

have created in our efforts to achieve clean air and clean water.

So we recognize that a moratorium is an extreme measure that, frankly, does not work. It is an extreme measure that may have been part of a 100-day plan in the House. Nevertheless, I do not care whether we take 1,000 days in the State, it is not something that we can support here.

Let me also commend Senators GLENN and LEVIN for their work over the last couple of days. They have improved the original version of the regulatory veto in a very significant way. I think their efforts have given even greater life and support to the concept that Senators REID and NICKLES have presented to the Senate in the regulatory veto.

Let me just say in closing, Mr. President, that this is an example of the moderating influence of the Senate. We have seen extreme measures acted upon in the House over the last couple of months. Those extreme measures are not ones that we feel very comfortable with on this side of Capitol Hill. Indeed, we had similar reactions to the House proposals on unfunded mandates, congressional coverage, and line-item veto, and a number of very important pieces of legislation.

Because of the moderating influence of the Senate, because of the ability of Democrats and Republicans to work together more effectively, we have been able to take the extreme proposals and put them away, hopefully for good, and pass legislation that many of us are very pleased to support.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this year we are going to be involved in a very significant debate about the Conservation Reserve Program. From time to time, I want to address the Senate on various agricultural-related issues. Perhaps one of the most important of all is the Conservation Reserve Program. It has touched nearly every facet of life in rural States, including that of the distinguished Presiding Officer. It has reduced soil erosion, it has substantially increased wildlife habitat, it has improved water quality, and it has reduced crop surpluses.

As I look back at the many programs that Congress has contemplated, considered, and ultimately enacted in the last 10 years, I think one would be hard pressed to find a program that has worked better than the CRP. No program has more effectively invested Federal dollars in natural resources than has the CRP. As a consequence of the program's tremendous success, it enjoys broad support from agricultural groups, conservation groups, environmental groups, and virtually everybody else in rural America.

Mr. President, 2.1 million of the 36.4 million acres enrolled in the CRP are located in my State. In South Dakota, the erosion rate on CRP land fell from

12 tons an acre to just over 1 ton an acre over the last 10 years—a dramatic reduction in destructive and wasteful erosion. All told, the CRP has generated a reduction of soil erosion in my State alone of over 22 million tons.

Nationwide, soil erosion has decreased by 19 tons per acre. So the program has had an even greater effect in other States than it has had in South Dakota.

Chart 1 shows where the bulk of the success has been. The red depicts those areas where we have seen significant soil erosion reduction—the Mountain States, the southern plains, and the northern plains, which includes, of course, South Dakota. We have seen about 126 million tons of soil erosion reduction in the Mountain States; 145 million tons of soil erosion reduction in our area of the country; and in the southern plains, we have seen the greatest success story of all, 170 million tons in soil erosion reduction.

So in every part of the country, we have seen a substantial degree of progress in reduction of soil erosion. But if you look more carefully at the chart you will see that where the greatest potential lies for soil erosion, where we saw the greatest consequences of soil erosion in the past, we have now seen the greatest progress. That really, in one picture alone, depicts what I consider to be the success story of CRP over the last 10 years.

Simply looking at the topsoil savings really does not tell the whole story, however. Costs to society of impaired water quality from farmland erosion are \$208 billion a year. We are substantially preserving and improving water quality through the CRP because it idles so much highly erodible land.

The CRP has also had a significant positive effect on several species that were endangered. The prairie chicken and the sharp-tailed grouse were threatened and endangered species. Those have come back to flourish as a result of the efforts in CRP.

More than 85 percent of the CRP acres have now been planted to grasses. The CRP also has fostered tree plantings on 3,600 square miles. That, Mr. President, is the equivalent of Yosemite and Glacier National Parks combined. In a sense, with the CRP, we have actually created the equivalent of two new national parks, if you just consider the effect in tree plantings alone. So the program has created a substantial new incentive to plant trees and, obviously, when trees are planted, it is far less likely that the enrolled land will come back into production in the future.

In my State, of course, pheasants are very prominent, and we are very proud of the fact that we are probably the pheasant capital of the world. We have attracted 128,000 hunters in 1993 who spent more than \$50 million in our rural communities. More than \$13 billion in resource-based benefits to soci-

ety have been generated by the CRP over the life of the program.

So I guess the short summary is, Mr. President, if you look at endangered species, if you look at the tree plantings, if you look at the consequences for recreation and tourism—and in my State, something I love personally to do, the opportunities for more pheasant, goose, and duck hunting—CRP has vastly expanded the opportunities to do the kinds of things that we go out West to do each and every year.

