That’s because it was discussed by none other than the President himself. The President of the United States is discussing confidential information in the public arena. And in the process, he’s doing exactly the same thing that his opponent has admonished him to stop: the President’s attorney for doing earlier this year.

So here is what we have learned from the President’s skirmish yesterday with reporters. First, he has now done a U-turn, and he’s right to do so, and this is not keeping up in the mean-spirited attitude of his zealous White House staff. Second, he has allowed himself to stoop to the level of the leaking and character assassins by discussing confidential information. Is this behavior befitting of what is expected of the President of the United States?

At the same time, the President has not kept his eye on the central issue—the one he went right to wrongs perpetrated by zealous White House agents.

Mr. President, this Travelgate issue is marked by a curious but telling phenomenon. At the beginning, the President said one thing, but the government he ran was doing the opposite. Obviously, we don’t want or expect this in a Presidency. You want the President to say one thing, and have those in his control do that one thing, too. You want uniformity. You want the “saying” and the “doing” to be one and the same.

But there is another variable in the equation. In the Travelgate matter, the President’s words reflected the right thing, and his staff’s deeds reflected the wrong thing. So the President, in seeking uniformity, made the wrong choice. Instead of making his administration conform to his admirable utterances, he abandoned his commitment to stand up for all these high and mighty principles—just not in my back yard, or which affect him personally. (This is one such matter.) And to me, the President has failed that test of leadership.

By not doing the right thing—and in fact, by now joining the wrong side in the central issue—Mr. President, you have undercut his own moral authority as a leader. He has abdicated his responsibility to see that justice was done for seven of his own former employees and their families. He has abandoned them to the treatment of the little guy. In a sense—it is okay to stand up for all these high and mighty principles—just not in my back yard.

And that is why, Mr. President, the President’s about face in the Billy Dale matter is disappointing to me. And it tells me much about his leadership capacity.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM. ROBERT J. NATTER, U.S. NAVY CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding Naval officer and dear friend, Rear Adm. Robert J. Natter, who has served with distinction for the past 33 months as the Navy’s Chief of Legislative Affairs. It is a privilege for me to recognize his many outstanding achievements and commend him for the superb service he has provided this legislative body, the Navy and our great Nation.

A native of Trussville, AL, Admiral Natter comes from a patriotic family of seven boys and two girls that has contributed immeasurably to our Nation’s defense. All seven boys have served as commissioned officers in our Armed Forces across the world. His strong training in the Air Force. Four graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy, one was commissioned through Navy Reserve Officer Training Corps, and one attended Officer Candidate School. Two are currently Navy admirals. I salute this family who has served our Nation so well.

Admiral Natter enlisted in the Naval Reserve at the age of 17 as a seaman recruit. Following 1 year of enlisted service and 4 years at the Naval Academy, he was graduated and commissioned an Ensign in June 1967.

Admiral Natter’s service at sea includes department head tours in a Coastal Minesweeper and Frigate, and Executive Officer tours in two Amphibious Tank Landing Ships and a Spruance Destroyer. He distinguished himself in combat as Officer-in-Charge of a Naval Special Warfare detachment in Vietnam. He later commanded the guided missile destroyer U.S.S. Chan- dler and guided missile U.S.S. Antietam. He has been the recipient of many awards and commendations including the Silver Star and Purple Heart.

As the Navy’s Chief of Legislative Affairs, Admiral Natter has provided timely support and accurate information on Navy plans and programs. Working closely with the United States Congress, he helped maintain the best-trained, best-equipped, and best-prepared Navy and Marine Corps. His leadership provided a legacy of innovative, affordable and technologically superior naval systems and platforms for those who will serve in the Navy decades after he steps down as the Chief of Legislative Affairs. His consummate leadership, integrity, and tireless energy serve as an example for us all.

