

Secretary Babbitt is ignoring the National Academy of Sciences report that he himself commissioned and the taxpayers paid for—and we are at an impasse today.

And because of that impasse, low-level radioactive waste is piling up at 800 sites around California, including most major colleges and hospitals.

Some of the sites are in densely populated areas, vulnerable to accidental radioactive releases from fire, flood or earthquake.

“Americans for a Safe Future” are headquartered in Santa Monica, according to their letterhead. I asked my staff to review the 2,106 radioactive materials licenses in California, and they quickly found 13 in Santa Monica. There are 432 in Los Angeles County. And yes, some are even in Beverly Hills.

Do these activists and movie stars know that radioactive waste is piling up in California neighborhoods, hospitals and college campuses, because they are standing in the way of a facility in the remote and unpopulated desert?

Do they know that fire, earthquake or flood could result in a release of radioactive materials from these sites?

Are they suggesting we halt cancer treatment or AIDS research that uses radioactive materials?

Mr. President, these activists and movie stars may be sincere, but they are sincerely wrong. They do not realize the effect of their activism. They are endangering the environment and their communities while they intend to do the opposite.

Mr. President, like most Americans I like to go to the movies and see talented actors and actresses practice their craft.

And as talented as these actors and actresses are, they are not experts in the field of hydrology or radioactivity.

Nor am I. That is why I rely on experts. And the experts of the National Academy of Sciences have spoken.

Ward Valley is safe. Let us get the waste out of populated neighborhoods, and out to a monitored site in the remote desert where it belongs.

I urge these movie stars who lend their names and talents to these causes to examine the facts and the scientific evidence about Ward Valley, and to reconsider their actions.

I know that they want a safe future. We all do.

But I do not believe we need to trade a safe present to achieve that goal. A single, licensed, monitored disposal site at Ward Valley will not only result in a safe future—but it gets the waste being stockpiled in hospitals and college campuses out of our neighborhoods and away from our children today.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor a bipartisan bill Senator JOHNSTON and I have introduced to end the impasse: S. 1596, the Ward Valley Land Transfer Act.

Let us listen to science, and end this stalemate.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

I see other colleagues seeking recognition.

I wish you a pleasant recess, Mr. President.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

THE VOID IN MORAL LEADERSHIP—PART X

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last week, attorneys for the President of the United States filed an appeal with the Supreme Court to delay the sexual harassment lawsuit filed against him by Paula Jones. Ms. Jones is a former Arkansas State employee.

The President's strategy is to try to delay the lawsuit until after he leaves office. Among the reasons he cites for the need for delay is the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940. This law lets those who serve in the military postpone civil litigation until the subject's completion of active duty military service.

Columnist Maureen Dowd writes about this issue in this morning's, New York Times. She says it is a move “that marks a new level of chutzpah in American politics.” She says, “As a society, we haven't preserved our sense of shame. But Bill Clinton is doing his best to preserve our sense of shamelessness.”

Why is this? Ms. Dowd goes on to explain: “* * * Mr. Bennett (the President's attorney in the case) is getting paid too much to make the hideous mistake of reminding the public of one of Mr. Clinton's improvidences (his maneuvering on the draft) in defense of another (his wandering eye).” That is a quote from Maureen Dowd's column in today's issue of The New York Times.

In a “Dear Colleague” letter dated May 21, BOB STUMP, the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, also addressed this issue of the President allegedly serving in the armed forces. Mr. STUMP, I might remind my colleagues, was once a member of the President's own party. Here is what Mr. STUMP says, speaking about the President's use of the 1940 act:

This ignoble pleading is a slap in the face to the millions of men and women who either are serving on active duty, or have served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States. In 1969, President Clinton ran away from his military obligation, dodging the draft, claiming that he ‘loathed the military.’ Now, President Clinton by claiming possible protection under The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, makes a mockery of the laws meant to protect the honorable men and women who serve their country in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. President, I have given a series of statements on this floor regarding the President's absence of moral leadership for this country. I have been very specific about when he has failed to set a good example for those he serves and leads. I have been specific about how he says one thing and does another.