CRP has also had significant consequences with regard to reductions in Federal spending. We have saved the Federal Treasury \$16 million in subsidy payments just in 1 year alone by removing the marginal lands from production. We save money in large measure because the CRP gives farmers an opportunity to do something other than plant for the program on their highly erodible acres. It is no longer necessary for producers to plant their erodible land just to get deficiency payments, to get disaster payments, or to get whatever other payments the Federal Government may have. Now, CRP gives them an ecologically and economically sound alternative.

In South Dakota, nearly 1.5 million cropland base acres were enrolled into the CRP. If commodities had been planted on this land, taxpayers would have paid crop subsidy payments on these acres, and the figure would have been millions of dollars more than what it is right now.

Chart 2 depicts really the anticipated result of what would happen if we lost the CRP in the future. The post-contract CRP land uses have been the subject of a good deal of discussion. What we see here is that all of the green would be what we anticipate going back into production. There would be plant to crop, 43 percent; cash rent to other farmers, 13 percent; annual set-asides, 4 percent; and, of course, some would go into the 0/92 program.

In essence, you have a good percentage of current CRP acreage that would go back into the same kind of production activity that we experienced in the mid-1980's, that massive production was one of the primary causes of the cataclysmic economic situation that rural America experienced in the mid-1980's.

The contracts begin to expire this year, and over half of the CRP contracts will expire by 1997. All will expire by the year 2001. Only 63 percent of contract holders now plan to return the CRP acres. That is this green that I have mentioned. Only 9 percent would voluntarily keep their land in wildlife habitat or trees. That is something we hope to expand dramatically. Obviously, 9 percent is a good start, but we have to go a lot further than 9 percent if, indeed, the CRP will have the lasting benefits that we all hope it will have.

The third chart depicts, Mr. President, the effect of the CRP on the actual farm program itself.

When all CRP contracts expire, wheat and sorghum prices may actually fall by 36 cents. The effects of CRP on farm program expenditures and prices are even more impressive in the aggregate. This chart depicts the millions of dollars we can save with the continuation of the CRP. As you can see, continued enrollment of 50 percent of the CRP acres are depicted in the purple; 100 percent in the red. For example, if in 1996, 100 percent of the CRP acres are reenrolled, as we hope they will be, we could actually save about \$100 million in farm program expenditures. But the real savings come in the outyears. The program could generate savings in the years 2000 and 2001 of over \$1.5 billion a year. As you can plainly see, a substantial amount of savings is generated as a result of the CRP.

I am very hopeful that people will understand that CRP generates those savings, in large measure, because the program effectively helps manage the supply of many program crops. If we lose this supply management tool, sorghum prices would fall 36 cents; barley prices would fall 53 cents; corn prices would fall 6 cents; and oats prices would fall 17 cents. Without the CRP, we would, once again, be forced to consider more dramatic efforts to try to bring balance to commodity prices by increasing farm program benefits and outlays.

CRP can certainly be improved, Mr. President. We want rental rate reform. We want expanded economic uses of CRP acreage, including limited haying and grazing. We want partial field enrollments. We want management to control noxious weeds. We want competitive bids for enrollment. We want sensible reform. And I think we can build a strong, bipartisan consensus in support of continuing the CRP and reforming it to ensure that its benefits will grow in the future.

I know that there are those who are here to resume debate and consideration of amendments on the Reid-Nickles legislation.

At this time I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I think time is now controlled. I wonder if the Senator from Nevada will yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could say to my friend from Oklahoma, it is my understanding that there is a Republican Senator who wishes to speak for a couple minutes; Senator BOXER wishes to speak for a couple minutes; and Senator LEVIN for 6 minutes. It is my understanding that the majority leader also wishes to speak prior to the vote. Is that true?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 10:50 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could, with the approval of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Michigan wishes 2 minutes; the Senator from California, 2 minutes; the Senator from Texas, 2 minutes. Is that true?

Mr. NICKLES. Yes.

Mr. REID. Could we have that, and the remainder of the time will be split between me and the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. NICKLES. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the American people are winning a double victory today here in the Senate. First, we are defeating the regulatory moratorium. This bill that came over from the House was a reckless and arbitrary bill. It caught all new regulations in its web. Even health and safety regulations would have been stymied, which are important to gaining uniform, high-quality mammograms; new regulations that would have protected children from unsafe toys; new regulations that would have protected the American people from *E. coli* bacteria. All of those would have been caught and stymied in the House regulatory moratorium. It was a bad, reckless, arbitrary bill. It is important that the Senate stop it, and we did stop it. For that, I think the American people can claim victory No. 1.

Victory No. 2 is that we are passing legislative veto or legislative review. It is long overdue that Congress take the responsibility to look at the regulations which come out of the regulatory process and to have a realistic opportunity to veto those regulations which are excessive, which cannot be justified by the benefits, and which are not carrying out legislative intent.

