

the other material—unsubstantiated charges, rumors, innuendo and speculation—on Speaker Wright would be a terrible precedent for the House, threatens all Members and makes a mockery of fair play.

The Outside Counsel has followed every lead, pursued every rumor, and reported on each to the Committee. Appropriately so.

But as the Ethics Committee prepares its recommendations to the full House, it should release only the information which the Committee agrees is relevant and necessary to support its findings. To ask a Member, any Member, to also respond in the court of public opinion to allegations, rumors and innuendo not deemed worthy of charge by the Committee would be totally unfair and a perversion of due process. Especially in a time of press sensationalism.

Consider this: More than 70 Members of Congress were investigated in the outside counsel's inquiry into the sex/drugs page scandal in 1983, of which only two Members were eventually proceeded against. Would it have been fair to release unedited, unsubstantiated or inconsequential allegations that the Committee considered against the other 68 Members?

For the Ethics Committee to release raw material not deemed by the Committee to be worthy of formal action sets the stage for the ruination of any Member's career—possibly triggered by the political or personal animosity of any other Member or outside group.

Public release of material not germane to formal Committee action in the Wright case would be similar to the process used during the Joe McCarthy era: Ignore the discipline of due process and firm evidence, and dump unproven allegations out in public and let the ensuing publicity destroy the person's reputation and career.

Is that the procedure we want the House to adopt? Is that what this institution and our Ethics Committee stand for? We hope not.

We hope the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct will adhere to its distinguished history of fairness in the matter of releasing unsubstantiated, uncharged items. Fairness to all Members requires the same treatment now.

DAVE NAGLE.  
JIM MOODY.  
ROBERT T. MATSUI.

Below is a list of 100 Democrats who signed a "Dear Colleague" letter asking for the suppression of information in the Wright inquiry.

THESE MEMBERS DID NOT WANT FULL DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION ON SPEAKER WRIGHT'S ETHICS

Alexander, Bill; Andrews, Michael; Bilbray, James; Borski, Robert; Brennan, Joseph; Brooks, Jack; Brown, George; Bryant, John; Bustamante, Albert; Campbell, Ben; Nighthorse; Cardin, Benjamin; Chapman, Jim; Clarke, James McClure; Clay, William; Coleman, Ronald; Collins, Cardiss; Cooper, Jim; Coyne, William; Darden, George; DeFazio, Peter; de la Garza, E; Dellums, Ronald; Derrick, Butler; Dingell, John; Dorgan, Byron; Durbin, Richard; Dymally, Mervyn; Edwards, Don; Espy, Mike; Evans, Lane; Fascell, Dante; Flipppo, Ronnie; Foglietta, Thomas; Ford, William; Frost, Martin; Garcia, Robert; Gejdenson, Sam; Gephardt, Richard; Gibbons, Sam; Glickman, Dan; Gordon, Bart; Harris, Claude; Hawkins, Augustine; Hayes, Charles; Hayes, James; Hefner, W.C. (Bill); Hughes, William; Jenkins, Ed; Jones, Ben.

Kaptur, Marcy; Kennedy, Joseph; Kennelly, Barbara; Kostmayer, Peter; Laughlin, Greg; Leath, Marvin; Lehman, Richard; Leland, Mickey; Levine, Mel; Lewis, John; Lowey, Nita; Luken, Thomas; McCloskey,

Frank; McDermott, James; Manton, Thomas; Mavroules, Nicholas; Mfume, Kweisi; Moakley, Joe; Neal, Richard; Oberstar, James; Olin, Jim; Ortiz, Solomon; Owens, Major; Owens, Wayne; Payne, Donald; Pease, Donald; Penny, Timothy; Perkins, Carl; Pickle, J.J.; Rangel, Charles; Richardson, Bill; Rostenkowski, Dan; Roybal, Edward; Sabo, Martin; Savage, Gus; Sawyer, Thomas; Scheuer, James; Schroeder, Patricia; Slaughter, Louise; Staggers, Harley; Stenholm, Charles; Synar, Mike; Tallon, Robin; Tauzin, W.J. (Billy); Thomas, Robert; Unsoeld, Jolene; Volkmer, Harold; Williams, Pat; Wilson, Charles; Wise, Robert.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). 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 Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS 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 Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON 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 Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILIRAKIS 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 Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH 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 Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HANSEN 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 gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REVIEW OF TODAY'S HEARING IN THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, or this afternoon, to review a hearing that was held this morning in the House Committee on National Security. I think that this should be of concern to every Member of this body. The hearing this morning, which lasted for approximately 3 hours, had before us Secretary Perry; Secretary of Defense, General Shalikashvili, Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Gen. Wayne Downing, director of the Downing Assessment Task Force. General Downing is the author of the report that was done following the attack that resulted in the deaths of 19 of our troops in that housing complex in Saudi Arabia just a few short months ago.

Mr. Speaker, this hearing today was important because it revealed some concerns that I raised that I think should be the concern of every Member of this institution. During the discussion by General Downing of his assessment of the attack on the barracks in Saudi Arabia, he made some very critical comments about the Pentagon and the Defense Department and what we should have done and could have done to better protect our troops.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, one of the suggestions that he made was that the Pentagon needed to provide more focus on the operation in the Middle East in terms of protecting our pilots and the enforcement of the no-fly zone for the Iraqis. It was because we did not have it as a separate line item in the budget where we could provide adequate resources, where we could have had the backup materials and equipment in place to better support the command officer in that theater. When he made that comment and that suggestion, I was taken aback, Mr. Speaker, because exactly 1 year ago the House Committee on National Security included as a part of our defense authorization bill a very specific requirement addressing that very concern because a year ago we felt the same thing. We felt there was not enough focus within the Pentagon in terms of prioritizing resources for the Middle Eastern operation. We asked for that, and even though the Pentagon certified to us just a few short weeks ago that they were doing that, in fact they in fact had not done that.

So here we were recommending something that now after the fact we find out perhaps helped cause the loss of life in that barracks.