There are some who argue that the American people can already decide when they want new representation by simply voting us out of office at the next election. That claim, Mr. President, assumes that incumbents and challengers compete on a relatively level playing field. They don't. Look at the 1994 elections. In 1994, a year of radical political change in America, 92 percent of all Members of the Senate and 90 percent of the House Members who sought reelection were returned to office. The power of incumbency is vast.

Mr. President, I was the only Member of this body elected in 1994 to have defeated a full-term incumbent Senator. Now, some have said that my election proves it's possible to defeat an incumbent, and they're right. But I believe, as do the American people, that it should be more than merely possible for ordinary citizens to be elected to Congress. What of the ordinary citizens who never even come forward to challenge incumbents because of extraordinary odds against them? Surely the current system, which gives so much power to incumbents, discourages some of our finest citizens from ever running in the first place, clearly depriving the electorate of the widest possible choice of candidates. Every Member of each body should know that there is a date-certain when they will return home to make room for another citizen to serve in Congress. That is not a radical idea; it's an idea that is embraced by over 80 percent of the American people.

And to those who argue that the American public is served well by legislators who have years of experience in Congress, I say that the Federal Government should not be so large and complicated that only a professional class of politicians can possibly understand or oversee it. We should restructure, streamline and downsize the Federal Government so that Americans from all walks of life can serve in Congress without having to become professional politicians to master its inner workings.

President Andrew Jackson who occupied the seat I hold in the Senate said it well, nearly 170 years ago: ''I can not but believe that more is lost by the long continuance of men in office than is generally to be gained by their experience.'' Later Presidents agreed. A former Member of this body from Missouri by the name of Harry Truman said in a way that only Harry Truman could, that term limits would ''cure both senility and seniority, both terrible legislative diseases.''

Mr. President, I do not believe the Constitution should be amended any time there is another way of reaching the same legislative goal. That's why the first bill I introduced in this body was the Electoral Rights Enforcement Act of 1995, a statute that would have given the States and the people additional authority to enact limits on the terms of their delegations in Congress. I also believe, as Justice Thomas argued in his dissenting opinion in U.S. Term Limits versus Thornton, that the States already have the right to enact term limits under the 10th amendment to the Constitution, which states that:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the only way to implement the American people's demand for term limits on Members of Congress is through a constitutional amendment. If Tuesday's vote is unsuccessful, I intend to support the grass roots term limits movement that grows ever stronger outside the beltway. This movement will not be quelled with the Senate's failure to enact a constitutional amendment this week. In fact, this vote may well fuel an even stronger groundswell in favor of a term limits constitutional amendment.

For those who oppose the reforms which I consider to be of seminal importance, a term limits constitutional amendment and a balanced budget constitutional amendment, they should take note of article V of the Constitution, which would allow the calling of a Constitutional Convention upon a vote of two-thirds of the States. That is only 34 States, Mr. President, and 23 States have already voted in favor of term limits. Term limits activists approach their cause seriously and tenaciously, and I support their efforts to enact a term limits constitutional amendment in whatever way is possible. I look forward to Tuesday's vote, and I hope that each Member of this body will consider his or her vote carefully, with the knowledge that a vote against this measure is a vote against the will of the people.

I thank the chair and yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

THE VOID IN MORAL LEADERSHIP—PART 5

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on March 19, I began a series of speeches on this floor. The subject—the common thread in these speeches—has been the void in moral leadership at the White House. What this means is simply this: The President and the First Lady are failing to set a good example for the American people.

These are failures of the most basic principles that Americans expect from their leaders: Failures like accountability; taking responsibility for one's actions; straightforwardness and candor; the public trust. The breakdown of these principles has eroded the President's ability to show strong leadership. It has undercut his moral authority to lead. The best way to lead is by example. If this is true, then White House leadership is truly lacking.

In my previous speeches, I gave illustrations of my observations. I identified specific actions from each of Whitewatergate, Travelgate, and Cattlegate. And I showed how these illustrations are of great significance to the average citizen.