For 15 years, I have fought for legislative veto. When I came here, I introduced and got passed, with Senator Boren and others, legislative veto legislation. Today's generic legislative veto or review legislation is a great victory for the American people. It will put the responsibility here to look at regulations one on one, not to sweep all regulations into a net and to sweep out the good with the bad, but to force Congress to take responsibility to look at regulations one on one and to veto those which are excessive or cannot be justified by the benefits.

Finally, Mr. President, we must make sure that in conference this so-called moratorium stays dead. It does not belong on the books, and it is now up to the Senate not just to win these two victories for the American people today, but to maintain these two victories as we proceed to conference with the House.

I congratulate the Senators from Oklahoma and Nevada for this legislative review mechanism. It is a very significant achievement. They are to be congratulated for their efforts. I also thank Senator GLENN for the work he has put in on this bill.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to congratulate Senators REID and NICKLES for drafting the alternative to the regulatory moratorium bill passed by the House. The truth is almost anything would be better than the House bill, but in fact the Nickles-Reid bill is a very reasonable response to the problem of unreasonable regulations.

It is good to see the Senate playing the role the Founding Fathers intended for it. We have rejected a poorly conceived and inadequately considered House bill and offered instead a reasonable and workable solution, one that does not relinquish our responsibility to public health and safety.

Unfortunately, this responsible alternative must be conferenced with the draconian House bill. Our Republican colleagues say they will try to convince House conferees that the Nickles-Reid bill is a better approach, but they also say they continue to support the moratorium itself. Let me be very clear about this: I oppose a regulatory moratorium, and if the conferees return to the Senate with anything like it, I will filibuster it.

A moratorium would bring to a dead stop scores of sensible rules, including safety standards to protect our children from food poisoning, our workers from cancer-causing indoor air pollution, and our elderly people from deadly contaminants in tap water.

A moratorium is bad for California and bad for the Nation. It would stop needed health and safety standards and do nothing to address the underlying problems that produce unreasonable, burdensome, or unnecessary regulations.

Let us look at some of the standards that would be stopped by the House bill.

SAFER MEAT AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

The moratorium would stop new meat and poultry inspection rules proposed by the USDA. These rules would help end the threat that has killed hundreds of Americans in the past few years, including Eric Mueller, a 13-year-old from Oceanside, CA.

In late 1993, Eric died from eating a fast-food cheeseburger tainted with the *E. coli* bacteria. Eric had been his class president, on his school's honor roll, captain of his soccer team, an assistant coach for his little sister's soccer team, a member of his school's surfing team, a member of the school band, and a member of Oceanside's all-star Little League baseball team.

Death by *E. coli* poisoning is a very painful and tortuous death. Eric's father recently testified before the Governmental Affairs Committee to protest the regulatory moratorium. He told the committee:

As a parent standing by and watching my only son go through incredible agony and pain before he lost consciousness and died, was something I don't even wish on my worst

growth, behavioral, or developmental problems. The principal source of lead exposure is lead-based paint.

Regulations that are set to become effective October 28, 1995, require that people be notified about the potential danger associated with lead-based paints used in homes built prior to 1978. Until the regulations are in place, the kind of tragedy that happened to the Sauser's will happen again and again. In fact, after the house that poisoned the Sauser's two sons was repossessed, it was sold to another unsuspecting family with three young children.

Implementation of the USDA's proposed rules to improve meat and poultry inspection would help prevent or reduce the 20,000 illnesses a year and 500 deaths a year from E. coli bacteria. According to the Centers for Disease Control, foodborne illness from all food sources range from 6.5 million to 81 million cases each year, and up to 9,000 deaths. We cannot afford to impose a moratorium that would simply cause more needless death and injury from contaminated meat.

PROTECTION FROM LEAD CONTAMINATION

The moratorium would also leave American children vulnerable to the ravages of lead poisoning. This is a totally preventable tragedy that strikes families all across the nation.

In 1990 the Sauser family bought a 67-year-old home in Kalamazoo, MI, which they decided to renovate themselves. The Sausers were never informed of the possibility of lead-based paint hazards. The family refurbished hardwood floors, repaired cracks in the plaster, and scraped and sanded old paint from the windowsills, door frames, and walls, unaware that renovation work that disturbs lead-based paint can create serious lead poisoning hazards.

