BURTON), this is a quote, ''refused to release the transcripts until the week Hubble was indicted for tax evasion and fraud, a committee source said. Mr. Bossee, one committee staffer, has several friends close to independent counsel Kenneth Starr and urged Burton to withhold the tapes until last week.''

Yesterday, a Republican aide on Mr. BURTON's committee was quoted in the press as admitting that the timing looked ''fishy,'' but he denied there was any coordination. Well, I agree that it looks bad and that it deserves investigation.

These facts raise a simple question: Did Judge Starr let Chairman BURTON'S staff know in advance that he was returning an indictment on Webster Hubble? If so, what other kinds of information is he sharing with Republican investigators? If Judge Starr has been sharing information with Chairman BURTON, these would constitute violations of law by the independent counsel himself.

Frankly, I believe these allegations are far more specific and credible than those which today compelled Attorney General Reno to seek an independent counsel for Miss Herman.

The Attorney General admitted that she found ''no evidence clearly demonstrating Secretary Herman's involvement.'' Nevertheless, a counsel was appointed.

It disturbs me greatly that the independent counsel law can produce this kind of result. Department of Justice investigators worked for 5 minutes and found no clear evidence of wrongdoing by Ms. Herman. Nevertheless, Attorney General Reno felt compelled to appoint an independent counsel.

Now, if the Attorney General can appoint an independent counsel, a person with unlimited resources and time and money to spend investigating these kinds of allegations, then surely it is appropriate for the Attorney General to at least investigate some of the disturbing coincidences that surround Chairman BURTON's release of the Webster Hubble tapes at the beginning of the month.

□ 1945

By the way, what was the purpose of Chairman BURTON subpoenaing tapes from the Department of Justice and then releasing them to the public? What was his point? What service was he providing, or thought that he was providing?

Judge Starr has said that the rule of law is supreme, and on that he is right. The law applies to all equally, including him, the Independent Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a communication that I have from Attorney Stuart F. Pierson, counsel for Marsha Scott, who says that he has found that the questions put to him by the Burton committee were extraordinary in that they were virtually identical to the questions put to her less than 2 months ago before a Federal grand jury.

The material referred to is as follows:

LEVINE PIERSON SULLIVAN AND KOCH,
Washington, DC, May 8, 1997.

RICHARD D. BENNETT, Esq.,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

KENNETH W. STARR, Esq.,
Independent Counsel, Office of Independent Counsel, Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BENNETT AND MR. STARR: As counsel for Marsha Scott, I am writing to advise you of a concern which has arisen in connection with deposition questions propounded by majority counsel of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs (the ''Burton Committee'').

Ms. Scott has appeared five times before federal grand juries under subpoena by the Independent Counsel, once in Little Rock and the remainder in Washington, D.C. The last appearances were on March 26 and 31, 1998.

Prior to her appearances in March, Ms. Scott had been examined by the Independent Counsel about a wide variety of subjects, including her relationship with Webb Hubbell, her communications with Mr. Hubbell and people in the White House while he was in prison, his business activities following his resignation from the Justice Department, his financial condition, and conversations in the White House concerning him, his family and his financial condition. Ms. Scott answered all of those questions to the best of her ability.

Ms. Scott has also appeared at numerous depositions under subpoena by the committees of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives. On April 1, 1998, as a consequence of her withdrawal from a deposition that had become repetitious and vexatious, as taken by counsel for the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight (the ''McIntosh Subcommittee''), Ms. Scott was required forthwith to appear at a closed-door hearing called by Mr. McIntosh. At that hearing, Ms. Scott agreed to return to complete the deposition by counsel for the McIntosh Subcommittee. Within ten days of that agreement, counsel for the Burton Committee called informally to advise that she intended to take deposition testimony in addition to that to be taken for the McIntosh Subcommittee.

On April 28, 1998, Ms. Scott returned for the completion of her deposition by the McIntosh Subcommittee. Following all testimony taken by counsel for that subcommittee, counsel for the Burton Committee appeared and conducted further examination of Ms. Scott over objection. It is that further examination that has raised the concern to which I refer.

