Ten independent counsels were named between 1978 and 1992 and two others conducted confidential investigations. The inquiries ranged widely in complexity and cost; Iran-contra cost $47 million and lasted nearly seven years; a three-month investigation into a drug allegation against an aide to Carter cost $3,348. The Whitewater inquiry by Starr and his predecessor has cost more than $20 million so far and is one of three now pending against the Clinton administration.

Arthur H. Christy, a New York lawyer appointed in late 1979 to investigate a drug allegation against Carter White House chief of staff Hamilton Jordan, said he declined to defend ''some white-collar criminal types because I didn't think it was appropriate to be defending them on the one hand and on the other trying to put some guy in jail.''

Arling M. Adams, a former federal judge from Philadelphia who looked into allegation of financial improperties involving Department of Housing and urban Development money, said that while he did not completely divorce himself from his law firm at the time, ''I did substantially restrict my activities.

''People might say I'm a fool'' because of the lost income, he said, ''but I had in mind in particular the necessity of gaining the confidence of the public and the press. I tried to avoid anything that would deflect attention from what I was doing as IC. The issue is perception and confidence.''

A number of the independent counsels interviewed last week said investigating a sitting president puts a special burden of probity on the investigator.

''It's different order of magnitude,'' said Lawrence E. Walsh, the Oklahoma lawyer and former judge who ran the Iran-contra investigation. ''The one excuse for an IC is his independence. If not necessarily full-time detachment from everything else, he can't be involved with anything that impairs his freedom of action.''

''When you're investigating a president, it's different,'' said Joseph E. diGenova, a Republican who was named an independent counsel in late 1992.

DiGenova, a former U.S. attorney in the District who as independent counsel looked into the State Department's search of Clinton's passport records, said that while Starr has ''pristinely adhered'' to the statute permitting counsels to keep their private legal practices, he should eliminate all the partisan sniping by relinquishing it for now.

''It's a distraction,'' diGenova said. ''He's giving the enemies of the law ammunition to use against him. He should take away the phony weapon from his adversaries.''

Whitney North Seymour Jr., a New York litigator who as counsel won a prejury conviction against former Reagan White House aide Michael Deaver, said the complexities of that case forced him to work virtually full time.

''When we were engaged in the intensive parts of the investigation or trial preparation, I did not have time for anything else,''Seymour said. ''My practice was to be hands-on; interviewing witnesses, reading documents and presenting to the grand jury.''

James C. McKay, a partner at the Washington firm Covington & Burling who investigated the Wedtech defense contractor and Reagan White House political director Lyn Nofziger in the late 1980s, said he regarded the assignment as a full-time job. ''I shed everything I was doing after a month,'' McKay said. ''I was devoting 99.9 percent of my time to the job I was given to do. I felt like I could concentrate on the very difficult problems much better if I did that and the job could be done more quickly and efficiently.''

Added diGenova: ''For the good of the office and the good of the investigation, sometimes you have to do some things you don't want to do.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LINDA SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 153. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF THOSE INVOLVED IN THE SEARCH FOR WILLIAM E. COLBY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of more than 100 individuals—both paid and volunteer—who spent many hours in the cold waters and on the shoreline of the Wicomico River searching for the late William E. Colby, the former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The search ended early Monday morning after his body was discovered near the shoreline, ending an intense search that began when his canoe was found April 28.

There were many agencies and organizations involved in the search which was headed by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Police. I want to recognize all of the participants in this search, including Sheriff Fred Davis and the Charles County Sheriff's Department who handled press inquiries and protected the Colby residence.

