

East Jessamine Middle School from Nicholasville, KY on their trip to Washington, DC. Washington, enshrined in history and tradition, provides an excellent setting for both educational and exciting activities. It is always refreshing to hear of young men and women with an interest in visiting our Nation's Capital. This trip demonstrates East Jessamine Middle School's dedication to excellence in education. I wish them the best for the future.

HONORING THE AUBURNTOWN  
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 8, 1996*

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Auburntown Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study the latest videos featuring the latest in fire fighting tactics, as well as attend seminars where they can obtain the knowledge they need to save lives. Within a year of becoming a volunteer firefighter, most attend the Tennessee Fire Training School in Murfreesboro where they undergo further, intensified training.

When the residents of my district go to bed at night, they know that should disaster strike and their home catch fire, well trained and qualified volunteer fire departments are ready and willing to give so graciously and generously of themselves. This peace of mind should not be taken for granted.

By selflessly giving of themselves, they ensure a safer future for us all. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

EX-PROSECUTORS CRITICIZE  
KENNETH STARR

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 8, 1996*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the House and joining the Judiciary Committee, I've been involved with the independent counsel law. When that law expired just as Bill Clinton was taking office, I was one of the Democrats who insisted that it was essential that we reauthorize the law, despite the fact that it would now be once again be a Democratic administration which would be subject to its impact. I noted that the law had originally been passed by a Democratic Congress under a Democratic President, and that Republican objections during the 1980's and early 1990's that it was a partisan instrument aimed at them was obviously inaccurate.

And I am pleased that the Democratic leadership in Congress and President Clinton did everything possible to get the law reauthorized—even though it did lapse temporarily because of a Republican filibuster in the Senate.

When questions arose involving accusations about the President in 1993, I was one of those urging that an Independent Counsel be appointed. I think Attorney Reno behaved with great integrity and appropriateness in doing everything she could under the law to provide for an independent investigation, even during that period when the law had temporarily lapsed because of that Republican filibuster. And I have continued to defend the institution as a necessary one.

I am therefore all the more distressed by the insensitive and disturbing pattern of behavior engaged in by the current independent counsel, Kenneth Starr. First, it should be noted that Judge Sentelle, who was named by Chief Justice Rehnquist to head the panel of judges who appoint independent counsel, erred grievously by appointing someone as partisan and as politically opposed to the Clinton administration as Kenneth Starr as the independent counsel to investigate the President in the first place. Mr. Starr should have said no. And having said yes, he should have determined that he would be extremely careful in carrying out his duties in a way that minimized any concern about his objectivity and fairness.

Instead, he has behaved in a way that has bothered a wide range of objective observers, including apparently many of those who have preceded him as independent counsel. In Monday's Washington Post, R.H. Melton writes a story which is accurately headlined "Ex-Prosecutors Concur on Case Against Starr's Private Work."

In the article, R.H. Melton quotes from a wide range of former independent counsel, including several people who held important appointed office under Republican President, who agree that Kenneth Starr has erred seriously in his conduct in the independent counsel office. Particularly by taking on a wide variety of cases in which he is representing people who are legally and politically arrayed against the President he is investigating, Mr. Starr has compromised the very nature of the independent counsel office.

This investigation of the President has already gone on for a very long time, with no results in terms of any negative information being brought forward against the President. It costs an enormous amount of money for the results we have gotten, and it has called into question unfortunately the usefulness of this very important office.

Mr. Speaker, the article by R.H. Melton and the wide range of Republican and Democratic criticisms of the independent counsel so quoted in it makes it clear that this is a serious problem, and not simply a case of Democrats objecting to Mr. Starr's work. As one who has worked hard to preserve this important office, and who joined in asking for an independent counsel to look into the allegations against President Clinton, I am extremely disappointed by Mr. Starr's performance and I think it is appropriate for R.H. Melton's documentation of the view of previous independent counsel about Mr. Starr's work to be printed here.

EX-PROSECUTORS CRITICIZE KENNETH STARR  
(By R.H. Melton)

The former independent counsels are a varied lot, composed of Republicans and Demo-

crats, smooth-talking silk-stockings and gruff old men. Varied, too, were their assignments. Some had big cases; some worked virtual anonymity.

But from the well-heeled New York lawyer to the New Orleans septuagenarian, the former prosecutors agree on one thing: Whitewater counsel Kenneth W. Starr has put himself in a bad spot.

In separate interviews last week, former prosecutors expressed a consensus view that their old U.S. government position, with its broad investigative powers, is too important for any counsel to be distracted by the busy outside caseload and high-profile clients that Starr has kept. They advise Starr to strictly limit the non-Whitewater activity that has prompted recent criticism and focus on his wide-ranging investigation into President Clinton's decade-old real estate venture and the White House reaction to inquiries into the matter.

"He's devoting a hell of a lot of time to private practice," said Gerald J. Gallinghouse, 75, a Republican and retired U.S. attorney from New Orleans who investigated an aide to President Jimmy Carter on a drug allegation in early 1981.

"He should either get in or get out," Gallinghouse said. "I don't give a damn about the Republicans, Democrats, Bull Moose or mugwumps. He should get on with the investigation and bring it to a conclusion as soon as practicable. And you're not going to do it with the top man running all over the country making speeches and taking care of private clients."

Starr's clients range from tobacco giants to the NFL Players Association. Last month his schedule took him from the halls of the Supreme Court to a federal appeals court in New Orleans within one week. He has some clients whose interests are inimical to those of the Clinton administration. In a major school-voucher case in Wisconsin, for example, Starr was paid by a conservative foundation that has funded some of Clinton's harshest critics.

Even though his outside work is quite legal, critics point to such cases as evidence that Starr is not as independent or devoted to his government duty as he should be. Much of the criticism has been strongly partisan, fueled by White House aides and other Democrats who want a tidy resolution to Starr's inquiry before the presidential election this fall.

Still, the observations of the former counsels are unusual in their breadth and force. Some of them know Starr personally, and others know his reputation as a brilliant legal mind with strong Republican credentials. Nearly all of the seven counsels interviewed expressed surprise that Starr would load so much on his plate and stir partisan controversy, particularly in an inquiry focused squarely on a sitting president and first lady. A few of them voiced disappointment.

Starr declined to be interviewed for this article, but a month ago he issued a spirited defense against the criticism that had been mounting against his outside caseload. Starr told a bar association group in San Antonio that the independent counsel "was never expected to become a full-time employee of the government and leave his or her law firm."

"To require independent counsels . . . to become full-time employees wastes not only government resources, but the legal talents of the individuals called to serve," Starr said.

Starr noted that nearly all of the independent counsels continued to maintain their private practices. But a number of them recalled in interviews that they scaled back their practices sharply and turned down prospective clients who may have created the appearance of a conflict of interest.