While relatively short, the questioning by counsel for the Burton Committee was in at least five respects virtually identical to examination taken of Ms. Scott by the Independent Counsel before a federal grant jury on March 26, 1998. Specifically, both examinations addressed: (1) whether Ms. Scott was aware of any displeasure expressed by or for the First Lady about the possibility that Mr. Hubbell might sue the Rose law firm concerning his billing dispute; (2) whether Mr. Hubbell ever discussed the nature or extent of his cooperation with the Independent Counsel; and (3) what knowledge Ms. Scott had of conversations with, and the activities of Mr. Hubbell's accountant, Mike Schamfele. Additionally, both examinations repeated questions about any conversations Ms. Scott had with Mr. Hubbell concerning his clients after leaving the Justice Department, and any discussions in the White House that Ms. Scott was aware of concerning Mr. Hubbell's financial condition. The identity of such examination was particularly remarkable considering that Burton Committee counsel had asked to take it without any formal notice less than a month after the Independent Counsel has conducted its examination.

At the close of the examination by counsel for the Burton Committee, I asked that the committee and the subcommittee be advised that I found it extraordinary that the questions asked of Ms. Scott were virtually identical to questions put to her less than two months before in a federal grand jury. I reiterate that observation by this letter, and I request that a responsible representative of the Independent Counsel and the Burton Committee advise me by return letter whether the examination of Ms. Scott is a consequence of the sharing of any information, documents or consultation between the Office of Independent Counsel and the Burton Committee.

Sincerely,

STUART F. PIERSON,
Counsel for Marsha Scott.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CLAIR A. HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a great loss with my colleagues. On April 11 of this year our country lost Clair Hill, a man I was privileged to call a personal friend. Clair Hill's death is an incredible loss to our community, State, and Nation. He was a legend in his own time.

Clair Hill was an internationally renowned engineer who was the major contributor to California's water supply planning and management. Mr. Hill worked on California's water issues most of his great life, and he is one of the principal authors of the original California water plan developed in the 1940s.

Clair Hill was born in 1909 in Redding, California, located within my congressional district. A personal friend of mine, Mr. Hill was the founder and president of Clair A. Hill & Associates, an engineering firm that merged with CH2M in 1971 to form CH2M Hill.

Mr. Hill, who spent much of his life in Redding, died there on April 11, 1998, at the age of 89. The father of two sons, he was married to his wife, Joan, since July of 1935. Clair Hill was an avid outdoorsman, horse enthusiast, and world traveler. Clair Hill studied forestry at Oregon State University, working in the northern California logging camps during the summers. However, engineering was his eventual calling, and Mr. Hill graduated with a civil engineering degree from Stanford University in 1934.

Clair Hill worked with the Standard Oil Company in San Francisco and the California Bridge Department, now Caltrans, before returning to Redding in 1938 to found his engineering firm,

Clair A. Hill & Associates. He specialized in water resources, surveying, mapping, and structural engineering, before entering military service in 1941, during World War II. He served 5 years in the Aleutian islands. After the war, in 1946, he reorganized his firm, which grew steadily in responsibility and reputation in the post-war boom.

Working from offices in California and Alaska, Mr. Hill's firm served clients such as the U.S. Air Force, the Sacramento Utility District, and Pacific Gas & Electric Company. Clair Hill had an independent spirit, and his reputation was embodied in his motto, you will never succeed if you don't try.

This dedication and independence spurred Mr. Hill to obtain a pilot's license and purchase his own airplane, which he used to service projects throughout California and the Pacific Northwest. Frequently called ''California's Mr. Water,'' Clair Hill was well known as a major contributor to California's water supply planning and management, having served for 32 years in the California Water Commission, 18 of those as chairman.

While on the commission, he signed California's original State water plan, which outlined projects that today store water in the State's northern section for use by communities and industries throughout the State of California.

In 1988 I was proud to assist in renaming Whiskeytown Dam, near Redding, as the Clair A. Hill Whiskeytown Dam. Mr. Hill's assistance and advocacy led to the development of the dam and reservoir to benefit the Redding area as part of the government's Central Valley water project. Although Clair Hill retired as CH2M Hill's California regional manager in 1974, he remained active as a consultant and adviser to the firm's water resources practice until just recently.

