

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

remind my friends across the aisle that the environmental heritage we are all so proud of was forged under Republican stewardship. Our Republican environmental heritage stretches back to Ulysses S. Grant, who established Yellowstone as the first of the crown jewels of our precious national parks. President Theodore Roosevelt set up the National Wildlife Refuge System and promoted the value of conservation.

It was Republicans, under President Nixon, who created the Environmental Protection Agency and enacted the first Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. Under Presidents Ford, Reagan, and Bush we enacted and implemented the majority of the enabling statutes to protect our environment. An important Clean Air Act revision in 1990, which introduced new initiatives like using markets to achieve our goals, has helped to set new directions for the future.

The progress we have made as a nation over the last 25 years deserves praise. We saw problems that needed to be addressed—setting pollution standards to protect public health and dealing with pollution that crosses State and international boundaries. We responded with laws that I was proud to support—laws that addressed those problems in the best way we knew then.

We have learned a lot over these 25 years of environmental experience and progress. America's ability to create innovative ways of dealing with environmental protection and, at the same time, have continued economic growth is the envy of the rest of the world. Now we are at a crossroads about how to make further progress. I want to improve the system so it protects people's health and the environment better with less cost and complexity. I want to put more trust in the ability of all Americans—at all levels of government—and their desire to do the right thing. The old ways won't help much as we face new problems in the future.

During the last 25 years, the States have become very knowledgeable about the best way to deal with most environmental problems. The States have become laboratories of innovation on better ways to deal with many issues of concern: Welfare and health care reform—and environment as well. California, for example, is leading the way in setting up an integrated approach that calls for simpler permits and dealing with air, water, and waste in a coordinated way that goes after the worst problems first. Other States also lead the way.

Wisconsin, for example, has a Brownfields program in place which allows appropriate clean up for urban areas previously written off for development. That makes good sense and shows a sense of the right priorities.

Eighteen States—including Kansas, Texas, Indiana, Colorado, and Oregon—are encouraging their own companies to voluntarily find and fix environ-

mental problems on their own. This is a partnership that works. We should follow that example and encourage rather than punish our communities and businesses for trying to do the right thing.

The States and localities are leading the way in these and other areas. We should use the most appropriate level of Government for the problem at hand. Try the local level first, States next. Try regional solutions when environmental issues involve more than one State. The Federal Government should step back when it can and use its expertise when it is most helpful to the States: To provide scientific or technical help.

Farmers, ranchers, businesspeople, families—all are partners, not villains. We should acknowledge that these people do the right thing every day. Let us measure environmental protection not by the size of a Federal bureaucracy or the number of regulations on the books but by the desire of our people to work together to protect the environmental values that we all treasure.

One of the things I have tried to promote this last year was that we must use good science to set environmental priorities, and then we should tackle the most important problems first. We know we could do better. The Harvard Center for Risk Analysis, for example, estimates that 60,000 lives per year could be saved with the same level of spending if we targeted our money at the worst problems.

It takes leadership to make choices. We need to be wiser about what we go after and at what level that is done.

I want to say one word about individual private property rights, which are so precious that they are protected by the Constitution. Owning property is a right that makes us strong and is a powerful force for the environment. If the Government takes someone's property for a public purpose, that person should be compensated. If we as a society believe that that person's property is needed for an important purpose, let us make that choice as a nation and ensure that we are not diminishing our citizens' rights.

I am proud of what we have done this year on the farm bill. It is the most environmentally sensitive farm bill ever. The conservation title of the farm bill reflects a commonsense approach. The bill continues the Conservation Reserve Program, expands the Wetlands Reserve Program, making this program the Nation's biggest and most successful environmental efforts. In addition, we provided \$300 million to restore the Everglades. This was an immediate response to a need identified by the people of Florida.

The farm bill provides a good example of what we can do in other areas: Injecting simplicity, common sense, and flexibility, and lifting the heavy hand of the Government. These goals were also met in the Safe Drinking Water Act and resulted in a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate 99 to 0. We

have set the same goals for Superfund reform, to get the lawyers out and get sites cleaned up. Yet today, no Democrats have joined us in this effort. We can get things done when we focus on the goals and not the rhetoric.

Today I received a letter from my Democrat colleagues. I share their environmental goals. But there are better ways to achieve these goals. No one is interested in repealing or weakening environmental protections. Years ago, we accomplished our work by using typewriters. Today our offices are run by computers. Were we rolling back our desire to communicate efficiently by moving from typewriters to computers? I think not. Let's take the same approach on the environment.

That proud tradition and the strong Republican values of personal stewardship, good science, trust in the people, and respect for the States and localities will be used to build a better environmental future for our children.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now ask that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the impression will not go away: The \$5 trillion Federal debt stands today as an increasingly grotesque parallel to the energizer bunny that keeps moving and moving on television—precisely in the same manner and to the same extent that the President is allowing the Federal debt to keep going up and up and up into the stratosphere.

A lot of politicians like to talk a good game—"talk" is the operative word here—about cutting the Federal spending and thereby bringing the Federal debt under control. But watch how they vote on spending bills.

Mr. President, as of the close of business Friday, April 19, 1996, the exact Federal debt stood at \$5,100,053,596,414.66 or \$19,268.51 per man, woman, and child on a per capita basis.

STATEMENT HONORING THE McWORKMANS ON THEIR 60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, families are the cornerstone of America. The data are undeniable: Individuals from strong families contribute to the society. In an era when nearly half of all couples married today will see their union dissolve into divorce, I believe it is both instructive and important to honor those who have taken the commitment of "til death us do part" seriously, demonstrating successfully the timeless principles of love, honor, and