the country. We understand that. We hope good sense will prevail because the President has said he will veto this legislation. I think that is the reason Senator MURKOWSKI, the chairman of the committee, wants to come up with something that is going to be such that it will not create a fight here on the floor.

As the majority leader knows, we have enough votes to sustain a Presidential veto. We hope we will not get to the point where that is necessary.

Will the leader again state what the request is?

Mr. LOTT. The consent would be for the Senate to proceed to the nuclear waste bill, S. 1287, following passage of the bankruptcy bill.

Mr. REID. I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. I understood the Senator would object.

I think it is very important, though, that we move this legislation forward.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Having heard the objection then, I move to proceed to S. 1287 and send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The assistant 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 180, S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Amendments Act of 1999:

Trent Lott, Frank H. Murkowski, Jim Bunning, Thad Cochran, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Mike Crapo, Richard Shelby, Larry E. Craig, Craig Thomas, Judd Gregg, Jeff Sessions, Bob Smith of New Hampshire, Phil Gramm, Slade Gorton, Tim Hutchinson, and Don Nickles.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, the cloture vote will occur on Wednesday, February 2. I will notify Members when the time has been established. Of course, I will confer with the Democratic leadership about the exact time.

In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived and the cloture vote occur immediately following the passage of the bankruptcy bill after the use or yielding back of 30 minutes of debate time, equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object to that request of the leader, I am confident that request will be granted. I cannot do it right now, but I am sure we will be able to—my colleague from Nevada is on an airplane. I want to be able to confer with him. I think we will be able to do that without a problem.

Mr. LOTT. We appreciate that and look forward to conferring with the Senator on that. I will talk to Senator MURKOWSKI, too, about any plans he may have. I know he wants to get this done. But he is also sensitive to concerns that exist.

We will continue to work to find a way to make this happen.

Mr. REID. Mr. Leader, if I could say this, too. I say about Senator MURKOWSKI, we have been real adversaries on this issue, but I have to say that he has been a total gentleman about everything he has done on this. As bitter as are some of the pills he has asked us to swallow, the fact of the matter is he has never tried to surprise me. He has been very open and above board. I appreciate that very much about Senator MURKOWSKI.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we should go ahead and clarify, there was not objection to this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, I do not know how, procedurally, we are going to go about doing this. I have to talk to Senator BRYAN before I can allow this to go forward. I cannot do that right now. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Let me revise that request and/or that notification and see if we can get unanimous consent that we have the cloture vote on Wednesday, February 3. We will notify Members exactly what the time will be. In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived and then not put in the limiting of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Let me say, while I believe very strongly that this legislation needs to be passed and is an issue that has tremendous environmental consequences and concerns we have to address, I think the Senator from Nevada would also acknowledge that we have always been sensitive to the need for him and his colleague from Nevada to know what is going on, to not be surprised, have a chance to make their statements, offer amendments, and resist in every way. I am very sympathetic to the need for them to have that opportunity. We will protect their rights as we go forward. We appreciate the way the Senator has approached it also.

I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Wellstone amendment to the bankruptcy legislation.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 8 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized for 8 minutes.

DECISION TO SUSPEND EXECUTIONS IN ILLINOIS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, earlier today, Governor George Ryan of Illinois made an announcement that is absolutely unprecedented for a sitting governor since the reinstatement of the modern death penalty almost 25 years ago. Governor Ryan plans to effectively block executions in Illinois by granting stays of all scheduled executions on a case-by-case basis until a State panel can examine whether Illinois is administering the death penalty fairly and justly. Governor Ryan is right to take this step, because real questions are being raised about whether innocent people are being condemned to die.

Since the U.S. Supreme Court's 1976 Gregg decision finding the death penalty constitutional, Illinois has executed 12 people and and found 13 people on death row to be innocent. This is truly extraordinary. After condemning people to death, Illinois has actually found more death row inmates innocent than it has executed! Some of the innocent were exonerated based on a new DNA test of forensic evidence. Others successfully challenged their convictions based on inadequate representation by disbarred or suspended attorneys or a determination that crucial testimony of a jailhouse informant was unreliable. Illinois has exonerated 13 individuals but the numbers are sure to grow, as other cases continue to be investigated and appeals make their way through the courts.

What is even more troubling is that the lives of some of these 13 innocent people were saved not by the diligence of defense counsel or a jury or judge, but by a group of students taking a journalism class at Northwestern University. These Northwestern University students uncovered evidence, which led to the exoneration of people like Anthony Porter, who spent 15 years on death row and came within 2 days of execution. The criminal justice system failed to do its job. These students and their journalism professor—actors very much outside the criminal justice system—did the footwork to uncover exculpatory evidence. Governor Ryan supports the death penalty as a form of punishment in Illinois. I do not. But he has courageously acknowledged what many lawyers, scholars, and journalists have argued for some time: the criminal justice system in Illinois is broken and it must be fixed.

I applaud Governor Ryan for what is unfortunately unusual courage. Many political leaders, even those who may be personally opposed to the death penalty, nevertheless feel it is somehow ''political suicide'' to support a moratorium on executions. They fear being