

004655 OCT 24 91

Mr. Brian Lamb
C-Span
400 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Suite 650
Washington, D.C. 20001

October 17, 1991

Dear Mr. Lamb,

During the Thomas Hearings most of your call in shows which I saw, indicated a distinct lack of education, by the viewers and panelists, as to what was happening.

For those who wanted definite answers by the nominee, they did not understand that he, as a sitting Federal Judge, must conform to the Code of Ethics and Conduct of sitting Federal Judges.

No guest, either partisan supporter or journalist, ever told the viewers that such a Code of Ethics exists or what it says. (For example, Federal Judges when originally appointed go to School to learn what a FEDERAL JUDGE CAN SAY OR DO.

During the Anita Hill Hearing, callers were confused as to whether or not a trial was occurring, or even that the Committee could not decide anything as to this allegation. Their Charge was to investigate and furnish to the Senate a transcript with all of the evidence and testimony to be available for individual Senators to decide how to vote after the allegation was aired.

The attached Letter to the Editor was sent and published in the Orange County Register in Orange County California on Friday October 11.

It was also mailed on October 7 to the Wall Street Journal. By chance the Journal published, on October 10, 1991 in its Editorial Column, the attached Editorial covering the same subject. (see 10/10/91 attached per well)

A great Public Service would be done if a series of round table discussions would be held on why Congress should be forced to conform to all U.S. Laws passed by Congress, or why they shouldn't.

In this election year it would be most useful to your countless viewers.

Very Truly Yours,

Mission Viejo, California
92691

Letter to the Editor

October 7, 1991

Now that the House of Representatives has decided to close the House Bank and to aggressively help to collect the past due \$300,000 owed to the operators of the House restaurant, the next step Congress must take is this:

Both bodies of Congress must pass new legislation that ensures that each and every active law enacted by Congress, both in the past and in the future, will apply to both Institutions, its members and employees as well as to us.

Whatever laws we must obey, they must obey, with no exceptions!!

Congress keeps saying we are a nation governed by the rule of law.

Lets have equal protection of the law for all, with no exceptions for Congress or any Branch of the Federal Government.

A series in your paper as to all of the areas of current law that exempts Federal Governmental agencies would be most informative.

[REDACTED]
Mission Viejo, Ca. 92691
[REDACTED]

W SS

10/10/91

Congress's Wild Ganders

There must be an old saying in Congress: What's sauce for the goose must under no circumstances ever touch the ganders. One Senate gander after another took the floor Tuesday night to puff up his chest and honk about how it would dishonor the Senate if it didn't look into the Anita Hill sexual harassment charges. And in the days since, most people have read a ton on sexual harassment in America. Well, here's one relevant fact you haven't read anywhere: The Senate itself isn't covered by any law on sexual harassment and it has never acknowledged that EEOC rules on such harassment apply to it.

Senate employees who have complaints are told to take them to a male-only ethics committee, which

with the House Ethics Committee. They reported that he asked for daily hugs from them, during which he would often pat them on the rear. He also humiliated one employee, Dorena Bertussi, when, in full view of his staff, he wrapped his legs around her extended leg and swayed back and forth, grinning.

The Ethics Committee merely issued a "letter of reproof," the mildest form of punishment possible. One former Bates staffer said the committee was telling women to keep their mouths shut about Congressional misbehavior. Ms. Bertussi was "outraged" by the committee's action. So were Mr. Bates's constituents. Last year, he lost to a Republican in a solidly Democratic district. Maybe People for the American Way should start a project to solicit sexual harassment information from congressional staffers and pages who've been victims of the Members' increasingly erratic and dysfunctional behavior.

Chuck Grassley is an unusual U.S. Senator. He believes Congress should live by the same laws that apply to everyone else and no longer exempt itself from the legislation listed nearby, dating all the way back to 1933.

