

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 gentlewoman 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

historic. Never before has an American President so boldly stood up to Big Tobacco and not backed down.

Mr. Speaker, to say that tobacco companies, like Brown & Williamson, have a contentious relationship with the Clinton administration would be a gross understatement. Never before has the tobacco industry faced so many challenges in its dealings with the Federal Government. Let me just add, as an aside, that problems for the tobacco industry are victories for America's children.

The Castano suit is the largest class action suit in history. It has been filed on behalf of all addicted smokers in the United States against the tobacco industry. If successful, the Castano suit will cost Big Tobacco millions and millions of dollars.

I could not believe that the politically savvy Mr. Starr—a former Solicitor General in the Bush administration—would be so naive as to not see a serious problem in his dual role as lead attorney for Brown & Williamson and the Whitewater investigator.

I was unnerved, to say the least, Mr. Speaker, when I turned on my television set several weeks ago and saw Mr. Starr—not in Little Rock, AR, working on Whitewater—but in New Orleans. He was there acting as the Counsel of Record, in other words, the lead attorney, for the entire tobacco industry in the Castano class action suit.

For several years now, I have worked to hold Brown & Williamson, along with the rest of the tobacco industry, accountable for manipulating the level of nicotine in cigarettes, for targeting America's children in advertising, and for misleading the Congress, Federal agencies, and the American people when it comes to the dangers of tobacco products.

Unfortunately, here is what they are getting:

Mr. Starr, while purporting to oversee and lead the Whitewater Investigation, remains actively involved in an enormous private practice, over \$1 million per year. Moreover, much of his private practice is dominated by ideological foes of the President.

For example, Mr. Starr is employed by Brown & Williamson—one of this Nation's largest tobacco companies. In fact, my interest in Mr. Starr's conflicts of interest stems from his work for Brown & Williamson.

Mr. Speaker, when the sitting President of the United States is under investigation, the public demands a fair and impartial investigator. I do not believe that is too much to ask. Currently, though, we have an Independent Counsel who seems to be the servant of several masters.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better than this, the Congress deserves better than this, and the President deserves better than this.

Mr. Starr fails to recognize the political context of this Whitewater investigation. If he is to serve effectively as

the Independent Counsel, it is imperative that he resolve problems his large, lucrative private practice creates. His unwillingness to address these questions will ultimately taint any resolution in this case.

Mr. Speaker, when a sitting President is the subject of any kind of investigation, the public demands a fair and impartial investigator. I do not believe that is too much to ask. Currently though we have an independent counsel who seems to serve several masters.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. The President deserves better. This Congress deserves better.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Starr needs to clear up this conflict of interest. You cannot serve two masters. He made a million dollars last year in private clients. Somebody who can conduct a politically charged investigation that involves potentially the President ought to be really independent. It is time, Mr. Starr. Answer these questions.

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on National Peace Officers Memorial day to pay tribute to the 14,064 peace officers who have given their lives to protect our communities. The names of these 14,064 brave men and women are permanently etched on the walls of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, located just a few blocks from here.

This year, Mr. Speaker, 161 new names were added in a candlelight vigil representing police offices who were killed during 1995, and anyone who attended the ceremony today saw the families of these 161 police officers had to be profoundly moved, just as they were by the President's heartfelt remarks and by the beautiful singing of Mariah Carey.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Minnesota has suffered the loss of three police officers who have died on duty since July of 1995:

Paul Moen, a Minneapolis police officer died during a struggle; Brian Klinefelter, a St. Joseph, Minnesota police officer was killed just 3 months ago by a liquor store robber; and less than 2 weeks ago we lost Rice County Deputy John Liebenstein when his car was rammed by the teenaged driver of a stolen car.

Tragedies like these, Mr. Speaker, remind me of cop friends I have lost over the years: Sergeant J.W. Anderson of the Wayzata Police Department; Officer Jerry Haaf of the Minneapolis Police Department. Just yesterday I met with St. Paul police officers Mike and Frank O'Brien, whose brother, John, was killed in the line of duty 15 years ago.

In spite of these and many other tragic killings repeated far too often in far too many communities, we must never lose hope in the war against crime, and with the selfless dedication of law enforcement professionals like John O'Brien, like Sergeant J.W. Anderson, like Jerry Haaf, like Paul Moen, like Brian Klinefelter, like John Liebenstein, we will prevail in the war against crime, selfless, dedicated law enforcement professionals like these brave men and women honored today at the steps of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, there truly is no greater love than the love shown by those who lay down their lives for their friends and their fellow citizens. We must never forget the ultimate sacrifice of police officers who have laid down their lives for people they do not even know. Every single visitor to our Nation's capital should pay a visit to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial located at the Judiciary Square Metro stop. The names carved in the wall of the memorial are a powerful, powerful testament to the thousands of officers who have sacrificed their lives and the hundreds of thousands more who risk their lives every day protecting our communities.

Mr. Speaker, we honor the dead by respecting the living, and today we honor law enforcement officials and their families for their sacrifices. Every single time a police officer puts that uniform on, he or she puts their life on the line.

I also hope, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to honor the memory of our fallen heroes through our actions in this Chamber, promoting policies which prevent crime and violence and supporting our brave men and women in law enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEBATE ON THE 1997 BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning a hearing was held before the House Small Business Committee. The topic of the hearing was the current debate over increasing the minimum wage.