

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 from 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.

The newspaper stories last week, reporting on the President's budget submission, missed the point. Like a straight man, the media dutifully reported on the budget using the standard White House spin—and with a straight face.

They reported that the budget would balance by 2002, just as the White House claims. Instead, they should have challenged its integrity. The balance part is all smoke and mirrors. Underneath, it is a brandnew box of steroids for big Government.

The media should have cried, "Stop the presses. Extra, extra, the era of big Government has returned. You see, the President pronounced in his State of the Union Address that the era of big Government is over.

That was 2 months ago. In other words, 2 short months after big Government was pronounced dead, it has miraculously resurrected.

Just look at this budget, Mr. President. Not a single government program terminated. They are all worthwhile—every last one of them, according to the President. Meanwhile, the Federal debt rises from \$4.9 to \$6.5 trillion in 6 years. Spending rises from \$1.6 to \$1.9 trillion.

How is it that the era of big Government can be pronounced over with this kind of a budget?

We have all heard the saying, "Put your money where your mouth is." We have also all heard the quote of former Attorney General John Mitchell: "You will be better advised to watch what we do instead of what we say." The budget is the fundamental statement of policy of any administration. In it, an administration puts its money where its mouth is. Except this administration. Its mouth is in shrinking Government; but, its money is in big Government.

With a discrepancy like this, which do we believe? The money or the mouth? Most insiders in this town, like John Mitchell did, know the answer. They know you will be better advised to watch what we do instead of what we say. I would submit, Mr. President, that that is why the presses did not stop when the President submitted his budget. The return of big Government was not big news.

The media must have been pretty skeptical 2 months ago of the President's pronouncement of the end of big government. They did not fall for the old soft shoe routine. They know well enough that, in this town, you watch what we do, not what we say. I have to hand it to fourth estate. They really know politicians.

Of course, they did have some clues about what to expect from the President. On June 4, 1992, Candidate Clinton told the country he would end deficit spending as we know it. He said "I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget." Since then, he submitted three no-year balanced budgets. Each one had rising deficits as far as the eye could see, usually around the figure of \$200 billion.

Even this budget—balanced in name only—will never balance in the real world. It lacks the integrity of true deficit reduction decisionmaking. It is the mañana budget. It puts everything off until mañana. A chimpanzee, banging away at a typewriter, would type out the entire Encyclopedia Britannica before the Clinton budget balances.

There are other clues of the old soft shoe routine. In September 1992, the President wrote, in "Putting People First," the following:

Middle class taxpayers will have a choice between a children's tax credit or a significant reduction in their income tax rate.

Yet, he just vetoed a children's tax credit. He did not even propose one until Republicans took control of the Congress.

Instead, he increased taxes more than any other President in the history of the Nation. He raised taxes too much. But do not take my word for it. Here is what the President himself said. At a fundraiser in Houston on October 17, 1995, Mr. Clinton said,

Probably there are people in this room still mad at me at that budget because you think I raised your taxes too much. It might surprise you that I think I raised them too much, too.

Mr. President, saying one thing and doing the opposite undermines one's moral authority to lead. That is the case with this President. There is a void in moral leadership in this White House. A good example for the Nation cannot be set when the President—any President—says one thing and does the opposite so consistently.

It is significant that such leadership has fallen to Congress which, as a body, is generally unsuited for moral leadership. Usually, it is the individual of the President who can hear the discordant voices of the Congress and the country, and unite them into harmony, into a single melody.

But in the absence of moral leadership in this White House, it was Congress—this Congress—that passed a balanced budget. The first balanced budget to be passed by any Congress in 27 years.

It was Congress that passed a children's tax credit. It was Congress that passed welfare reform. It was Congress that passed Medicare and Medicaid reform. It was Congress that passed a budget to end the era of big Government. These are all the items that the President pledged to do, but he did not do them. We did them.