The search involved countless volunteer hours and assistance from: the Maryland State Police Aviation Division; the Charles County Dive Team, who were the first divers in the search; the Cobb Island Volunteer Fire Department and EMS; the Seventh District Volunteer Fire Department Boat 5 from St. Mary's County; the Marbury Volunteer Fire Department—using their rescue boat and dive team; the Bel Alton Volunteer Fire Department; the St. Mary's County Sheriff's Department Dive Team; the Calvert County Dive Team; the U.S. Coast Guard; the Prince George's County Dive Team—Companies 22, 49, and 56; the La Plata Volunteer Fire Department; Sardom Search and Rescue Dogs; the Cobb Island Volunteer Fire Department Ladies Auxiliary; the Charles County Communications Department; the Virginia State Marine Police; the Naval Surface Warfare Center EOD Dive Team and the Rescue Squad Dive Team from Dahlgren, VA; and numerous local citizens who volunteered in many different ways.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the efforts of the paid and volunteer members of this special community. These individuals engage in hundreds of hours of specialized training and continuing education to enhance lifesaving skills just to be ready for emergency rescue calls and searches. Charles County and other communities across America benefit daily from the services of these dedicated professionals who are ready 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and they deserve our continued thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the efforts of the volunteer fire and rescue services personnel and other agencies involved in the intense search for Mr. Colby which lasted more than 1 week. I want each of them to know that my colleagues in Congress share my pride in the selfless manner in which they carry out their mission in our community and every community throughout America.

HONORING THE MONTEREY 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 Monterey 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 firefighting 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 at 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 catches 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 all of us. We owe these volunteer fire departments a debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice.

IN MEMORY OF ALLEN C. MEIER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before the House to celebrate the life of Allen E. Meier, Jr., who passed away peacefully in San Francisco, CA on September 10, 1993.

On Friday, May 3, 1996, the family and friends of Allen Meier gathered at Congregation Emanu-El for the rededication of the robing room of the temple in his loving memory.

The refurbishment of the robing room was made possible by the gifts of loving friends and family members to the Allen E. Meier, Jr. fund of the congregation as the first in a series of beautification and preservative projects.

This undertaking was one that Allen Meier would have participated in himself and is a fitting tribute to him because few human beings embodied the devotion and dedication present in this good man.

A member of a pioneer Oregon family and native of Portland, OR, Allen Meier acquired early on an internal drive to succeed. He served in leadership roles with the American Import Bank in San Francisco and on the board of the trustees of the Meier and Frank Co.

Yet the business community was not Allen's only community. With infinite vision and wisdom, Allen understood the importance of community involvement and volunteerism. His community participation was exhibited in his service to SCORE, KCBS call for action, the Temple Emanu-El, and the San Francisco Academy of Sciences as a docent.

As a loving husband, a caring father, a World War II veteran, and a community leader in San Francisco, Allen C. Meier was a master of both devotion to his family and his community.

For his loving wife Janis and three daughters, Lynn, Muffie, and Mary, the many loving nieces, nephews and cousins, as well as the innumerable friends of a lifetime, Allen Meier will be missed all the days of our lives. May his sweet memory live on in what the robing room represents.

AN ECONOMIC AGENDA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 8, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AN ECONOMIC AGENDA

One of the key questions facing policymakers today is what can be done to help improve the standard of living for the average American. I hear from people all the time who tell me they are working harder and longer than ever, but they feel squeezed and are just barely getting by. I believe we must make a determined effort in this country for a higher rate of economic growth. That must become one of our nation's top priorities. Higher growth will come from more saving and investment and from greater productivity, and it will do much to improve the outlook for working Americans.

STATE OF ECONOMY

All of us know that the overall economy is doing reasonably well. Growth and inflation are both around 2%. Many jobs are being created and the unemployment rate is low. The deficit is going down. Stock prices are at an all-time high. But at the same time, there is tremendous unease about the economy. Layoffs and downsizing are continuing as the inevitable result of global competition and technological change. There is job insecurity, enormous income inequality, and significant pressure on families.

I believe President Kennedy was right when he talked about a rising tide lifting all boats. We must have stronger economic growth.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Economic growth is the rate at which the overall economy grows from year to year. In 1994 our nation's total output of goods and services (Gross Domestic Product) was $7.1 trillion and in 1995 GDP was $7.25 trillion, for a growth rate last year of 2.0%.

The U.S. growth rate has slowed since the decades after World War II. Economic growth averaged a robust 3.9% per year in the 1950s and 4.3% in the 1960s, but it has dropped to 3.2% in the 1970s, 2.7% in the 1980s, and, with the 1990–91 recession, 1.8% so far in the 1990s. We need to do better. Many economists believe that we should be striving for growth of around 3.5% per year over the long term. They believe that the structure of the economy has changed in recent years to allow that kind of growth without reigniting inflation.