Mr. President, Bob Natter, his wife Claudia, and daughters Kelly, Kendall, and Courtney have made many sacrifices during his 33-year naval career. They have made significant contributions to the outstanding naval forces upon which our country relies so heavily. Admiral Natter is a great credit to both the Navy and the country he so proudly serves. As this highly decorated combat veteran now departs to take command of the United States Seventh Fleet, I call upon my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to wish him fair winds and following seas. He is a sailor’s sailor.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN WAYNE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, John Wayne, “The Duke”. The mere name evokes in people around the world powerful images and fond recollections of the late actor and great American. Though he has been gone for 17 years, his spirit clearly lives on through his many movies and in the minds of his millions of fans. On August 17th, hundreds of people who admire this great man will gather in Los Angeles, CA to pay tribute to an individual who is a legend and an institution.

Americans are a tough lot. We are a nation that was founded by men and women of great courage, strength, and moral fiber. It took ordinary people to win our independence from the British; to fight for the cause of the Confederacy or the Union; to tame the wild west; to twice lead the world to victory in two vicious global wars; and to have led the world against forces bent on subjugating the freedom loving people of the world under the corrupt doctrine of godless Communists. Americans are individuals who admire self-reliance, honesty, and hard work, and within them John Wayne was someone who personified these traits as a man, and who brought these qualities to the silver screen through his prolific career as an actor, director, and producer.

In countless movies, John Wayne portrayed mythic figures of American lore. Characters that included cowboys, lawmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines in films such as “Stagecoach,” “True Grit,” “The Duke,” “The Shootist,” “The Green Berets,” “The Shootist,” “True Grit,” and dozens of other titles that soon became classics. It was impossible not to admire John Wayne and the roles he played for they all embodied the ideals that Americans hold dear. Moviegoers knew that if “The Duke” took a swing at someone, they deserved it, or if John Wayne fired a weapon, it was only to protect the life of an innocent person, to uphold the law, or to help defend the Nation. The characters John Wayne played were decent men committed to doing what is honorable and just, and for those reasons, he will be remembered as an American icon for many generations to come.

Mr. President, the United States is a nation that is made up of men and women who labor tirelessly to make our country a better place. Few people think about the police officers and firefighters who put their lives on the line, or the tens of thousands of service members spread around the world protecting American security, or the...
nurses who tend to our sick. Day in and day out, these people carry out heroic acts with little or no recognition. John Wayne portrayed these people in his films, and they saw their efforts chronicle and, in The Duke, these Americans saw a little bit of themselves. There will probably never again be another John Wayne.

TRIBUTE TO GARRETT D. BOURNE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Colonel Garrett “Gary” D. Bourne, as he prepares to retire from his career as an officer and a soldier in the United States Army.

Gary Bourne began his career more than 28 years ago when he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Field Artillery, and spending his first tour of duty in Airborne Division. Throughout his career, Gary Bourne has expertly met the many challenges of military service as an Army officer, and he has faithfully served his Nation in a variety of command and staff assignments, including the continental United States, Vietnam, Europe, Southwest Asia, and Panama.

If there is one thing an officer in the Army wants to do, it is to command troops, and Colonel Bourne again did so at the battery and battalion levels. He ultimately held the much coveted position of Brigade Commander when he was tapped to lead the 210th Field Artillery Brigade. During his time with the 210th, the United States faced down artillery commander for the VII Corps during Operation Desert Storm. It was responsible for leading his brigade the 210th, the United States faced down the VII Corps during Operation Desert Storm.

The Colonel brings to the Army’s ability to ensure that safe and effective new medicines are available to patients without delay by eliminating redtape and streamlining operations. The FDA is designed to achieve the goal of ensuring a safe and effective approval process. And, the FDA has been concerned to protect the public from unsafe drugs.

But, it is time to ensure that the agency becomes equally concerned about promoting public health by making available and distributing new medicines just as they can by the approval of unsafe new medicines.

I urge the majority leader to consider this legislation in a timely enough manner so that we can send it to the President and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Senators Kassebaum and Mikulski in support of this piece of legislation.

FDA PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have accomplished many things this Congress. Just this week we passed a comprehensive welfare reform proposal which will end welfare as we know it. We passed a meaningful small business tax relief bill. And, we will pass a momentous health insurance reform bill that will improve the availability and portability of health insurance coverage.

I would like to point out another opportunity Congress has to pass a significant reform proposal and that is the Food and Drug Administration Performance and Accountability Act. And I hope we can consider this bill when we return in September.

