

background investigation on Livingstone. In an interview report discovered in Livingstone's file, Sculimbrenne quoted then-White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum as saying Livingstone owed his job to the first lady.

Among those notified after Shapiro's call to the White House about the item were Hillary Clinton, her chief of staff and communications director, two lawyers for Nussbaum, deputy White House chief of staff Harold Ickes, senior policy adviser George Stephanopoulos and spokesman mark Fabiani.

"We behaved appropriately," Fabiani said. When Clinger made Sculimbrenne's account public, "we were able to respond quickly."

Nussbaum denied making the remarks attributed to him. Hillary Clinton said she had nothing to do with Livingstone's appointment.

By July 16, when Clinger's investigator went to inspect the interview report, Shapiro and his top deputy, Thomas A. Kelly, had dispatched two agents to Sculimbrenne's home to question him about the Nussbaum interview. Sculimbrenne has decided to resign from the FBI, sources said yesterday.

House Appropriations Committee Chairman Bob Livingston (R-La.), who had been watching the hearing on C-SPAN, charged that the agents' visit was "absolutely intended to intimidate" Sculimbrenne and "constitutes, in my view, obstruction of justice." He told reporters that Shapiro "should immediately resign" and the Justice Department should begin an investigation "to determine whether a criminal charge can be brought."

In his statement last night, Freeh said he was "satisfied that none of Howard's actions were done in bad faith or for partisan purposes. . . . Howard has been instrumental in every major investigation and issue handled by the FBI over the last three years."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1996]

CLINTON LOSES COMPOSURE ON TRAVEL OFFICE  
(By Adam Nagourney)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 1—His eyes narrowed in anger, President Clinton today punctured what was supposed to be a Rose Garden ceremony celebrating good economic news by heatedly renouncing a White House promise to pay the legal bills of travel office employees who had been dismissed.

"Are we going to pay the legal expenses of every person in America who is ever acquitted of an offense?" Mr. Clinton said, his voice even and steely as he plunged his hands into his pockets, rejecting a suggestion that he urge the Senate to proceed on stalled legislation that would reimburse the employees.

When a reporter reminded him that his own press secretary had previously pledged Mr. Clinton's support to the Senate legislation, Mr. Clinton shook him off:

"Well, he didn't talk to me before he said that," Mr. Clinton said. "I didn't say that. I said, 'I don't know what's going to be in it.'"

At that, Mr. Clinton turned to his questioner, a Washington Times reporter, and said: "I don't believe that we should give special preference to one group of people over others. Do you? Do you?"

Mr. Clinton is renowned among staff members for his fast and frequent outbursts of anger, and, typically, equally fast cooling downs and apologies.

In this case, Mr. Clinton later called aside one of his targets, Bill Plante, a CBS White House correspondent who asked the initial question that The Washington Times reporter followed up, and apologized. Mr. Plante said the President attributed his fit of temper to fatigue and the stress he was feeling because of the destruction of T.W.A. Flight 800.

Still, the exchange came over an issue that has caused Mr. Clinton much difficulty in

the past two years, the dismissal of seven employees of the White House travel office by Mr. Clinton's Administration shortly after he took office. The Washington Times has closely followed the situation involving Billy R. Dale, the director of the White House travel office, who was dismissed and then acquitted of embezzlement charges brought against him by Mr. Clinton's Justice Department. The reporter who asked the question today, Paul Bedard, said this afternoon that Mr. Clinton had not offered him an apology.

Within hours of the televised news conference, aides to Mr. Clinton's likely opponent this fall, Bob Dole, who have customarily had to deal with questions about Mr. Dole's temperament, pounced on this incident to raise questions about the temper of the man in the White House.

"We have to assume that in anticipation of Dole's pro-growth economic plan coming out next week, Clinton is coming unglued," said John Buckley, Mr. Dole's communications director, referring to Mr. Dole's pending release of an economic plan that has caught White House attention over the past few days.

"But there is the larger issue of the President's ability to control his temper in public. And they're going to have to monitor that very carefully at the White House."

Mr. Clinton's aides asserted that Mr. Clinton's exchange in the Rose Garden was the public relations equivalent of Mr. Dole's televised confrontation with Katie Couric, the host of the NBC News "Today" program, over Mr. Dole's ties to the tobacco industry.

"On the Katie Couric interview, Dole was asked several questions on the same subject and he showed a glint of testiness," Mr. Buckley said. "But there's a far cry between that and the leader of the free world having a meltdown at a news conference."

George Stephanopoulos, a senior adviser to Mr. Clinton, said in response to Mr. Buckley: "Valiant spin. What else do you expect him to say in the face of historic economic growth?"

□ 1730

I think there is a real question as to the propriety that Mr. Shapiro has taken. I for one will wait and see what will be done with regard to that. Because we cannot have a situation whereby the general counsel of an agency that has such a long and distinguished record does something like this that can bring blemish and concern with regard to the objectivity in the minds of the American people.

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

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

#### A WAR ON THE WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to discuss something I think is very, very

important in concept and also to the American people.

We see something in the West that is happening to us. We like to refer to it many, many times as a war on the West, and it is a war. But I want to tell the people of America and the people here in the Chamber, a Member of this House, that if it can happen to us in the timber industry, it also can happen in other industries as well. I want my colleagues to think about this when they hear about what goes on and what is happening to us in the West, because this might be an issue now that is not addressed, does not concern others, but, remember, this lesson can be applied to any issue that we may see coming before you concerning your private property, your interest, your educational systems, and even your self-governing systems.

This is not a fault of any political attitude, it has nothing to do with the executive branch, although I will point out what is happening, but it has to do with the concept of America.

We have a cultural battle going on, a battle of self-determination, of individuality, of being responsible against a culture of liberalism and to a one-world conflict or a big national social government. In this body, if people examine this body, they will see that there are not Democrats or Republicans in this body; there are conservatives in this body and there are liberals. I think that is what the ultimate goal will turn out to be. Who will win this conflict, I think, will be determined in the very, very near future. We are starting to have some very, very serious problems concerning the attitude of a one-government, big-brother-knows-all continuous responsibility for everything that everybody does with no self-responsibility for the individual or the local control by the local communities.

We passed a timber salvage bill, and here is a good example of what is happening in my district, and I want to be able to point this out. We passed an emergency salvage bill in 1995 on June 7. On June 8, the President vetoed it. Between June and July, 1995, there was negotiation between Congress and the administration and a letter from Dan Glickman implementing the program. The President signed the legislation in a rescission bill.

The bill was signed on July 21, 1995, revising the salvage measure and passed by Congress. On July 27, the President signed this bill. What this bill did in very simple terms is that it would allow the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to salvage dead and dying and burnt trees.

At the same time, a law that was passed in 1988 which was referred to as rule No. 318, had to do with green-cut sustainable yields in the Northwest. At the same time the salvage bill went through the process in the U.S. Senate, we added the 318 section to the salvage bill, which was actually passed by Congress, and signed by the President of