

that now propose dramatic welfare reform must come to the Federal Government and beg for waivers. This is wrong; States should be free to design their own reforms.

The second recommendation I make is that we use a portion of these additional welfare savings to make the proposed reduction in the Federal gas tax permanent. State and Federal gas taxes now total over 40 cents a gallon. This is a tremendous burden on the middle class and working poor; it also hits particularly hard in the high mileage States out west. Repealing the 1993 increase would save taxpayers in my State of Colorado \$70 million a year. Working families deserve welfare reform and they deserve tax relief.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the majority's budget proposal reads like a hit list of education programs from Goals 2000 to student loans to education improvement grants. If a budget proposal reflects a party's priorities, then education is the least of the concerns of the majority party. I am dismayed because my personal priority has always been education—my life's work has been in education. It is incumbent upon those of us who do understand the importance of the investment in our schools and colleges to call attention to the damage that this budget proposal will wreak on school systems.

Some of these budget cuts are downright mean-spirited and are not based on the effectiveness of a program—the bilingual education programs are targeted for elimination as a consequence of an ongoing attack on immigrants and minorities.

I remember the good old days when the majority even had a President boasting that he wanted to be the "education President". I urge my colleagues to oppose the cuts to education—if it is asking too much for us to be the "education Congress", let us at least avoid our going down in history as the "slash and burn Congress".

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the Republican efforts to radically alter the Medicare program. While the Republican budget resolution is short on details, I am assuming that they will follow the model that they proposed last year in order to meet their \$168 billion reduction in Medicare spending over the next six years.

Republicans are proposing changing Medicare from a defined benefit to a defined contribution program. It does not propose controlling costs, but simply shifts those costs from the Federal Government to senior citizens and providers. It will end the prohibition against balance billing and allow doctors and hospitals to bill senior citizens for extra or added charges. It would even allow HMOs to charge seniors extra for the basic Medicare package. My Republican colleagues need to remember that 18 percent of seniors—which is about 7 million people—are living on less than \$7,000 a year. Can they afford these new hidden, extra charges?

I attempted to discuss these concerns with the Budget Committee, I was told not to worry—these terrible things simply will not happen. But, with little or no details, it is hard to understand how they plan on achieving \$168 billion in savings without shifting costs or forcing seniors into restrictive managed care plans. We should not move to these radical changes without detailed and thorough hearings, which have not been planned. There are

too many questions and the implications are far too serious to implement a \$168 billion change. Medicare has worked and has provided access to affordable, quality health care for millions of senior citizens. Do we have to jeopardize this success in the name of tax cuts for the wealthy?

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, May 14, 1996, the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 178.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May 10, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Re District of Columbia versus Yvette Yolanda Jones.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that an Office of Finance has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

SCOTT M. FAULKNER,
Chief Administrative Officer.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:15 a.m. tomorrow, May 16, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. WISE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

THE CAREERS ACT, CONCERNS VERSUS REALITY

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at what length special groups and organizations will go to in order to stir up controversy, manufactured controversy so they can get contributions to keep their organizations going.

We are working for years on a bill called the careers bill. It started when the General Accounting Office indicated that there are 163 Federal job training programs spread over every agency downtown possible, most of which are totally ineffective. Many are duplicative, and so we set out to see what it was we could do, first of all, to consolidate these programs to eliminate those that overlap and are redundant and return the power and the authority back to the State and particularly back to the local communities so that they could plan job training programs that would actually prepare people for jobs that will exist in that particular area.

Well, as I indicated, it is amazing at what lengths some of these organizations would go to keep filling their coffers so that they can stay in business. Of course, the only way they can stay in business is to create controversy. Whether it is there or not, they create it.

Mr. Speaker, now let me mention some concerns and then some facts. First concern: Does the careers bill merge the Departments of Education and Labor? The fact: No, nothing in careers merges these Departments.

Second concern: Does careers reference Goals 2000? Fact: No, there is no reference to Goals 2000 in the bill.

The other day I almost had an accident on the Beltway because again these same groups will use any statements they want to make to prove

whatever it is they are trying to prove, no matter how false it may be. So this person on the radio was saying that these sixth-grade girls were receiving examinations, physicals in school, and they were very thorough physicals. He was very upset, and it was because of Goals 2000 and outcome-based education that they were receiving these physicals.

Now, how ridiculous can anybody be. Physicals, when I was a principal of school, superintendent of school and a teacher, were required by our State, that certain grades had physicals. As a principal, the first doctor that I lost came in to me one day and said, I am not about to continue this. He said, I am not going to sign if I do not examine them, and I am not going to examine them and then have these innuendoes and so on spread all over the community. My business is too important to me.

So I had to hire another doctor who did it the way they used to do when we went through our physical in the Army, stood us at the other end of the room and said, oh, you are okay, move on. But he got paid for that.

No, nothing in this bill references Goals 2000. In fact, nowhere does the legislation require that any individual enter into a specific career track or enter into employment. In fact, special language was included to specifically guard against such abuses.