Growth in the material standard of living is obviously not the sole measure of success as a society. But strong, balanced, and sustained economic growth helps in many ways. Jobs multiply and wages rise during periods of solid growth. Prior to the 1970s when we had strong economic growth, wage growth was also solid. But as the economy has slowed, wage growth has flattened out. Strong economic growth also makes it easier to balance the budget, as the growing economy boosts revenues and reduces social safety net costs, and it makes it easier for Americans to tackle a variety of domestic problems. Strong economic growth alone cannot solve the nation's problems, but without it they are likely to become increasingly difficult.

We need, in short, an economy that will provide employment for everyone willing and able to work, and an economy that will provide opportunity for a consistently higher standard of living for those employed. The only way I know to get that is with strong private sector growth. That growth will come from higher levels of investment and superior public services.

PRO-GROWTH AGENDA

I believe there are several parts to a pro-growth agenda. First, we must balance the federal budget. Large federal borrowing drains the pool of national savings available for productive private sector investment and it drives up interest rates. Progress has been made on the deficit, as it has been cut in half over the last four years. We need to build on that progress, put aside our partisan differences, and balance the budget.

Second, we need to reform the federal tax system so economic growth becomes a much more central objective. That means it has to do a much better job of encouraging saving and investment. How it should be restructured to achieve that is a matter of debate. We may need a variation of the flat tax, a lower tax on capital, or a system of taxing consumption instead of investment, but we must put at the top of our national agenda a search for a tax system that enhances growth.

Third, we must expand our trade opportunities and open foreign markets to U.S. products. Jobs in exporting industries tend to be higher-paying, so our companies must have fair access to the rapidly growing markets overseas. We need to continually review and adjust U.S. trade policy to make sure it is working in our national interest and is helping to expand our economy and good-paying jobs.

Fourth, we need to curb excessive and costly government regulations. Many federal regulations provide important health and safety protections. But overall we need to make sure their benefits exceed their costs and they are carried out in the latest burdensome way. Regulations should recognize that a vibrant private sector is the best engine for economic growth and jobs.

Fifth, I also think we need higher levels of public investment in infrastructure. Federal, state, and local governments need to invest in more and better roads, bridges, highways, water systems, sewer systems, harbors, ports, airports and all the rest that helps make the private sector more productive. We also need to promote investment in research and technology, which boosts economic growth.

Finally, we need greater attention to upgrading the education and skills training of our workers. Improving educational performance is an absolute priority in today's world so all Americans—not just those at the top—can prosper as the economy grows. Education is, of course, primarily a state responsibility, but it is a national problem. Access to higher education and more skills training is a must.

I do not suggest that such changes will come about easily. We must be prepared to deal with the human problems that emerge. We should do all we can, for example, to create a system of portable pensions and portable health care to cushion the transition for people who have to move from one job to another. We must find ways of providing profit sharing and stock ownership plans for employees, not just for the top corporate management, so everyone has a greater stake in the success of our companies.

CONCLUSION

In sum, our objective is simple: higher growth in the American economy. That basic goal needs to become the much more central focus of what the federal government does on a variety of fronts—whether it be our budget or tax policy or our trade, regulatory, and public investment policy. In the end I think what is important for working people is for this economic system of ours to grow and to create more good-paying jobs. We don't know all the answers about getting higher growth, but we know some of them, and we should get about the business of implementing them.

LET'S FILL THE EDUCATIONAL GAS TANKS, NOT LET THE KIDS RUN OUT OF GAS

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make my point for the children in school today who may be struggling with economics as put forth by Representative ARMEY over the weekend. The Gingrich-Armey Republicans have now suggested that a reduction in a Federal tax on gasoline should be offset by further cutting Federal spending for education.

All across America students and teachers are probably scratching their heads this morning trying to figure out how any person in their right mind, much less a person in an apparent position of responsibility such as being a Member of the U.S. Congress, could conceive of such a crazy robbing Peter to pay Paul scenario.

If we were to seriously consider such a crazy alternative—then we would probably be dumb enough to believe some of the statistics reported by Representative ARMEY in a national television talk show last weekend. In fact, Mr. ARMEY said that the Gingrich-Armey proposed gasoline tax repeal might make Americans happy because it would save the average motorist about $27 a year.

If Mr. ARMEY would do his own math on comparing the proposed gasoline tax repeal