

money without being accountable until they feel that they have identified all constituencies necessary to build the voting majority. But I hope the American people will be a little more sophisticated; that they will understand this issue is about how you make the Federal Government responsible, how you pass on to our children not only excellent education but a chance for a prosperous and fulfilling lifestyle, and that that second part of the exercise involves addressing the issues of how this Government spends its money in the entitlement accounts, something about which, unfortunately, the other side of the aisle has decided to bury its head in the sand and the President of the United States has decided to join them.

I thank the Chair for his courtesy. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold that suggestion?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. GREGG. I withdraw my suggestion.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. COATS].

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the DC appropriations bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the D.C. Appropriations bill:

Bob Dole, Trent Lott, Jesse Helms, Phil Gramm, Judd Gregg, Dirk Kempthorne, Strom Thurmond, Olympia Snowe, Bob Smith, Dan Coats, Larry E. Craig, John Ashcroft, Thad Cochran, Jon Kyl, Mark Hatfield, Robert F. Bennett.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546 be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are ordered under rule XXII, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Bennett	Gorton	McCain
Bond	Gramm	McConnell
Bradley	Grams	Murkowski
Breaux	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Byrd	Hatfield	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Johnston	Stevens
Craig	Kassebaum	Thomas
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Dole	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lott	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Harkin	Nunn
Boxer	Heflin	Pell
Bryan	Hollings	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Chafee	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Specter
Exon	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND RELATED MATTERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XXII, the clerk will now report the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227, regarding the Whitewater extension:

Alfonse D'Amato, Trent Lott, Jesse Helms, Phil Gramm, Judd Gregg, Dirk Kempthorne, Strom Thurmond, Jim Jeffords, Olympia Snowe, Bob Smith, Dan Coats, Larry E. Craig, John Ashcroft, Thad Cochran, Jon Kyl, R. F. Bennett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate be brought to a close? The yeas and nays were ordered under rule XXII.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Bennett	Brown
Ashcroft	Bond	Burns

Campbell	Grassley	Murkowski
Chafee	Gregg	Nickles
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Helms	Santorum
Coverdell	Hutchison	Shelby
Craig	Inhofe	Simpson
D'Amato	Jeffords	Smith
DeWine	Kassebaum	Snowe
Dole	Kempthorne	Specter
Domenici	Kyl	Stevens
Faircloth	Lott	Thomas
Frist	Lugar	Thompson
Gorton	Mack	Thurmond
Gramm	McCain	Warner
Grams	McConnell	

NAYS—47

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	Wyden
Feingold	Levin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53 and the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, today we have seen what is the first of probably a number of votes to attempt to curtail the filibuster against moving forward with the Whitewater investigation.

Let us be clear and set the record straight. I have offered publicly, and I offer again on the Senate floor, an opportunity to answer the question of whether or not the committee is looking to continue the investigation into the political season and to do so by incorporating an indefinite time agreement. I can state, we are willing to limit—not that I am happy about it—since the setting of arbitrary time limits, as stated by the former Democratic majority leader, Senator Mitchell, is a mistake. Senator Mitchell came to this conclusion to prevent the possibility of lawyers from stalling and keeping matters from coming forth. However, recognizing that we are in a unique situation, this Senator has indicated before and I indicate publicly now that we would be willing to terminate the committee's work, even if it is not finished, within 4 months. It will take us, I believe, at least that period of time since there is a trial which is taking place right now in Little Rock, AR. There are witnesses who are unavailable to us who are testifying there. I believe that their presence, at least the opportunity to attempt to bring them forward, is important.

Mr. President, let me quote something. Let me read it to you.

No arguments about politics on either side can outweigh the fact that the White House has yet to reveal the full facts about the land venture, the Clintons' relationship with Mr. McDougal's banking activities, Hillary Rodham Clinton's work as a lawyer on Whitewater matters, and the mysterious movements of documents between the Rose Law Firm, various basements and closets, and the Executive Mansion. The committee, politics notwithstanding, has earned an indefinite extension. A Democratic filibuster against it would be silly stonewalling.