Senator Grassley tells his colleagues that "It's time we stopped being hypocrites." He isn't getting many takers. Last week, he tried to shame the Senate into applying the family-leave bill to congressional employees. He was told to take a hike.

He will now try to apply the pending civil-rights bill to Congress. When he tried to do that last year, GOP Senator Warren Rudman told him what the facts of Congress were. "It is absolutely essential that, as to our legislative employees, we have an absolute right without outside review by anyone of what we do," said Senator Rudman. To do otherwise would encourage "frivolous lawsuits."

The smearing of Clarence Thomas may have at least one desirable outcome. It may once and for all alert people to the absurdity of allowing an Imperial Congress, accountable to no one, to both put itself above the laws of America and then sit in judgment of other Americans.

Congress exempted itself from:

Social Security Act of 1933
National Labor Relations Act of 1935
Minimum Wage Act of 1938
Equal Pay Act of 1963
Civil Rights Act of 1964
Freedom of Information Act of 1966
Age Discrimination Act of 1967
Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970
Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972
Title 9 of Higher Education Act Amend. of 1972
Rehabilitation Act of 1973
Privacy Act of 1974
Age Discrimination Act Amendments of 1975
Ethics in Government Act of 1978
Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988

Source: Sen. Charles Grassley

likes to cite a Senate rule forbidding employment discrimination. But if they don't like the outcome, tough luck. There is no recourse to a court. Congress's guilty conscience explains a great deal of the moralistic fervor with which it has responded to the allegations against Clarence Thomas. One Senator told us that some of his colleagues were in terror that the sexual-harassment searchlight would focus on them if they didn't drag Judge Thomas over the coals.

The way Congress has handled sexual-harassment cases is shown by the treatment of former Rep. Jim Bates of California. In 1988, several of his female employees filed a complaint

A New Political Ball Game

WST

A-6
10/16/91

The first political fallout from the Thomas nomination is likely to be an end to Congress's tradition of exempting itself from laws against discrimination and sexual harassment, along with others listed nearby. Iowa Senator Charles Grassley wants Members

Congress exempted itself from:

- Social Security Act of 1933
- National Labor Relations Act of 1935
- Minimum Wage Act of 1938
- Equal Pay Act of 1963
- Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Freedom of Information Act of 1966
- Age Discrimination Act of 1967
- Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970
- Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972
- Title 9 of Higher Education Act Amend. of 1972
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973
- Privacy Act of 1974
- Age Discrimination Act Amendments of 1975
- Ethics in Government Act of 1978
- Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988

Source: Sen. Charles Grassley

to join him in forcing Congress to live by the same laws that apply to everyone else. National TV shows are preparing exposes on how the Imperial Congress isn't covered by pending bills on family-leave and civil rights. Some Members are urging the White House to veto any future legislation that exempts Congress.

Neil Newhouse, a GOP pollster with Public Opinion Strategies, says that 70% of Americans are now willing to go beyond criticizing Congress and vote against their own Congressman. Re-election numbers for incumbents are now at their lowest level since Watergate. Former Democratic analyst Charles Cook says entrenched Members in both parties are at risk: "They are clearly seen as being part of the problem." And for once, minority voters may not be in the pockets of liberal incumbents.

The twin scandals of Kitegate and the Thomas smear have already had an immediate political fallout. Speaker Tom Foley and the rest of Washington State's congressional delegation have decided not to fund a major campaign to defeat a retroactive term-limit initiative on next month's ballot. If it wins, Mr. Foley and most of the other Members will have to leave office in 1994. The delegation decided that fighting term limits was a lost cause now; they are saving their money to have term limits declared unconstitutional.

Congress's record is so indefensible that top House leaders will use back-door courtroom maneuvers to have the reforms demanded by voters declared invalid. They may have underestimated how angry people are now with Congress.

MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691



MR. Brian Lamb
C/O C-SPAN
400 North Capitol St. N.W. Suite 650
Washington, D.C. 20001