

With a top income tax rate of 49.9 percent, Sweden ranks as one of the two highest-taxing countries in the world. "But today," says this article, "Swedes are deep in debt, taxed to the limit, edgy about unemployment, and cynical about the model in which they once took pride."

Even Soviet leaders once praised Sweden's welfare state. But now, continues the story, "the welfare dream is in crisis, along with the Social Democratic Party that built it."

While Bill Clinton and the liberal establishment try to push America toward the kind of high-taxing, big-spending government Sweden has tried and is now rejecting, Sweden's Social Democrats are pushing for a balanced budget, tighter welfare rules, and entrepreneurship.

"There is a growing insight that you can't tax a society into equality." Let me say that again. "There is a growing insight that you can't tax a society into equality." That is from a speechwriter for Sweden's retiring prime minister.

Somehow, Mr. President, we have moved perilously close to following in Sweden's footsteps, but it is not too late to take a step back.

If we are serious about giving our children a better future, the best thing we can do is to cut taxes, end the current spending frenzy, balance the budget, and begin paying off the national debt.

"Americans want a government that uses common sense when it makes decisions that affect their lives," concludes the administration's little budget primer.

I agree, as long as we're talking about the common sense of a family crafting its budget around the kitchen table, and not the nonsense we too often craft around the conference tables here in Washington.

#### NAVAL PROMOTIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I spoke in support of the Senate Armed Services Committee not granting promotion to Comdr. Robert Stumpf. Last Thursday night I had an opportunity to listen to Senator COATS, Senator BYRD, and Senator NUNN speak on the same subject. I agree with everything they said. I will speak, once again, on that same subject but put it in a little broader context.

Before I do that, there was, last Thursday, in the Washington Post this article about Commander Stumpf and the Navy, pushing for his promotion to be granted again. I suppose that means it will come back to the Senate Armed Services Committee sometime in the future.

If people wonder why this might not be granted, I read a paragraph from this article. It talks about the Tailhook conference 4 years ago in Nevada. It talks about the behavior at the Tailhook convention in September

1991. It drew scrutiny on at least two accounts about the behavior of Commander Stumpf. It says he was present in a hotel room hosted by his squadron where two strippers performed, although he left the room before one of the women engaged in a sex act with another airman. Now, he avoids all responsibility for that. I assume that is the moral of the story, why it should not be considered in whether or not he gets a promotion.

It would be similar if I had a Christmas party for my staff and I hired a couple of strippers, and before they did their act, before other things would happen, I leave the party and claim no responsibility for that. Commander Stumpf was the commander. It was his group that was involved. He thinks he can avoid responsibility for what goes on there. I think not.

But also for the entire Navy, I point out that when you have that sort of convention, it is under the auspice of the U.S. military, and we have two strippers hired and a sex act performed with an airman, I remind the Navy—and I say this because farming is my background and my son operates our family farm—that is the way animals operate. Animals operate that way. Human beings, in their interaction with people of opposite sex, do it with love and with concern and of course with the goals that every act of love has. That is what separates human beings from animals. I suggest to the Navy that they act like human beings and not like animals.

I want to put this whole thing in a different context because the latest tremors concern the future career of this Navy Commander, Robert Stumpf. Commander Stumpf's promotion to the rank of captain has been blocked, and properly so. The committee remains opposed to the promotion because Commander Stumpf is suspected of inappropriate behavior, as I described at this Tailhook convention.

Last week, under intense pressure and lobbying, the committee reexamined the promotion one more time, and the outcome was sustained. Commander Stumpf is off the promotion list and will stay off. I said 2 weeks ago that I support the committee's action, and I support their reconsideration by taking no action.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, I do not think we have heard the last from Commander Stumpf. A recent report in the Washington Times suggests that Commander Stumpf's name will be on the 1997 captain's promotion list. Now the good commander is suing Secretary of the Navy Dalton for helping the Senate to improperly block his promotion.

Commander Stumpf's predicament is a sign of a much bigger problem. It is the "problem of naval leadership," as one naval aviator put it recently. The Navy's leadership problem neither begins nor ends with Commander Stumpf. The root cause of the problem may be much higher up in the chain of command. I believe the Navy's leadership

problem may lie at the very top, with people like Secretary Dalton and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jeremy Boorda.