In my March 22 speech, I referred to a familiar quote from John Mitchell. He was an Attorney General in the Nixon administration. He's remembered as saying, ''You will be better advised to watch what we do instead of what we say.''

People all across America now are discovering the secret of politicians who give the profession a bad name. People in this town have known this little secret for a long time. The secret is this: Say what the public wants to hear, but then do whatever you want. By the time they figure out what you did, you can point the finger at someone else.

The governing-industry in Washington has mastered this game.

It has created a process designed to avoid accountability. It is designed to avoid taking responsibility for one's actions. Most data are presented in a way that avoids measuring performance. They are designed to show that everything is always rosy under their watch.

Think of how a used car dealer often buffs up a lemon of a car until it gleams—to gloss over all the defects. Unless you know about cars and what to look for, you might be tempted to buy that pile of junk because it looks so pretty. A few months later, you suddenly discover that the parts are falling off right there on the highway.

This is what our Government is like. They tell the taxpayers all the great things they are getting in this budget, or that bill. What a deal. And the people buy it. But after a while, all they see are piles of debt, a rising tax burden, growing job insecurity, serious social pathologies, and rampant crime and drug use. Do you see the analogy, Mr. President?

The question is, How can we be told everything is going to be rosy, and yet it turns out so bad? The answer is, We listened to what they said, not what they did. We made the mistake of falling for the ol' political soft shoe routine, the ol' used car pitch. They did a bait and switch on us, and we took the bait. Many of us here in Congress have worked hard to shine a big spotlight on this racket. We have tried to expose some of the games played that create the illusions—just like Dorothy exposed the Wizard of Oz.

For instance, by showing systematic bias in budget estimating, we were able to cause the Congressional Budget Office to produce more realistic estimates of Congress' budget decisions. For the lay person, all this means is, we can now better estimate how much our income and outgo will be. Before that, we were always unjustifiably optimistic. We always assumed we would have a flood of revenues pouring into the Treasury.

Why? Because that way we could keep the spending faucets on full blast.

Things did not look so expensive as long as we could cook the books and show a rising tide of revenues. The shell game was on, Mr. President. It got us all re-elected, but it also got us in a ton of debt. I call this problem the Narcotic of Optimism.

There are other examples of attempts by some of us to expose Government by illusion. Let me just describe some that I have taken the lead on, just to illustrate what I am saying:

First, most recently, I and my colleagues in both the House and Senate forced the President's AmeriCorps Program to clean up its act. It is a program that was paying $29,000 per volunteer. Imagine the taxpayers paying $29,000 per volunteer. This gave boondoggles at the Pentagon a real run for their money.

We poured through AmeriCorps' documents during a 2-year battle. We shined a big spotlight on the program's activities and costs. We showed where the bulk of the money was going—overhead and bureaucracy. We have now reinvented the program.

Before this, the program never lived up to the President's lofty rhetoric. Now, it has a chance to do what the President says it will do.

Second, I worked hard, with the help of many of my colleagues, on protecting whistleblowers, who are the footsoldiers of the war to expose Government illusions. Every administration waxes poetic about how much they honor whistleblowers. But as soon as our backs are turned, Government managers search them out like a heat-seeking missile.

That is because whistleblowers, want the truth out; Government does not. Congress has toughened up the laws protecting whistleblowers. And we are always on the vigil.

Third, I have worked to pass or bolster initiatives that detect and measure bureaucratic sleight of hand at the Pentagon. We created an independent office of testing to make sure our troops have fully and effectively tested equipment. We were not getting that before.

We have also worked on numerous financial reforms that expose cost and budget problems. All of these are designed to make it easier for us to see what the Pentagon is actually doing, as opposed to what they say they are doing.

I have been at this kind of reform since I first joined the Senate in 1981. Sometimes it is a lonely battle. I often think I can live to be 100 years old and work on reforms non-stop, but I will still only make a dent because the problem is so big.

That is what Presidents are for. Presidential leadership can make the biggest difference in the world. The credibility of the presidency, as leader of the executive branch, can bring leadership to bear on the system and really shake things up. The President has not just the ability to do this, but the responsibility to do it as well.

