

We are not going to get cloture. We have four or five absentees. We have two or three who have not seen the light on this side yet, maybe four. But despite all the horror stories, despite all the distortions and despite the desperate attempt to shift the focus of this debate—in fact, the President said on Saturday on the radio show if you adopt this bill, there are going to be more air crashes. And this is the same President a week ago who said we should be more civil, we should not make statements like this, we should treat everybody with civility. And he charges Republicans, on a bill like this, with air crashes, dirty meat, dirty water, dirty air, two or three other things. He did not have much time on the air. He mentioned three or four ridiculous, ludicrous, exaggerated statements like that.

We think we have made a lot of progress. We think this is a bipartisan effort. If I have missed something somewhere along the line, then I think we should try to address it. I am willing at any time to set down a schedule of amendments to finish this bill. I am ready to vote tomorrow morning, tomorrow noon on the big substitute. Maybe that is one way. Once we determine how that is going to come out, maybe that will move the debate.

I think we may as well vote. We do not have the votes. Those who are not ready for regulatory reform will vote "no." Those who are will vote "aye."

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 6 p.m. having arrived, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

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 pending substitute amendment to S. 343, the regulatory reform bill.

Bob Dole, Bill Roth, Fred Thompson, Spencer Abraham, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Jon Kyl, Chuck Grassley, Craig Thomas, Orrin Hatch, Larry E. Craig, Mitch McConnell, Conrad Burns, Bob Smith, Jesse Helms, Jim Inhofe, Judd Gregg.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

#### VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1487 to S. 343, the regulatory reform bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Are there other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 309 Leg.]

#### YEAS—48

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grams	Packwood
Brown	Grassley	Pell
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Coats	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Johnston	Snowe
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner

#### NAYS—46

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatfield	Pryor
Bumpers	Hollings	Reid
Byrd	Inouye	Robb
Chafee	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	
Exon	Levin	

#### NOT VOTING—6

Bennett	Kemphorne	McCain
Heflin	Kerrey	Pressler

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 46. Three-fifths of those duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Senator PRESSLER, was necessarily absent during the cloture vote on the Dole-Johnston substitute amendment to S. 343, the regulatory reform bill.

Senator PRESSLER was on his way back to Washington from Sioux Falls, SD, but has experienced a number of flight delays due to mechanical difficulties and weather surveillance. Had Senator PRESSLER been here for the vote, he would have voted to invoke cloture.

(At the request of Mr. DOLE, the following statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE

• Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent during rollcall vote No. 309 on the motion to invoke cloture on the Dole-Johnston substitute amendment to S. 343, the comprehensive regulatory reform bill. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted in the affirmative.

I was unable to be here for the vote due to a number of travel problems that occurred on my flights from Sioux Falls to Washington, DC. Specifically, the aircraft that was to have taken me from Sioux Falls to Minneapolis was kept on the ground due to mechanical problems. The delay, in fact, forced me to take a later flight on another plane. I was further delayed at Minneapolis due to weather surveillance. I regret this series of flight delays prevented me from being present during the cloture vote earlier this evening.

• Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise today to explain my absence from the floor during Senate vote No. 309 to invoke cloture on S. 343. I was necessarily detained on my return flight to Washington, DC, due to severe weather conditions causing flight delays. Had I been present for vote No. 309, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, as an original cosponsor of Majority Leader DOLE's regulatory reform package, I am delighted to have this opportunity to discuss the many benefits to be gained from its enactment. For perhaps the first time, we are confronting the astoundingly sensible idea that the regulations we impose at the Federal level should reflect risk-assessment and cost-benefit analyses. These important tools will ensure that limited dollars are spent on solving our most serious problems and in turn will return the greatest results.

Throughout this debate, we have been treated to a barrage of rhetoric from naysayers, the opponents of common-sense regulating. Those in favor of realistic balance have been portrayed as coldhearted calculators determined to destroy the environment, eradicate the safe workplace, and jeopardize the health of every American.

Mr. President, that simply is not true.

Regulations imposed by the Federal Government should bear a direct relationship to the potential risk to public health, safety, and the environment. They should also reflect a significant benefit for the costs incurred.

Those dual considerations form the centerpiece of the Dole-Johnson substitute.

The measure directs Federal agencies to conduct a cost-benefit analysis for major regulations, defined as having a gross annual economic impact of \$50 million in reasonably quantifiable direct and indirect costs. Where appropriate, standardized risk assessments reflecting the best available science also would be conducted, with public participation and peer review. Since many speakers have preceded me, I will not belabor the specific provisions of this package.

Earlier this year, the Environment and Public Works Committee, on which I have served for 9 years, held a hearing on the impact of regulatory reform

proposals on environmental and other statutes. That hearing confirmed a glaring certainty: Federal agencies are not using the discretion at their disposal to adequately consider or appropriately weigh costs and benefits. Burdensome Government regulations are imposing significant costs on our national economy, our productivity, and our ability to compete in the global marketplace. To reverse that trend, we must include cost-containment features and regulatory impact analyses whenever any new Federal regulation is considered. Agencies should be required to include sound science before they promulgate rules and regulations anew; the public should be allowed to petition for the review of risk assessments made by agencies.