Mr. Dalton and Admiral Boorda should have been flagged—just like Commander Stumpf—when their promotions came up here to be at these highest ranks. Unresolved issues in their past raise questions about their integrity and their ability to lead the Navy. The adverse information in their background should have been exposed to public scrutiny and debated, but that did not happen.

Surely these troublesome facts lay buried in Government files somewhere during the confirmation process. We were sleeping at the switch when they were slipped quietly through the Senate confirmation net. Mr. President, we had no reason to ask questions about Mr. Dalton. Mr. Dalton was presented to the Senate as a financial wizard with extensive business and managerial experience. He got a green light instead of a red warning flag that his wizardry deserved.

Mr. Dalton was confirmed on July 21, 1993. Exactly 1 year later, the damaging information in Mr. Dalton's background began leaking into the public domain. The New York Times ran a front-page story on July 22nd, 1994. It was written by Mr. Jeff Gerth. This is how it began:

When President Clinton announced that he had picked John H. Dalton to be Secretary of the Navy, he praised the nominee's true leadership ability as a Texas businessman.

As Mr. Gerth pointed out, "There was a part of Mr. Dalton's background that most Senators were unaware of."

His leadership was not advertised. We did not know he was deeply involved in the management of at least two failed savings and loan institutions. Mr. Dalton's S&L's were bailed out at the cost to the taxpayers of \$100 million.

As president of one S&L institution, Mr. Dalton was threatened with a suit by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for violating State and Federal laws and for gross negligence. The institution's insurance companies had to pay \$3.8 million to settle a civil suit.

Now, Mr. President, this is very damaging information, I believe. It raises questions about the Secretary's integrity and his ability to lead the Navy. How did he skate right through confirmation without red warning flags? Commander Stumpf got the flag treatment for the big question marks in his file, and rightly so. Why did Mr. Dalton not get flagged and confronted?

We had an identical experience with Admiral Boorda's nomination. He, too, slipped right through the confirmation net. Admiral Boorda should have been flagged. Admiral Boorda was confirmed on April 1, 1994. About 2 months later I picked up a newspaper and saw this headline, "Court Says Navy Brass Shielded Official's Son: Lenient Treatment is the Latest Plight in the System." That is a headline. This report appeared in the Washington Post June

15, 1994. It was written by Mr. Barton Gellman.

Mr. Gellman's report went on to say, "Some of those criticized by the court in the case remain in important posts. Among them is Admiral Boorda." That really bothered me, so I got the court document and read it. I was truly dismayed by what I saw—a bunch of senior naval officers behaving in dishonest ways. So I came to the floor of this body, and on June 28, 1994, spoke on this subject. If the people are wondering what I spoke about a year ago on this subject, they can find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD S7744 to S7745. Those are the pages.

My concern about Admiral Boorda's character comes directly from that military court document. Specifically, an opinion by the United States Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review in the case of the United States versus Chad E. Kelly, U.S. Navy. The document is dated June 13, 1994.

This was a clear-cut case of command influence and abuse of command authority.

The court document clearly indicates that Admiral Boorda may have interfered with a criminal investigation. Now, Admiral Boorda claims he was unaware of the suspect's criminal activities when he had him transferred to his own headquarters. That may be. The suspect was a low-ranking enlisted man who happened to be Navy Secretary Garrett's son. He was suspected of drug use, larceny, credit card fraud, receipt of stolen property, and lying under oath. That is very heavy stuff.

Once Admiral Boorda realized criminal behavior was involved, Garrett should have been ordered back to the scene of the crime—consistent with common Navy practice. But that did not happen. Why not?

Now, Mr. President, this brings me back to Commander Stumpf. We should not be surprised, when Commander Stumpf sets a bad example. A follower likes to imitate a leader's behavior. He is not blind. He sees the big boys abusing the system, doing bad things, and getting rewarded for it. So he figures it should be OK for him to do it as well.

No aspect of leadership is more powerful than setting a good example. If the Secretary and Chief of Naval Operations expect integrity, discipline, courage, and competence from their followers, then they must demonstrate those very same qualities themselves. Herein lies the crux of the Navy leadership problem.

