

project was stalled shortly thereafter, he became the region's Budget Officer for six years. Subsequently, from 1984 to early 1993, Tom was the Assistant Regional Director for Administration, overseeing such functions as personnel, budget, finance, procurement, and computer processing.

In 1993, Tom received his final and perhaps most challenging position with the Bureau—that of Manager of the Central California Area office. The area includes the Folsom and Nimbus Dams and the Folsom South Canal on the American River, New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River, and Lake Berryessa located between Napa and Winters.

Mr. Speaker, many of the issues relating to the facilities and watersheds in the Central California Area have been controversial, yet Tom has constantly sought to serve the public's best interest. As a veteran of California's renowned water wars, Tom has frequently had to be a facilitator amongst numerous competing interests. Despite the challenging and often unpleasant nature of this position, he has weathered it with patience and a continuing willingness to stand on principle.

One such example that has been of special importance to me has been Tom's unwavering support of the Auburn Dam. For three decades, Tom has helped promote the need to build the Auburn Dam by championing its unmatched ability to provide flood protection, water supply, hydroelectric power, recreational opportunities, and environmental benefits. Tom rightly recognizes that the Auburn Dam is the only solution to the Sacramento region's water management needs, and he has been one of the few who has stood steadfast in that position despite the misguided opposition of those in the environmental community and from within the Bureau itself. Tom's commitment to the Auburn Dam is nothing less than a testament to his dedication to faithfully uphold the Bureau's mission of providing a reliable water supply to the West in the most efficient and effective way possible.

Tom has received several honors for his good work, including the National Administrative Support Units' Annual Award for Executive Leadership in 1991, Who's Who in Government Service in 1990, and the Interior Department's Meritorious Service Award in 1984.

As he retires from public service, Tom will be free to spend more time with his family, including his wife, Linda, his children, Joe and Me'Shay, his step-daughters, Jennifer and Lisa, and his five grandchildren. Also, he will have more time to pursue his oil painting and show his 1934 Ford hot rod. His family's gain is the public's loss.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain—Tom Aiken's expertise, cooperative attitude, clear thinking, and toughness will certainly be missed in California's water community.

THE SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 2003

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the Department of Defense Inspector

General's public report on Richard Perle, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, and a clip from The Washington Times.

[Editorial from the Wall Street Journal]

PERLE'S VINDICATION

One obligation of editors is to distinguish phony political scandal from the genuine article. On that standard, any number of writers and editors owe Richard Perle an apology.

The noted defense intellectual voluntarily resigned in March as chairman of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee after his enemies pumped up a few anecdotes into allegations about "conflicts of interest." The Pentagon's Inspector General has been investigating those charges and last week issued a report absolving Mr. Perle of even the "appearance" of impropriety.

The accusations, fanned by Michigan Democrat John Conyers, had received especially prominent coverage in the New Yorker magazine and the New York Times. They boiled down to the all-purpose Washington smear that Mr. Perle has exploited his position for personal financial gain. But Pentagon investigator Donald Horstman concluded in a letter to Mr. Perle that "all of your activities with respect to those private entities complied with statutory and regulatory standards." There were no "quid pro" offers or attempts to leverage his (unpaid) Pentagon access.

In Washington, of course, people are often run out of office merely for the "appearance" of a conflict of interest. But Mr. Horstman says he also examined that "more elusive issue" and concluded that Mr. Perle's "activities did not create such an appearance" under the "perspective of a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts." Mr. Perle's accusers knew all the facts, so the only conclusion is that they are not "reasonable persons," which will not come as news to most of our readers.

Mr. Conyers is now trying to compound his political felony by proposing to close what he claims is a "loophole" that requires someone to work more than 60 days a year before certain, more stringent Pentagon ethics rules apply. But this would essentially bar anyone with private expertise from advising Defense officials even in a voluntary, unpaid capacity. How this would enhance U.S. national security is not obvious. Then again, U.S. security was the last thing on the mind of Mr. Perle's critics.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 20, 2003]

WASHINGTON-STYLE POLITICS

I beg to differ with Greg Pierce's recent item "All-purpose smear" (Inside Politics, Nation, Tuesday), claiming that charges levied against former Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee Chairman Richard Perle were an "all-purpose Washington smear."

A close reading of the inspector general's report would indicate that Mr. Perle's conduct raises real conflict-of-interest issues. There is no doubt that Mr. Perle had an important role in shaping our nation's defense policy and heavily influenced the mobilization of our war machine in Iraq, along with all the defense contracts and profits that follow. The IG's report confirmed that while guiding this effort, Mr. Perle benefited financially by working for firms with major business before the Department of Defense.

The report notes that Mr. Perle appears to have represented Global Crossing and Loral in matters pending before the Defense Department, but escaped violations of the conflict-of-interest laws by virtue of the fact that he was considered to be in the board's employ less than the required 60-day period.

Mr. Perle went so far as to sign an affidavit claiming that his position as chairman of the Defense Policy Board gave him a "unique perspective on and intimate knowledge of national defense and security issues." The fact that the offending language subsequently was removed from the affidavit doesn't change the reality of the assertion or the awkwardness of the conflict.

My legislation responds to the loopholes highlighted by the IG's report by merely ensuring that persons such as the chairman of the Defense Policy Board are treated as if they worked for the government for 60 days.

This would ensure that persons awarded with the public trust through prominent public positions do not use that trust to feather their own nests financially. At a time when we are asking our soldiers to make so many sacrifices, I hardly think it is too much to ask the chairman of the Defense Policy Board to refrain from representing clients with financial interests before the Defense Department.

ALL-PURPOSE SMEAR

"One obligation of editors is to distinguish phony political scandal from the genuine article. On that standard, any number of writers and editors owe Richard Perle an apology," the Wall Street Journal says. "The noted defense intellectual voluntarily resigned in March as chairman of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee after his enemies pumped up a few anecdotes into allegations about 'conflicts of interest.' The Pentagon's inspector general has been investigating those charges and last week issued a report absolving Mr. Perle of even the 'appearance' of impropriety," the newspaper said in an editorial. "The accusations, fanned by Michigan Democrat John Conyers, had received especially prominent coverage in the New Yorker magazine and the New York Times. They boiled down to the all-purpose Washington smear that Mr. Perle has exploited his position for personal financial gain. But Pentagon investigator Donald Horstman concluded in a letter to Mr. Perle that 'all of your activities with respect to those private entities complied with statutory and regulatory standards.' There were no 'quid pro' offers or attempts to leverage his (unpaid) Pentagon access. 'Mr. Horstman says he also examined that 'more elusive issue' and concluded that Mr. Perle's 'activities did not create such an appearance' under the 'perspective of a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts.' Mr. Perle's accusers knew all the facts, so the only conclusion is that they are not 'reasonable persons,' which will not come as news to most of our readers."

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL
DIABETES MONTH

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, this November, we recognize National Diabetes Month and renew our commitment to preventing and eradicating diabetes. Just last week, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that the number of Americans with diabetes rose to an all-time high. According to their report, an estimated 18.2 million Americans now have diabetes, more than 6 percent of the population.

Even more alarming is the fact that many Americans are unaware that they may be at