

So, educate our kids? Does it make sense then when we understand something that works, like a Head Start Program where you take a 3- or 4-year-old kid coming from a home of poverty, from a circumstance of disadvantage, and we say to them, "We're going to invest money in you in a Head Start Program, and we know it works, and it makes life better for those kids," does it make sense for us to say, "Look, there are 60,000 of you who have names, Jim, Bill, Mary, Donna, and we've got news for you; we can no longer afford to have you in a Head Start Program"? Does that make sense?

Does it make sense, especially at a time when we are saying, "By the way, we have money to give tax breaks, especially to people over \$1 million a year in income, but we can't afford to keep 60,000 of you kids in a Head Start Program"?

The answer is, no, of course, it does not make sense. It is nuts. It does not make any sense to establish priorities that are so far out of bounds. Our kids matter. Investment in our kids matters to all of us.

The Head Start Program works. I use that simply as an example of the need, the desperate need, to get our priorities straight.

Jobs: No one comes to the floor on any regular occasion and talks about the merchandise trade deficit in this country. The merchandise trade deficit is higher than our fiscal deficit. What does that mean? Jobs that used to be here are elsewhere. Jobs that used to be American jobs are now in Malaysia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh. I know the American people contribute to this. You cannot wear Mexican shorts and Chinese pants and shirts made in Taiwan and television sets made in Thailand and drive cars made in Japan and then complain about, "Where have American jobs gone?" People do that, but you cannot do that.

American jobs are leaving to go to where the international enterprises want to produce, where they can pay a dime an hour, a quarter an hour, 50 cents an hour, \$1 an hour to compete against American workers, where we pay a living wage, minimum wage to those who work in factories that are safe because we demand they be safe, compete in circumstances where we will not allow 12-year-olds to work in textile mills because we have child labor laws.

The jobs have left this country because we have not dealt with our trade problem in a straightforward way, but you cannot get many people on this floor to talk very thoughtfully about that. People just do not want to discuss it.

But the issue of jobs is at the root of interest of families that are going to sit down for supper tonight and talk about their lives and their future and what they want for their kids. It is going to be, "Are we going to have an opportunity to get a good job that pays a good income?"

Values? The fact is the American people are very concerned about collapsed values in this country. Just go out the door and look around a bit—the rate of crime, the rate of violent crime—and understand what is happening.

Look at the accelerated rate of teenage pregnancies and understand what is happening. Look at the number of people who have fathered children in this country and, once having fathered the child, said, "Sayonara, I'm out of here," and takes no responsibility for that child and refuses to make a payment.

Collapsed values? You bet. Teenage pregnancy, deadbeat dads, crime epidemic, epidemic of violent crime—these are the issues that we have to work on, and we have to work on them in a way that responds to the way the American people want us to respond to these issues.

Welfare reform: That is part of the values issue. It is also part of kids, but two-thirds of people on welfare in America are kids under 16 years of age.

But with respect to values, it seems to me our public policy ought to be—there ought not be great debate about this—to say those who are able-bodied in the welfare system have a responsibility to work.

We have offered a proposal called the Work First Program. What we have said is, we want to turn welfare offices into employment offices. We are not interested in paying welfare. We are interested in making sure people who are able-bodied go to work. But while doing that, we insist that we not subject America's children to lives of poverty and circumstances that none of us in this room would allow our children to live in.

We cannot decide that while we solve the welfare problem, we are going to say to the poorest people in this country, and especially poor children, "By the way, you're not entitled to health care if you're sick." Does that make any sense to anybody, at a time when we are talking about tax cuts for the upper-income folks in this country? It does not to me.

This week—the reason I recite some of this—is on the floor of the Senate, on the heels of the proposal for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, which I will not go into, but it misuses the Social Security trust fund to balance the budget, on the heels of that, with all of the people saying, "We want to balance the budget," the first jump out of the chute this week is, again, adding money, adding hundreds of millions of dollars, for a star wars program. Yes, a star wars program. We cannot afford the basic things, but we can afford a star wars program.

It seems to me at some point we are going to have to reconcile in this Chamber what we say with what we do. At some point, we ought to try to figure out, as I said when I began, what we agree on rather than what we disagree on, and at least enact those

things and move those things that represent common interest.

