

feel at peace in their communities, that they are not secure.

At times like this, we can find some comfort in the fact that no amount of violence can destroy the progress we have made toward becoming a more tolerant society. Everyday, in communities across the country, men and women young and old are teaching the lessons of peace, love, and faith so central to American life. But even as we take comfort, we cannot become so comfortable that we do nothing. For if we do nothing, we are accepting bigotry as part of our social landscape—and we will never accept that.

Cowardly actions demand powerful responses. The President began today by saying, "They know not what they do." Some may not know, but the perpetrators of these acts know exactly what they do—and it cannot be tolerated.

When those who burn churches send their message of hate, good people across this Nation need to rally together. When bigots tell millions of Americans that they are less than equal, then we must tell the bigots that we are all brothers and sisters. And when arsonists slink in the dark of night trying to undermine our community, we must stand up in the light of day and proclaim that our community is far too strong to be damaged by their actions.

Those who burn churches want to mark the Earth with the ashes and rubble of their intolerance. Instead, let us rebuild these churches as a living memorial, made of stone and brick, to our commitment to human rights and human dignity.

By passing this resolution, we let the purveyors of hate know that the good people of this Nation will drown out the message of hate wherever it appears.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WHITE HOUSE FILE SCANDAL— THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE ANSWERS

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there certainly is no deficit of delusion, distortion and desperation from these born-again budgeteers on the liberal side of the aisle, but, Mr. Speaker, I come here today to commend to everyone's attention the article that appears in this morning's Wall Street Journal headlined "Inside the White House File Scandal", which I submit for the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Thursday,  
June 13, 1996]

INSIDE THE WHITE HOUSE FILE SCANDAL  
(By Gary W. Aldrich)

I loved my career with the FBI and treasure my years as a special agent. Of the many

assignments I was privileged to have over the course of a 26-year career, the highlight was the five years, just prior to my 1995 retirement, I spent assigned to the White House.

For more than three decades the FBI, the Secret Service and the White House Counsel's Office had worked as a team to clear the hundreds of new staff members who come with each new administration. This clearance process entailed a lengthy FBI background investigation to document the good character of every White House employee. It was a comprehensive and effective security system, perfected by six presidents to protect national security, the taxpayer and the White House itself.

#### DEEPLY DISTURBING

But the things I saw in the last 2½ years of my tenure deeply disturbed me. And the recent disclosures that the Clinton White House requested, and the FBI provided, more than 340 background investigations on previous administrations; employees raise questions that pierce the very heart of national security, and call into question the relationship between the White House and FBI.

Some presidents have made good use of the FBI background investigations, and some to their regret have not. Never before has any administration used background investigations of another president's political staff. FBI employees knew it would be wrong to give raw FBI files on political opponents to the other party. In fact, they knew it would be illegal, each disclosure a violation of the federal Privacy Act.

Why, then, did the Clinton administration request such files, and why did the FBI provide them? The White House's "explanation"—that it was "an honest bureaucratic snafu"—is really too much for this FBI veteran to believe. How does a unit at FBI headquarters copy and box for shipment to the White House Counsel's Office more than 340 highly confidential files, when the two FBI supervisors are both lawyers? Do the White House and the FBI really expect us to believe that the wholesale copying of hundreds of FBI files wouldn't raise an eye brow? That the two FBI supervisors didn't know who James Baker was? If the FBI supervisors didn't know that hundreds of confidential files were going out the door, they were so grossly negligent as to imperil not only the civil rights of more than 340 individuals, but also national security.

In truth, I know that FBI management had plenty of warning that elements of security and background investigations were drastically wrong at the Clinton White House. As early as May 1993, Special Agent James Bourke, supervisor of the FBI office responsible for background investigations, had come under fire when, at the behest of the White House, he started a criminal investigation of seven innocent men in the Travel Office.

Not publicly known until now were the constant warnings that Mr. Bourke and other FBI management received from me and from my partner, Dennis Sculimbrene (who would go on to testify against his own agency and the White House as a defense witness in the Billy Dale trial). Why are Mr. Bourke and the good folks at the FBI just now finding serious reasons to check on the legitimacy of the requests of this White House? Documents exist that prove they have known about these problems for years. Mr. Bourke declined to be interviewed for this article, so one can only speculate as to why he ignored the repeated warnings. It may be that, like any bureaucrat, Mr. Bourke was simply trying to win favor from those he thought could advance his career—in this case, officials at the White House.