Six months into the renovations, 2½-year-old Jonathan began acting up—he was easily excited, easily frustrated, and violent. Soon after Jonathan's negative behavior change, Margaret Sauser became pregnant with their second son. Although Cameron was born a little early, he seemed healthy. Then, at 11 months, his weight and height, which had been in the 95th percentile at his birth, dropped to the 25th percentile. It also became clear that he was not progressing in speech or movement as a healthy baby should. Meanwhile, Jonathan was still throwing himself into walls.

Eventually both boys were diagnosed as lead poisoned. The poisoning had come from their home's lead pipes and by the dust created by their home's renovation. The lead hazard in the home was so severe that no matter how much cleaning, mopping, and washing the parents did, the boys' blood lead levels continued to climb.

The family could not afford to move and eventually had to declare bankruptcy in order to get the boys into lead-safe housing. At age 2, Cameron Sauser has hearing loss and is developmentally delayed. His big brother Jonathan, now age 6, is still hyperactive and doctors believe he has attention deficit disorder due to lengthy exposure to lead and possible neurological damage.

Some 1.7 million American children have blood lead levels high enough to cause reading and learning disabilities, reduced IQ and attention span, and

growth, behavioral, or developmental problems. The principal source of lead exposure is lead-based paint.

Regulations that are set to become effective October 28, 1995, require that people be notified about the potential danger associated with lead-based paints used in homes built prior to 1978. Until the regulations are in place, the kind of tragedy that happened to the Sauser's will happen again and again. In fact, after the house that poisoned the Sauser's two sons was repossessed, it was sold to another unsuspecting family with three young children.

According to HUD, approximately 57 million pre-1978 housing units contain lead-based paint, of which 13.2 million contain chipping and peeling lead-based paint. EPA has proposed certification and training standards for lead-based paint testing and abatement work. These regulations will ensure such work will be done in a safe manner, but would be delayed by a moratorium.

DRINKING WATER STANDARDS

Public health in the United States also continues to be threatened by contaminated drinking water. Under the current Safe Drinking Water Act that is being criticized as overly burdensome—a law approved by a Republican-controlled Senate by a vote of 94 to 0 and signed into law by President Ronald Reagan—people all across America have been getting sick and even dying from drinking tap water.

In 1987, 13,000 people became ill in Carrollton, GA, as a result of bacterial contamination in their drinking water. In 1990, 243 people became ill and 4 died as a result of E. coli bacteria in the drinking water in Cabool, MO. In 1992, 15,000 people were sickened by contaminated drinking water in Jackson, County, OR. And in late 1993, over 400,000 people in Milwaukee became ill and 120 died as a result of drinking the water from their taps.

The House regulatory moratorium bill would disrupt efforts to establish a new rule on microbiological contaminants in drinking water supplies. The new safety standards, produced by a team consisting of industry, State, and local government and citizen representatives would protest against cryptosporidium, E. coli, and other contaminants. The moratorium would delay the information collection necessary to finalize the standards.

SECOND-HAND SMOKE

The moratorium would also delay OSHA's proposed rule to protect workers against second-hand smoke in the workplace. According to the American Lung Association, environmental tobacco smoke causes an estimated 3,000 lung cancer deaths, 12,000 non-lung cancer deaths, and 35,000 to 40,000 deaths from cardiovascular disease each year. The Association also estimates that 14 million to 36 million non-smoking adults are exposed to environmental tobacco smoke at work. Those workers are 34 percent more likely to

develop lung cancer than those who work in smoke-free environments.

I should say a word about some of these regulations and the argument that the moratorium might not affect them. As the Senate sponsor of the moratorium says, the rules on E. coli and cryptosporidium might come under the "imminent threat to public health or safety" exemption of his bill. But he has been asked repeatedly for a definition of "imminent threat" from the bill's backers and has yet to respond. Would the rules on lead contamination or indoor smoke come under the exemption? What about the bay-delta water accord that is so important to my State of California? Because we have no definition of imminent threat it is impossible to say.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA ACCORD

I believe that the exemption would not apply to rules like the one implementing the historic bay-delta agreement—an agreement that will have major repercussions in California and all across the country.

Late last year, California farmers, bankers, municipalities, and environmentalists all came together to approve a plan to provide the certainty they need to allocate water in the San Francisco Bay-Delta among competing users. The agreement is a direct result of years of negotiation, and provides a blueprint for managing fresh water supplies, minimizing water quality impacts on San Francisco Bay, and providing the assurances that the financial community needs to support economic activities throughout California.

The beneficiaries of the agreement, memorialized in an EPA rule finalized in January, are the consumers of food produced with delta water—45 percent of the Nation's fruit and vegetable production—and the 20 million Californians who rely on the delta for drinking water.

Due to the lack of an agreement, no new investment decisions had been made with respect to new canals, major construction projects, water allocation, alternative sources of water supply, canal systems, or reservoir management in the bay-delta for the last 20 years.

