

"He was one of the stalwarts for the state of Mississippi," said state Sen. David Jordan of Greenwood, who as an early civil rights supporter found himself on the other side of Stennis' pro-segregation stand.

"I would have liked to have seen him more open to all of the state. We didn't always have the access to him that some of the white folks had. But over the years he changed. He became a statesman for all of the people."

Former Lt. Gov. Evelyn Gandy said Stennis remained in close contact with state officials throughout his stay in Washington. When there was a problem, she said, Stennis would make a point to fix it.

"His heart was with the people of Mississippi, and he responded to their needs, and he helped those of us who were elected at the state level to respond to those needs," she said.

Rex Buffington, Stennis' press secretary from 1978 until the senator retired in 1988, said the key to Stennis' power sprang from his reputation.

"A lot of that came from being committed to doing the right thing. A lot of his power and influence came, not just from the positions that he held, but from the esteem that people held him in," Buffington said.

Buffington said he admired Stennis long before going to work for him, and when he took the job he was concerned that in Washington he would find a man much different from his public reputation.

"What I found when I got there was just the opposite. He was an individual who was even greater than that wonderful image," he said. "It was incredible, really, working for a legend, and one who lived up to and even exceeded his reputation."

Almost immediately after leaving office, Stennis' health began to seriously fail and he was forced to drop out of all public life, Buffington said.

"The senator that we knew has really been gone for a while," he said. "It was as though when he left the Senate he finally let go."

Buffington now serves as executive director of the Stennis Center for Public Service at Mississippi State University. It was created by Congress in 1988 to attract young people to public service careers.

Former Gov. William Winter campaigned for Stennis when Stennis first ran for the Senate in 1947. He later served as his legislative assistant.

"He represented, to me, what a public leader ought to be like," Winter said. "His total commitment to public service, his integrity, his impeccable personal character and his qualities as a true gentleman."

"During his service in the United States Senate, Mississippi had one of the most effective and highly respected senators that this or any other state ever had," Winter said. "We shall not soon see his like again."

Others echo Winter's assessment.

"He truly was a man of great stature. He will long be remembered as one of the finest senators Mississippi ever produced," said U.S. Sen. Thad Cochran, a former colleague. "He never said anything bad about anybody else and looked for the good in others. He was appreciated for that. People noticed that."

Former Gov. Ray Mabus, currently ambassador to Saudi Arabia, called Stennis "a statesman for the ages."

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, John C. Stennis devoted his long life to public service. He encouraged, taught, and inspired many Senators and Senate staff members, and was the model for many young people who have entered public service, not only in Mississippi but throughout this country. The John

C. Stennis Center for Public Service at Mississippi State University continues that work with programs for young people and for current public servants at the local, State, and Federal level. Starting with the 103d Congress, the center began conducting leadership workshops for senior congressional staff members. Senator Stennis' strong commitment to honorable public service will live on through the work of the Stennis Center, and through the countless lives he influenced.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside so we can present another amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1548 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1487

(Purpose: To extend the terms of permits for grazing on National Forest System lands to allow time for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 in connection with permit renewals)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, for and on behalf of Senator THOMAS of Wyoming, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] for Mr. THOMAS, proposes an amendment numbered 1548 to amendment No. 1487.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . RENEWAL OF PERMITS FOR GRAZING ON NATIONAL FOREST LANDS.

Notwithstanding any other law, at the request of an applicant for renewal of a permit that has expired before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act for grazing on land located in a unit of the National Forest System for which a land and resource management plan under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) is in effect, if all action required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to the land and resource management plan has been taken, the Secretary of Agriculture shall reinstate, if necessary, and extend the term of

the permit until the date on which the Secretary of Agriculture completes action on the application, including action required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(b) This section shall apply only to permits that were not renewed solely because the action required under the National Environmental Policy Act had not been completed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this amendment has been cleared by both sides. We are prepared to accept it and make it part of the Senate bill. I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if that is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. The amendment is acceptable on this side, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

So the amendment (No. 1548) was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1549 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1487

(Purpose: To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to modify the bottled drinking water standards provisions to require the establishment of regulations relating to contaminants in bottled drinking water)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. I send this amendment for and on behalf of Senator SNOWE, our Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Ms. SNOWE, for herself, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LEAHY and Mr. LIEBERMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1549 to amendment No. 1487.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the substitute amendment insert the following new section:

SEC. . BOTTLED WATER STANDARDS.

