

Yes, let us have regulatory reform, and let us do it in the right way. Let us be aggressive in making sure that regulations make good common sense. Let us get rid of silly, useless regulations, and let us get rid of the people that write those kinds of regulations. But, at the same time, let us make sure that we protect this country with reasonable regulations that protect our air, water, food safety, and more. That ought to be the job for all of us on the floor of this Senate. There ought not be any disagreement about it. Nor should there be disagreement about whether anybody is stalling. If the majority party will simply allow those who believe that amendments are necessary to this bill to be offered and debated, this bill will move, and move quickly—with proper amendments.

But it is disingenuous, in my judgment, to be delaying because you do not want to vote on amendments, and then accuse the other side of stalling. That is not much of a legislative strategy and will not produce much of a result for this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1029 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING FIRST-DEGREE AMENDMENTS—S. 343

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all Senators have until 5 p.m. today in order to file first-degree amendments to the pending Dole-Johnston substitute to S. 343, the regulatory reform bill.

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

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, was leader time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

DISASTER IN SREBRENICA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I had hoped that the profound disaster in Srebrenica would have provoked a greater response from this administration than what we have seen in the last 48 hours. Tens of thousands of Bosnians have fled, Dutch peacekeepers are being held hostage, young girls are being taken away by Bosnian Serb forces, and the two other eastern enclaves—also U.N. designated safe havens—are under continued attack. Yet, instead of leadership, all the administration has to offer is press spokesmen to defend this catastrophe.

The best defense would be a change in the present approach. However, that

is unlikely from what the cadre of administration spokesmen have said.

Despite the obviousness of this colossal failure, Western leaders cling stubbornly to the myth that no other options exist.

There are reports that the administration is working with the allies to withdraw U.N. forces from the Eastern enclaves and redeploy them in central Bosnia and Sarajevo. In my view, this would be redefining failure.

I remind my colleagues that in the spring of 1993, Secretary Christopher went to Europe with the lift-and-strike plan and returned with the joint action plan. This plan was sold as the humanitarian option. The option that put the Bosnians' interests first. The joint action plan committed the United States, Britain, France, Russia, and the European Union to the protection of six U.N.-designated safe havens and closing the borders between Serbia and Bosnia.

There are those of us who urged the administration not to go along with this so-called plan, who warned that creating giant refugee camps with minimal defense would support Serbian war aims. We were ignored.

I might say these suggestions came not just from this side but on both sides of the aisle.

The administration went ahead and what a trade. Two years later Milosevic is still sending supplies and troops across the border and, the Bosnians are not only defenseless, but undefended.

Now we are faced with a widening catastrophe, but there is no longer any attempt to save the Bosnians—only to save face. The rapid reaction force is intended to save face.

I believe that the United Nations must begin preparations for withdrawal immediately. I am prepared to support the use of U.S. forces, if they are necessary, but under strict conditions.

If we have to use U.S. forces, it is going to be because of a total lack of policy by the Clinton administration. We are going to be backed into the use of U.S. forces because of a lack of clear leadership by this administration. That should be clear to everyone.

But even having said that, we have some obligations and I would be willing to support use of U.S. forces—under strict conditions.

First, unified NATO command—no dual key.

Second, robust rules of engagement which provide for massive retaliation if any U.S. forces are attacked.

Third, all necessary measures are taken to protect United States and NATO personnel from likely threats—from any source, to include Serbia—to include the suppression of Serbian air defenses.

Fourth, no risking U.S. lives to save equipment.

Fifth, agreement from our allies to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia.

The administration must know that it will be held responsible and that if

these conditions are not met, the risk to U.S. forces will be far greater than necessary.

Mr. President, the United Nations must withdraw and the arms embargo must be lifted. The United States cannot continue to subsidize and support a U.N. mission that serves largely to supervise ethnic cleansing and aggression. The United States must exercise leadership and support the fundamental right of self-defense.

I listened last night to one of the spokesmen, a White House press person, talking about Bosnia. He said, "Well, we cannot afford to lift the arms embargo. That would cost us money."

What does he think we are spending now? We are spending a great deal of money, and we are picking up 31 percent of the tab right now in Bosnia. Hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the U.S. taxpayers. So I wish if they are going to trot out the press spokesmen, at least they should have the facts correct and tell the American people the truth, and give them an accurate report of what is actually happening.

I yield the floor.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? LOOK AT THE ARITHMETIC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on that evening in 1972 when I learned that I had been elected to the Senate, I made a commitment to myself that I would never fail to see any young person, or any group of young people, who wanted to see me.

It has proved enormously beneficial to me because I have been inspired by the estimated 60,000 young people with whom I have visited during the nearly 23 years I have been in the Senate.

Most of them have been concerned about the magnitude of the Federal debt that Congress has run up for the coming generations to pay. The young people and I always discuss the fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why I began making these daily reports to the Senate on February 22, 1992. I wanted to make a matter of daily record of the precise size of the Federal debt which as of yesterday, Wednesday, July 12, stood at \$4,927,810,673,266.79 or \$18,706.05 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

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

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

Under the previous order, the Senator from Pennsylvania, [Mr. SPECTER]

is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

THE RUBY RIDGE INCIDENT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought this special order for recognition this morning to renew my urging that the Senate conduct oversight hearings into the incident at Ruby Ridge, a subject that I have spoken on at length on the Senate floor—on May 9, 10, 11, 18 and 26—and on those occasions urged that hearings be conducted before the August recess because of what I view to be the urgency of the situation.

I renew that request in light of the release by the Federal Bureau of Investigation yesterday, and the extensive publicity in the news media today, reporting on the suspension of a ranking FBI agent involved in the Ruby Ridge incident, the suspension occurring "after authorities allege that he destroyed a document that could have altered the official account of what happened at the standoff on August 22, 1992."