The moratorium could void the agreement and eliminate the opportunity it offers to maintain the delta as a viable source of drinking and irrigation water. Long-term use of the bay-delta as a viable source of water would be threatened because of overuse and lack of coordination among the millions of users of bay-delta water, especially during droughts. Vacating the agreement could threaten the State of California's credit rating and our economy.

TRUTH IN POULTRY LABELING

Finally, Mr. President, the moratorium would stop a very simple rule designed to protect consumers against fraud every time they go to buy a chicken or turkey at the supermarket.

Current law allows poultry that has been frozen hard as a bowling ball to be thawed out and labeled "fresh" for sale to consumers—consumers who will pay significantly more for a fresh project.

In January the Agriculture Department proposed a commonsense rule to restrict the use of the term "fresh" to poultry that has never been kept frozen. In fact, this was actually just a reissuance of a rule that was first proposed at the end of the Reagan administration and then shelved. The moratorium would add at least another year to the delays that began in 1988. While 8 years is far too long for consumers to wait for basic truth in labeling, the 45-day review period contemplated by the Nickles-Reid bill is not unreasonable.

Mr. President, like many of the provisions of the Contract With America, the regulatory moratorium may look at first glance, but it begins to look pretty ugly upon closer examination. The moratorium is nothing more than a valentine to industry, to polluters, to the tobacco companies, and others who would prefer not to live up to the responsibilities we all share to our neighbors, our communities, and our Nation.

Our responsibility is to improve the lives of all the American people, not just the bottom line of the corporations. We must do the hard work to produce real regulatory reform—not walk away by putting a stop to all regulations, reasonable and unreasonable alike.

I agree with Senator GLENN that we should simply declare the moratorium dead. The 45-day review provided in the Reid-Nickles bill will give Congress another chance to stop the unintended consequences of well-intentioned regulations before they burden the American people. If the bill comes back from conference in this form, I will give it my full support. However, if it comes back looking like a moratorium, on behalf of the people of my State and the 49 others, I will stand on this floor as long as it takes to stop it.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Texas 2 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, on the day that President Clinton gave the last State of the Union Address during which he talked about reducing the regulatory burden, his administration published over 300 pages of new regulations in the Federal Register. In fact, in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, the level of regulatory burden, as measured by the number of pages in the Federal Register, has been higher than the first 2 years of any President in the history of the United States. Despite all of the rhetoric to the contrary, the Clinton administration is imposing more regulations than any administration at a comparable point in that administration's term in the history of the United States of America.

I congratulate our leader here, DON NICKLES, for bringing to a final vote a bill that does make some marginal improvement. But this bill is a far cry

from the original bill. I think a regulatory moratorium is called for. I think it is something that is needed. I am still strongly in support of it. And while you might say this is a kiss, it is a kiss from your sister and not your sweetheart.

This is not something that is going to dramatically change American Government. The Congress is already burdened with doing what it is doing. The idea that we will be able to go through regulations and assess them, I think, is fairly unrealistic.

There will be one positive result that will come out of it, however. That is, we will be able to do zero in on some items where clearly the Federal Government is dramatically increasing the cost of doing business, dramatically limiting our ability to create jobs, and making decisions through regulations that do not make any sense.

So, this is a marginal improvement. This is a long way from a victory. I think the House approach was better. I intend to vote for this because it is an improvement on the current procedure.

This is not the end of this debate. This is the first short step in trying to bring rationality to Government regulations which, today, cost the average American family \$5,000 a year.

Something has got to be done about these regulations. This is a marginal improvement. This is a long way from victory.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Texas 2 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership on this issue.

I was one of the original cosponsors of the moratorium bill. I would like to say to my senior colleague from Texas that I agree with everything he said. But I would just add that a kiss from your sister is better than no kiss at all.

I think it is very important that we understand that we are taking a giant first step toward reining in regulators that have gone far beyond congressional intent.

Some people say, "We really do not have the right in Congress to assess what regulators do." To them I would say, "If we do not have the right, who in the world does?"

Why are the regulators out there? They are out there implementing congressional legislation. If Congress does not rein them in and say, "You are not doing what we intended for you to do in implementing our laws," who will? The answer is, no one will.

It is our responsibility to rein in regulators to whom we have authorized implementation of the laws that we pass. The buck stops here.

With this bill today, we are taking the responsibility that we have to the people of America, to the small business people of America. We are saying "We are going to look at everything the people we have delegated our authority are doing, and hopefully we are

going to bring common sense into the process."

I hope our colleagues will vote for this today. It will give Members that first measure to say the regulators have gone beyond where we wanted them to go, and we are going to have a say.

Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the Chair advise the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Oklahoma how much time we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). There are 3 minutes on each side remaining.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Business Week on the 23d day of January of this year, wrote, among other things:

Lately there has been a wave of creative regulatory reform at both State and Federal levels, relying on such devices as free competition under price caps and mandated cost sharing by competitors. Such reforms are designed to reconcile the contradictory goals of universal service and increased competition.

Mr. President, the reason I mention this is that we have a magazine such as Business Week, we have entities such as the chemical manufacturers saying regulations are good if they are handled properly. And that is what this substitute deals with. If we handle regulations properly, as we will do after this, this is a giant step forward for the American business communities and the American people, in general.

I believe, as I have stated on this floor the last 2 days, that there will be by the Federal bureaucracy, a more stringent review of regulations than we intend to promulgate. Why? Because we legally have the right to veto those regulations.

This, Mr. President, is good. It is an indication that bipartisan work in this Chamber can produce good legislation. This final product is the result of not only the work of the Senator from Oklahoma and this Senator, but also the good work done by the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, and a number of individuals on both sides of the aisle who have worked toward making this more meaningful legislation.

I indicated yesterday I appreciate the work of the Senator from Oklahoma. I want to reiterate that. The work that he has done has been exemplary in being able to listen to both sides and then make decisions. We have been able to work together on this.

This legislation, Mr. President, will go a long way to meeting what the American public said they want. That is, they want product without people taking credit for it. There is no party that can take credit for this legislation. It is a product of the Senate of the United States. We will work very hard to make sure that this bill that will pass out of here by a very large margin is the final product that comes

out of this Congress and be sent to the President.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to thank my friend and colleague from Nevada, Senator REID, for his leadership not only on this amendment but on several other issues that we have had the pleasure of working on in the past.

Also, Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator BOND and Senator HUTCHISON for their cooperation and leadership, as well as Senator LEVIN and Senator GLENN for their contributions in making this bill a reality. Hopefully, this bill will become law.

Mr. President, during this process I have heard a several comments regarding this legislation. Some people are still debating the regulatory moratorium passed by the House. I have heard that it is bad and reckless and if it passed we will have E. coli in meats, and we will have cryptosporidium in our water, and people are going to die.

I disagree with that assertion. The original regulatory moratorium did have problems, but frankly it was not that it was too strong but that it had numerous exceptions that could have left the bill inadequate.

I want to get the attention of my friend from Texas, Senator GRAMM, because I think this is a better bill than the original regulatory moratorium.

One of the reasons is because the strength of original moratorium has mischaracterized by saying such things as saying E. coli regulations would be stopped. That is false, because there are broad exceptions to exempt regulations such as the E. coli regulations. The bill that passed the House and the bill that passed the Governmental Affairs Committee had lots of exceptions—enough exceptions to drive trucks through.

We started out with 8 exceptions, and it ended up 10 or 12, and frankly these exceptions gave the President complete discretion to determine any exception that he would want.

Also, I might mention and tell my friend from Texas that the House bill was temporary, it would only last until we passed permanent regulatory reform. That is probably going to happen in 60 days. It is a temporary moratorium.

The bill the Senate is about to adopt is a permanent moratorium on new significant regulations. If this bill becomes law, it will still be in effect 3 years from now, 5 years from now. And so Congress will have a chance to review significant regulations. It is a moratorium on significant regulations of 45 days. During this 45-day moratorium, Congress would have the opportunity to repeal those regulations and reject them if we felt it was necessary.

I think this is a vital improvement to regulatory process. It is not a panacea. It is not a cure-all, but this gives Congress a chance to carry out its oversight responsibility in making sure that excessive regulations can be stopped.

We also have the opportunity, I might tell my colleagues, to review the regulations that are not classified as significant but yet we find are troublesome or confusing or do not make sense. We would have a chance to review those, to reject those, to repeal those.

So I would just urge my colleagues to take a close look. I will urge my colleagues in the House to look at this legislation and to realize that their temporary moratorium would have no effect probably in 60 days because we will pass comprehensive regulatory reform legislation.

The bill before us today has a chance to become law and have a significant impact for the for years into the future, and therefore, in my opinion, is a far superior piece of legislation than the original regulatory moratorium legislation.

I urge my colleagues to adopt it. I think it is a big step in the right direction. I also want to say that we have had good support from Democrats and Republicans.

This idea, I might mention, came from a State representative in the State of Oklahoma, Danny George, who contacted my staff. I think it is an excellent idea. I am hopeful it will be agreed upon by a very large margin, that the House would concur, the President would sign it, and we would take a giant step toward real regulation reform this year. I thank my colleagues. I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to make two points regarding the efforts made in the Senate to craft meaningful regulatory reform.