That is what we have seen today. Every single Democrat came in here and voted to stonewall at the direction of the White House.

Let us not make any mistakes about who is calling the shots here. It is the White House. Now, that is not a statement in terms of the stonewalling or being silly. That is a quote from the New York Times—the New York Times. They are certainly not an organ or a mouthpiece of the Republican Party.

Let me quote today's Washington Post—today's Washington Post:

Lawmakers and the public have a legitimate interest in getting answers to the many questions that prompted the investigation in the first place and those that have been raised in the course of it by the conduct of many administration witnesses . . . If Democrats think that stalling or stonewalling will make Whitewater go away, they are badly mistaken. The probe is not over, whether they try to call it off or not.

Now, that is the Washington Post today, certainly not a mouthpiece of the Republican Party.

Let me read to you from the current issue of Time magazine, just a small part.

The question of whether specific laws were broken should not obscure the broader issue that makes Whitewater an important story. How Bill and Hillary Clinton handled what was their single largest investment says much about their character and integrity. It shows how they reacted to power, both in their quest for it and their wielding of it. It shows their willingness to hold themselves to the same standards everyone else must—whether in meeting a bank's conditions for a loan, taking responsibility for their savings, investments and taxes, or cooperating with Federal regulators. Perhaps most important, it shows whether they have spoken the truth on a subject of legitimate concern to the American people.

That was written by James Stewart, a Pulitzer Prize winning journalist. Mr. Stewart has just written a major book, "Blood Sport," about the Clintons' investment in Whitewater.

I come right back to the final question: What are my friends afraid of? What is the White House afraid of? Why are they reluctant to allow the committee to conclude its work? What are they hiding from the American people?

I believe that the American people have a right to these answers. No amount of criticism as it relates to what the committee has done to date will obfuscate the fact that they are continuing to stonewall. It is not silly. It is incorrigible. It is wrong. And it does not bring credit to this institution

or to either political party or to the process.

Once again, I lay forth the opportunity to settle this so that we do not have to have speeches and debates and say that we can conclude the committee's work in 4 months.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority manager of the bill is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to outline a second-degree amendment which will be offered—

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield at this point? Can we get 5 minutes to respond, on this matter that has been raised for the purpose of debate, for the ranking minority member, appropriate to give him a chance to respond to Senator D'AMATO?

Mr. SPECTER. I would yield for that purpose on a unanimous-consent request that when the response is concluded I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am going to be very brief.

It would be expected that the assertions would be made that have just been made. The fact is that Senator DASCHLE offered a perfectly reasonable proposal with respect to this inquiry dealing with Whitewater, and that was to provide an extension into early April. The inquiry was supposed to end at the end of February. That was provided for in the resolution which the Senate passed. The reason that was done was in order to keep this inquiry out of the election year so it would not be subject to a public perception that it was being carried on for political reasons.

Now, that concern paralleled a concern that was expressed by the Republican leader, Senator DOLE, in 1987, when the Iran-Contra inquiry was undertaken. That was in a Congress controlled by Democrats. It was an inquiry into the activities of a Republican administration. There were Democrats who wanted to carry it on indefinitely through the election year. Senator DOLE, at that time the minority leader, was very insistent that it would have a fixed timeframe that would keep it out of the election period. The Democratic Senate responded to that and, in effect, agreed that the inquiry would be brought to an end in the latter part—in fact, in the fall—of 1987, and later we moved that date up in order to keep it even more out of the election year.

Now, Senate Resolution 120 provides that the two leaders should get together and discuss any proposal for extending the committee, and I think that ought to be done.

