

must live under the permissive rules set by these liberal judges when they attempt to rid our streets of crime and drugs.

The judicial philosophy of nominees to the Federal bench generally reflects the judicial philosophy of the person occupying the Oval Office. We in Congress have sought to restore and strengthen our Nation's war on crime and on drugs and to guarantee the safety of Americans in their streets, homes, and workplaces. For all of the President's tough-on-crime rhetoric, his judicial nominations too often undermine the fight against crime and drugs.

This is an important issue. It may be the single most important issue in the next Presidential campaign. Frankly, I hope everybody in America will give some thought to it because I for one am tired of having these soft-on-crime judges on the bench. I for one am tired of having people who, as activists, do not understand the nature and role of judging, which is that judges are to interpret the laws that are made by those who are elected to make them. Judges are not elected to anything. They are nominated and confirmed for life. Hopefully, they will be removed from the pressures of politics and will be able to do what is right. I have to say that many of these judges are very sincere. They are kind-hearted, decent, honorable people who are so soft-hearted that they just do not see why we have to punish people because of the crimes they commit, or why we have to be as tough as we have to be. But those of us who really study these areas know that if a person is put in jail—a violent criminal—until they are 50 years of age there is a very high propensity that they will never commit violence after 50. But if we have them going in and out of the doors in those early years when they are violent criminals, they just go from one violent crime to the next, and society is the loser. We understand that here in the District of Columbia, which is sometimes known as "Murder Capital U.S.A." and "Drug Capital U.S.A." That needs to be cleaned up.

That is why I put \$20 million in a recent bill to give directly to the chief of police here so that they can acquire the necessary cars and weapons and ammunition and other facilities that they need to be able to run a better police force. Consider that it was the best police force in the Nation 20 years ago; today it is the worst in the Nation. So we put our money where our mouth is, at least as far as the Senate is concerned. I hope that money stays in in the House.

We have to pay attention where judges are concerned, too. We have to get people who really are going to make a difference against the criminal conduct in our society. I am fed up with our streets not being safe. I am fed up with our homes not even being safe. We are becoming a people who have to lock the doors every time we

turn around, and I for one think it is time to stop it.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this morning my friend from New Jersey reflected a little history of public lands. I listened intently, and while I appreciate his point of view, I suggest there are two points of view relative to the history of public lands and the transition that has occurred in this country.

Under the Northwest Ordinance, which, as a matter of fact, predated the Constitution, the prevailing philosophy was simply to dispose of lands either to the States or the territories or to private individuals. And as the several States obtained their inheritance, they for obvious reasons began to lose interest in further Federal transfers. In other words, they had achieved what they wanted.

Mr. President, this goes back to the period of about 1788 when this Northwest Ordinance prevailed. So they lost the incentive once they received their land and further Federal transfers simply were not necessary. The State of Arkansas obtained over 11 million acres from the Federal Government, over one-third of its total acreage. Only about 3 percent of New Jersey currently is in Federal ownership.

So the history of public lands is a history of those States, mainly the Eastern States, that have already obtained the lands needed for their schools, their roads, their economy, and other purposes. Then we have the Western States and territories that basically remain captive to the Federal Government and the interests of those Eastern States. The definition of "West," as we all know, steadily moved west. It moved from what was West, in 1790, Ohio, to Utah and my State of Alaska in 1990.

According to the 1984 BLM public lands statistics, Florida obtained over 24 million acres from 1803 to 1984 out of a total of 34 million acres in that entire State. Arkansas, as I mentioned, obtained over one-third of its entire acreage. Now, there was a time when the State of New Jersey looked at the western lands as a source of raising money for needs in New Jersey—roads

and docks, the harbors, other public works in New Jersey—and there was a time when New Jersey wanted the western lands basically to feed its industry.

It was a concept that is not unknown to us, Mr. President. The Eastern States had the capital base, and where did they look? They looked to the West to put that capital to work in investments that could generate a handsome return because the money centers at that time were in the East, as they are today for the most part. So the eastern at that time, I think it is fair to say, elitists chose to invest in the West and generate a return, and they could continue to live in the more luxurious lifestyle that existed in the East because the West was considered pretty much a frontier. So States like New Jersey and New York invested in western lands to feed, if you will, the fruits associated with the productivity of the West.

