

this incident and the activities of the Federal agents involved.

I say this on behalf of the FBI and its reputation, which is critically important as the major law enforcement community of our country, Federal law enforcement community, and I also say this for the families of the victims of Ruby Ridge, that it is time we move now openly and publicly with hearings both here, in the Senate, and with the activities of the Justice Department to clear this issue.

Mr. Freeh, in that conversation, pledged full cooperation in all activities that will occur in the Senate and in the House in the hearings that may come about. I certainly hope we can move late this summer or early this fall to full and thorough investigative hearings, oversight hearings on this incident. I think the American people now demand it, and I think it is important we once again reestablish the credibility of the FBI by the cleansing of this issue.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I compliment my colleague from the State of Idaho. I probably was nearly as shocked and surprised as he was to hear a few moments ago on national television that the Deputy Director of the FBI has been "reassigned."

It seems to me that the Senator from Idaho has made a very good point. I do not claim to have any inside information with what happened at Idaho. It is entirely possible my colleague from that State knows much more about this than I do.

If I understand it correctly, the Deputy Director of the FBI has been reassigned. I do not know what that means, but I hope that the Senate will move forthwith and speedily for a thorough investigation of this matter. I reserve the right to exercise my final judgment on this after I know more about it than I do at this particular moment.

But I think the Senator from Idaho has put his finger on the matter. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is something that must be beyond reproach. Again, I do not know at this moment what the reason for this was, but as I understand it, the Director of the FBI has determined that, for the good of the service and because Mr. Potts is under some investigation that I believe started in the House of Representatives, that he thought it was best for him to be reassigned.

I do not agree with that matter at all. If Mr. Potts has not done anything wrong, not done anything improper, not violated the law, not violated the Federal Bureau of Investigation rules, then the Director of the FBI and the administration should stand square behind him and fight out the matter.

If, on the other hand, that is not the case and he did do something wrong in any area that I just mentioned, or any

other area, he should be fired, because it appears to me that this is a tremendously serious matter. I certainly agree with my colleague from Idaho that I hope the proper committee of jurisdiction, which I assume would be the Judiciary Committee, should move aggressively on this matter in the Senate so we can, too, make sure that we have a full explanation of what is or is not going on.

This is a serious matter that has had a very adverse effect on this Senator's view of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and what it does or does not do properly.

I thank my friend from Idaho for bringing this up. I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion on the Delaney clause in connection with S. 343, the regulatory reform bill, with which we are dealing right now. There is a provision in S. 343 that would eliminate the Delaney clause "zero-cancer risk" criterion and replace it with a "negligible risk" criterion when determining the maximum permissible levels of pesticide residues on foods.

The Delaney clause, a provision contained in section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1958 states that no additive will "be deemed safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal. . . ."

The intention of this law is admirable: To prevent cancer-causing agents from entering our food supply. I do not disagree with this intent, and I am sure that no one else does in this body either. The problem, however, is that in 1958 when the Delaney clause was passed, scientists could not measure additives in parts per billion or parts per quintillion, as they can today. In 1958, scientists could only detect cancer-causing additives in parts per thousands—concentrations that, indeed, often posed legitimate health risks to many Americans.

This 37-year-old Federal law establishing a "zero risk" level for pesticide residues in processed food is outdated and unnecessary and has adverse impacts on almost every farmer in the United States.

In my own State of Washington, more than 200 minor crops are affected by the Delaney clause. Since 1988, our farmers have lost nearly half of all pesticides registered for agricultural use and are currently faced with a shortage of agricultural pesticides because the cost of registration and reregistration is so high.

For example, about 2.6 million acres of crops in the United States rely on

Propargite. Propargite, a common pesticide used for mite control, is absolutely necessary to combat mites that feed on apples, grapes, hops, mint, potatoes, alfalfa seeds, and many other crops that are grown not only in my State but in other States as well.

The potential impacts of a Propargite cancellation would be detrimental to agricultural producers in States like California, Idaho, Oregon, and my own State of Washington where crops grown on smaller numbers of acres, like these, are important to the economy.

These potential impacts could cost our farmers hundreds of millions of dollars and would not only unnecessarily increase the price of our food but may well jeopardize food safety itself.

Further, I have always been an advocate for safe, affordable, and abundant foods. Let me be clear, safety for foods will not be threatened because of this provision in S. 343. The specific provision only replaces the "zero-cancer-risk" criterion and replaces it with a negligible risk criterion. This "negligible risk" standard will give the Federal Government the flexibility it needs to permit our farmers to use newer and safer pesticides when they do not provide any significant risk to our foods. The status quo, however, is a threat to our farmers because present technology can measure these commodities in amounts so small as not to have any real impact, other than to bar the use of particular pesticides.

As the Senate prepares to pass legislation that will move us toward a balanced budget in the year 2002, we must make tough choices. In light of reducing price support programs, I believe we should also work extremely hard to eliminate outdated and burdensome regulations that are placed on our farmers, among others. The Delaney clause is such an example of such an unnecessary regulation, and I am convinced that the Senate should pass legislation that will reduce regulatory burdens that farmers across this country face every day with no true, valid social purpose.

As I travel around my own State, I have listened closely to the comments, suggestions, and concerns of my State's agricultural community. Their message is clear: Reduce the regulatory burdens that restrict our ability to do what we do best—provide healthy, safe, affordable, and abundant food. As Members of Congress, we should do all we can to provide that relief for those who carry out this important and very vital task.

In summary, the science that drove the intent of the Delaney clause 37 years ago is outdated. With today's technology and science, it is right—not only right but necessary—to revise and to revisit that law passed in 1958 and put a new one in its place that will meet its goals and, at the same time, save the ability of our farmers to produce food accurately and well.

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. 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.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we are prepared to lay down—at least the other side is prepared to lay down—the Glenn-Chafee amendment. So I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily set aside so that can occur and we can at least begin preliminarily to debate on that.

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

THE TENNESSEE DEBACLE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me take a minute to state I am going to make an announcement here, in the next half hour or so, about what the Judiciary Committee is going to do about the Tennessee debacle. So I just want to put people on notice that the Judiciary Committee is going to act on that debacle. I am very upset about it. I am upset about the way law enforcement officers have acted. It appears that there may have been—these are allegations, not necessarily facts—may have been ATF agents, FBI agents, perhaps even U.S. attorneys and other officials, there may even have been some Canadian Royal Mounted Police involved in this racist incident.

So I am going to have a few remarks to make, and I am going to set a committee agenda on that before we end today. I just want people to be aware of it because we are not going to sit around and let that type of stuff happen.

Mr. President, I will announce with more specifics what we are going to do. But as of today I am sending out a notice that the Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing next Friday on this matter. We expect top representatives from Justice, Treasury, FBI, ATF, and others to be in attendance and to come and tell us what they are going to do to get to the bottom of this, what kind of action they are going to take, to the extent they can tell us with the investigation as of that date.

So I will talk about it with more specificity before the day is out, but I already have a notice going out. I have consulted with Senator BIDEN, and I have to say I have consulted with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Senator THOMPSON, who, representing his State, said that Tennesseans want to get to the bottom of this, they want to resolve it, and that he, representing Tennessee, will want to be involved in it and do everything he can to resolve it as well. He has shown great interest. I want to pay a special tribute to him for his work with me on this matter.

Next Friday there will be an intensive hearing on this matter. We are

going to just start to get to the bottom of it, and we are going to make some demands on the leaders of this country to come up with a system that will never permit this to happen again anywhere. We are not going to have law enforcement people, who wear the badge of the public, acting like racists, or being racist, or participating in racist activities.

From what I have heard about this, assuming that it is true—and I have only read newspaper accounts and I have checked with some of these leaders—what I have heard about this, it is abominable. I have to tell you, I have chatted with some of the leaders who confirmed that it is true, that some of our agents have participated in this. Frankly, it is time to put an end, once and for all, to that type of racist activity, and we are going to do it.

I want to personally pay tribute to people in Justice and the FBI and ATF and Treasury who have all indicated to me that they are with me on this, they want to get to the bottom of it, and they are going to handle it with great care and with efficiency.