Section 410 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 349) is amended—

(1) by striking "Whenever" and inserting "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), whenever"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b)(1)(A) Not later than 180 days after the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency promulgates a national primary drinking water regulation for a contaminant under section 1412 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1), the Secretary,

after public notice and comment, shall issue a regulation under this subsection for that contaminant in bottled water or make a finding that the regulation is not necessary to protect the public health because the contaminant is contained in water in public water systems (as defined under section 1401(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 300f(4))) but not in water used for bottled drinking water.

"(B) In the case of contaminants for which national primary drinking water regulations were promulgated under section 1412 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1) before the date of enactment of the Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act of 1995, the Secretary shall issue the regulation or publish the finding not later than 1 year after such date of enactment.

"(2) The regulation shall include any monitoring requirements that the Secretary determines appropriate for bottled water.

"(3) The regulation shall require the following:

"(A) In the case of contaminants for which a maximum contaminant level is established in a national primary drinking water regulation under section 1412 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1), the regulation under this subsection shall establish a maximum contaminant level for the contaminant in bottled water that is at least as stringent as the maximum contaminant level provided in the national primary drinking water regulation.

"(B) In the case of contaminants for which a treatment technique is established in a national primary drinking water regulation under section 1412 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1), the regulation under this subsection shall require that bottled water be subject to requirements no less protective of the public health than those applicable to water provided by public water systems using the treatment technique required by the national primary drinking water regulation.

"(4) (A) If the Secretary fails to establish a regulation within the 180-day period described in paragraph (1)(A) of the 1-year period described in paragraph (1)(B) (whichever is applicable), the national primary drinking water regulation described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of such paragraph (which is applicable) shall be considered, as of the date on which the Secretary is required to establish a regulation under such paragraph, as the regulation applicable under this subsection to bottled water.

"(B) Not later than 30 days after the end of the 180-day period, or the 1-year period (whichever is applicable), described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, with respect to a national primary drinking water regulation that is considered applicable to bottled water as provided in subparagraph (A), publish a notice in the Federal Register that—

"(i) sets forth the requirements of the national primary drinking water regulation, including monitoring requirements, which shall be applicable to bottled water; and

"(ii) provides that—

"(I) in the case of a national primary drinking water regulation promulgated after the date of enactment of the Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act of 1995, the requirements shall take effect on the date on which the national primary drinking water regulation for the contaminant takes effect under section 1412 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1); or

"(II) in the case of a national primary drinking water regulation promulgated before the date of enactment of the Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act of 1995, the requirements shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after such date of the enactment."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I understand that both sides have agreed to accept this amendment. Therefore, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the amendment is acceptable on this side. My understanding of the amendment, and I would like perhaps confirmation of this from my friend from Utah, is that this amendment gets into the problems that have been created for the bottled water industry by the delay in getting the rules which they are waiting for accepted and promulgated.

If my understanding is correct, this is an instance where it is the business community that wants the rule. Sometimes we think it is the business community alone that is bothered by burdensome regulations. There have been too many instances where there have been burdensome regulations. There has also been many instances where there were critically necessary regulations, and the struggle we are going through is to try to come up with reform which will leave in place the essential process to protect our health and safety.

But my understanding of this amendment is that in the case of the bottled water industry, we have an industry which has been waiting for regulation, asking for regulation in order to stop people from representing on bottled water that it, for instance, might be spring water if it is just tap water.

We need, we are told by the bottled water industry, the agency to act, and the delay in this is actually hurting an industry.

So this is an instance where it is the industry which is trying to get through a regulatory process, trying to get a rule which will both protect it from bottled water which is misrepresented as something other than it is not, and we also had the situation where this was caught up in a moratorium.

One of the arguments against the moratorium is while it may sound good at first blush, the problem is we have a whole lot of businesses, as well as people, waiting for safety and environmental and health rules, that are awaiting the regulatory process to work.

I have not had a chance to study this amendment, and I want to make sure my understanding is correct, but it is my understanding that the purpose of this amendment is an attempt to get the bottled water regulations finally adopted; is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. As I understand it, the Senator has stated it correctly. This is the situation where regulation can be a very good thing if it is appropriately done. And, in many cases, it can be a very good thing. And so I commend the Senator from Maine for bringing it forth at this time. I believe the Senator is correct. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I want to first thank the majority leader and Senator HATCH for working with me and Senators COHEN, KEMPTHORNE,

LEAHY, and LIEBERMAN on this amendment. Throughout this process, they have clearly demonstrated their strong support for the bottled water industry and for bottled water consumers, and they deserve to be commended for their cooperation and good work.