Now we have seen a change in that, a rather remarkable change. Let us be realistic and recognize New Jersey and other States now want western lands not necessarily as a return on the investment that was initially generated there, although some of it is fourth and fifth generation wealth, but they look at the West as a playground, a recreation area for themselves and others of that elitist group.

If the State of Utah is unable to use its school lands to fund education, that is even better, because then Utah will become even more dependent on the Federal Government and the preferred social agenda of Washington, DC. Make no mistake about it. This is not unique to the State of Utah.

Those of us who are westerners question when is enough enough. There has been no change in the policy of some of these eastern seaboard States and many of the other original States from 1790 until now. What has changed is what they want western lands for. There would be a considerable difference if New Jersey as a State were 63 percent owned by the Federal Government, like Utah, but it is not. The State of New Jersey is only 3 percent owned by the Federal Government, so it has the luxury to assume that two-thirds of Utah is, one might interpret, for the private pleasure of the residents of New Jersey.

We can get into a long discussion over the various conservation measures mentioned by the Senator from New Jersey, but I think the Senate should remember that the primary purpose of the national forests—a lot of us seem to have forgotten this—the primary purpose of the national forests, when they were withdrawn from public domain, was simply to ensure a steady supply, a renewable supply, of timber. That is almost seen as a joke today, but that was the concept; the forests were to be conserved, used, and managed to provide a steady supply of timber.

The Wilderness Act, speaking of history, was originally intended to set

aside pristine areas, untrammelled areas where mankind was not evident. Now, in our zealous efforts, we seem to be ready to put almost anything into wilderness—roads, structures. Whatever the objective, a wilderness designation is not to preserve pristine areas but to prevent other uses that some organization or group wants to prevent.

So, I hope, as we reflect on history, we do reflect on this dichotomy associated with the traditions of the influence of the Eastern States, which have virtually no public land in those States, which have virtually no wilderness in those States, setting the precedent for the rest of the Nation.

I am going to try to leave us with a little understanding of what this business of public land and wilderness land is all about, reflecting on how some States, like mine, enjoy a significant amount of wilderness. My State of Alaska has 365 million total acres. We are 2½ times the size of the State of Texas. I am glad my friends from Texas are not here to be reminded of that. Out of that 365 million acres, we have 57.4 million acres of wilderness. That is quite a bit of wilderness. We are proud of that wilderness. We take good care of that wilderness. But we think enough is enough.

If you took the State of Arkansas with 33 million acres of wilderness, you add the State of New Jersey with 4.8 million acres, West Virginia with 15 million acres, Vermont with 5 million acres, you come up with about 57 million acres—equal to what is in my State of Alaska. So there are four States. The difference here is we are not talking about wilderness in Arkansas, New Jersey, West Virginia, or Vermont. We are talking about their total acreage. So I do not want to mislead the Presiding Officer when I say Alaska has 57 million acres of wilderness out of 365 million acres. If you take the entire landmass of the State of Arkansas at 33 million, New Jersey 4.8, West Virginia 15, and Vermont 5, you come up with a combined area of 57.8 million acres for those four States. That equates to what is in my State alone as wilderness.

Let us go one step further. Let us look at some of these States and recognize that Arkansas has 33 million acres in its entire State, 120,378 acres in wilderness—not very much. New Jersey has 4.8 million acres in the entire State, 10,341 acres of wilderness.

Let us compare that with Utah. Utah has 52 million acres in the State, 890,858 acres of wilderness, and we are proposing to add 2 million to that, that would be 2.9 million acres of wilderness in the State, 891,000 managed by the Forest Service and 2 million under BLM wilderness.

I think it is important that we reflect on those comparisons. The States in question with large wilderness acreage, outside of the State of Alaska, include Arizona at 4.5 million acres, California at 5.9 million acres, Colorado at

2.6 million acres, Florida at 1.4 million acres, Idaho at 4 million acres, Minnesota at 805,000, Montana at 3.4 million acres, New Mexico at 1.6 million acres, Oregon at a little over 2 million acres, Washington at 4.2 million acres, and Wyoming at 3 million acres. So, by this action we would be creating in Utah wilderness equal to that existing in Wyoming today.

