

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