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that now propose dramatic welfare reform must come to the Federal Government and beg for waivers. This is wrong; States should be free to reform themselves. 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 nearly $20 billion 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 program, for example, for eliminating it as a consequence of an ongoing attack on immigrants and minorities.

I remember the good old days when the majority 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 packed with details, I am assuming that they will follow the model of the budget cuts last year 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 form 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 on the State of the Union, reported that the 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. HINCHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days with 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,

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH, Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Re District Convention versus Yvette Yo­
landa Jones.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (30) of the Rules of the House that an Office of Finance has been served with a subpoena issued by the Su­erior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Coun­cil, 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.

HOUR OF 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.
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 afterward in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHITEWATER INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

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

[Mr. MEHAN addressed the House.]

SPEAKER

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. Senator J. William Fulbright has done nothing to rectify the situation. In face, 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 cost him well-placed roles in the 1996 Presidential election.

Mr. Speaker, the Bradley Foundation is one of this Nation's most conservative 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 American Savings Bank, a failed savings and loan association. After Mr. Starr was appointed Independent Counsel, Kirkland & Ellis paid the RTC $250,000 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 questionable payments 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 tobacco industry representative was blissfully unaware of this case. Because, during the same period, Mr. Starr's 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.