What about some of the other States? Interestingly enough—and I hope my colleagues from Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, and Rhode Island are listening, because these six States that have no wilderness. There is no wilderness in Connecticut, no wilderness in Delaware, no wilderness in Iowa, no wilderness in Kansas, no wilderness in Maryland, and no wilderness in Rhode Island.

How do you suppose that came about? It came about, as I indicated in my opening remarks, when those States that have been around a long time—when the Northwest Ordinance philosophy prevailed, back in 1788—acquired their land. That is where it ended. Now these States are saying we do not want any wilderness in our State. We want the wilderness out West.

I think everybody ought to have a little wilderness. I think, before I get out of this body, I am going to propose some legislation that every State have a little wilderness. They can designate where it is. Maybe Sterling Forest should be a wilderness. Perhaps the States of New York and New Jersey could designate this transfer of land into a wilderness. It is going to be used as a watershed. Why not make it a wilderness?

Another curious consideration is, who owns the States? Alabama is 3 percent owned by the Federal Government, Alaska 68 percent owned by the Federal Government; Arizona, 47 percent; Arkansas, 8 percent; California, 44 percent; Colorado, 36; Connecticut, 1 percent; Delaware, 2 percent; District of Columbia, 26 percent. I am surprised it is not higher. Florida, 9 percent; Georgia, 4 percent owned by the Federal Government; Hawaii, 16 percent. You get to Idaho, 62 percent of Idaho's landmass is owned by the Federal Government; Illinois, 3 percent; Indiana, 2; Iowa, 1; Kansas, 1; Kentucky, 4; Louisiana, 3 percent; Maine, 1 percent; Maryland, 3; Massachusetts, 1; Michigan, 13; Minnesota, 10; Mississippi, 4.

These are extraordinary comparisons with the prevalence of Federal ownership being out West. Missouri is 5 percent owned by the Federal Government; Montana, 28; Nebraska, 1; Nevada, 83 percent owned by the Federal Government; New Hampshire, 13; New Jersey, 2 percent; New Mexico, 33; New York, 1—New York 1—North Carolina, 6; North Dakota, 4; Ohio, 1 percent; Oklahoma, 2 percent; Oregon, 52 percent owned by the Federal Government; Pennsylvania, 2 percent; Rhode Island, 1 percent; South Carolina, 5 percent; South Dakota, 6 percent, Ten-

nessee, 4 percent; Texas, the second largest State in the Union, Mr. President, has only 1 percent of its landmass owned by the Federal Government.

Clearly, when they came into the Union, they made certain conditions prevail relative to ownership, and the Federal Government today owns 1 percent of the land mass of Texas, compared with Utah, which is 64 percent; Vermont, 6 percent; Virginia, 6 percent; Washington, 29 percent owned; West Virginia, 7; Wisconsin, 10; Wyoming, 49.

So there you have it, Mr. President, a comparison of the States. Now we look at the merits of adding 2 million acres to Utah wilderness, as recommended by the delegation from Utah and a vast majority of the Utah Legislature, both the house and senate and the Governor.

I think it is also interesting to note that the process that occurred in Utah did not happen by accident. It happened as a result of a number of meetings that were held and the consensus that was developed there over an extended period of time. As the record indicates, some \$10 million was spent reaching the point we are at today, evaluating just what would be appropriate for the State of Utah; 15 years went into that study; 16,000 written comments were processed; 75 formal public hearings were held. This was a process that was open to the public throughout the United States, professionals were hired to make the recommendation of 1.9 million, and today we have a proposal of 2 million acres in the Utah wilderness.

As I indicated to my friend from New Jersey this morning, the matter of Sterling Forest is also somewhat contentious, as evidenced by the consideration of some of the specifics, which I will share with my colleagues. But nevertheless, I support the Senator from New Jersey in his efforts, because I believe he has to answer to his constituents, and I believe it is fair to say that both the Senators from New Jersey support the Sterling Forest. I respect that process. But I think the Record should note who owns the Sterling Forest.