Finishing where I started, one area of common interest, I think, is the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, unless those who voted for it were not voting their hearts. Mr. President, 100 people voted for Kassebaum-Kennedy to reform this health system in a way that will benefit every American family. One hundred Senators voted for it, and now it is being held hostage in some legislative prison because someone is insisting that something else be added to it or they will simply not allow it to move. What an outrage.

I hope next Monday or Tuesday that those who are insisting they get their way or we will not have health care reform will finally decide that is not in the public's interest. Let Kassebaum-Kennedy move and bring your bill up the following day. That is just fine. None of us object. You can do that. We are going to have a vote on that.

If you have the votes here, you win. We do not weigh votes here. We count votes. If you want to bring it up, bring it up, but do not hold hostage a health care reform bill that this country needs that passed this Chamber 100 to 0.

Mr. President, I have gone on longer than I needed to. I know that my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, is on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that Senator LIEBERMAN be allowed to speak for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend from North Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate his final request, and I express to him and my colleagues my fervent desire not to use—particularly I express this to the occupant of the chair—it is my fervent desire not to use the full 20 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolutions 270 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

FILEGATE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to express a concern about the recent discussion, both publicly and in Congress, concerning what has become to be called Filegate—that is, the questions regarding the use of FBI files and the secret, confidential material contained therein.

I am deeply troubled. I am troubled because it appears that the reaction of the White House is not to be forthcoming with regard to this crisis. My belief is that the appropriate responses is for the White House to, frankly and directly, respond to the issues, spell out what they did, indicate their corrective action, and put this question behind us. It is not one that should occupy a lot of time with regard to the congressional inquiries. It is not one that should occupy a lot of time with regard to public concerns. It ought to be dealt with and put out of the way.

To that end, Senator HATCH, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, addressed a letter involving pertinent questions to the White House and to the Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta. That was on June 13. It had included in it what I thought were fair questions, ones reasonably raised by the questions that are involved and asked for the appropriate information.

That letter was answered on the 19th, 6 days later. But Chief of Staff Panetta did not choose to respond. Instead, he delegated that to one of the counsel, Jack Quinn.

Mr. President, I think that is unfortunate. This is an important matter, and while it can be dealt with quickly, I think it does deserve the attention of the Chief of Staff. I think it is unfortunate that he choose not to address it. Jack Quinn answers the letter.

I want to express my concern about the answers. Frankly, Mr. President, what happened in those answers was simply to stonewall the questions. I know that is a harsh and strong judgment, and I invite Members to make their own decisions about whether or not it is accurate. But I want to share with the Members—just for the questions that I felt were relevant questions that were reasonable to ask under the circumstances—the answers. Members can make up their own minds.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, and the response letter from Jack Quinn of the White House, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 13, 1996.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,
Chief of Staff to the President, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PANETTA: I have several questions concerning the White House's acquisition of various FBI files, such as those of Billy Dale, as well as at least 330 other individuals, including persons who worked at the White House under Republican Administrations who no longer had access to the White House. I would appreciate your prompt response to these questions:

1. Please list the names and titles of those persons who had the authority, in December 1993, to send a memorandum under Bernard Nussbaum's name to the FBI requesting the FBI to send its background files to the White House.

2. Please provide a copy of the December 20, 1993 memorandum on White House stationery to the FBI requesting background files on Mr. Billy Dale.

3. A. Who caused this memorandum to be sent to the FBI and for what purpose(s)?

B. Did anyone direct, request, or otherwise cause such individual to send the memorandum to the FBI, and if so, please identify any such person by name and title.

C. Who is the person referenced in paragraph 4 of the June 9, 1996 declaration of Anthony Marceca (enclosed)?

4. A. When were the FBI files on Mr. Dale received by the White House?

B. Who at the White House received the FBI files on Mr. Dale?

C. Where have the FBI files on Mr. Dale been stored since their arrival at the White House?

D. Who had access to the FBI files on Mr. Dale at the White House since their arrival at the White House?

E. Did everyone who had access to the FBI files on Mr. Dale have to "sign out" the files when viewing them?

F. Did anyone at the White House review the FBI files on Mr. Dale, and, if so, please identify any such person by name and title.

G. Did any such person provide information from these files to other persons, and, if so, please identify any such other person by name and title.

5. A. Please identify by name and title any person(s) who directed the initiation of "Project Update," referenced in paragraph 3 of the June 9, 1996, declaration of Anthony Marceca, and identify by name and title all persons who participated in "Project Update."