Mr. President, less regulation will not result in less protection for the public if our dollars are used efficiently. On the contrary, the net effect of using sound science and real risk assessment to prioritize regulations would be more real protection. Best of all, that enhanced protection of health and safety would be cost-effective.

We are all aware that life will always involve some risk—we cannot and should not attempt to protect everyone from every possible degree of risk. Instead, we must prioritize on the basis of definitive risk factors. Each rule must be carefully scrutinized; choices must be based on relative risks and associated costs.

My interest in regulatory reform has been honed further by my membership on another committee—Agriculture.

I am deeply concerned with the economic health of the agriculture community, especially that of the family farmer. One of the most debated issues concerning agriculture and agricultural chemicals today is the so-called Delaney clause. Under its restrictions, pesticide residues found in processed foods are considered food additives. The Delaney clause prohibits the inclusion of any chemicals or additives in processed foods, including pesticides and inert ingredients, which have been found to be carcinogenic in humans or animals.

Ironically, the very good intention of the Delaney clause—to protect consumers from unsafe exposure to chemicals which might induce cancer—is being subverted. Technological advances which make it possible to detect trace compounds in parts per trillion and greater have made the zero risk standard of the Delaney clause unreasonable. The very scientific advancements which should be enhancing consumer safety are instead hindering. It would be far more reasonable to institute a negligible risk standard. For carcinogens, such a standard would represent an upper-bound risk of 1 in 1 million over a lifetime, calculated using conservative risk assessment methods. Again, we are talking about a matter of sensible risk assessment.

Mr. President, listening to this debate, I have had to ask myself why

anyone would not want to see beneficial rules and regulations, which protect from real risk while outweighing their costs. At a time when budgetary constraints are a serious priority, we should—we must—spend those scarce dollars wisely. Regulations associated with high levels of risk undoubtedly may be expensive to comply with, but if they are deemed necessary to protect the national health, safety, and the environment, the compliance costs will be money well spent.

However, excessive rules and regulations associated with minimal public risk amounts to hunting fleas with an elephant gun. It is neither fair nor reasonable to ask the taxpayers to bear such expense.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I hope we can now agree on a time to vote on the substitute. We have had a lot of debate on the substitute. I hope we can reach an agreement before we depart, with the managers, on when we can vote on the Glenn substitute—hopefully tomorrow morning or by noon tomorrow.

There will be no more votes tonight. I think the first thing we want to do is have a vote on the substitute and perhaps we can reach some agreement on that.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that I may have a few moments to speak as in morning business to introduce a bill and make a few remarks.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1043 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there has been much discussion lately about the future of the U.S. Postal Service. Should the Postal Service be freed from current statutory restrictions in order to become more competitive? Should the Postal Service be privatized?

Many observers believe there are problems which need to be resolved in order for the Postal Service to continue into the next century. Unfortunately, there is not a consensus on the solutions to the problems—and, indeed, not everyone agrees that there are problems which require changes in current law.

As part of the ongoing review of the Postal Service, I received a paper written by Murray Comarow. Mr. Comarow served as the Executive Director of President Johnson's Commission on Postal Reorganization in the late 1960's and was a Senior Assistant Postmaster General.

In the paper he urges the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to analyze the root causes of the Postal Service's problems and recommend

changes. He suggests that perhaps the Postal Rate Commission and the requirement for binding arbitration with employee unions be eliminated, and that the Postal Service should have the ability to close small, unprofitable post offices if service could be maintained through other means such as leasing space in local businesses.

In addition, Mr. Comarow observes that the monopoly on first-class letters as well as universal service at a uniform price should be maintained. However, the Postal Service should be able to compete for large contracts and offer experimental services, and he does not believe that employees should be given the right to strike—a right not possessed by any other Federal employees.

Mr. President, I do not here pass judgment on the conclusions reached by Mr. Comarow, but he provides an historical reference and raises some issues which ought to be considered during any debate on the future of the Postal Service. In the interest of reducing costs, I will not ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Comarow's paper be reprinted in the Congressional RECORD. Copies of the complete paper can be obtained by contacting Mr. Comarow directly at 4990 Sentinel Drive, No. 203, Bethesda, MD, 20816-3582.

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

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

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Again, Mr. President, I do not think the Senate is in order for my friend to speak, any more than it was when I was speaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate will come to order.

The Senator from Ohio.

#### HEMOPHILIA AND HIV

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, the Institute of Medicine—or IOM—last Thursday released the findings of a major investigation into how America's hemophilia community came to be decimated by the HIV virus. It is a very sad and compelling story.

In the early 1980's, America's blood supply was contaminated with HIV. Many Americans have become HIV-positive by transfusions of the HIV-tainted blood.

One particular group of Americans has been extremely hard-hit by this