

R. Michael Clurman Jr. of Manhattan; two daughters by a previous marriage, which ended in divorce: Susan Emma Clurman of Manhattan and Carol Duning of Alexandria, Va., and two grandchildren.●

SHERIFF HENRY HEALEY

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wanted to take a few moments today to speak about the passing of a distinguished citizen of Connecticut and a great American—Henry Healey, Jr.

At the time of his death, Henry Healey was the high sheriff of New Haven County. But his legacy was far greater. He was a WWII veteran, a successful businessman, a dedicated member of the Democratic Party, and a close and dear friend.

I first got to know Henry Healey because of his relationship with my father, Senator Thomas Dodd. And later, when I decided to leave the House of Representatives and make my own run for the U.S. Senate it was from Henry Healey that I sought counsel.

His advice then, as it was every time I spoke to him, helped to guide me in my decision-making process. Because, Henry was a man of great wisdom and shrewd understanding of political history.

Like few men I've known, Henry was endowed with a vision that allowed him to presciently see beyond the political machinations of the day to the long-term political currents of the future.

It's one of the main reasons why Henry was probably one of the three or four most influential people in the past 30 years of Connecticut political history.

But of course there was more to Henry than just his political acumen. He was a man of great loyalty and understanding, who knew how to accomplish things without being flamboyant or self-serving.

He wasn't a great ideologue or a firebrand. He was more interested in people's human skills and their ability to work with others.

I think his chief deputy sheriff, Frank Kinney, Jr., said it best: "People with problems in their lives could always open up to him and he never failed to respond, to do what he could for them. That's what I learned from him, and that's what I admired most about him."

And in his official role as New Haven County sheriff, Henry Healey turned what had been a largely administrative position into a bully pulpit for drug education, crime prevention, and charity.

And he was recognized across the country for his innovations in law enforcement. He was one of the first officials in America to advocate neighborhood block watch programs. He was a strong voice in the fight against substance abuse in New Haven County schools. And he was recognized by his peers, when he was appointed president of the National Sheriffs Association, in the late 1980s.

But, Henry Healey was also a man of great personal charity. His New Haven scholarship fund helped give hundreds of Connecticut children the opportunity to seek higher education. And, he made it a regular practice of hiring ex-convicts for his car dealerships. In addition, he ended the practice of serving eviction notices at Christmas.

This charity was certainly smart politics for an elected official. It was no accident that if you had hopes of a career in politics in Connecticut, it was a good idea to stay on the right side of Henry.

But, it also reflected Henry's integrity as a public servant and as a man. He was a throwback to an earlier, simpler age in American politics and he will be dearly missed by the residents of New Haven County and the State of Connecticut.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Jean and his children Patrick, Henry Bryan, Michael, Constance, Christina, and Irene.●

ADJUSTING THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, a number of careful statements have been made on the floor yesterday and today concerning the use of the Consumer Price Index [CPI] as a proxy for measuring changes in the cost of living. As we all surely know, the Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] is insistent that the CPI is not a cost of living index: never has been; cannot be. It would be more than a third of a century ago that I became Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Kennedy administration. In that role, I had nominal supervision of the Bureau, and I attest that this was fully understood at that time, well before the CPI began to be used as it is today as an index for various entitlement programs and tax schedules.

The question has been properly raised as to whether economists are in general agreement that the CPI overstates inflation. My distinguished friend from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, described the near unanimous testimony of a panel of economists that testified before the Senate Committee on Finance to this effect. I would draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that well before the Finance Committee established the Boskin commission to enquire into this matter, the subject was under consideration in the Office of Management and Budget. Specifically, a memorandum of October 3, 1994, sets forth the matter in specific terms.

I ask that portions of that memorandum be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1994.

From: Alice M. Rivlin.
Subject: Big Choices.

When we met in August, we noted that it was time for a serious discussion of the budget and economic agenda for 1995 and 1996. Decisions must be made soon about the policies to be articulated in the FY 1996 budget, the

State of the Union, and our response to the Kerrey-Danforth Commission report. These policies and the message they contain are crucial to the record we will run on in 1996.