B. Did Mr. Marceca request files from the FBI on individuals not included in "Project Update?"

6. In updating security files at the White House for purposes of continuing to grant access to the White House, is it routine for the White House to request all of the FBI files on each individual, regardless of how far back in time the date of the file?

7. With respect to the requests for the FBI files for at least 330 individuals based on, according to news accounts, outdated lists of White House pass holders provided by the Secret Service:

A. Please provide a copy of the lists upon which these requests were made.

B. Please identify by name and title the person or persons who sent the requests for FBI files, based on these lists, from the White House to the FBI.

C. Please identify by name and title those persons in the chain of custody who provided the lists to the person(s) who sent the requests for files to the FBI.

D. Please identify by name and title anyone who reviewed any of these FBI files after their delivery to the White House, and the date of such review.

E. Please identify by name and title anyone who was provided information based on any of these FBI files, and the name and title of anyone who provided such information to such individual(s).

F. Please identify by name and title the person(s) who discovered the error of relying on the lists from which these requests to the FBI were made.

G. On what date was the error of relying on these lists discovered?

H. Upon discovery of the error, what action(s) were taken and on what date(s)?

I. Upon discovery of the error, why weren't the files immediately returned to the FBI?

J. Please identify by name and title the individual who halted the requests for FBI background files based upon the list reportedly provided by the Secret Service.

7. A. Why did Ms. Beth Nolan, of the White House Counsel's office, send a memorandum dated August 19, 1993 to the Department of Justice inquiring as to whether the White House Counsel could release information from FBI background checks on the seven White House Travel Office employees fired on May 19, 1993?

B. Did the White House receive any oral or written response to this memorandum? If so, please identify by name and title anyone who provided such a response, the date of such response, and any written record of such response.

C. Was any information from FBI files on these seven employees disseminated by anyone in the White House?

8. Has the White House requested FBI files on any member of Congress or any person

employed by Congress, other than in connection with an employment related security clearance check or a background review for purposes of possible employment within the Executive Branch, or appointment to the Judicial Branch?

9. Please provide a copy of all White House Counsel policies or guidelines on contacts between the White House and the FBI.

Sincerely,

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, June 19, 1996.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HATCH: This letter is in response to your letter of June 13, 1996 to Leon Panetta.

As you know, the investigation of the FBI files matter has been handled by both the Office of the Independent Counsel and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The White House has been cooperating fully with these investigations. As a result, we are not undertaking our own investigation or conducting file searches. However, we will provide the information we have available that bears on your inquiries.

1. We have not undertaken to determine the identity of all persons with authority to request background files from the FBI in December 1993. In December 1993, the Office of Personnel Security's Director was Craig Livingstone, the Executive Assistant was Mary Anderson, and the staff assistant was Lisa Wetzl. Also detailed to that Office was Anthony Marceca. Mr. Livingstone reported to Mr. William Kennedy, Associate Counsel to the President, who in turn reported to Mr. Bernard Nussbaum, Counsel to the President.

2. We are not aware of any memorandum on White House stationery regarding Billy Dale that was sent on December 20, 1993. However, the request to the FBI for copies of Mr. Dale's previous reports is attached.

3. With respect to your questions about the request for Mr. Dale's file, please see the attached declaration of Anthony Marceca. We believe that the person referred to in paragraph 4 of Mr. Marceca's declaration is Nancy Gemmell.

4. Regarding the receipt and maintenance of Mr. Dale's file, please see the attached statement of Jane Sherburne.

5. Regarding your questions about "Project Update," in addition Mr. Marceca, we understand that Lisa Wetzl, Executive Assistant to the Director of Personnel Security, also worked on the Update Project.

6. With respect to whether it is routine for the White House to request prior FBI reports for all holdover employees, we understand from the recently completed FBI Report that it is indeed routine to request all prior FBI reports.

7. To the extent we have information responsive to your questions about the requests for and chain of custody of any of the mistakenly obtained FBI reports, please see the Sherburne statement, the Marceca Declaration and the attached Declaration of D. Craig Livingstone. Further, we understand that Lisa Wetzl is the person who identified Mr. Marceca's mistake.