Mr. Dalton and Admiral Boorda demand excellence from Commander Stumpf, but failed to deliver it themselves. "Flagging" is good for junior officers, but somehow not for admirals and above. That attitude does not sit well with junior officers. The big boys are asking their troops to do something they are unwilling to do themselves, and that just does not work.

So we cannot begin to address shortcomings in the leadership at Commander Stumpf's level until those at

the top, like Mr. Dalton and Admiral Boorda, set an example of excellence in their personal behavior.

I suggest, once again, that as far as what went on at the Tailhook scandal, I want to remind the Navy that those things are things that are done in the animal kingdom, and human beings should not be involved in that sort of sexual behavior.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

#### PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I just want to express some conflicting feelings here this morning about the bill we are about to go to. I know the Senator from Alaska understands this because we have been talking and working together on the Presidio for quite some time.

The Presidio legislation that is about to be before us—if it simply was the Presidio and other environmental issues that were not controversial, this would be one of my happiest days since I came to the Senate, because, for me, the Presidio bill is so close to my heart. Mr. President, I represented, for many years, the congressional district in which the Presidio sits. Years ago, Congressman Phil Burton, looking at the Presidio, said, "If the gates ever close, we would not want to lose this extraordinary resource." Back in the early 1980's—actually, I stand corrected, in 1972, Congressman Burton's legislation creating the Golden Gate Recreation Area and the Presidio was passed. The law provided that the Presidio would become a national park when it was no longer needed by the Army.

In 1988, when the Base Closure Commission recommended the closure, the law kicked in and triggered this incredible new park called the Presidio for the people of this country.

So why do I say that I am faced with such a terrible conflict here? It is because, rather than just voting this Presidio legislation up or down—which, by the way, we can do in 10 seconds because everybody agrees it is so important; it sets up a trust, and that would enable us to use the buildings on the park to create revenue to keep the park in good shape and to keep it safe and beautiful—we have this tangled up in the Utah wilderness conflict.

I suppose there are those who say, well, that is just the way it is done. Well, I simply do not buy that. If we really want to make progress here, if we really want to cut through the gridlock, what better chance do we have than to pull out this Utah wilderness bill—which is so controversial that it deserves its own separate attention—and pass these other environmental measures that are so important to the people of the country? We could do that in a minute.

I want to give you my feelings as to how much work has gone into this Presidio legislation. I already told you that the vision was established in the 1970's, and in the 1980's when the Presidio was closed, we all realized at that moment that it would become a glorious park. We also knew that funds were not there to keep it in the pristine condition. We figured out a way, with Congresswoman PELOSI's leadership, and Senator FEINSTEIN and I working with many others, we introduced the bill that would set up a trust. Everyone agrees that it is a wonderful idea.

I want to compliment Senator MURKOWSKI for coming out to the Presidio on more than one occasion to meet with the people. Senator CAMPBELL has been a key person working on this. Senator CHAFEE went out to visit the Presidio. Perhaps, for me, the most rewarding thing happened when Senator DOLE went out and, in fact, agreed this was the way to go.

So we did something here that we did not think was possible. We reached across party lines and we agreed on an approach for the Presidio that both Democrats and Republicans could support. Did it have everything that this Senator wanted? No. Did it have everything that the Senator from Alaska wanted? No. Clearly, we would have written it a little bit differently. But we worked together and we got a wonderful bill.

It is hard for me to imagine why it now has to get caught up in this tangle with the Utah wilderness bill, other than the fact that there are those who are pushing that bill and feel the only way they can pass it is to get it on the Presidio train.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from California that the 5-minute limit has been exceeded.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent for another 3 minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. So we have a national historic landmark. Five hundred buildings are on the National Register of Historic Buildings. We need to make sure that these buildings do not deteriorate and make sure we get the revenues to support the Presidio. Today, what are we faced with? The best of bills and the worst of bills—in one bill. It is like the Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde approach here. We take a wonderful piece of legislation, the Presidio trust bill, and everyone supports it from both parties, the whole spectrum, and it gets hooked to this Utah wilderness.

I hope, Mr. President, a couple of things will occur today in the time that we have. No. 1, I hope we take the Utah wilderness bill out of this omnibus bill. It deserves its own debate. Right now, 3.3 million acres of that Utah wilderness are basically under protection. If this bill passes, half of those acres are going to lose protection. How can we even call it a Utah wilderness bill? Clearly, it puts the