Illustrative entitlement options

Options	5-yr savings (\$ B)
COLA reduction:	
CPI minus 0.5 "technical" reform	
(CPI may be overstated by 0.4% to 1.5%)	33
Eliminate COLAs for one year	55
CPI minus 2 for five years	109●

THE VOID IN MORAL LEADERSHIP—PART IX

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last Sunday marked the third anniversary of the firings of the Travelgate Seven from the White House travel office. That is 3 years of the Federal Government harassing these innocent public servants, and their families, and the harassment continues as I speak. This is a story of an abuse of power by the new occupants of the White House, back on May 19, 1993.

The Clinton White House used the full powers of the Federal Government to fire these seven loyal workers, destroy their reputations, deplete their bank accounts, steal their dignity, and cause great suffering for their families.

I wonder how many Americans have been the target of an abusive Washington bureaucracy—like the IRS.

Or how about when four Federal agencies fight over the right to tell a farmer how to use land that his family has been farming for three generations.

And how many small businesses have been harassed by OSHA or EPA?

Untold numbers of citizens across this land have been harassed and abused by the Federal Government. Hard-working families try to play by the rules. Next thing they know, they are unfair targets of zealous Washington bureaucrats who are out of control.

Mr. President, no hard-working, honest citizen should have to go through such an ordeal. It is unjust and unfair. Government is supposed to promote justice and fairness, but Washington turns these principles upside down.

There are many examples of bureaucracies harassing citizens; but there are few examples of Washington putting the full force of its powers against decent, hard-working families. The case of the Travelgate Seven is one such example. For them, the harassment was many times greater than what most citizens have endured. These seven provided a service for the President and the press corps in the interest of open government. Their bosses were seven previous Presidents and the American taxpayers. But cronies of President Clinton, infatuated with newly derived power, coveted the business for themselves.

The only barriers to themselves and a lucrative business were these seven loyal workers, so the cronies went on the attack. First, they spread false allegations against the seven workers, accusing them of mismanagement and embezzlement. This led to their firings by the President.

When there was a public backlash, the White House damage-control operation went into full gear. The White House publicly smeared the reputations of the workers with all the false charges. The workers and their families were publicly humiliated. Next, to justify the false charges, the White House then unleashed the FBI and the IRS on them. Finally, the Justice Department prosecuted them on trumped up charges.

Nearly 3 years and hundreds of thousands of dollars later, a jury acquitted the fall guy and scapegoat of the White House offensive, Billy Dale. They acquitted him in less than 2 hours.

There can be no doubt that this case was a miscarriage of justice, no doubt that these seven workers were unjustly and unfairly persecuted. And no doubt that the President made a mistake in firing them. Yet, the President has failed to own up. He has failed to take responsibility for their firings and their continued harassment.

There is lots of finger-pointing and blaming going on at the White House, but no one will stand up and take responsibility for what happened. That is usually the sign of failed moral leadership. The leader in the White House—the President—will not take responsibility for the unwarranted firings at the behest of cronies and then, he will not seek accountability for whoever unleashed the powers of the Federal Government to harass the Travelgate Seven.

Mr. President, is it unfair to ask the President to take responsibility for his actions? Is it unfair to hold accountable those zealots on his staff that unjustly unleashed the FBI, the IRS, and the Justice Department on these innocent employees? Is it unfair that the President should admit that he made a serious mistake?

Instead of considering these questions, the President has sent his lieutenants out to again harass these former workers. The House of Representatives earlier this year voted overwhelmingly to provide legal expenses for the Travelgate Seven. It had bipartisan support. But when the bill came to the Senate, it was ambushed by Clinton loyalists. They were afraid of the embarrassment it would cause the President to have to sign such a bill that would prove he had made a serious mistake. Rather than face the music, the President sent out his lieutenants to block the bill in the Senate. They succeeded. The minority leader succeeded in using the Senate procedures to block consideration of the bill that would make these seven families economically whole, and put the ordeal behind them—not psychologically whole, not their reputations whole, not their dignity whole, not their pain and suffering whole, just their expenses—the least of what should be restored.