Sterling Forest is currently owned by the Swiss Insurance Group of Zurich. They signed a purchase agreement with the Swiss company for the property in June 1995. What is it valued at? I am told it is valued somewhere between \$55 and \$65 million. How much would it cost if we were to buy it? The request in the legislation of the Senator from New Jersey is for Federal participation of about \$17.5 million. This will be the Federal figure regardless of the total purchase price. The balance of the purchase price is going to be paid by the States of New York and New Jersey and the private sector. I understand about 2,400 acres of Sterling Forest rests in New Jersey. The balance is in New York.

There are those who might think Sterling Forest is just that, an ancient

growth forest, but Sterling Forest has been logged. What you have there today is second growth. Hardwood logging has taken place. I thought I would ask the question, When was it last logged? The answer was, it is currently being logged, Mr. President, by the Sterling Forest Corp., a subsidiary of the Swiss Insurance Group of Zurich.

If the Sterling Forest is acquired, of course, logging is not continued, and that is really the business of the delegation from New Jersey. The primary reason for purchasing Sterling Forest, as I understand, appreciate and support, is to protect the watershed. Hunting would be allowed.

So if anybody wants further information with regard to the situation in Sterling Forest, why, I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will be happy to provide it. If not, we have the address and phone number of the Zurich Reinsurance Center in New York, the principals to contact.

I do not put this out as a criticism; I simply put it out as a reality that here we have an acquisition taking place in the best interest of clearly the State of New York and the State of New Jersey. There are about 30 square miles, 19,200 acres are in New York and about 2,400, as I have mentioned, in New Jersey.

It is also my understanding that what we are purchasing here are certain easements owned and managed by the U.S. Park Service that are in the Appalachian trail area but that triggers, if you will, a process whereby New York and New Jersey will come up with the additional funding, and that would be somewhere in the area of \$40 or \$45 million to acquire the land.

It is also interesting to note Sterling Forest has roads through it and other access, so it is pretty hard to suggest, perhaps, that it be made a wilderness. Nevertheless, I think it is important that as this watershed is addressed, relative to its use as a watershed, that as much of the wilderness characteristics as possible be retained for the benefit of the citizens of New York, as well as the citizens of New Jersey.

A lot of people do not really appreciate what 1 million acres equates to in size. We are talking about adding 2 million acres of wilderness in Utah. One million acres is equal to the size of the State of Delaware. If we are talking about 2 million acres, we are looking at three times the size of the State of Rhode Island. Two million acres is about half the size of the State of New Jersey, so it is a big chunk of real estate. Unless you have some idea of acreage or the vastness of wilderness, you have no idea as to the significance of what that large a piece of real estate is.

As I indicated in my remarks, for those who come from States that have little or virtually no wilderness or States with little, if any, Federal ownership of their land, it is difficult for those Members to have an appreciation of what it means to designate an additional area the size of 2 million acres.

While many of us support adding 2 million acres to wilderness, that is not enough for the advocates here who want 5 to 6 million acres of wilderness.

They do not seem to care about the ability of the State of Utah to support its schools, support its economy. All they see is a vision out there that tells them somehow this is not enough. As I have indicated, Mr. President, as you look at the comparisons, what is enough? What is reasonable? What is balanced? The people of Utah, in their own good judgment, after \$10 million and 15 years, have indicated, 1.9 million acres. The legislation proposes 2 million acres.

Mr. President, as we look at the history of Western public lands, little is said about the economy of the region. What happens to the jobs? We cannot all be employed by the Federal Government. Who pays the taxes? We have resources in the West that have fueled the economy of this Nation for a long time.

Where we are lax, Mr. President, is in not recognizing that science and technology has given us the opportunity to develop our resources better, more efficiently, with more compatibility with the environment, the ecology. As we address new and better ways to develop those resources, we seem reluctant to go back and review those of our laws that protect these areas. We did not update our environmental laws. We did not seem eager to look at cost-benefit risk analysis to determine, indeed, if it is practical to develop one resource or another.

So what we have here, Mr. President, is a fast-developing technology. The minute you attempt to look at more efficient ways of cutting timber, of mining, grazing, oil and gas development, it is suggested that you are irresponsibly unwinding the advancements that have been made in the environment.

Mr. President, the water is cleaner, the air is cleaner, we can do a better job. But we still need to maintain a balance. That balance dictates a healthy economy. Only with a healthy economy can we meet our environmental obligations.