I also wanted to clarify a couple of points that were raised during the discussion on the amendment between Senator HATCH and Senator LEVIN. First, it is definitely correct that the amendment is supported by the bottled water industry. In fact, this legislation has been one of the bottled water industry's biggest priorities for the past couple of years.

Second, Senator LEVIN referenced the FDA's standards for defining spring water. This amendment does not apply to the FDA's spring water definition rules. It applies only to public health standards for bottled water.

In addition, I wanted to point out that the big issue here is more the discrepancy in timing between the EPA's and the FDA's issuance of rules for tap water and bottled water, respectively, than it is the bottled water industry's level of enthusiasm for Federal regulation. The bottled water industry does have an interest in the promulgation of reasonable regulations that provide additional assurances of the safety of its product, but the industry's biggest interest is in making sure that the FDA does not take too long in issuing its regulations for bottled water after the EPA promulgates regulations for tap water. And I will explain why in a moment.

I also wanted to thank Senator KEMPTHORNE, who chairs the Subcommittee on Drinking Water, Fisheries, and Wildlife, for his assistance in getting this amendment adopted. My motive in offering the amendment to the regulatory reform bill was to provide another option by which we can get the legislation enacted, giving it a better chance of ultimate success. But I think it is important to recognize that Senator KEMPTHORNE has been working on this issue as part of the Safe Drinking Water Act reauthorization bill that he is now drafting, and that he will continue to do so as that bill moves through the Environment and Public Works Committee. I commend him for his efforts on this issue, and I look forward to working with him during the SDWA reauthorization process so that we can give this urgently needed legislation another opportunity for eventual adoption.

Mr. President, my amendment, which is cosponsored by Senators COHEN, KEMPTHORNE, LEAHY, and LIEBERMAN, is designed to make the regulatory process for bottled water more efficient and responsive, while expanding health protections for the consuming public.

Under current law, bottled water is considered a food product, and is therefore subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. My amendment requires the FDA, which has jurisdiction

over bottled water, to publish final regulations for a contaminant in bottled water no more than 6 months after the EPA has issued regulations for that same contaminant in public drinking water or tap water.

Unfortunately, the FDA has a history of long delays in issuing its regulations for bottled water after EPA publishes its standards for tap water. On December 1, 1994, FDA published a final rule for 35 contaminants in bottled water. Nearly 4 years earlier, however, in January 1991, the EPA regulations for these contaminants had already been issued.

In another case, it took the FDA 4 years to issue regulations for a series of volatile organic chemicals in bottled water after the EPA issued regulations for those chemicals in public drinking water in 1989. And presently, final regulations for 23 new contaminants in bottled water are still pending at FDA, even though the EPA's version of the regulations went into effect in January 1994—a year and a half ago.

While the FDA takes its time, bottled water producers and consumers are left in limbo. In the absence of Federal standards, the bottled water industry, which is composed of 430 bottling facilities in the United States, is vulnerable to charges that its product is unsafe. In fact, the Administrator of the EPA suggested publicly on two occasions that bottled water was not fully protected because the FDA had not issued certain regulations that had already been issued by the EPA for public drinking water.

Of course, charges that bottled water is unsafe or unprotected couldn't be further from the truth. Bottled water is subject to strict industry safety standards and to various State rules. But the Federal standards do provide an important additional assurance for consumers nationwide. Without these standards, consumers may question whether bottled water is really a safe, natural, and healthy alternative to tap water, and sales in the industry could be unnecessarily dampened. Not only do consumers lose when the bureaucracy drags its feet, but an industry that employs thousands of Americans loses.

My amendment will ensure a more expeditious response in the future. In addition to the 6-month deadline for new contaminants, the FDA will be given 1 year to issue final regulations for contaminants that the EPA already regulates, but that have not yet received new FDA standards for bottled water. If the FDA fails to meet either the 6-month or 1-year deadlines, the existing EPA standard is automatically implemented for bottled water.

In some cases, FDA may determine that a particular contaminant regulated by EPA does not occur in bottled water. My amendment would allow the FDA to simply publish such findings in the Federal Register before the deadline periods expire.

The amendment also stipulates that in all cases, the FDA standards for bottled water must be at least as stringent as the EPA's standards for public drinking water. The bill does reserve the FDA's right to issue more stringent standards, however, adding an extra measure of public health protection, if necessary.