The President's lieutenants—the Democrats in this body—shot the bill down. It was pure and simple legislative harassment. That was on May 7.

And so, the harassment continues. It is simply not right. It is not fair. And they need to be held accountable.

Mr. President, is it fair for these Democrats to not do the right thing just to save the President from embarrassment? I will let the American people answer that question. Perhaps they will call the office of their Senator.

Tell the Democrats to stop playing politics with the Billy Dale bill. After all, they voted 52 to 44 on May 7 to block the Billy Dale bill.

Mr. President, the bottom line of this story, and of the record of this President, is the absence of moral leadership. A President—a leader—who fails to take responsibility for his actions; who allows cronies to run roughshod over innocent employees; who allows his staff to violate the civil rights of these workers; who lets his staff unleash the powers of the Federal Government against innocent families; who fails to seek accountability for those who did the unleashing; and who covers it all up by claiming executive privilege—in light of all this, can we truly call this President a leader?

He has failed to set the proper example for the country. He has failed to set an example for the people he serves—the American people. He has failed to set an example for his own staff. And, he has failed to set an example for the seven fired workers and their families. Rather than face the music, the President has his lieutenants do his dirty work in the darkness of night, and in the Democratic cloak room, all to avoid the embarrassment of his mistakes.

In the coming weeks, the Billy Dale bill will be brought to the floor again—this bill to restore hope and dignity for these families. I call upon the American people to not allow this injustice to stand. Make the Senate Democrats do the right thing. Make them support the Billy Dale bill. This morning's Washington Post editorializes on this matter. The editorial is entitled, "Another Travel Office Travesty." It says, get politics out of the way and pass this bill. I agree, Mr. President. I urge my Democratic colleagues to get out of the way. I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed in the RECORD and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1996]

ANOTHER TRAVEL OFFICE TRAVESTY

Why are some people in Congress maneuvering to keep that institution from making right some of the wrongs done to fired White House travel office employees? Nothing the Congress can enact will make up for the damage done to the reputations of these workers. But fooling with them the way they are is simply wrong.

The travel office fiasco should have been resolved days ago. Billy Dale and his six travel office colleagues were summarily dismissed from their jobs in 1993 for the shakiest of reasons. They were summarily told to vacate their offices by the incoming Clinton White House and publicly smeared

with charges that they had engaged in wrongdoing. White House staff that had an interest in taking over the travel office even helped to concoct the allegations. The reputations of the fired travel office employees were unfairly damaged, and Mr. Dale in particular was made to undergo a painful and costly ordeal before he was exonerated by a jury.

All of the fired employees incurred legal expenses in connection with criminal probes launched against them following their discharge. Mr. Dale bore \$500,000, the lion's share, but no ex-travel office employee escaped without a crushing debt burden. The others incurred about \$200,000 themselves. So to undo at least some of the damage, legislation was introduced in Congress to reimburse them for some of the costs of defending themselves. The House passed the bill by an overwhelming 350 to 43 vote. President Clinton says he will sign it. Sen. Orrin Hatch has introduced the bill in the Senate.

But Senate Democrats have been blocking action on the Hatch measure because they want a vote on the minimum wage increase and can't get one. To make matters worse, the Dale bill was amended by Bob Dole to include the Republican gas-tax repealer. Hence, Bill Dale et al. are now part of the Senate's five-car pile-up, the rest of which includes the minimum wage boost, gas tax cut, taxpayer bill of rights, and the T.E.A.M. measure.

Mr. Dale and the former travel office employees, having taken shots from the White House and lost much in the process, are now caught in another political crossfire. The people holding up action on the reimbursement of the misused travel office employees should back off. The time has come to rectify a wrong.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar, Calendar No. 594. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

ARMY

The following United States Army National Guard officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated