

around through a program in vocational skills training.

This young woman is named Jessica Shillander. She spent her young life in a two-parent family, but later experienced a difficult family breakup. After this happened, this soon got very difficult for Jessica, and she had to prove how capable and resilient she really is—a thing we shouldn't ask from any child in America.

Jessica was kicked out of her mother's home as a seventh grader. Not surprisingly, she almost immediately got involved with gangs, drugs, and an abusive boyfriend almost twice her age.

Jessica dropped out of school, and if it were not for the help of caring adults, and a special program funded with Federal School-to-Work funds, she would not be the success story she is today.

However, due to a dropout retrieval program run by the New Market Vocational Skills Center in Tumwater, WA, Jessica started having success in school.

At New Market, Jessica felt the support from adults which allowed her to improve her academic and job skills. Thanks to the program, Jessica has almost graduated. She has turned away from violence.

She is now working a paying job as a student advocate, and looks forward to a career helping young people. Last week she spoke to applause at the White House Conference, letting adults and youth learn from her story.

This dropout retrieval program would not be possible without Federal School-to-Work funds. Run through the vocational skills centers in Washington State, the program is unique in the country. High school dropouts—kids from lower- and middle-class working families—get special assistance to get them involved in instruction which is relevant to their lives.

If they need help with transportation, or child care, or just need someone to care enough those first few days back at school to give them a wakeup call or see that they get an alarm clock or work clothes—the help is there.

And, like most Americans, these young people respond well to high expectations and a caring attitude—they need less help as they become more confident in their own abilities. These programs have an average placement rate of 90 percent—either in jobs, higher education, or the military.

At a time when our world is more complex than ever, when all employees, young or old, are finding the working world more difficult, when all schools need to be more relevant, Congress is about to cut the very School-to-Work funds that make Washington's School-to-Career program possible.

Here's Jessica's reaction: "School-to-work transition needs to begin as early as kindergarten, to help all students find value and self-worth. I want all students to have this opportunity."

Mr. President, I just held four children's forums in my State, in Yakima,

Vancouver, Spokane, and Tacoma. In every one of these meetings, adults and young people came out in the winter weather to confirm that all schools need to be more relevant, and that School-to-Career programs are exactly the kind of thing this country needs more of.

But, instead, we are here today debating an amendment to restore these funds after they have been cut. This is folly. We must invest in our future, not bankrupt it. The Daschle-Harkin amendment will restore School-to-Work funds for programs like the one that helped Jessica.

I believe, as did President Franklin Roosevelt, that "The only real capital of a nation is its natural resources and its human beings." America cannot continue to act like a business having a fire sale, we must continue the investments which will give our country a future. Education is paramount among these. I want my colleagues to support the Daschle-Harkin amendment in this light.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I wish to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

#### EXTENSION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WHITEWATER

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I wanted to say how disappointed I am that the Senate failed in a vote a few minutes ago to end the filibuster of our resolution to continue the Whitewater hearings.

The question before the Senate today should have been whether or not we would authorize additional funding for the continued investigation into Whitewater. Unfortunately, the current filibuster that is underway prevents us from even considering this question or voting on either the resolution or the Democratic alternative.

I recognize that some of our colleagues who have not closely followed the course of this investigation could reasonably believe that enough time and money has been spent on the matter, and under ordinary circumstances, they might be right.

Should we not have the opportunity to openly and honestly debate—and vote—on this issue? We may have disagreements over the need to continue the Whitewater investigations, but shouldn't those disagreements be argued and resolved in the light of full public scrutiny? I believe they should.

Unfortunately, that is not the situation we face today. But that should not come as any surprise; after all this filibuster simply follows the course of action directed by the White House.

Whatever its motivation, the White House has refused to fully cooperate with this investigation. For months, they have delayed the production of documents, presented witnesses who exhibit suspiciously selective memo-

ries, and raised dubious questions of privilege in order to withhold potentially damaging evidence. All for the purposes of downplaying the significance of Whitewater and running out the clock on this investigation.

Let us review the facts. Nine people have been convicted for crimes relating to Whitewater, and seven more—including Arkansas Governor Jim Guy Tucker and the Clintons' business partners, Jim and Susan McDougal whose trial has begun in Little Rock—are currently under indictment.

The President and the First Lady have both been compelled to testify separately before grand juries on the subject of Whitewater.

Yet, the White House still refuses to make full, prompt disclosures in response to our requests. And in those refusals rest the real Whitewater scandal.

Just as important as the actual and alleged crimes committed in Arkansas during the 1980's is the potentially criminal coverup going on in the White House today.

Our chief frustration centers around the stark difference between the claims the First Family makes in front of the cameras and the actions taken by the White House behind closed doors.

The President and the First Lady have repeatedly pledged full cooperation with this investigation, but as a Washington Post editorial puts it, "they have a weird way of showing" that cooperation.

It has been clear from day one that a concerted and coordinated effort has been made on the part of the White House, associates of the President, and Clinton appointees to thwart the work of the special committee.

You can think of Whitewater as a jigsaw puzzle with a timelock—a puzzle that did not come in a box or with a picture to work from. You begin assembling the scattered pieces, but when you think you are done, something does not seem quite right.

Maybe it is the holes at the edges of the puzzle or the extra pieces you are holding that don't seem to fit anywhere. With time ticking away, you look around to see if anything is missing, when you find them in someone else's hands.

And as all the pieces begin to fit together, you still have no idea what you'll end up with, but you realize that the puzzle is bigger than you had ever imagined.

It sounds incredible but look at the obstacles we have had to face.