In fact, Mr. President, these were the types of things that Bill Clinton pledged to do as a Presidential candidate in 1992. He would expose and put an end to the illusions game in Washington. That is what he promised. And that would help put on an equal footing those who had played by the rules, yet had failed to get ahead. And so the American people put their thrust and faith in Bill Clinton to lead the way.

After 4 years, however, a different picture has emerged. As I have specifically laid out in my previous speeches, the President has failed in such leadership, because he has failed to set the proper example.

For instance: How can this President end cronyism and favoritism? He fired innocent, low-level public servants in the White House Travel Office, and gave the travel business to a family member and a slick Hollywood buddy. What kind of example is that for equal treatment and fairness?

How can this President end the failure in this town to take responsibility for one's actions? When the Travelgate Seven were fired, fingers were pointed at others for having made the decision to fire them. What kind of leadership is that? What kind of example is that? How can this White House end the enormous problem in this town of cover-up, and lack of candor and straight shooting?

The mysterious appearance of the Whitewater documents in the White House reading room were blamed on the Document Fairy. Whenever the First Lady or her staff are questioned in either the Whitewatergate or Travelgate affairs, no one can recall a thing.

In my speech of March 28, I gave an example of this. On March 21, the First Lady responded to questions from Chairman CLINGER of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The subject matter was, who knew what, when, about the firing of the Travelgate Seven. In 16 pages of responses, I counted 54 instances of ''I cannot recall;'' ''vague recollection;'' ''it's hard to remember;'' and so on. Anything but candid, Mr. President. And this from people who are at the very top of their profession—the legal profession—in terms of intelligence and competence. That is kind of hard to swallow.

Moral leadership means leading by example. If you are a leader, that means the people expect you always to be candid in what you say; they expect you to treat everyone fairly and equally; they expect you to be accountable and take responsibility for what you do, both good and bad. That is what people expect in their leaders.

The American people are not getting that kind of leadership from this White House, Mr. President. Instead, they are seeing their leaders commit acts of favoritism, cronyism, avoiding responsibility, cover up. When people who work for such leadership see this, they follow the leader. People tend to do what their leaders do. Could this be why there are an unprecedented four independent counsels looking into questionable actions of Clinton cabinet secretaries?

We certainly should not be surprised at this record-setting pace for investigating high-level government officials.

I have been searching for an explanation for why an administration that promised to change all this is instead caught up in it, at record levels. I think I may have found a clue. It is a quote from this week's Time magazine. The article is called ''Clinton's Stealth Campaign.'' It is written by Eric Pooley.

Here is what it says:

> Since the Republicans control Congress, he [meaning, President Clinton] opted for an illusion of control, which suits him just fine. In this almost holographic approach, speeches are as important as substance and rhetoric becomes its own reality. For this President, says senior adviser George Stephanopoulos, ''words are actions.''

Do you see, Mr. President? Here is a senior adviser to the President saying ''words are actions.'' There is no distinction. Either this shows a breakdown of leadership, or it reflects very questionable leadership from the top down—remember I mentioned that workers tend to do what their leaders do. This practice—as articulated by a White House senior adviser—turns John Mitchell's adage into something you would read in Kafka, or Orwell. It turns Mitchell's statement on its head. In effect, it is a sly, Washington way of saying ''watch what we say, not what we do.'' It says ''watching what we do is irrelevant; only words are relevant.''

This clarifies a lot for me, Mr. President. It reinforces my perception of the void in moral leadership in this White House. But it also gives us a glimpse into how the continuing charade of illusions is being conducted and perpetrated by this White House. It does so precisely because of an absence of leadership.

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.

Mr. DOLE. 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 OAK RIDGE BOYS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I apologize for being a bit late, but I was listening to the Oak Ridge Boys next door. You might be able to hear them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was listening, too.

Mr. DOLE. They were very good.

EARTH DAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as America marks Earth Day 1996, I would like to