8. The memorandum that Ms. Nolan wrote to Walter Dellinger at the Department of Justice did not request advice on the release of FBI background information. Instead, as part of its investigation into the Travel Office matter, the General Accounting Office had requested the personnel files (which do not include FBI reports) of the seven fired individuals. Ms. Nolan was seeking advice as to whether fulfilling that request would be

appropriate. Copies of relevant documents, which have been provided to the House Government Oversight and Reform Committee, are attached for your information. We are not aware of a written reply.

9. We have no information responsive to your question about requests for FBI reports on Members of Congress or their staffs.

10. Enclosed is a statement released by then-White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum which governs contacts between the White House and the FBI in the event of a potential investigation. We will provide other materials that may be helpful to you under separate cover as soon as possible.

In addition to responding to your questions, I believe it would also be helpful if I explained to you the measures taken by the White House in the wake of the mistaken and inappropriate request for FBI background investigation information in late 1993 and early 1994.

As indicated above, the White House has requested and received background investigation reports from the FBI for many years. The information is sought and used to assist the White House in making determinations about the suitability of individuals for access to the White House for employment or other official purposes.

Plainly, the requests for background investigation information that are the subject of your hearing were wrong. Based on representations made to us to date, it appears that the requests were the product of innocent errors. Obviously, if we learn otherwise with respect to White House staff, we will act swiftly and decisively.

After learning of this situation last week, President Clinton informed me in the clearest terms that he wanted (1) the American people to know the truth about what happened in this matter, (2) disciplinary action to be taken, as appropriate, and (3) policies and procedures to be initiated that would guarantee to the American people that this mistake could not happen again.

I will address each of these points in turn. First, we have made clear that the White House not only welcomes but also encourages a complete and vigorous investigation into the matter by the appropriate law enforcement office. As you know, the Attorney General has directed the FBI to conduct a prompt and thorough investigation. I have said publicly and I say here again that the White House welcomes that investigation, and we will work cooperatively with the FBI to facilitate the prompt completion of its investigation.

Second, the President's directive that any appropriate disciplinary action be taken will be implemented based upon the facts developed in the upcoming review by the FBI. Earlier this week, Craig Livingston, who headed the personnel security office, asked to be placed on paid administrative leave, and we agreed that that was appropriate. Mr. Livingston will not return to the White House unless and until this matter is clarified to the satisfaction of the Chief of Staff. If he does return to a position in the Administration, it will be to one that is appropriate and not to the White House Office of Personnel Security, which, as described below, has been absorbed into the Executive Office of the President (EOP) Security Office.

Third, at the direction of the President, I have instituted new policies and procedures to prevent any recurrence of the events in question. We are confident that these reforms will help restore public confidence in the integrity of the personnel security system. These new procedures, which are as rigorous as they are unprecedented, include requirements that:

Control of the White House background investigation process be placed in the hands of

a personnel specialist who is a career, non-political employee;

Current, express, written consent of an individual be obtained before the White House seeks his or her background investigation information from the FBI;

The Counsel to the President or a specifically designated Counsel's Office attorney approve each White House request to the FBI for background information;

The security or vetting officer who initiates the request certify that the request is made for official purposes only; and

Access to background investigation information is authorized only to those White House employees designated in writing by the Chief of Staff and the Counsel to the President.

No prior Administration had in place policies and procedures designed so effectively to prevent the type of mistake that occurred in this matter. The Report of the FBI General Counsel, dated June 14, 1996, found that the procedure by which the FBI provided background investigation information to the White House "has changed remarkably little over the intervening three decades" since the Johnson Administration. I am confident that our reforms will more effectively safeguard the privacy of the individuals whose background files are sought and obtained by the White House.

Below, I elaborate on some of the key changes in our policies and procedures:

On June 14, 1996, I initiated a series of reforms focusing on the process by which the White House requests background investigation information from the FBI. We will now require that White House requests to the FBI background information be made only with the express written consent of the individual who is the subject of the investigation. The individual's consent must be signed within thirty days of, and must accompany, the White House request to the FBI. No information may be obtained without the individual's consent except in extraordinary circumstances set forth in a letter of justification to the FBI from the Counsel to the President concurred in by the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

Each request to the FBI must also be approved and signed by the Counsel to the President or a specifically designated Counsel's Office attorney whose regular duties require the review of such information. In addition, each request must be signed by the Counsel to the President or a specifically designated Counsel's Office attorney whose regular duties require the review of such information. In addition, each request must be signed by the security or vetting officer who initiates the request, and that person must certify that the request is made for official purposes only. These new reforms also require identification of the specific reason why the information is being requested.