Mr. Hill was the only honorary life member of the California Water Commission. Last year he was one of eight civil engineers nationwide to receive an honorary lifetime membership in the American Society of Civil Engineers. Clair Hill was also the first recipient of the Association of California Water Agency's Lifetime Achievement Award, and the National Academy of Engineering elected him to membership in 1992.

As I mentioned before, it was truly a privilege to count Clair Hill among my good friends. He will be missed by many, and he will never be forgotten. Clair Hill, our Nation thanks you.

''SHORTAGE'' OF INFORMATION TECHOLOGY WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I have risen before to talk about the H–1B program, and I think it is time to do it again, because so many of our colleagues have not looked at this program.

A lot of people say, ''H–1B, it sounds like a new Air Force plane.'' What in fact it is is a program which allows foreign workers to come here temporarily for a 6-year period and take jobs that otherwise would have gone to American citizens. We permit that when the companies have a hard time finding people with specific skills.

In particular, the H–1B program was started back in 1990 to alleviate what was then seen as an anticipated shortage of scientists and engineers, particularly at a Ph.D. Level. I do not think that ever particularly was proven to have come about, because in the interim the Berlin Wall fell, and the demand by our defense industry was a lot less than we thought it should be.

The problem with this program is that there is now no universally accepted definition of who these high-tech workers need to be, particularly as it goes to the information technology area. The reason I stress the information technology area is because under the current program, we allow 65,000 temporary workers to come in a year.

The Information Technology Association of America is now coming to Congress and saying, 65,000 temporary workers is not enough. The fact of the matter is that we never came close to hitting 65,000 until last year. All of a sudden a lot of companies out there, particularly in the temporary training and temporary employee business, have discovered this as a way of making a lot of money.

They have discovered a method whereby they can find workers who come from various countries, from Pakistan, from India, from Russia, and they can bring those workers in here, and they are really little more, Mr. Speaker, than indentured servants. While they have H–1B status, the visa is for an occupation, not for a certain person. That person can be underpaid, they can be forced to work 7 days a week until they get their green card, until they are forced to go back home again. How many of them are going to complain? In the meantime, these high-tech jobs are not going to our kids who are graduating from colleges and universities with degrees, and could easily be trained to go into these fields.

In particular, in information technology, that industry has defined their technology so broadly as to try to overdemonstrate the need for IT workers. Yet, they define very narrowly what the skills are that are needed to fill these jobs.

The Information Technology Association of America and the Commerce Department of the United States government defined the pool of qualified IT workers as those who have obtained a bachelor's degree in computer or information science. They did not consider degrees or certifications in computer or information science other than a B.A. degree in those areas. They did not stop and think that somebody who has a degree in business or social science or math or engineering or psychology or economics or education could be trained to do this technical work.

As I have railed against this, some of these companies that are out there hiring these foreign citizens to take these jobs that I think American citizens could be trained to take, now all of a sudden they have begun to strike back. One of them wrote to the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette this weekend. I was kind of amused by this. She owns a company, and this lady's name is Christine Posti. She owns a company called Posti & Associates.

She says that I ask why our companies cannot do the right thing and train American workers. That is the question I do ask. Ms. Posti says that I am under the mistaken impression that business exists to educate our citizens, when really, it is up to the government to educate workers.

I am amazed. It is now up to the Federal Government, that big Federal Government, that is supposed to go out and do all the job training for all the companies in America. They bear no responsibility. We are going to let big government take care of that. Who pays for that? The fact of the matter is that the taxpayers at every level, local property taxpayers, State taxpayers, Federal taxpayers, are being asked by people like Ms. Posti to go out and subsidize their companies. We are supposed to train people.

If they cannot find people in the education system that are already trained to do it, they will go get foreign workers, bring them here, and have them take the jobs. What are our children supposed to do? What are our displaced workers supposed to be retrained to do? What kind of a society will we have in this country?

If Members remember NAFTA, when we voted on NAFTA back in the 103rd Congress we were told, we are going to lose the manufacturing jobs. As we go from a manufacturing society into an information technology society, the new information technology jobs will go to our people. Now here we are, only 4 years later, and we are being told that our students and our workers are too dumb. We have to bring people in from other countries to do it.

I would ask my friends and colleagues to take a look at the H–1B program. Do not be fooled. Keep Americans in the American jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EDWARDS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)