These allegations are more serious than anything we have seen in decades. So how can the White House, through Attorney General Janet Reno, be allowed to order the FBI to investigate itself? No federal bureaucracy is good at conducting an internal probe that has this kind of potential for explosive political revelation.

Right up to the time I retired in June 1995, Mr. Bourke and other FBI supervisors responsible for background investigations continued to honor each and every outrageous request the Clinton White House Counsel's Office made. Mr. Bourke cannot claim he did not know these requests were improper. He was well aware the Clinton administration had relaxed the security system at the White House so that those loyal to the administration could evade background checks. Other agents and I had told him so, and scores of documents gong across his desk provided more evidence, just in case he did not believe his own agents. In fact, at the time the White House requested the files on previous administrations' appointees—one full year into the Clinton administration—more than 100 Clinton staffers, including then Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers, still had not been investigated by the FBI for passes or clearances.

Yet the Clinton's White House Counsel's office apparently was wasting no time looking deeply into the background of any one who was not lucky enough to have been hired by President Clinton. As Mr. Bourke also knew, permanent White House employees whose loyalty to the Clintons was in question were in for some "special" attention, Hillary Clinton style. For example, permanent employees in the White House residence who were suspected of being disloyal to the first lady were reinvestigated out of sequence, that is, early—in some cases four years before their periodic review was due.

Some of these staff members, appointed by Presidents Carter, Reagan or Bush, had just been cleared by the FBI. When I attempted to head off what appeared to be unnecessary and premature investigations by offering to obtain copies of the background investigations, my superiors at the FBI and Craig Livingstone, director of security for the White House Counsel's Office, effectively told me to mind my own business. What prompted the White House to investigate these staffers was a story, leaked to the press, that Mrs. Clinton had thrown a lamp at the president during a domestic argument. The Clintons had to know who the leader was. Result: Decent, loyal, law abiding citizens with spotless records were investigated by the FBI again, just to make sure. I believe that these permanent employees were being harassed and that if anything, anything at all, had turned up in a new FBI probe, they would have been summarily tossed out the door to "make slots" for the Clintons' people. And indeed, other employees besides Billy Dale were fired on the basis of these investigations.

At the same time, the White House was requesting copies of FBI investigations of hundreds of long-gone Reagan and Bush staffers. Why? Knowing that the Clintons casually used the FBI to weed out politically suspect employees, would it be so unreasonable to suspect them of also misusing the FBI to investigate political "enemies"? Statements by Clinton spokesmen that nobody looked at these FBI files are as plausible as saying that if 340 Playboy magazines were sent to a boys' high school, they would remain in their boxes, unmolested.

#### BEDROOM-SIZE SAFE

The safe where these secret records were allegedly kept was the size of a small bedroom. Maybe the files were taken out of the

safe, and maybe they weren't. There was no need to take them out to examine them. Anyone—including Mr. Livingstone, whose desk was just outside the entrance to the safe—could have walked in, sat down at the table and perused the files to his heart's content. And the security office was equipped with a photocopy machine. I knew Mr. Livingstone as a fierce defender of the Clintons, especially Mrs. Clinton, who handpicked him for this sensitive position.

Which of these files were copied, and where were the copies sent? The time has come for real explanations, real investigations of the Clinton White House Counsel's Office and, sadly, maybe even of the FBI. In particular, Mr. Bourke and Mr. Livingstone should explain their roles. These FBI files could not have been requested, received and maintained without Mr. Livingstone's full knowledge, consent and direction. Mr. Bourke is responsible for protecting the FBI files and for ensuring the FBI's arm's-length relationship with this or any administration.

These two men should be brought before both a federal grand jury and Congress to account for this highly irregular conduct—conduct that has embarrassed the presidency and the FBI, undermined the public's trust in both institutions and potentially violated federal law. The Clinton administration has earned its reputation. But the FBI—my FBI—deserves better. Enough is enough.