Yet, what did he do in reality? He vetoed them. Balanced budget? Vetoed. Welfare reform? Vetoed. Medicare reform? Vetoed. Medicaid reform? Vetoed. Children's tax credits? Vetoed. This is the "Veto President." His policy is "Just Say No." This is the "Do-Nothing Presidency." The reason is simple—there is no moral leadership coming from the White House.

Some of us have tried to work with the President. I have found that, when he does what he says, we can work together. An example of that is the Presi-

dent's national service program, AmeriCorps. I have been warning the administration for 2 years that AmeriCorps needed to be reinvented. Arrogance appeared to be in the way. For 2 years, the administration resisted the obvious need for reform.

But any program that pays close to \$30,000 for a volunteer is in bad need of reinvention. AmeriCorps was giving boondoggles at the Pentagon a run for their money.

Under the new leadership of Harris Wofford—a former colleague of ours in the Senate—AmeriCorps is finally being reinvented. Two weeks ago, we held a joint press conference to announce the reinvention, and I pledged my support for their budget this year. We have heard lots about reinventing Government from this administration. They have done some good things. But they are just tinkering around the edges.

The Balanced Budget Act, passed last fall by this Congress, was a blueprint to reinvent the whole Federal Government. It did not have to be done our way. We would have worked with the White House on an alternative. But the White House refused to work for a real, credible balanced budget. There was a battle royale in the White House over the mind and soul of the President. The budget wonks lost out to the political operators.

The politicians argued that doing nothing would allow them to fund their special interests and maintain their voting base. Forget what is good for the country. They simply put reelection over reform. So the President followed the advice of the political operatives. The bloated ship of state steams along, on a rising tide of debt. Special interests are at the helm.

One of our colleagues in this body, Mr. President, understood this leadership problem in the White House last year. On October 21 of last year, he is quoted in the New York Times saying of President Clinton,

What troubles me is that after three years as president, he doesn't appear to know where he wants to lead America.

That quote is from a member of our President's own party, Mr. President. It is a quote from Senator BOB KERREY of Nebraska. I agree with him.

Even more to the point is the inability of the President to lead. And every time says one thing and does the opposite, he further erodes it.

It should have come as no surprise that politics would win out over fiscal sanity with this administration. Many of us had hoped a balanced budget was possible. We could have saved ourselves the trouble if we were not quite so optimistic. We should have done what the fourth estate did. We should have watched the President's actions, not his words.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I thank you very much. On the heels of that request, I also ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 20 minutes to give two statements for the RECORD.

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

## FARM BILL CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, as farmers in Minnesota and across the Nation enter this year's planting season, I rise today in support of the farm bill conference report Congress will consider later this week.

In the coming days, the Senate and the House, and ultimately the President, will have to make a choice: we will either revolutionize Federal agriculture policies as outlined in this conference report, or we will continue the failed, Washington-knows-best policies of the past 60 years. But that choice should be very clear, Mr. President.

After considerable delay, this much-needed legislation will give our agriculture communities a reasonable and responsible policy roadmap for the future.

In the short term, decisions about planting, equipment purchases, fertilizer and seed sales, and credit will no longer hang in the balance. In the long term, farmers will have less Government interference from Washington, giving them the flexibility to plant for what the marketplace demands—not what traditional Government crop payments have dictated.

I am also proud to note that this legislation is comprehensive and balanced when it comes to protecting our environmentally sensitive lands.

Foremost among these environmental provisions is the Conservation Reserve Program, more commonly known as the CRP. I have heard from many of my Minnesota constituents, including farmers and sportsmen and women, who are pleased to see that the CRP and Wetlands Reserve Program were recognized, maintained, and strengthened because of their high success rates. In Minnesota, these programs will further protect our highly erodible lands while expanding hunting and fishing opportunities.

Mr. President, overall this bill offers tremendous benefits to Minnesota's agriculture community, which already ranks among the Nation's most productive in many of the traditional raw and processed commodities.