The proposal before us is for an indefinite time period. The proposal which my colleague from New York has

just put forward, the 4-month proposal, is virtually the equivalent of an indefinite time period. I think there needs to be some reasonableness here, and I think the reasonableness was reflected in the proposal put forward by Senator DASCHLE, the minority leader, which would have provided that the committee could continue its work into early April and have a month after that in order to do its report.

Now newspapers across the country are beginning to editorialize about this matter. These are newspapers "outside of the beltway" raising questions. For instance, the Tulsa paper says:

How far must taxpayers go? How much must they pay to keep this charade going? The vote in the Senate to extend the investigation probably will be along party lines. If it does, the extra \$650,000 should come from the coffers of the Republican party, not from the taxpayers. It is the Republicans, not the taxpayers, who stand to benefit. The Whitewater probe is shaping up to be the longest, most costly fishing trip in American history.

These are not my words. I am now quoting what is being said out across the country. Of course, what that does, it substantiates the observation I made that if this thing is prolonged through the election year, it will be increasingly perceived as a political endeavor and it will lose its credibility as a consequence, or even further lose its credibility.

The Milwaukee paper said:

Last week, Senator Moseley-Braun asked a good question of Senator D'Amato, chairman of the Senate committee that is investigating the Whitewater affair. Could these hearings, she asked wearily, go on into perpetuity? Although D'Amato was really at a loss for words, he could not provide a satisfactory answer to that question, but somebody should.

They then go on to make the point that this thing has been dragged on long enough.

The Sacramento Bee headline said, "Enough of Whitewater."

Senator Alfonse D'Amato, the chairman of the Senate Whitewater Committee and chairman of Senator Bob Dole's Presidential campaign in New York, wants to extend his hearings indefinitely, at least one presumes until after the November elections. In this case, the Democrats have the best of the argument by a country mile. With every passing day, the hearings have looked more like a fishing expedition in the Dead Sea.

Now, Senator DASCHLE, I thought, made a very accommodating proposal. There has been nothing back from the other side to which one can attach the rubric of reasonableness. It seems clear to me that as long as they continue to press for an indefinite period or something that is virtually equivalent to it, we ought to resist it because it simply makes it more transparent that this is a political exercise.

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time—

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, might I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will seek the floor in my own right. I wish to just make a comment here in responding to the suggestion of our colleague from New York that the Democrats here voted against an open-ended \$600,000 appropriation hearing process because of the White House pulling strings. No one suggested that our Republican friends who voted unanimously to continue this were somehow having strings pulled at all, nor would I make that suggestion.

But certainly the fact that at this juncture we find ourselves in a stalemate ought to suggest, particularly when you consider it was only a few short months ago that this body voted almost unanimously for these hearings to be conducted—this was not a partisan issue. As in most cases, it was bipartisan to get this underway. It was almost unanimous, I believe.

Mr. SARBANES. Ninety-six to three.

Mr. DODD. Ninety-six to three, in fact, for the resolution to terminate the hearings, to call for the termination on February 29. It is unfortunate we have come to this where you have a request unprecedented in the annals of Congress—unprecedented, Mr. President—for an open-ended hearing with an additional \$600,000. That brings the pricetag of this investigation to in excess of \$30 million in this country.

That is the reason people are upset, frankly, that kind of open-ended appropriation, no end in sight and, of course, no substantiation of any unethical or illegal behavior. When you add that to the fact that we have had virtually no hearings occurring on major issues affecting people's lives in this country, like Medicare, Medicaid—we are going to have an extensive debate on education today; we are going to be cutting \$3 billion in education programs—there were hardly three or four hearings on all of education, as the Presiding Officer knows.

Yet, we had 50 hearings on White water and 10 or 12 hearings on Waco and Ruby Ridge and almost none on education, none on Medicare, none on health, and you want to know why people are angry? That is why they are angry in this country.

We spoke up and said, "Look, 5 weeks, \$185,000." That is plenty of time to complete this process. We are not saying stop it today. We are saying take another 5 weeks and wrap up the business of this committee. That is a reasonable, reasonable proposal, and I think it is regrettable we have a position taken of 4 months now which takes us virtually into September—when we eliminate the August recess—September, October, a handful of days before the election.