The Senate Labor Committee has spent a considerable amount of time on this comprehensive piece of legislation. And, let me point out, this reform proposal passed out of committee on an 11 to 4 vote.

The commonsense proposals in this bill are designed to strengthen the agency’s ability to ensure that safe and effective new medicines are available to patients without delay by eliminating red tape and streamlining operations.

The FDA is designed to achieve the goal of ensuring a safe and effective approval process. And, the FDA has been concerned to protect the public from unsafe drugs.

But, it is time to ensure that the agency becomes equally concerned about promoting public health by making available and distributing new medicines just as they can by the approval of unsafe new medicines.

I urge the majority leader to consider this legislation in a timely enough manner so that we can send it to the President and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Senators Kassebaum and Mikulski in support of this piece of legislation.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 1996]

The FDA CAN WORK BETTER

(ByBarbara Mikulski and Nancy Kassebaum)

The Post editorial “Reform Isn’t Risk-Free” continues the drumbeat of negative commentary on our efforts and the efforts of a bipartisan group of our colleagues on the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee to achieve meaningful reform of the Food and Drug Administration.

At the outset, we would make the point that a free market based reforms is by no means a risk-free proposition. Inaction and delay victimize just as surely as the wrong action. We hear constantly about the deformities prevented in the early 1960s by the agency’s not approving thalidomide. Rarely, however, is a word spoken about the cases of spina bifida that could have been averted had thalidomide been permitted health claims to be made about the benefits of folic acid in preventing such neural tube disorders.

As the 1989 Edwards Commission report put it: “The agency should be guided by the principle that expedient approval of useful and safe new products enhances the health of the American people. Approving such products can be as important as preventing the marketing of harmful or ineffective products.”

The Edwards Commission was but one part of a series of distinguished panels convened during the past two decades that have urged FDA reform.

The year-long process in which our legislation was developed, we drew heavily from the work on these expert panels. Contrary to The Post’s suggestion that we are rushing a poorly thought-out piece of legislation to the Senate floor, we believe that this bill embodies the best thinking on this topic produced over years and years of study.

However, we have drawn as well from the successful experience of the FDA in expediting approval of AIDS drugs without jeopardizing safety and effectiveness. In response to sustained pressure from the AIDS community, the agency demonstrated that it could, in fact, change its culture and its procedures to implement reforms it had resisted for years.

Unfortunately, this experience has not been regarded as a foundation upon which to build further improvements but, rather, has been used as a reason to say that further changes are unnecessary. Scientific methods and technology have changed dramatically since the thalidomide incident, while regulatory structures have hardly changed. Applications for the approval of new drugs typically run to hundreds of thousands of pages.

An incentive is growing for U.S. companies to move research, development, and production abroad, threatening our nation’s continued world leadership in new product development, costing American jobs and further delaying the public’s access to important new products.

It is disconcerting to us that our efforts are being regarded as a “hostile takeover” of the agency, as opponents argue. Sincere effort it is to enhance the professionalism, stature and effectiveness of the agency. The bill maintains the FDA firmly in the driver’s seat; it does not turn over all the regulatory power to the private sector, as critics have charged inaccurately. It encourages cooperation from the very beginning of the process so that costly delays can be avoided at the end of the road.

It is perhaps even more disconcerting to hear critics of our efforts suggest that we are willing to put people at risk in order to collect large campaign contributions from the drug industry.

The strong bipartisan vote in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee reflects the desire of Republicans and Democrats alike to make the FDA work better for all Americans. We have reached out to the administration, and we are more than willing to make constructive changes in the legislation as reported by the committee. We are not, however, willing to tolerate endless rancorizations as to what quagmire should be maintained. Our goal is to maintain these core principles: streamline and clarify the regulatory process while maintaining safety and efficacy.

Our determination to move forward is fueled by the plight of countless individuals who have contacted us over the years to request assistance in spending the FDA’s evaluation of new therapies that hold promise for treating serious illnesses, such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), multiple sclerosis and cancer. For these individuals, the real risk is not that we will act in haste, but rather that we will fail to act at all.

Barbara Mikulski is a Democratic senator from Maryland. Nancy Kassebaum is a Republican senator from Kansas.