I think moral leadership, from my definition, is doing what you say you are going to do.

This is yet another example—this use of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940—where the President of the United States, albeit a citizen, is indeed the Commander in Chief, but he probably is not doing what the intent of the law is. The Constitution empowers him, of course, to be their leader.

With that power, he has responsibilities. Responsibilities to set the best possible example for those in the military.

The U.S. Navy has recently undergone enormous public criticism. One of the most damning incidents was sexual harassment associated with Tailhook. Congress and the public have put great pressure on the Navy to assign responsibility and accountability for that outrageous behavior. Admirals and captains could not hide behind loopholes, helped by clever lawyers, to avoid accountability. They had to face trial, and take responsibility for their actions.

In his appeal to the Supreme Court, the President would like to avoid taking that responsibility. What kind of message does that send to the men and women he leads as Commander in Chief?

Is not the mark of a true leader one who would do the same that he asks of those he leads? How can a leader have one standard for himself and another for everyone under him—a double standard? Is this setting a good example? Is this leadership? And what kind of military would we have if our officers chose to follow their leader, in this case the Commander in Chief, and avoid responsibility in the same way? Well, of course, you know the answer. The integrity of the military would be severely compromised.

Mr. President, this is a good illustration of why moral leadership in a President is so important, just as Franklin Delano Roosevelt observed. I have quoted him so many times on this floor in this series of speeches that I am not going to quote him again, but FDR laid out very clearly that if there is anyplace you are going to question a President, it is his moral leadership. In this President, there is a fundamental lack of moral leadership.

It has a corroding effect on the public's trust in their Government and authorities. It breeds cynicism. That is my great fear, and that is why I have reluctantly taken the floor recently with my observations about the President not doing what he said he would do.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The Senator from North Dakota.

CRITICIZING THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I must observe before I speak briefly about what I intend to speak about, the Senator from Iowa does not seem so reluctant; he says he reluctantly takes the

floor, and he certainly has been persistent, and today at least he has taken the floor criticizing the President for what he has not done.

The minority leader just finished reading the statement in the Chamber that describes accurately the circumstances of the filing on behalf of the President, and it categorically rejects the assertions just made by the Senator from Iowa. But it is an even-numbered year. We all know what that means. And being President certainly means you are subject to criticism. I understand that, as do others who serve in public office. I believe the American people understand all of us have things about us that are positive, things that are not so positive perhaps. None of us are perfect.

This President, like President Bush and President Reagan, President Carter and others before them, I suspect, resides in the White House trying to figure out how to do the best job he can to move this country forward and serve the best interests of this country.

It is easy to be critical. I hope all of us would understand that the job of the President of the United States is a tough job. It is tough for Republicans and tough for Democrats. This is a country with a lot of good and a lot of opportunity, and I hope all of us can work together to help this President and future Presidents realize that opportunity.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I take the floor to say that it appears to me we may be talking about National Missile Defense or the Defend America Act very soon. Perhaps it will even be laid down before we finish tonight so there is a cloture vote when we come back. I am not sure.

I want to observe—and I have done this for years that I have been in Congress—that we just finished a budget in which there was a lot of talk about reducing the Federal deficit, the need to reduce Federal spending, and the Defend America Act, or the National Missile Defense Program, is a program, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that just to build—not to operate, just to build—will cost between \$30 billion and \$60 billion. Now, the operational costs will be much, much greater than that.

It seems to me the funding question ought to be posed and ought to be answered by those who bring a spending program to the floor of the Senate that says let us spend up to an additional \$60 billion more on a program that I do not think this country needs because the National Missile Defense Program, or the Defend America Act, will not truly be an astrodome over our country that will defend us against incoming missiles. It presumes that we should build a defense against ICBM's in the event a rogue nation would launch an ICBM with a nuclear tip against our country, or in the event there is an ac-

cidental nuclear launch against our country.