For individual Minnesota farmers, this legislation will help meet the

needs of the growing number of value-added cooperatives and their customers who benefit from products such as ethanol. This in turn will help Minnesota's rural communities, which depend on high-output agriculture and value-added products for a large portion of income and jobs.

Farmers and others dedicated to protecting the environment will not be the only individuals helped by this legislation. The American taxpayers will also benefit from the \$2 billion in total budget savings that will go toward balancing the Federal budget.

No longer will this portion of the agricultural budget serve as a potential runaway entitlement, as we saw happen after the 1985 farm bill. Instead, taxpayers and farmers will now know well in advance the specific amount of Federal dollars involved in food production.

But while I enthusiastically support much of this bill because it works on behalf of both Minnesota's farm community and the American taxpayers, I must raise my strong concerns about its potential harm to Minnesota's dairy industry.

For years, dairy producers and processors in the Upper Midwest have struggled against the harmful impact of the archaic Federal milk marketing order scheme. This complex set of regulations has played a key role in the loss of over 10,000 dairy farms in Minnesota over the last decade—an average of nearly three farms every day.

I am pleased to see that this legislation pays some attention to reform of those archaic Federal dairy policies, specifically with the proposed consolidation of milk marketing orders and the elimination of costly budget assessments on producers. However, I must state for the record that continuation of milk marketing orders makes little sense, particularly when most other commodities in the bill are subject to declining Federal payments over a 7-year period.

Continuing the milk marketing orders is disappointing, but the bill's inclusion of the Northeast Dairy Compact provokes even greater concern among the members of Minnesota's dairy industry.

It should trouble my colleagues and their respective dairy industries when Congress authorizes more regulatory burdens and interstate trade barriers.

Unfortunately, that is exactly what happened during conference negotiations on the farm bill with the mysterious resurrection of the Northeast Dairy Compact.

Mr. President, many of my colleagues rightly thought the compact idea to be effectively defeated after we voted 50 to 46 to strike it out of the Senate's farm bill.

However, despite the clear message sent by the Senate, the compact has reappeared in the conference report.

Many of the compact's supporters will say that this is a compromise. After all, the Secretary of Agriculture

will now have to decide whether to allow the New England States to create a compact.

If authorized by the Secretary, the compact would only exist until the implementation of milk marketing orders takes place, which is 3 years from now.

Perhaps they are right. But we are still creating a bad precedent by making it easier for any region to set up its own monopoly. The Senate previously voted against the compact because it would ultimately result in a proliferation of antitrade barriers between the States and regions. At a time when we are trying to open up global markets for our Nation's farmers, it makes no sense to encourage protectionism within our own borders. Yet, that is exactly what the dairy compact would do.

In response to the compact, other regions will work to get similar regional monopolies enacted. For far too long, regional politics have made many farm programs the way they are today—archaic, unfair, unwise, and unworkable.

The purpose of this farm bill is to remove Government interference in the agricultural decisionmaking process and reduce the regional conflicts that have plagued our farm policy for years.

Creation of the Northeast Dairy Compact would accomplish just the opposite—it would expand the role of government across America at the expense of free-trade opportunities.

I will not stand for that and neither should any other Senator who voted against the compact last month. I urge my colleagues to join me in standing up for small dairy farmers across the country by cosponsoring a bill which I am introducing today to repeal the Northeast Dairy Compact.

Instead of compromising on free-market principles and retreating into the past, my bill will move America's dairy industry forward.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that the farm bill before us is obviously not a perfect piece of legislation. It does indeed have weaknesses, but I believe those weaknesses are outweighed by those provisions which move us in a more market-oriented direction.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on behalf of rural America, and on behalf of the taxpayers.

## THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, they are going to be handing out the Oscars tonight in Hollywood, honoring the film industry's best efforts at creating fantasy and make-believe. Well, we create a lot of that in Washington, too, and if it were a movie, the latest Clinton budget would be taking home the award for "Best Special Effects."

After all, it is a document that makes the impossible appear possible. It disguises reality with the smoke and mirrors that are staples of any good special effects team.