

Congressman Glenn English  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

7/1/83

Dear Congressman English,

The staffer who responded to me under date of 6/24, bg, completely misunderstood my letter and my purpose in writing you.

I did not ask for help for me. That would be improper for both of us. I did not ask your subcommittee "to investigate individual complaints of violations of the" Act.

Rather, and I thought I made it explicit, did I write in the interest of preserving the Act as we now know it and I sent a copy of an affidavit which reflects what, from the title of your subcommittee, I would like to hope is a suitable matter for its attention.

If yours is a subcommittee on the operations of the Justice Department and any reason to believe that perjury and its subornation is not a suitable subject for its attention, well, no wonder that for more than a decade I am familiar with both perjury and its subornation. The Congress is licensing it. Even approving it.

With regard to the proposed amendment that I understand from George Lardner's story the ACLU has agreed to, eliminating certain CIA components from FOIA entirely, based on my experiences with it and litigation with it, that amendment will probably include all files of its supposedly illegal domestic operations from FOIA requests.

It is almost an insult to write someone who includes an affidavit for an ~~XXXX~~ Foia case that is in its sixth year (without the initial searches either made or claimed to have been made) and tell him that "the Act provides judicial remedies." And then add what is not true, "I notice that you are already ~~proceeding~~ pursuing your right to appeal."

Do you really believe what bg wrote, after learning that in this case I've been in court for more than five years, that "I trust you will obtain appropriate relief from the courts."

Because I do believe your staff can read and understand, I do not believe he read my letter, leave alone the enclosure.

What I also wrote you about is the Department's success in rewriting the Act again by placing the burden of proof on the requester/plaintiff. They have a court order to show that they succeeded. I think this also was clear in my letter.

Do you really think that a court which issues such an order, which tolerates more than five years of stonewalling and worse, could possibly consider granting "appropriate relief?"

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

GLENN ENGLISH, OKLA., CHAIRMAN  
STEPHEN L. NEAL, N.C.  
RONALD D. COLEMAN, TEX.  
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., W. VA.  
BUDDY MACKAY, FLA.  
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, N.Y.

THOMAS N. KINDNESS, OHIO  
TOM LEWIS, FLA.  
DAN BURTON, IND.  
(202) 225-3741

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, JUSTICE, AND AGRICULTURE  
SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
B-348-C RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

June 24, 1983

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Route 12 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, Maryland 21701


Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding your Freedom of Information Act experiences with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Because of limited resources, the Subcommittee is unable to investigate individual complaints of violations of the Freedom of Information Act. The Act provides judicial remedies for those who are dissatisfied with the processing of their requests by agencies. I notice that you are already pursuing your right of appeal, and I trust that you will obtain appropriate relief from the courts.

As you requested, I am returning to you the copy of your affidavit attached to your letter.

Sincerely,

  
Glenn English  
Chairman

GE:bg:fh  
Enclosure