So we will talk more about it a little bit later. Those hearings are scheduled now for next Friday, and we are going to get to the bottom of this thing as much as we can as of that date. Then we are going to follow up.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am sickened by media reports, if they are correct, regarding the so-called "Good O' Boys Roundup" in Tennessee. According to these reports hundreds of law enforcement officials are involved in this whites only event in the spring of each year.

These reports describe events at the gathering, sale of items like T-shirts with a target superimposed over a picture of Rev. Martin Luther King. Activities and displays so blatantly racist that I would not want to repeat them on the floor of the Senate. But, I want to make clear that the behavior of these officers, if the reports are true, is reprehensible and cannot be tolerated. They must be condemned if engaged in by anyone. But, if the participants were law enforcement officers sworn to protect the rights of all Americans, such activities are all the more reprehensible.

I am pleased to see that Director John Magaw has ordered an investigation into the involvement of any ATF officers. I would hope that State and local authorities would follow suit. I trust that the ATF investigation will be timely, professional, and thorough, and that a full report will be made to the appropriate committees of Congress, and that officers found to have participated in racist activities should be discharged.

Mr. President, this kind of overt racism is unacceptable and has no place today in American life. It is a sad fact of American history that it has existed at all. I am confident that the American people overwhelmingly reject such behavior, particularly by officers of the

law, and will demand that it not be tolerated.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Washington Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, July 11, 1995]
RACIST WAYS DIE HARD AT LAWYERS' RETREAT—ANNUAL "GOOD O'BOYS ROUNDUP" CITED AS EVIDENCE OF "KLAN ATTITUDE" AT ATF

(By Jerry Seper)

OCONEE, TENN.—They're trying to tone down the racist trappings of the "Good O'Boys Roundup" here in the Tennessee hills east of Chattanooga, where hundreds of federal, state and local law enforcement officers gather every spring to let off steam.

There was a lot to tone down. Gone, for example, are many of the crude signs that once greeted arriving officers, like this one: "Nigger check point."

The "Good O'Boys Roundup" is organized by agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and it was held this year on May 18-20.

Also gone this year was the traditional Saturday-night skit highlighting the Good O'Boys steak dinner. In one skit, an officer in fake Ku Klux Klan garb pulled a dildo from his robe and pretended to sodomize another officer; who was in blackface.

But according to law enforcement officers who attended this year's and other events, a whites-only policy remains in effect.

Still on sale were T-shirts with Martin Luther King's face behind a target, O.J. Simpson in a hangman's noose and white D.C. police officers with a black man sprawled across the hood of their car under the words "Boyz on the Hood."

"Nigger hunting licenses" also were available throughout the compound, consisting of motor homes, trailers, tents and pickups gathered around a large beer truck.

At this year's event, some black officers—including ATF agents—attempted to crash the party and were turned away after having "bitter words" with some of the white officers in attendance, the sources said.

At attempt by roundup organizers to tone down the event's racist activities comes at a time when black agents have charged ATF with discrimination. In a lawsuit pending in U.S. District Court in Washington, they claim ATF supervisors have done little to address complaints of racial slurs, harassment and other job discrimination.

Brought by 15 plaintiffs, the suit alleges that such incidents as "nigger hunting licenses" seen in ATF offices, a Ku Klux Klan card posted in ATF's Oklahoma City office and use of the word "nigger" by white ATF officials have gone unpunished. There are about 200 blacks among the 2,000 agents within ATF, a law enforcement arm of the Treasury Department.

Representing the black agents is lawyer David J. Shaffer of Washington. He said that his clients were aware of the Good O' Boys Roundup and that discovery in the case found that announcements concerning it had been circulated exclusively by and to white agents.

"This is what this lawsuit is about: a Ku Klux Klan attitude among some of the white agents that seriously affects black agents on a day-to-day basis," Mr. Shaffer said.

Trial in the case has been tentatively set for next year before U.S. District Judge Royce C. Lamberth.

The roundup, according to invitations sent out last year, has been coordinated unofficially for the past several years through the