It is patently political. It is so transparently political that an infant can see through it, and most of the American people have. That is why we object to this request of an open-ended proposal with \$600,000. I hope that the majority Members, at least some of them, will step forward and offer to sit down

and resolve this matter so we can get the work done and not allow it to spill over into the campaign.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for providing us some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority manager of the bill is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, as I had started to say earlier before yielding to my distinguished friend from Connecticut, I did not know he was going to mention Ruby Ridge, or I might not have yielded to him. What is wrong with Ruby Ridge?

Mr. DODD. I just say to my colleague, I think there is a value in having those hearings. My colleague did a good job. My point is, if you do it to the exclusion of other hearings, then it seems to me we are off on the wrong track. My colleague did a good job.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague for that comment.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as I said, I had sought recognition to talk about a second-degree amendment, which shortly will be offered on behalf of myself and Senator HARKIN, which has been crafted very carefully after very, very extensive discussions among many parties. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, for his cooperation. I thought we might save some time by talking about the amendment for a few minutes while some final language change is being incorporated to accommodate some concerns which have arisen.

There had been extensive discussion yesterday and today—I did not hear it yesterday because I was traveling in my home State of Pennsylvania—but I heard the discussion this morning about the need for education. I think there is a consensus in America about the importance of education, about the priority of education and about our doing everything we possibly can to stretch Federal dollars as far as we can along the education line. I know that is something the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Vermont, feels very strongly about.

What we have done is structured an amendment with offsets, where we preserve the balanced budget so that we do not encumber future generations with more deficit spending. The amendment, while raising funds for education, job training, and head start, which is a very high priority, obviously, second to none—but it also is offset so as not to encumber future generations with our spending money

that they have to pay for—another high priority also second to none. These are very top priorities.

What we are submitting is an amendment in the second degree which will provide additional funding for education, Head Start and job-related issues.

We have heard from many, many mayors and many, many commissioners in local government. A comment was made this morning about summer jobs being a very important anticrime program, which is widely recognized, not really disputed at all. This amendment would add \$635 million for Summer Youth Employment Programs in the Department of Labor, a high priority item.

We are adding \$333 million in additional funds for the Dislocated Worker Retraining Program, which brings the total to \$1.2 billion, a very, very important item in an era where there is so much downsizing, where we have seen so many layoffs, we have seen so much anxiety in America, and people in the prime of their working lives losing their jobs which they have held for 10, 15, 20, 30 years but still with many good years ahead of them. So the Dislocated Worker Retraining Program will have that additional funding which also impacts upon base closures, something which is very important to my State and very important all over the country.

We are adding \$182 million in additional funds for the School-to-Work Program jointly administered by the Departments of Labor and Education. This brings the School-to-Work Program to a total of \$372 million.

We are adding \$137 million to restore fully the Head Start Program for the 1995 level. We will be adding \$60 million in additional funds for the Goals 2000 program, bringing the total in the bill to \$350 million. This is a matter which has produced some controversy, but I think that ultimately we may be in a position to eliminate strings so that we do not have the objection of too much Federal intervention and too much Federal control.

I personally believe that education ought to be left to the local level, but the idea of standards and goals is one which has great merit. Those standards and goals can be figured out at the local level; they do not need to come from Washington.

The Secretary of Education has testified of his willingness on behalf of the administration to give up some of the bureaucracy and some of the councils. Last September, the subcommittee had a hearing on Goals 2000, where we listened to people who were opposed to the program and might even be able to strike an accommodation of the disparate points of view by eliminating some of the Federal strings. Perhaps if the States do not wish to take Goals 2000 money, as some have so stated, that the funds might go directly to the local level.

We will be adding \$814.5 billion in additional funds for title I Compensatory