Today, I also recommended a restructuring of the personnel security functions at the White House to further accomplish the President's objective of ensuring that the mistake will not happen again. I suggested—and Chief of Staff Leon Panetta and the President agreed—that the administrative personnel security functions currently performed by the White House Office of Personnel Security be incorporated into the EOP Security Office. This change will be implemented immediately.

The EOP Security Office currently conducts personnel security functions for all EOP offices except for the White House Office, the Office of the Vice President, the Office of Policy Development, the National Security Council, and the Executive Residence. The restructuring announced today will bring the administrative personnel security functions for those offices within the pur-

view of the EOP Security Office so that the EOP Security Office will have unified authority over all EOP personnel security functions.

The EOP Security Office is currently supervised by Charles "Chuck" Easley, a career employee who has served for ten years as the EOP Security Officer since joining the office in the Reagan Administration. Before coming to his current job, Mr. Easley had a twenty-year career in the U.S. Army, including eight years as the Technical Security Advisor to the Security Officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Mr. Easley heads a career staff at the EOP Security Office and reports to the Associate Director for Human Resources Management of the Office of Administration, a career personnel specialist.

The EOP Security Office will perform its work on White House personnel in accordance with the procedures announced last Friday and described above. In addition, access to the background investigation information will be limited to those EOP and White House employees so authorized in writing by the Chief of Staff and the Counsel to the President whose assigned duties require the review or processing of such information.

I believe that the reforms we have now instituted will restore the public's confidence in the integrity of the process by which the White House decides who appropriately may have access to the White House complex.

Sincerely,

JACK QUINN,
Counsel to the President.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the first question that I thought was quite clear and, perhaps, most appropriate was this: Basically, who had authority to request the FBI files?

That is a reasonable question and one that I think is important in order to understand the issues that came about.

What did the White House answer in response to that question? Let me read it:

We have not undertaken to determine the identity of all persons with authority to request background files from the FBI in December 1993.

Then they go on to explain they have statements from some of the people involved.

Mr. President, that is not an answer. A reasonable, direct question was asked, and it was absolutely stonewalled in the White House response. Mr. President, that is not adequate. The American people understand mistakes can be made, but they do not understand a stonewall from the White House with regard to those questions that arise.

The second question dealt with the chain of custody of the list. They are referring to the list that was put together that requested files from the FBI, the custody and who had that list. That is a reasonable question, and it is my belief that that is an appropriate one to try to identify and get answers to.

Here is the White House response:

To the extent we have information responsive to your questions about the requests for and chain of custody of any of the mistakenly obtained FBI reports, please see—

And they list statements by people. When you look at those statements, they are not responsive to this question at all. Some of the statements do

not even deal with the question or even relate to the question. What the White House has done to a reasonable question for the chain of custody, who had the list, is simply stonewalled. Mr. President, that is not adequate. Nor do I think it is in the interest of the White House to simply stonewall reasonable questions.

The third question: Were the FBI files' information disseminated by White House employees?

Mr. President, that is a reasonable question. Did they—which is really a violation of the law—disseminate the highly confidential information included in those files outside the White House?

How did the White House choose to answer that? Well, the fact is, they answered it in the same style they used in the last question, in No. 7 of their response. They refer you to statements that are not responsive. It is a reasonable question, and it is relevant to potential criminal activity, and it is totally stonewalled by the White House.

The Hatch letter asks: Has the White House requested FBI files on any Members of Congress or employees of Congress?

That is a reasonable question, and here is the answer:

We have no information responsive to your question about requests for FBI reports on Members of Congress or their staffs.

What does that mean? Mr. President, that is a stonewall. That is a total refusal to deal with the questions that are reasonably asked and raised by this inquiry.

Those are four specifics, but there are others.

I note that on CNN news this morning it was reported that a source close to Mr. Livingstone told CNN that Livingstone said the White House has another list that contains the names of top key Republicans whose FBI files they want or may have requested. But the White House has chosen not to share this list with the press.

Mr. President, I have no idea if that is accurate. I assume in due course we will understand. But it comes back and relates to the fact that the committee asked. Had they requested White House files, FBI files, on Members of Congress, or its employees? The White House absolutely stonewalled the question. My sense is this, Mr. President: It is in the interest of this Nation—both Democrats and Republicans—to get this issue behind us, and the White House ought to respond to the questions, get the facts out, solve the problem and move on. But, if they continue to follow the course of totally stonewalling this inquiry, it will not inure to their benefit, and it will not be taken as an appropriate action by the American people.