Listen to what Gary Aldrich, a former FBI official, writes: "Never before has any administration used background investigations of another President's political staff." How does a unit at FBI headquarters copy and box for shipment to the White House counsel's office more than 340 highly confidential files when the two FBI supervisors are both lawyers? Do the White House and the FBI really expect us to believe that the wholesale copying of hundreds of FBI files would not raise an eyebrow?

Oh, it raises more than an eyebrow, it raises serious questions. The American people deserve answers. This House will find those answers.

#### ANSWER TO THE QUESTION: WHAT IF IT WERE A REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION?

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I came to this floor to talk about this historic vote yesterday when all the judiciary Republicans voted unanimously against defining marriage as a non-adulterous, nonmonogamous relationship. I found that shocking.

Mr. Speaker, I really want to talk about something else now after listening to this. I want to congratulate the Republicans for being concerned about FBI files, and I want to congratulate this President for apologizing for what happened, and I want to say to the Republicans I can answer the question about what would happen if it was a Republican administration.

In 1972, when I was a candidate for Congress, our house got broken into over and over, our car got broken into, we kept having Jim's barber, my hus-

band's barber show up at our house. We could not figure out what was going on.

Many months after I got elected a man got picked up for breaking into a house, and he said, "You can't do this to me because I've been hired by the FBI to break into SCHROEDER's house."

That was the Nixon FBI. Not one Republican came forward and said anything about it, nor did President Nixon.

So, let us put this in context, please.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a sad day for the institution of marriage. The House Judiciary Committee voted down an amendment I offered that would have defined marriage as a nonadulterous, monogamous relationship.

For all their talk about family issues, not one Republican voted for my amendment. The party of family values failed to stand up for them when it counted. That's because in introducing the Defense of Marriage Act, the Republicans are far less interested in defending family values than in stirring up division and fear in the election season.

This bill is the first attempt in history by the Congress to define marriage. Traditionally, the power to define and regulate marriages has been entirely up to the States. What is the grave threat facing marriage that would prompt Congress for the first time in 200 years to sound the emergency alarm? Well, maybe in the next 3 years, the State of Hawaii, might recognize same-sex marriages.

But everyone knows that adultery is a far greater threat to marriage than the speculative threat of same-sex marriages, which not one State recognizes today.

Well, if Congress is going to define marriage, then I think it's important to make it clear in that definition that we do not condone adultery. But not one Republican was willing to make commitment to marriage.

Yesterday's committee vote showed who values families and who's just fooling around.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). 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.

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

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### BURRELL COMMUNICATIONS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this evening it is my pleasure to honor a distinguished citizen and corporate entity from my district, Tom Burrell and the Burrell Communications Group who on tomorrow, June 14, will celebrate 25 years of outstanding service to African-American consumers.

In this wonderfully diverse Nation it is essential that the broad span of American diversity be fully represented in advertising. It is good business because it extends the reach of corporate marketing efforts, and it is good social policy because it creates positive images of African-American culture, serves as a bridge of information and awareness among general audiences, and as a source of inspiration and self-esteem among African-Americans.

Twenty-five years ago as a young copy writer Tom Burrell affirmed that the best way to communicate with the black consumer is through the natural channel of communications, the African-American advertising agency. And thus began Tom's legacy of developing culturally relevant and sensitive advertising messages that have over the years generated business-building, award-winning marketing communications programs for some of our Nation's best-known companies.

Tom Burrell's creativity work embodies the highest level of professionalism. His award winning advertisements are often imitated by general advertising agencies. And most importantly he has never forgotten his community. Burrell Communications continues to be a significant training ground for young African-Americans in the advertising industry. Their work and financial contributions for the betterment of our community and our nation must not go unmentioned.

Tom has overcome many, many difficult obstacles in making these achievements, and some surely remain.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been one of my highest legislative priorities to work to improve conditions for African-American, women, seniors, and minorities in every aspect of this society. I first introduced The Non-Discrimination in Advertising Act in 1987, and I introduced H.R. 177, the Diversity in Media Act in 1995.

I am proud that I have been successful in amending a great deal of legislation over the past 23 years to make sure that minorities were included.

I would like to officially thank you Tom and the Burrell Communications