First, let me say I support the efforts we are making in the Senate to reform Government regulations and I look forward to participating in this bipartisan effort to make Government more effective and meaningful. Everyone has examples of Government regulations that have gone too far, become too onerous, or have otherwise disrupted peoples' lives. This is not the goal of the House-passed regulatory moratorium proposal, however, which brings me to my second point.

I have serious objections to any measure that would jeopardize public health and safety by suspending Federal rules on health, safety, or the environment. As a legislative body, our job is not to police the rest of Government; but it is to enable legislation that sets in motion solutions. It would be irresponsible to paralyze the Government process with a regulatory freeze, or by imposing costly, inflexible, and bureaucratic procedures.

In yesterday's debate, my colleagues brought to the floor reams of paper representing regulations recently approved by Federal agencies. I was reminded of the piles of paper that Vice President GORE saved through the streamlining of the National Performance Review. It seems we are all working for the same thing—to make Government work better for people. We

need to reduce paperwork, and repetitive, unnecessary regulations are a good place to do it, but only so long as we do not compromise public health or safety.

Some regulations are necessary and beneficial for the public. In my State of Washington, we saw first hand how dangerous ineffective regulations can be during a deadly outbreak of E. coli contamination in 1993. Tragically, four children died and many more children and adults got sick from eating hamburger contaminated with this virulent pathogen. In the absence of a single clear Federal standard ensuring the safety of the food supply, a host of insufficient regulations offered poor protection at best. Subsequent to this epidemic, USDA proposed reforms of its meat and poultry inspection system to bring these inspections into the 21st century. USDA's proposal would require the Nation's 9,000 slaughter and inspection plants to adopt preventative, science-based inspection systems. A regulatory freeze such as that imposed by the House or by S. 219 as passed out of committee would have prevented USDA from responding to this public health emergency.

Moreover, I have concerns that the proposal passed by the House would tie the hands of the fisheries management councils around the country. I commend the amendment approved in committee by my colleague from Alaska, Senator STEVENS. Without such a provision, the recently enacted halibut and sablefish ITQ Program would be negated. Furthermore, the National marine Fisheries Service would not be able to manage the opening or closing of fishing seasons, thereby gutting the oversight authority of a very credible agency.

Our deliberation about this moratorium proposal is just the beginning of the broader debate about regulatory reform. In fact, the alternative proposal offered by Senator REID and Senator NICKLES, allowing Congress to veto new regulations, has generated support, having passed the Senate Government Affairs Committee unanimously. I am confident that this body can address the need for regulatory reform without resorting to a heavy-handed moratorium, which could threaten the public good.

I support the Nickles-Reid amendment and hope that we can reach a compromise with the House in conference.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to announce my support for the substitute amendment offered by Senator NICKLES and Senator REID and offer my name as a cosponsor of this amendment. This amendment starts the Senate down the road toward regulatory reform. While I view our action today as an important step, I look forward to a more comprehensive regulatory reform bill which is working its way through the Senate.

I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the fact that the Federal

Government places burdensome regulations on State and local governments as well. Often times these regulations tie the hands of these governments in their attempt to address the needs of their citizens. That is why I introduced S. 88, the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act of 1995, on the first day of this Congress. The need to provide flexibility to local and State governments is enormous. While I intended to offer S. 88 as an amendment to the legislation on the floor, I did not want to delay passage of this bipartisan bill. However, I will continue to offer the Local Empowerment and Flexibility Act as an amendment to legislation which comes before the Senate. I will also work with other Members to push this legislation forward as I believe it addresses regulations which are often overlooked and are as burdensome as those that this amendment addresses.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is about to pass legislation establishing an expedited procedure for congressional consideration and, where necessary, disapproval of regulations. I believe this is the right choice. The original legislation, which provided for a moratorium on regulations, was fraught with difficulty. It was legislation which could not pass this body and which, if it did, would probably have been vetoed. The approach we take today holds far greater promise for responsible review of regulations. And I applaud the efforts made by Senator NICKLES, Senator REID, and Senator GLENN who floor managed and perfected this legislation.

However, there was one provision inserted in the legislation yesterday that deserves further scrutiny. That provision would require the General Accounting Office to provide a report to Congress on each and every significant regulation promulgated by an agency informing Congress whether the agency has performed its job. Among other things, GAO's functions would include checking out whether the agency consulted with State, local, and tribal governments under the unfunded mandates legislation recently signed into law as well as checking on the agency's compliance with cost-benefit and risk analyses requirements under Executive Order 12866 and under legislation the Committee on Governmental Affairs last week ordered reported.

