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 vield 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 grid-lock, 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

Senators from California in a very, very difficult position.

So I hope we can move this Presidio on its own. Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE both agree—they both cosponsor this bill—that it could be moved in a moment by a unanimous-consent request. Let us not load it down with a bill that has serious problems.

I hope we can get to the point where this is truly a celebration for the people of California, that we can have our bill, have it stand alone, and take up the controversial matters independently.

I thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KENNEDY. I think there was a unanimous consent request that was made by the Republican leader on how we are going to use morning business. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Each Senator is allowed to speak up to 5 minutes with the exception of Senator REID of Nevada and Senator DORGAN of North Dakota, who each have 15 minutes reserved.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am asking whether the consent request went after 11 o'clock. I think the Senator from Mississippi requested it for some of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator BRADLEY of New Jersey and Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts are authorized to speak up to 5 minutes at this point.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete this. I do not think it will be longer than 5 minutes, but if it is, it will be a minute or two, and I prefer not to be interrupted.

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

PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I wish to address a few of the points that were made yesterday by the distinguished Senators from Utah on the underlying wilderness bill. First, there is the assertion that S. 884, that we are now dealing with, had been fixed, particularly that the release language had been fixed, been modified.

It has been modified somewhat, I think, to reflect the debate in the Energy Committee but despite all the changes the amended version just drops the requirement that the released lands shall be managed for "nonwilderness multiple purposes" and substitutes a full range of uses—not much

difference. However, the amendment still says that the lands released "shall not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation."

The previous version of the bill as reported out was a kind of belt and suspenders approach to release. It had two protections against further wilderness designation. The revised version still leaves the belt even though the suspenders have been removed. It still remains an unprecedented provision in wilderness bills.

Next, the protected areas. Is it fair to say that almost 20 million acres have been released and can now be exploited? The distinguished Senator from Utah questioned whether you could say that, but both versions of the bill as reported and as amended find that all public lands in the State of Utah administered by the BLM have been adequately studied for wilderness designation. This eliminates further consideration of approximately 20 million acres.

There are other problems which I will not get into at this stage, but I would like to just focus on the acreage where the distinguished Senators from Utah have asserted that plenty of land in the Kaiparowits Plateau and other areas, plenty of land has already been protected—125,000 acres in Kaiparowits and 110,000 in Dirty Devil Canyon—but the point is what is not protected. There are about 525,000 acres in Kaiparowits that were in the House bill and 152,000 acres in the Dirty Devil area. So the question is not what is protected but what is not protected, particularly on the Kaiparowits Pla-

The proponents of the bill have basically constantly referred to the House bill which is 5.7 million acres. I am not pushing 5.7 million acres. I have not introduced a bill that advocates 5.7 million acres, nor has any such bill been introduced. I am simply concerned that 2 million acres is far too little to protect out of 22 million acres of BLM land. I am concerned that all the remaining land would be permanently released from consideration as wilderness. But once again I am not saying that 5.7 is the right number. Keep in mind that it is 3.2 million acres that are currently protected as wilderness.

Also, the Senators from Utah should recognize that if the Utah wilderness bill does not pass or is vetoed, the result will not be that 5.7 million acres are protected. Instead, for the time being, the 3.2 million will remain protected for study and a new recommendation will have to be developed.

Third, there is the assertion that acreage is an issue for Utah to resolve. I would argue that acreage is far from the only issue here. In fact, there are many other issues that should be of great concern to other Senators and to other taxpayers.

As to the hard release language, as I said, the belt is still there even though

the suspenders have been removed. The land exchange provision should be of concern to taxpayers since the State is going to likely give up land of little value in exchange for very valuable Federal land on which they will want to mine coal, according to the Assistant Secretary. The exceptions to traditional wilderness rules for motor vehicle, also to water rights language, all are very ominous precedents.

And finally there is the assertion that there was nothing wrong with the BLM inventory process. The distinguished Senator from Utah basically said that this was not the case, and he quoted Jim Parker, a former Utah BLM State director, to support the assertion that the BLM's inventory was not seriously flawed. Mr. Parker has made statements supporting the BLM wilderness inventory and has been cited as an expert. However, Mr. Parker did not work on the BLM in Utah during the inventory but was living in Washington, DC, at the time.

I think it should be clear what the BLM's position is on this bill. Yesterday, I received a letter from Bob Armstrong, the Assistant Secretary of Lands, Minerals and Management, that supports the view that the BLM officials recognize the Utah BLM process was in fact flawed. Mr. Armstrong says:

I am told by professional career staff at all levels of the organization that the Utah wilderness process was the most controversial, and perhaps the most political, in the entire BLM wilderness process.

The letter goes on to state:

It is the position of the BLM that far too little land is protected under this bill and too much land is released for development. In short, no one should be claiming the support of the Bureau of Land Management and its professional staff—

No one should be claiming BLM support—

for S. 884.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Armstrong be printed in the ${\tt RECORD}$.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, March 25, 1996.
Hon Bull Bradley

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BRADLEY: I understand you will shortly be considering whether to include S. 884, the "Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995," in an omnibus package of parks legislation. I would like to clarify the record with respect to the position of the Bureau of Land Management and the Department of the Interior on the subject of the acreage covered in this bill.

In 1991, President Bush forwarded his recommendation that 1.9 million acres of Utah lands be immediately protected as wilderness. The Congress did not act on that recommendation and President Clinton did not adopt it when he came into office. Interestingly, President Bush did not support the "hard release" of the rest of Utah's lands, as is proposed in this bill, and neither does the Clinton Administration.