Mr. President, my own sense is, just as in Watergate, that a dose of honesty and candor is absolutely the best thing that the White House can do.

I mention the following things because I am concerned that the White

House has chosen not to follow that path of honesty and candor.

That is a serious charge. Let me be specific, because I think it merits specifics.

In response to the questions about this issue about Travelgate, the White House on June 6 came back and said, "Yes. Files were requested, but the GAO did it." This is on Billy Dale. They blamed the requesting of the files on the GAO. The facts turn out that the GAO denied it. And it turns out that the GAO did not do it at all. The White House statement was inaccurate.

On June 6 the White House indicated that they had requested 338 files. Mr. President, that was inaccurate. On June 13 the same White House admitted that they had really requested 132 more for a total of 470 files. Mr. President, that statement was inaccurate.

On June 15, the FBI Director indicates that the White House had requested 481 files. Now the reports are that that may be too low as well.

Is the point how many files they requested? Well, it is relevant. We ought to know it. But I think it is much more important that the White House has chosen not to be forthcoming and give us accurate answers on these questions.

On June 10 the White House said that this whole incident was an accident because the Secret Service had given them an outdated list. That is, the request had gone in and included names that were inappropriate because the Secret Service had given them the wrong list. But on June 13 the Secret Service responded, and indicated and pointed out that their system is incapable of providing a list that the White House used to request files. The statement of the White House on June 10 appears to be inaccurate. It appears to have been impossible for the Secret Service files to produce the list that the White House said that they got because of inaccurate action on the part of the Secret Service. Moreover, it appears that their suggestion that they could not have a current list from the Secret Service was inaccurate; the Secret Service had produced a number of lists updated that could not have possibly included any of those names.

Finally, Mr. President, the White House has said this was a low-level bureaucratic mistake. That is the White House explanation—a "low-level bureaucratic mistake."

Mr. President, I will leave it up to Members and their own judgment. Mr. Livingstone's position was head of White House personnel security. That is not a low-level bureaucrat. Head of security at the White House is not a low-level bureaucrat. He was paid \$65,000 a year, or thereabouts, at least from the indications we have gotten from the committee. I do not believe—Members can make their own judgment—that someone paid \$65,000 a year is appropriately called a low-level bureaucrat.

Mr. President, the point is not just that the White House has made inac-

curate statements, or the White House has refused to answer questions.

The point is this: Where do we go from here? My hope is that the White House will do a couple of things: Get the facts out, be honest, and let us get this issue behind us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STALEMATE IN THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT/CAREERS ACT CONFERENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned by very partisan, political tone that is beginning to cloud deliberations over the Workforce Development/Careers Act legislation now in conference. The blame for this development cannot be placed at the doorstep of any individual or any political party. I am afraid that everyone is at fault, and that there is enough blame for everyone.

I voted for the Senate bill in committee and on the floor. I did so for several reasons. It brought a sweeping reform and a consolidation of a multiplicity of existing programs that simply were not working very well. It represented a new and innovative Federal-State partnership in administering programs that are so very important to the education and training needs of our Nation. And most important to me, it contained a series of very strong vocational and adult education provisions.

Unfortunately, the bill that is being developed in conference differs considerably from the one the Senate passed. The concept of a new Federal-State partnership that was a key element of the Senate bill is gone. The Senate provision that continued support for School To Work Programs appears doomed. A strong within-State formula that sends vocational education funds to those districts most in need is endangered.

Equally important, the need for reform is being lost in a battle for political gain. The lines of differences are hardening, and there is an all-or-nothing attitude beginning to develop on all sides. We have a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress and a Democratic administration. Yet, instead of a good give and take, instead of compromises in which both sides, we are reaching a stalemate that literally ignores the needs of millions of adult and young people who need these education and training services and who could rightfully care less who gets the credit.

Mr. President, I deeply regret this situation. I would implore both sides to erase the lines that have been drawn in the sand, and get back to the table in a serious spirit of bipartisanship. I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to refrain from anything that might be labeled a "Republican" bill. I would urge my fellow Democrats in both the Congress and the administration to refrain from an uncompromising insistence on provisions that will ultimately doom this