So, when I see my good friend, who I know is very dedicated and believes diligently in his point of view, become a self-anointed savior of the West, I have to ask, who is he saving the West from? From other westerners? Or is it really the elitist group, the big business?

Let me refer to the charts back here just very briefly with the realization that these well-meaning groups somehow get a little overly ambitious, in the opinion of the Senator from Alaska—let us recognize them for what they are. They are big businesses, just like a lot of other big businesses. As I indicated earlier, the environmental organization incomes, the 12 major organizations in this country have assets of \$1.2 billion. They have fund balances—that means immediate access to cash—of \$1.03 billion. There you have

it. The revenues, \$633 million; their expenses, \$556 million; their assets \$1.2 billion—the fund balances at \$1 billion.

There is nothing wrong with that, but let us keep it in perspective. They have to have a cause. They resolve one issue and they move on to the next so they can generate membership, generate dollars. Let us be honest. They accomplish a lot. But there has to be a balance. That is what is lacking, because if they had their way, the extreme would prevail.

They pay, as big business does, compensation. Several of the individuals who represent these organizations—the National Wildlife Federation, the World Wildlife Fund, the Environmental Defense Fund, the National Parks and Conservation Association—they pay their chief executive officers more than the President of the United States makes. That is neither here nor there, but it points out my contention that it is simply big business. It is just a different type of business. It is worthwhile business, just as are job-developing business is in mining, oil and gas, timber, and grazing.

Some of these people are extremists, though, Mr. President. They have to have a cause. The cause here is not wilderness, because 2 million acres of wilderness has been offered. It is more wilderness. It is 5 or 6 million acres of wilderness.

Where is the balance? They are generating dollars and membership, using scare tactics that suggest that the people of Utah are irresponsible, that they will go out and haphazardly develop their land or overdevelop it, overgraze it, overmine it. That will not happen, Mr. President. It will not happen in any State of the Union. But those are the scare tactics that they use. They say, "We must save the West from itself."

There have been abuses in the West, just like there have in the East, but I defy the membership of these organizations to take a look at the east coast. Go up in the train. Look at the aging of America. Take the train from Washington and look through New Jersey, look through Delaware, look out the window, look at New York, go on to Boston. Just look at the mess that you see in the backyards of America.

Where is the energy of these organizations to correct that? It is not there. They want to move out to an area where most people cannot visit, cannot see for themselves, see what the people in these Western States are responsible for. They are doing a good job. They are sensitive. No, they do not want to start near home. They seem to have no concern about the economy, the jobs, the taxes. I find that perplexing, Mr. President. They want to get on their white charger and save the world, but they will not start right in their own backyard.

What we are looking at, Mr. President, is trying to balance this process. As I said, there is nothing wrong with Sterling Forest. I support it. I support

the process that is underway here as far as reaching a compromise.

But we have to recognize reality, Mr. President. We have a trade deficit in this country. Over half of it is the price of imported oil. We have the reserves in this country. We have substantial reserves in my State. We have the technology to do it safely. But the environmental elitists need a cause. They say, "No, you can't do it. You don't have the science. You don't have the technology." So what we are doing is importing it. Fifty-four percent of our oil is imported now. We are bringing it in in foreign tankers.

If you ever have an accident, good luck in trying to find a deep pocket like occurred with the *Exxon Valdez* where you had responsible parties. While the ship was operated irresponsibly, at least the deep pocket was there.

Where are the payrolls going to come from? Are we going to ship our dollars overseas? The interesting thing, Mr. President, is that other countries are not quite so sensitive as ours. Their logging practices, their mining practices do not have the same sensitivity.

So are we not hastening, if you will, by being hellbent to reduce our own resource development the onset of the very problems that we are trying to avoid. Recognizing that we have the science and technology and experience to offset the imports from countries who allow exploitation without responsible resource development technology, without a response to renewable resources? So, are we really accomplishing a meaningful compromise? In many cases, I think not. We have many issues relative to development, private land issues, endangered species, wetland, Superfund.

We talk about cost-benefit risk analysis, the need to review our environmental laws as we look at new technological advances, to better protect our renewable resources. How do we get to a balance, Mr. President? I think we have that balance today in the proposal of 2 million acres of wilderness in the State of Utah.