It is my hope that this amendment will prompt the FDA to coordinate its regulatory activities for drinking water with the EPA from the beginning, before either agency issues a notice of proposed rulemaking. By coordinating in this process, the agencies could issue their regulations at roughly the same time. The amendment would therefore have the effect of improving the efficiency of the Federal regulatory process—something all of us agree is necessary—while enhancing health protections for consumers. It represents a clear win-win proposition for all of our constituents.

The bottled water industry generates \$2.7 billion in sales annually, and it serves millions of American consumers, with the potential to serve even more. Surely, these producers and consumers alike deserve the kind of consideration from their Government that my amendment guarantees. I am pleased to see that Senators on both sides of the aisle agree and support the amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am glad to be a cosponsor of Senator SNOWE's amendment which is the exact language of S. 412 regarding bottled water quality standards. Like many other enterprises from heart surgery to hang-gliding, the bottled water industry needs nationwide regulations that ensure the quality of its product.

The Food and Drug Administration [FDA] has been very slow in issuing regulations that guarantee a particular standard of quality. In fact, the FDA has lagged behind the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], sometimes by a matter of several years. The net result is that some water companies can legally distribute water that is less healthy than ordinary tap water. This is bad for consumers, bad for honest businesses, and underscores one of the reasons why our Nation is supportive of regulated standards.

I am particularly interested in this amendment because of a Vermont business that has a clear interest in enforceable standards of quality. The Vermont Pure Springs Company of Randolph Center, VT, is one of the great success stories of Vermont's growing specialty food industry. Vermont Pure Springs produces, in my opinion, the best bottled water in the world—Vermont Pure Natural Spring Water. In fact, I invite each of my colleagues to stop by my office to taste this water—I keep about a dozen bottles of Vermont Pure water in my refrigerator.

Each bottle of Vermont Pure Natural Spring Water contains water that is naturally filtered through Vermont

mountain rock strata for at least 12 to 20 years. Some of Vermont Pure Springs' competition comes from companies whose water is not only not as pure as Vermont Pure, but may in fact have pollutants that are illegal in tap water. Since its beginning in 1990, Vermont Pure Springs has been seeking the regulatory guidance in this amendment to ensure its water is known throughout the world and guaranteed by our Government as Vermont Pure.

The provisions of this bill ensure that whenever the Environmental Protection Agency issues new standards for drinking water, the FDA will have 180 days to issue regulations that address the same contaminants to the minimum standard required by the EPA. If the FDA does not issue formal regulations, the EPA drinking water standards apply to bottled water. In the case of EPA standards that have already been established and the FDA has not yet acted, the FDA has 1 year to act before the EPA standards automatically apply. This bill allows the FDA to hold bottled water to a stricter standard, but ensures that bottled water will be held to a minimal standards.

I appreciate the opportunity to consider this amendment today. I look forward to moving this particular legislation through Congress so that it may be signed by the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1549) was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it appears that we cannot get the Hutchison amendment completed and negotiated in a way that is satisfactory to both sides. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Texas is prepared to go to a vote on the amendment. I hope the other side is prepared to do that.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, we had a conversation where it was, I thought, indicated that we were trying to—

Mr. HATCH. I talked to the Senator from Texas and she felt it was not getting done.

Mr. LEVIN. We are awaiting their redraft of the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. 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. DOLE. Mr. President, we are making some progress. We would like to work through the afternoon.

I had a discussion with the distinguished Democratic leader about there being a number of votes on Monday. We may move the time for the cloture vote, depending on what I hear from the Democratic leader.

I have also indicated that in addition to that cloture vote, if cloture fails, there will be another cloture vote on Tuesday.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, 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 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.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as the distinguished majority leader indicated, he and I have had the opportunity to discuss this cloture motion.

I will say again, I do not know that cloture motions are even necessary at this point. We have had a very rigorous debate. There have been very few quorum calls and there is not a filibuster going on here.

We are proposing amendments. We will lay down the substitute this afternoon. We are ready to go to additional votes this afternoon. I hope that we could have a vote on the Hutchison amendment this afternoon. I am sure that is something the majority leader is prepared to do.

I yield to the majority leader for comment on the pending amendment.

Mr. DOLE. As we discussed earlier, obviously, if the amendments on either side are acceptable, that is certainly satisfactory to both the leaders, because some Members are necessarily absent, and there is no need to punish Members who are not here.

On the other hand, if we cannot agree, we ought to have the votes, and everybody was notified there could be votes throughout the afternoon on Friday.