Let me read a few specific protections. "Nothing in this act shall mandate that any individual, particularly youth served under title II of this act be required to choose a specific career path or major or to meet federally funded or endorse industry-recognized skill standards or obtain federally funded endorsed skills certificates.

Second, none of the funds made available under this title shall be used to compel any youth to pursue a specific career or to obtain a federally funded or endorsed skills certificate. Youth participating in the program under this title shall be eligible to change their course of study and training.

The problem we are faced with is that people out there who somehow believe that everybody should be a college graduate. That is a great idea. What are they going to do? We now have hundreds of thousands of college graduates who either have no job or they are working at something far beneath their education. On the other hand, we have hundreds of thousands of technical jobs out there with no one to fill them in.

These same people believe that somehow or other in high schools there is an academic program or a vocational program. They forget that a large percentage are in a general program, and I got news for you; a general program in this day and age is just that. A general program is a dead-end street by all means for these people. Will the CAREERS bill result in the collection of private information on individuals, especially children? No; the bill does not allow for the

collection of private information on individuals, and these are some of the protections.

Specific language restating title 13 of the Census Act relating to confidentiality of information. Specific language that states nothing in the act shall violate the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act under section 249 of the General Education Provisions Act. Specific language that all labor market data is aggregated from existing sources like the census, unemployment rates, and so on.

States would not be allowed to use funds to collect data about school-age youth. Those are just a few of the corrections that should be made. In future sessions I will make all the others because again, it is sheer nonsense that is being spread out there in relationship to the CAREERS bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHITEWATER INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor tonight to discuss the independence of Whitewater Independent Counsel Ken Starr.

Six weeks ago, I wrote Mr. Starr a letter. I asked him to immediately take the necessary steps to assure the credibility of his position by eliminating even the appearance of conflicts of interest in his Whitewater investigation. Since that time, Mr. Starr has done nothing to rectify the situation. In fact, he has not even responded.

At first, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised that Mr. Starr, who is such a highly successful attorney that he can pick and choose his clients, would decide to represent a tobacco company—a political foe of the President. However, as I began to take a closer look at Mr. Starr's career decisions, his representation of Brown & Williamson fits perfectly into a portfolio of controversial clients.

The archconservative Bradley Foundation, is another ideological client of the Independent Counsel. The Bradley Foundation hired Mr. Starr as a consultant and when Mr. Starr argued a school voucher case before the Wisconsin Supreme Court, the Bradley Foundation provided a \$150,000 grant to pay State's legal fees. By defending the Wisconsin school voucher system, Mr. Starr argued directly against the Clinton administration's stance on an issue that could very well play a role in the 1996 Presidential election.

Mr. Speaker, the Bradley Foundation is one of this Nation's most conserv-

ative and partisan organizations. Each year the Bradley Foundation doles out \$20 million to groups like the American Spectator, the Landmark Legal Foundation, the Free Congress Foundation, and others who attack the President and First Lady in a highly political and often personal fashion.

We can conclude then, Mr. Speaker, that Independent Counsel Ken Starr's personal wealth—he made well over \$1 million dollars last year—is quite dependent on a political clientele.

Let's now look at Mr. Starr's firm, Kirkland & Ellis, and its dealings with the Resolution Trust Corporation—the key Federal agency in the Whitewater investigation.

In May 1993, nearly a year before Starr's appointment as Independent Counsel, the RTC accused Kirkland & Ellis of professional misconduct in the negligent representation of the First America Savings Bank, a failed savings and loan association. After Mr. Starr was appointed Independent Counsel, Kirkland & Ellis paid the RTC \$325,000 to settle the claim.

Starr, who, as senior partner serves on Kirkland & Ellis' management committee, claims he was unaware of his firm's negotiations with the RTC. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope Mr. Starr was blissfully unaware of this case. Because, during this same period, Mr. Starr as Independent Counsel in the Whitewater Investigation, was questioning some of the same RTC officials who were involved with the decision to sue his law firm. Again, a reasonable person would see the appearance, if not the existence, of a serious conflict of interest.

Mr. Starr's appearance problems neither begin nor end with Brown & Williamson or the RTC.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has launched a number of grand jury investigations into possible criminal violations on the part of tobacco companies and their executives. According to the New York Times at least five grand juries have been convened. Department of Justice's probe of the tobacco industry represents the Department's largest investigation of the manufacturer of a consumer product under the Clinton administration.

However, while parents and health advocates overwhelmingly support the President's actions on curbing youth tobacco use, cigarette manufacturers, like Brown & Williamson, have retaliated with a massive political donation campaign to thwart the FDA's common sense regulations. Political donations by tobacco interests set new records last year. They gave \$4 million in PAC and soft money to the two major political parties and various congressional candidates. Tellingly, Mr. Speaker, more than \$3 million went to Republicans.

The Food and Drug Administration has proposed new regulations on tobacco advertising and marketing to children. President Clinton's leadership on the FDA's regulations has been