We are now in conference on the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. In neither body was a single vote cast against that legislation. We all agree the Government generates too much paperwork. While the central complaint concerns burdens on the public, there is also the recognition that Government imposes needless paperwork requirements on itself. In fact, Senators MCCAIN and LEVIN added important provisions to the paperwork legislation that would reduce unnecessary reports to Congress.

Now before those provisions even have a chance to get enacted, the Senate contradicts itself, mandating the

every working day of the year, the vast majority of which will be unnecessary and unread. These reports will cover functions already assigned to OIRA and in some cases duplicate the mission of independent peer review provisions in legislation ordered reported by the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Moreover, we all need to be reminded that serious discussions are underway to cut the budget of GAO by 25 percent. By its own admission, GAO lacks expertise in the area of regulatory review. This would be a new mission for that agency coming at a time when we need to see how the present core mission of GAO can be preserved on a smaller budget.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before contemplating today's bad news about the Federal debt, let's do that little pop quiz again: How many million dollars are in \$1 trillion? When you arrive at an answer, bear in mind that it was Congress that ran up a debt now exceeding \$4.8 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business Tuesday, March 28, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,849,995,857,343.69—meaning that every man, woman, and child in America now owes \$18,410.67 computed on a per capita basis.

Mr. President, again to answer the pop quiz question, How many million in a trillion? There are a million million in a trillion; and you can thank the U.S. Congress for the existing Federal debt exceeding \$4.8 trillion.

CIA LINKS TO GUATEMALAN MURDERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am deeply troubled by new information reported in the New York Times and elsewhere linking the CIA to those responsible for the murders of United States citizen Michael DeVine and Efrain Bamaca Velasquez, the Guatemalan husband of United States citizen Jennifer Harbury. At this point, we do not have all the facts necessary to get a full picture of what occurred, but these preliminary reports raise serious questions.

For most of the last 30 years, systematic human rights violations have been committed with impunity against Guatemalan civilians. The political repression and deplorable practices of the Guatemalan military—extrajudicial killings, political kidnappings, and death threats—have taken the lives of at least 100,000 citizens since the early 1980's.

It is because of Guatemala's miserable human rights record that I have closely followed the cases involving U.S. citizens, including the case of Jennifer Harbury's husband and Michael Devine. Over the last 2 years, I have taken several steps to find information

regarding the whereabouts and status of Mr. Bamaca, Mr. DeVine and others who have disappeared or been murdered in Guatemala. I have written letters or inquiry to the President, the National Security Council, and to the President of Guatemala, Ramiro De Leon Carpio, expressing my concern with these cases. Last year, I also introduced legislation urging the need for greater protection of human rights in Guatemala.

Throughout these efforts, and specifically on the case of Jennifer Harbury, I have been told that every attempt was being made to investigate her case, so that she could finally know the fate of her husband. Likewise, Congress has pressed time and again to resolve the questions surrounding the killing of Michael DeVine, an American innkeeper who was brutally murdered in Guatemala in 1990.

And now it is being reported that a Guatemalan Army colonel linked to the deaths of Michael Devine and Jennifer Harbury's husband was, in fact, employed by the CIA and twice trained by the United States Army.

According to Thomas Stroock, who served as United States Ambassador to Guatemala from 1989 til 1992, our Embassy, having investigated Mr. DeVine's murder, came to the conclusion that Col. Julio Roberto Alpirez was behind it. Reportedly, Ambassador Stroock then told his staff at the Embassy that they were to have nothing more to do with the colonel. Nonetheless, reports indicate that the CIA station chief in Guatemala keep Col. Alpirez on the payroll for nearly 2 more years. The reports go on to indicate that much later the CIA, in 1992, paid Alpirez a lump sum of \$44,000 for intelligence work done for the Agency, nearly 46 times the average yearly income in Guatemala. If these reports are true, it is difficult to understand how and why the policy carried out by the CIA was so clearly at odds with the policy established years earlier by the U.S. Ambassador. How could the CIA justify providing U.S. taxpayer dollars to this criminal? And whom did the CIA station chief answer to, if not the U.S. Ambassador?

The Clinton administration must continue to push the Guatemalan Government to prosecute Alpirez and any others who were involved in these murders. And if the reports I have described here are true, the CIA must be held accountable for their deeply troubling involvement.

It is equally of concern to me that Col. Alpirez evidently oversaw the killing of Michael DeVine just 6 months after Alpirez had graduated from an elite course for senior officers at the School of the Americas, a U.S. Army School in Fort Benning, GA. It was the second time that U.S. taxpayers paid to train Col. Alpirez, who evidently then went on to thank this country by ordering the murder of one of our own citizens.