As far as I know, the afternoon does not end at 1 o'clock. It ends much, much later. We will be here. As far as I am concerned, we will have votes. If we reach an impasse, or once I think the major amendments have been laid down on the so-called Glenn amendment—I think that will take considerable debate.

Until that happens, I would hope we would continue to work out some of the amendments.

Mr. DASCHLE. That is my point. I want to emphasize, at least to colleagues on this side of the aisle, there is likely to be additional votes this afternoon, and that Members ought to be prepared to come to the floor to cast those votes.

Let me say in the larger context, that is the reason why, in my view, we do not need a cloture motion, because, as I say, the work is getting done.

This has been a good debate this week on a very, very complex issue. I would hope we could continue to work in good faith and find a way to accommodate Senators who have good amendments, who have reasons to offer these amendments, and do so in a time that accommodates the schedule but also accommodates the Senator.

I appreciate the majority leader's decision, but I hope that at some point we could get beyond the cloture votes and try to finish this bill.

Mr. DOLE. I hope, too. The reason for the cloture motion is to make certain we do finish the bill. If we cannot get cloture, we will not finish the bill on Tuesday. It is my hope we can finish the bill on Tuesday.

Let me again indicate to all my colleagues who are at the majority leader. The August recess is not far away—at least the starting date is not far away. We have a certain number, I think a number of legitimate things we should do before that recess begins.

It may not begin on the 4th of August. It may not begin until the 12th or the 15th, or in that area. That is not a threat, just what may happen.

I put in the RECORD yesterday a proposed schedule which I believe is reasonable, but it depends on finishing this bill and then moving to the next bill, and appropriation bills. We hope to do six appropriation bills before the August recess. We have three major authorization bills: DOD authorization bill, foreign operations, State Department authorization. That will take some time. There will be a lot of amendments. Six appropriation bills, plus welfare reform, plus Bosnia, plus lobbying and gift reform, plus the Ryan White bill.

That is the reason the cloture was filed. Hopefully, if we cannot work it out, we will have a cloture vote on Tuesday, which I hope would be successful. Then we would at least have the end in sight.

Obviously, if we are making progress, and we are going to finish the bill Tuesday in any event, I would be happy to withdraw the cloture motion.

Mr. KERRY. If the distinguished majority leader will yield the floor, would it make sense to set a time certain for a vote on the Hutchison amendment? Should we not work it out?

Obviously as the day goes on, both sides may lose more people and therefore it would punish more not to have a time set in the event we do not work it out.

Mr. DOLE. I have no objection to that. Somebody suggested 30 minutes,

if they do not work it out. I will not be that arbitrary, but I think after some reasonable time, 30 to 45 minutes, that would be satisfactory.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOLE. I know some of these things are very technical and I do not profess to understand some of these technical provisions. I am not on the committee and have not followed that closely. I know they are meeting as we speak. Hopefully, we can do that.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the amendment process. I came to make a statement on the bill. I want to proceed if there are no amendments. I am willing to abbreviate my statement when the managers are ready to move to the next amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, we are grinding away slowly in this process on regulatory reform. I think all Members had hoped we would be able to move much more quickly on this legislation.

The majority leader has just outlined a schedule for the Senate between now and the August—I should say supposed August—recess. It seems to me that schedule will be impossible to meet, given the timeframe and the seriousness of the issues which we will be debating.

Nevertheless, we cannot even begin to get to complete that agenda if we cannot move along on this particular piece of legislation. We are now completing a full week's debate, with amendments. We have had long days and long nights, and there is no end in sight.

I hope that we can continue to make progress. I certainly am not going to be one to delay that process.

Let me say, Mr. President, that during the course of this debate, media reports about activities on the Senate floor, debate on this floor, and general discussion about what is taking place here, have left a misimpression as to what this legislation is designed to achieve.

There have been claims made, by a number of individuals, that if this bill stands as it is and is not drastically changed, the quality of our water and our air will be placed in jeopardy, our environmental treasures will be threatened, our Nation's wildlife will be endangered. There have even been accusations that the result of this legislation would be the increased incidence of contamination of the very food that we eat and the water that we drink.

I think we need to set the record straight on some of these charges. These are disturbing charges because they threaten to undermine a process of reform that I believe is critical to the viability of our economic system. Our current regulatory process is, I believe is complicated beyond the ability of many of our small business people to understand or to comply with. It is punitive in many ways. It is duplicative