Of course, a nuclear device might very likely come from a less sophisticated missile like a cruise missile. We have thousands and thousands and thousands of cruise missiles proliferating this world. They are much easier to get access to. A nuclear-tipped cruise missile is a much more likely threat to this country than the ICBM, or perhaps a suitcase and 20 pounds of plutonium and the opportunity to turn it into a nuclear device, or perhaps a glass vile no larger than this with the most deadly biological agents to mankind.

Of course, we will spend \$60 billion on a star wars program, at the end of which it will be obsolete and will not protect this country against that which we advertise we need protection.

We had an ABM system built in North Dakota. Billions and billions of dollars in today's money went into that in northeastern North Dakota. It was declared mothballed the same month it was declared operational. In other words, the same month they declared operational a system which they said we desperately needed they decided would no longer be needed, and it sits up there as a concrete monument to bad planning. It was an expenditure of the taxpayers' money that, in my judgment, need not have been made.

Now we are told that we have the need for a national defense program, or Defend America Act, of some type that will defend us only against a very narrow, limited threat, not a full-scale nuclear attack from an adversary, because it will not defend us against that, will not defend us against a nuclear attack of cruise missiles. It cannot do that. It will not defend us against a nuclear attack by a terrorist nation putting a nuclear bomb in a suitcase in the trunk of a Yugo car, a rusty old Yugo at a dock in New York City. But we are told \$60 billion to build and how many tens of billions of dollars to operate is what is necessary.

I say to those who will bring that to the floor, while you do that, please bring us a plan telling us who is going to pay the tax to build it. Where are you going to get the money? Who is going to pay the tax? And then describe why that is necessary and the fact when you get done you have not created the defense for America you say you are going to create.

There are many needs that we have in this country in defense. Many remain unmet. This kind of proposal ranks well down, in my judgment, in the order of priorities. If it is technologically feasible to be built to protect this country, it ranks well down in the order of priorities. My hope is that we will have a full, aggressive, interesting debate on this because it is not a debate about pennies. It is a debate about a major, sizable spending program, new spending program at a time when we are trying to downsize and at a time when we are talking about the need to control Federal spending.

Those who bring this to the floor of the Senate have an obligation to tell us how it is going to be paid for. The announcement of this so-called Defend America Act was made at a press conference recently, and the question was asked: Where do you get the money for this? And the answer at the press conference by Members of the Senate was: Well, we will leave that to the experts.

No, it will not be left to the experts. This Congress will have to decide who pays for a new Federal spending program that will cost \$60 billion plus and after being built will not in fact defend this country against a nuclear attack.

There are many needs that we have in our defense system in this country. Some worry that we are in a circumstance where we will decide to downsize in defense too much: We will be unprepared to meet an adversary; we will be unprepared to meet a threat.

I understand that. I understand this country has gone through this in previous periods, and I do not want us to be in that position. But I also understand that in every area of the armed services there are weapons programs that simply seem to have a life of their own and they tend to build and build, and they become not so much a justifiable program that is necessary to defend our country, but they become a program that is supported by a range of politicians and corporations and other interests that give it a life of its own, even when it becomes unnecessary or when the science and the technology demonstrate it is not needed.

I hope we will have an aggressive discussion about this, about the threat and about the amount of proposed expenditure, and about who is going to come up with the money, and especially about whether, in fact, this is needed for this country's defense.

Mr. President, I thank you for your indulgence. I yield the floor, and I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. 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 INTERSTATE STALKING ACT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to talk about a bill that I hope we can clear tonight in the Senate because it is a very important bill that will begin to protect the victims of stalking all over this country. You know, we did not really know much about stalking until the last few years. That is because it was a hard crime to pin down. Stalking is threats. It is harassment. It is the constant terrorizing of a victim, whether the act that is said would be done is actually perpetrated or if, sometimes, it is not. But whether it is or is not, it is a very tough thing for a