Mr. President, it has been my judgment for some considerable period of time that the Congress has been derelict in failing to have oversight hearings on very serious matters involving Federal law enforcement operations in the United States, and that it is up to the Congress as a matter of congressional oversight to make sure that there is accountability at all levels of the Federal Government.

I have considered very carefully the very heavy responsibility of law enforcement officials, the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and others, agencies that I have worked with extensively over my whole career of public service—since I was district attorney of Philadelphia—and have a full appreciation of the very high risks that law enforcement officers at all levels undertake. But there is great concern in America today about excessive Federal authority, and about the incidents which have occurred not only at Waco but also at Ruby Ridge.

This is in line with the concern in this country, which is as old as the Declaration of Independence itself, in challenging the legitimacy of government.

That brought the revolution and the founding of the United States of America. Our history is full of challenges to be sure that the Bill of Rights is respected. It is no coincidence that the United States has had the longest record in world history for stable government, no coincidence that record is the result of having a Bill of Rights which has been meticulously enforced, and one of the agencies of enforcement is the constitutional prerogative and responsibility of the Congress of the United States to conduct oversight.

Mr. President, it is a matter of the utmost gravity when there are allegations that there has been the destruc-

tion of a document which could shed light on what happened at Ruby Ridge, and this is only another step along the way on matters which already were in the public record suggesting substantial impropriety.

In my statement on the Senate floor on May 26, I referred to a letter from FBI Special Agent Eugene Glenn, who was on the scene at Ruby Ridge, and who was disciplined, and Mr. Glenn had this to say on page 6 of an extensive letter which he wrote to Mr. Michael Shaheen of the Justice Department's Office of Professional Responsibility:

On August 22, 1992, then Assistant Director Potts advised during a telephonic conversation with the special agent in charge that he had approved the rules of engagement and that he articulated his reasons for his adjustments to the Bureau standard shooting policy.

At that time, I called the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in my personal conversation with Mr. Potts on May 17, he said to me categorically, "There was never a change in the rules of engagement." And Mr. Potts advised me further that there was "no authorization to change the deadly force policy."

Mr. President, as I have said previously in this Chamber, I have talked extensively to people who have participated, been involved in the incident at Ruby Ridge. I talked to Mr. Randy Weaver at some length back on May 13, 1995, and got his account of what was truly a tragic incident which resulted in the killing of a deputy U.S. marshal, the killing of Mr. Weaver's young son, Sam, who was shot in the back, and the killing of Mr. Weaver's wife, who was holding their infant daughter.

The entire incident involving Mr. Weaver occurred, according to Mr. Weaver, when he was approached by agents from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms asking if he could sell them sawed-off shotguns, which apparently he later did in a context where a court found it to be entrapment. I questioned Mr. John Magaw, the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and he conceded to me that there was what he called borderline entrapment in the Weaver case.

So that you have a sequence of events of Mr. Weaver living in Boundary County, ID, right next to the Canadian border, really wanting to be left alone, an incident with this issue of entrapment, and later the marshals coming to the premises of the Weaver household. And then you have an incident, tragic, the killing of a deputy U.S. marshal, two members of the Weaver family, and then a dispute as to whether the FBI acted properly under the rules of engagement; and then yesterday the disclosure that in fact there had been some indication of further wrongdoing.

This is a matter, Mr. President, in which it seems to me it is imperative that the Congress of the United States exercise its oversight responsibilities.

We have had on the record for some time glaring conflicts which need to be investigated, inquired into by the Congress—the disparity between Special Agent Glenn, who is in charge of the FBI office in Salt Lake City, and the account of Mr. Potts, who has since been promoted to the position of Deputy Director of the FBI.

As noted in this morning's Washington Post:

Last year, a Justice Department task force sharply criticized the FBI action during the incident.

Referring to Ruby Ridge.

The task force concluded that the Bureau's conduct "contravened the Constitution" and that criminal charges should be considered against the responsible agents. The task force report was forwarded for comment to the Justice Department's Office of Professional Responsibility and the Civil Rights Division. Those offices in their evaluations held that no criminal conduct took place.

Now, Mr. President, I submit that in the context of a task force report saying the Constitution has been violated and suggesting criminal prosecution, and a disagreement within the Department of Justice itself, that we have is the quintessential circumstance where the Congress of the United States has oversight responsibilities. And yet we sit by idly and do nothing.

I have said on the Senate floor that in my judgment Congress has been derelict in its duties. I think it is a matter of nonfeasance, the failure to perform a positive obligation and a positive duty. And for the Congress, the Senate, the Judiciary Committee to continue to turn its back would amount to more than nonfeasance, perhaps misfeasance, perhaps malfeasance.

There is great unrest in America today, Mr. President, as we all know, with the development of extensive militia around the country and a vivid, active distrust for what goes on in Washington. I can understand that distrust in the face of what I see personally as a Member of the Senate and as a Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I not only understand that distrust and skepticism, but I share it in the absence of any oversight having been undertaken by the Congress, the Senate, and the Judiciary Committee on these important matters.

I made an effort to hold these hearings with the Subcommittee on Terrorism, the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over these matters, and I was thwarted in that attempt to do so. And I took the highly unusual step of bringing the matter to the floor of the Senate in a resolution calling for hearings on Ruby Ridge, among other things, in advance of the August 4 recess.

I had no doubt, Mr. President, no naïveté that that resolution was not going to be adopted in the face of our standards as to prerogatives of chairmen, but it seemed to me sufficiently serious to bring it to the floor of the Senate and to bring it to a head.

In my capacity as chairman of the Terrorism Subcommittee, I have had a