Withheld records. Last summer, the committee requested the phone records of Margaret Williams and Susan Thomases for the time period immediately following the death of Vince Foster. By December, we had received them, but only after making four separate requests and issuing a subpoena.

The records detail a phone tree between Williams, Thomases, and the First Lady on the night of Foster's death, leading to the removal of documents from Foster's office. But it took months to get them.

Last minute surprises. On November 3, Deputy White House Counsel Bruce Lindsey was deposed by the special committee. Not until the eve of his deposition did Lindsey supply the committee with Whitewater documents, and then, 12 days later, discovered another 80 pages of information.

With this new information, the special committee decided to depose Mr. Lindsey again, when, surprise, he once again provided additional documents on the eve of a deposition.

And just a few weeks ago, when we least expected it, boom—more documents from Bruce Lindsey.

Missing and redacted notes. On February 7 of this year, the White House released a redacted version of notes taken by then-White House Communications Director Mark Gearan from Whitewater response team meetings led in 1994 by White House Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes.

But only on the day of Gearan's deposition was the unredacted version released—3 days before Gearan was scheduled to testify. When questioned, Gearan gave little explanation for why these, shall we say, colorful notes were not turned over in response to a committee subpoena for Whitewater documents issued over 3 months ago.

Overlooked documents. Upon receiving confirmation from the Gearan notes about Ickes' role in Whitewater, the committee requested any additional notes that might have been taken by Ickes.

Sure enough, less than 48 hours before Ickes was scheduled to testify, over 100 pages of notes and documents appeared on our doorstep, accompanied by the dubious explanation that the documents were mistakenly overlooked.

To top it off, how can one forget the long delayed discovery of Mrs. Clinton's billing records in the White House book room. Coincidences? Hardley.

The White House knows exactly what it is doing. Make no mistake about it.

Publicly, they claim to be the most forthcoming administration in history. And they point to the tens of thousands of pages of documents they have turned over as evidence.

Only after you leaf through the piles, and see first hand the fragments, the redactions, and the irrelevant information the White House has provided do the pieces of the puzzle begin to fit together in the image of a stone wall.

I've often compared it to looking for a needle in a haystack—the trouble is, when we ask for the needle, the White House gives us the haystack. And now, they want to say "Times up. We win."

Mr. President, when we started this investigation, our purpose was to examine the reasons for the taxpayer-financed \$60 million failure of one Arkansas savings and loan. But what we have uncovered, in Washington and in Arkansas, is enough to make any ethical person cringe—and still, many questions remain.

It is these findings and unresolved questions which lead me to wonder why our Democratic colleagues have chosen to filibuster this investigation, rather than let us gather the facts and complete our job.

There has already been a great deal of speculation in the public's eye over issues related to Whitewater and the death of Vince Foster. We cannot afford to leave these questions—or to give the American people reason to doubt the integrity of our efforts.

Mr. President, we have a choice. We can either continue our investigation and get to the bottom of this whole affair or we can give up. We can begin dismantling the White House's stone wall piece by piece or we can throw our hands up in the air and allow the Senate to become just another part of a potential Whitewater coverup.

Mr. President, we cannot allow that to happen.

We have a responsibility to uncover the truth to every taxpayer whose hard-earned dollars bailed out Madison Guaranty, to every citizen who questions the honesty and integrity of their Government, to every American who believes in the saying, long forgotten in Washington, about "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

If it takes us days, weeks, or months to wipe the Government clean from the tarnish of Whitewater, then that is what we must do. The Senate cannot continue to wash its hands of this responsibility. The investigation must continue. If it takes us days, weeks, or months to wipe the Government clean from the tarnished Whitewater, then that is what we must do. The Senate cannot continue to wash its hands of this responsibility. The investigation must continue.

Now, I know my colleagues argue many points, but I believe they ignore the merits. They argue time and money, but they ignore the facts. They say, "What is the big deal about Whitewater?" But, again, they ignore the fact that nearly two dozen friends and associates of the Clintons have become casualties of Whitewater being sent back home in disgrace, charged or convicted of crimes related to Whitewater, or even worse.

And, also, they charge that the investigation is political, but they ignore the fact that it would be more political to end this investigation without getting the answers. It is political, but the politics are being played by the White House and our Democratic colleagues in not allowing this investigation to continue. If there is nothing to fear, why not get the job done and put it behind us?

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

## BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3473

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Iowa and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for their work in bringing us to this point on one of the most important aspects of this omnibus appropriations bill, the education amendment. Yesterday we offered an amendment with an expectation that we could restore full funding to the 1995 level. This legislation does that. There was some miscalculation as to the funding level required to bring us to fiscal 1995 levels for title I. As I understand it, the question relating to how much funding would be required to do just that has been resolved.

I am satisfied that this does restore the fiscal 1995 level for title I, as well as for the other educational priorities identified in the underlying amendment. So, clearly, this agreement is a very significant development. It ought to enjoy the support of both sides of the aisle. I hope we can get unanimous support for it. It removes what I consider to be one of the most important impediments to bringing us to a point where we can get broad bipartisan support for final passage of this bill.

So, again, I thank the leadership of the Senator from Iowa, and certainly the Senator from Pennsylvania. I hope that all of our colleagues can support it. I hope we can work together on a bipartisan basis to reach similar agreements on other outstanding differences related to this legislation, including funding levels for the environment, crime, and technology. We also need to remove the contentious riders the House included in their version of the bill. I believe that if we did that this afternoon, we could put this bill on the President's desk before the end of the week and, at long last, resolve the many problems we have had with these appropriations bills.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 16, as follows: