.

Of that 1.3 million, this administration was in such a rush to grant them citizenship that thousands upon thousands of individuals who should have been screened out because they were convicted felons have been granted U.S. citizenship and turned loose among us.

This cannot be tolerated. I would hope that the American people note who is trying to solve the problem and who is not trying to solve the problem, who is trying to come to grips with the ever increasing load of taxation and spending that we have seen from Washington, who is trying could to come to grips with this threat of a massive flood of illegal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have served in this Congress, a Congress that has at last come to grips with some of these problems and challenges to our country's well-being.

FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I have enjoyed serving here in this Congress with you. Let me say that this session, the first in 40 years with conservatives in control, we made many fundamental changes. We did end the era of big government and ushered in the Information Age in government, the age of less government, but more responsive government. This is a great institution, the U.S. Congress. It is here that the people's will is carried out, maybe not always with rushing speed, but it is certainly carried out, heard and eventually carried out.

The greatest honor that I have had bestowed on me has come from the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin, who have elected me nine times to this U.S. House of Representatives, and for that I thank them. This is a wonderful institution, wonderful people to serve with, and as I take my leave today, I just want all of my colleagues to know how much I have appreciated serving in this body, and I hope to see them often, and I know that they will carry on in the great traditions that this Congress has served the American people for over 200 years.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). 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.

FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to comment on a couple of things that have been said over the course of the past few days. First of all, I want to comment on the ridiculous and intemperate remarks made by Governor Bush of Texas with regard to the Yankees and Bronx, NY, which I am proud to represent.

When asked if he would be coming to Yankee Stadium to see the Yankees play, he made a remark about if he came he would have to carry his gun. I think that that is a remark that ill behooves a Governor of a great State and, quite frankly, if Governor Bush had cared as much about taking guns out of the hands of criminals and perhaps controlling, having some kind of gun control instead of signing legislation that allows people to carry concealed weapons, perhaps the streets would be safer for all of us.

I would invite him to come to the Bronx, where crime has dropped tremendously; in fact, as the mayor of New York, who is a Republican, has pointed out, that New York City has led the way. There has been a reduction in crime across the country. I think President Clinton deserves credit, Congress deserves credit, and local officials deserve credit. But New York City has led the way in the drop in crime, and so has Bronx, NY. And so I just think that Governors ought to think about what they say before they go shooting their mouths off and making intemperate remarks.

I also wanted to comment on some of the remarks made by Senator Dole the past couple of days where he has been very critical of President Clinton's foreign policy. I want to say that I think that the President, certainly over the past couple of years, has shown great leadership in terms of foreign policy. One only needs to look around the world.

One needs to look at Bosnia, where ethnic cleansing was going along until the United States stepped in firmly and stopped it. Has everything been a 100 percent success? Nothing is 100 percent success, but we know under President Clinton's leadership we have ended most of the killing in Bosnia and the United States has shown leadership and only the United States can show that type of leadership.

In the Middle East, we saw the accords signed and we saw a potential unraveling of the peace accords in the

Middle East. It took a great courage, in my opinion, for President Clinton to have called Mr. Arafat and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu and King Hussein to the White House to try to get calmer heads to prevail, to try to start a dialog, to try to ensure that the peace process is put back on track. That was done 5 weeks before his reelection. I think that took an inordinate amount of courage for him to do it.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said, what else do you expect the President of the United States to do? He tried to bring the parties together. That is what he has done in terms of his leadership.

In Iraq, I was one of those Democrats that broke with my party and supported President Bush on the Persian Gulf war. Frankly, if President Bush's administration had done the job it was supposed to do, we would have been rid of Saddam Hussein. Many of us could not understand why he was allowed to stay in power after American triumphs in the Persian Gulf war.

And so now I think it ill behooves Senator Dole and others to point fingers and criticize when, quite frankly, during those days leading up to the Persian Gulf war, when this House had the great courage and the Senate did as well to pass my resolution declaring Jerusalem the undivided capital of Israel, it was Senator Dole back in those days of 1990 who criticized it, said he had been to Arab capitals and all the Arab leaders wanted to talk about was this terrible resolution which should not have been passed. One of the so-called Arab leaders that he spoke with in those days traveled to Baghdad and spoke with Saddam Hussein and was very concerned about what Saddam Hussein thought.

□ 1445

And then several months later we were battling him in the Persian Gulf; so frankly I do not think that Bob Dole is in any kind of position to criticize President Clinton in that regard.

Northern Ireland; we can go on and on. The President has tried very, very hard to say that the United States needs to play a leadership role, I think in world affairs. And again Senator Dole when he was here was cutting back foreign aid, cutting back American involvement overseas.

I think we make a terrible mistake if we move back to the isolationist policies, as friends of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle seem to think, moving back 100 years ago. When communism collapsed, suddenly many of my friends on the other side of the aisle did not think the United States ought to play a role, a major role, in world affairs. I think we need to be engaged if we are the leaders of the world, the leaders of the free world and the leaders of the world as we are. Then with leadership comes responsibility. No one anointed us the leader of the world; we claim that mantle, and we ought to act that way.

So I think we ought to be helping these countries, we ought to be doing

what we can. We cannot be the policemen of the world, but we need to pick and choose and show American determination and American leadership, and that is what this President has done, and that is why I support him.

CAN GOVERNMENT THRIVE IN SUNSHINE?

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for my last speech very saddened by the fact that I have to ask the question: Am I too idealistic for government, or is government possible without—can you possibly relate to values and character and disclosure? Can government ever be anything other than a fungus? Can it thrive in sunshine? I tend to believe it can. But I want to tell you I came in with difficulties with the Defense Department, and I leave with the same frustration and difficulties with the Defense Department. It is now under my own party, and they are probably happier to see me leave than anybody, even on the other side of the aisle. How saddened I am that their real message to me is:

You are leaving. We do not care. Good-bye. We are not even going to answer inquiries.

Now for 6 months almost we have been asking the Defense Department about why they would deploy high ranking officials to the Speaker's office. We have asked that and asked that and asked that. They have stonewalled and stonewalled.

Then we add a Freedom of Information Act, and what did I get? I got their memo talking about how the Speaker had requested these high quality officers in his thing. Then I got a wonderful four pages, totally blacked out, and the rest of it was copies of my letters to them.

Now, this is treating me like I have the brain of a gnat. You think that if they are sitting over there with over 20,000 employees and that kind of arrogance: we do not care what the law is, we are going to do what we want; this saddens me very much, and I think it only breeds cynicism about what happens to people when they come here.

I remind them that I thought they worked for the Commander in Chief. He put out a memo on what department heads and agencies were supposed to do with the Freedom of Information Act. I remind them I thought they worked under Janet Reno and her memo about what you are supposed to do with the Freedom of Information Act and that kind of information.

How classified could this information be? I mean please. These memos all say that, if one sentence is classified, you are not to blank out the whole page. Well, tell that to the Defense Department.

Furthermore, how classified is that that public regulations in the House and public regulations in the Defense

Department, which clearly deny the use of military officers for partisan purposes when they are being requested; the Joint Chiefs then send them over? That is not classified. That is not any great secret. I guess the only secret is if other Members of Congress find out this happened, they too may request officers in their office. And where does this all end?

That is why this is so dangerous.

Look, a lot of people liked it when they grow up playing with soldiers, little tin soldiers; but we are not supposed to be able to requisition fully funded taxpayer soldiers to play with in your office. This is not GI Joe. This is a legislative body.

So, obviously, what this has done was one more way the Pentagon lobbies on this Hill. They lobby on this Hill in a way that no other agency can, and people will be outraged if any other agency did. Yet, they get by with it, and I think it is very sad that they would duck the Freedom of Information Act, duck the memos from the Attorney General, duck the memos from the President and do their total blackout on something that I cannot imagine has one classified secret that you could even dream of in there.

I think all this is is protecting their backside. All this is is saying that that woman will go back to Colorado, and we will not have to deal with her, and no one else will take this up. Well, I hope other Members in this body take it up because I think, once you start allowing the military to come into political offices, I do not care if they are Republican or Democratic offices, and sit around to use military strategy to figure out how you declare partisan war on the other side, that is a shock. I think the taxpayers would find that shocking. I do not think they think we pay military officers to engage in partisan political games. I think they think they are paying them to do something in an entirely different non-partisan way.

So I hope these lines do not ever get blurred again. We have seen a tremendous blurring of them, and we have seen the Defense Department stonewalling and defending them and defending their right to do it. But as I leave here, I certainly hope somebody picks this up and we put this to bed.

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 Mrs. SCHROEDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)