As we wind up this debate, at least probably for today, I urge my colleagues from the following States to recognize the reality of where we are in this legislation. If this package does not stay together, Colorado, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Utah, Idaho, Arizona, West Virginia, Hawaii, New York, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, and California will be affected because there are titles for public lands and changes in those States, as well as Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Idaho, Wyoming, Ohio, my State of Alaska, New Mexico—some 56 titles or changes, Mr. President, a pretty significant number.

Now, the Senator from New Jersey said in a dear colleague letter that he had joined with 17 of his colleagues. There are many provisions important to our respective States within this omnibus park legislation. Well, we

have plenty of them, Mr. President. As I said earlier today, the majority of these bills were placed on the calendar of the Senate April 7, 1995—almost a year ago. The Senator from New Jersey could have let these environmental bills make their way to the House and go on to the President months ago. Unfortunately, he chose not to do so. Mr. President, the direct result of these actions is this package. The Senator from New Jersey, by his own actions, is in reality the ghost writer of this bill that we are considering today.

As I said earlier, I accommodated the Senator from New Jersey on Sterling Forest because I think it is in the best interest of his State and his constituents. Unfortunately, the Senator from New Jersey and others do not seem to extend the same degree of confidence and respect to the citizens of Utah. I guess that is where we part.

Now, if this bill stays together, Americans are going to get 2 million acres of new wilderness. There is nothing in this legislation that will prevent another Congress, another day, from adding additional wilderness lands in Utah or my State of Alaska. The will of Congress prevails.

The reality is this cannot go piecemeal. One bill cannot go without the other. I guess, to quote the three musketeers, one for all and all for one, or none. I urge my colleagues to support this package as it has been presented, because an awful lot of hard work and an awful lot of benefits to an awful lot of States is at jeopardy here. To suggest it is irresponsible and to threaten the State of Utah because this legislation does not propose enough wilderness, in the opinion of the Senator from Alaska is not only unrealistic and impractical, it is simply absurd.

Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to recognize while we have had an extended debate here about a lot of titles that are covered under the bill, the success or failure of this bill is related tremendously to the Utah wilderness. I implore my colleagues who have titles and interest in this bill to recognize that this does represent a compromise, a 2-million acre compromise. As we have seen, the intensive lobbying by a relatively small segment of motivated extremists who say 2 million acres is not enough, does not represent the prevailing attitude in Utah by a long shot, nor the prevailing attitude in the West by a long shot. It represents, perhaps some of the elitist Eastern States who simply have their land and do not have a dog in this fight.

This is far too important, Mr. President, to let slide for another Congress—15 years, \$10 million expended. We have a solid recommendation and a solid base of support.

Mr. President, as we look forward to another day on this matter, we have attempted to accommodate each State that had an interest in public lands legislation. Now we are down to the point of determining whether or not

those Members who have an interest will stick together to keep this legislation in its package form. I have been assured that it will pass in the House if it is kept that way. If it is broken up, if Utah wilderness is stricken from the body, the legislation and the packages as we know it today will fail.

I urge my colleagues, in conclusion, to reflect on the significance of that reality.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate now, I send a cloture motion to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Murkowski substitute amendment to Calendar No. 300, H.R. 1296, providing for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer:

Bob Dole, Frank H. Murkowski, Rick Santorum, Slade Gorton, Trent Lott, Jim Inhofe, Hank Brown, Ted Stevens, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Conrad Burns, Don Nickles, Larry E. Craig, Jim Jeffords, Judd Gregg, R.F. Bennett, Orrin G. Hatch.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. For the information of all Senators, under the provisions of rule XXII, this cloture vote will occur at Wednesday at a time to be determined by the two leaders, according to rule XXII—whichever.

I believe the Chair understands that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chair understands that the provisions under rule XXII will prevail.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I see no other Senator wishing to be recognized.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 Chair wishes to advise all Members who use time to expedite the debate. In the event Members are not here to debate the issue, we will proceed to the question.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VOID IN MORAL LEADERSHIP—PART III

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, President Clinton has once again failed to demonstrate leadership to the American people in the budget crisis.