

of these points, I have to say it has been very interesting working with them and I appreciate the good faith that they have put forth.

Mr. President, I would like to change the subject if I can. Hopefully that will end the debate. As soon as we can, I would like to wrap up and let everybody go for the day.

I understand Senator MURKOWSKI will be coming over. I assure the other side we are not going to talk any more on this, unless Senator MURKOWSKI is. I do not know. But if he is, it will only be another statement or so.

#### JUDICIARY HEARING ON THE EVENTS IN TENNESSEE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I informed everybody that I was going to make a statement on the Tennessee situation.

Mr. President, ours is a Nation of laws. We are a Nation that guarantees liberty and justice to all people. Our Nation is only as strong as our commitment to justice is strong. When the public's faith in the arm of Government responsible for safeguarding our liberty and our democratic Government is threatened, then we have to do something about it.

So I rise to announce that 1 week from today, on Friday of next week, the Senate Judiciary Committee will convene a hearing on the appalling events which took place in Tennessee, the so-called "Good Ol' Boys Roundup."

If newspaper reports are accurate, several Federal law enforcement agents from among other agencies, the ATF, FBI, DEA, Secret Service, and Customs participated in a so-called Good Ol' Boys Roundup, an event that is alleged to have involved hateful, racist, ugly conduct.

After consultation with the Judiciary Committee's ranking member, Senator BIDEN, and fellow committee members—especially Senator THOMPSON, who wants to make sure the great State of Tennessee plays a role in resolving this matter—I have decided it would be best for the Senate to move expeditiously on this matter.

Accordingly, I have informed the Directors of the ATF, FBI, and Deputy Attorney General Gorelick—I have personally informed them of my plan to hold a hearing next Friday. Witnesses I plan to call include the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Directors of the FBI, ATF, DEA, and others. I can only express my outrage and anger that Federal law enforcement officials would allow themselves to be compromised in such a way, and to participate in such conduct. I am sure that the Clinton administration officials that I have mentioned share my contempt for what has gone on. I expect this hearing will provide the American people with an opportunity to hear from our top law enforcement leaders,

the plans they have to root out this racism.

Those who engaged in this conduct, who have stood by, knowing of it, and did nothing, must be held accountable. When a person who is clothed with the authority of the people engages in hateful conduct, that conduct must be condemned by the people. I condemn this conduct. The Senate condemns it.

This hearing will, hopefully, provide the American people with an explanation, detailing what the Clinton administration plans to do about it.

Attorney General Reno, Director Louis Freeh, and others have made great strides in improving the efficiency, fairness, and operation of our law enforcement agencies. These acts of prejudice, if true, and I have been led to believe that many of them are true, threaten to undermine the strides they have made to date.

It is in their interests, the interests of African Americans and other people of color, and the public, that we hold these hearings. In fact, it is in the interest of all Americans that we hold these hearings.

We must not stand by while Government officials betray the public's trust. These events, if true, disgraced Federal law enforcement and the United States. It is Congress' obligation. After all, I have to say all of us are directly accountable to the people. But it is Congress' obligation to hold the executive branch accountable. And I intend to do so.

Now, I have to say in conclusion that these leaders have all expressed a desire to clear up this matter and to stop it and to make sure that this never happens again. These are fine people who lead these organizations. They have made strides in some of these areas and I want to continue those strides and we want to stop this type of offensive, racist, despicable conduct now and we intend to do so, and we hope these hearings will be efficacious in helping us to get there. Having said that, we look forward to those hearings next Friday and I hope all of our Judiciary members will be able to participate.

I see the Senator from Alaska is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Utah and wish the Chair a good day. I know it is late in the afternoon. I just wanted to make a few remarks with regard to the status of our regulatory reform debate that has been going on for an extended period of time.

There is no question, Mr. President, that we all want to see regulatory reform legislation passed by this Congress for two very, very important rea-

sons. They are simply fairness and common sense.

As chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, we passed out a bill that would accomplish fairness and common sense, and in so doing address corrections needed in our regulatory process. We passed a bill that was easily understood. And, as a consequence, we find ourselves immersed now in almost a legal discussion of various types of binding conditions associated with what was generally understood to be a high degree of frustration among the public, a public which was frustrated over policies of the Environmental Protection Agency such as the one that occurred in the largest city of Alaska, Anchorage, AK, where the city was notified that the water that accumulated after rains in the drains that ordinarily went out in Cook Inlet for disposal. Cook Inlet has some 30-foot tides twice a day.

Suddenly, the city was advised that they were in violation because, prior to discharging that water, 30 percent of the organic matter had to be removed. In testing the water they found there was no organic matter to be removed, and they appealed to the Environmental Protection Agency. Surprisingly enough, the EPA simply came back and said, "You are out of compliance and subject to fine." As a consequence, some enterprising member of the city council suggested that they add some fish guts to the drainage system so that they would have something to remove that was organic and, therefore, comply.

Finally, the issue got so much publicity, Mr. President, that the Environmental Protection Agency saw fit to, so-called, "clean their skirts." So they wrote a letter saying, "Yes, these were the circumstances, but they did not make the city of Anchorage put the organic matter, the fish guts, into the water system." People of Alaska understood that. They understood the lack of sense that such a mandate made.

We have these horror stories. We have heard them on the floor.

Another concern that was expressed from time to time was the realization that citizens will not be asked to pay huge amounts of money to have trace amounts of arsenic or radon or chloroform removed from their drinking water when there was absolutely no evidence of any adverse health affects, no scientific proof of any kind.

We heard cases where workers who have rushed to rescue a colleague from a collapsed ditch are subject to fines, subject to penalties for not having a hard hat on in the first place.

We had a situation in Fairbanks—where it does snow occasionally in Fairbanks, AK—where the city was in violation of a wetland permit because they moved the snow off one lot where the city barn is to the next lot which was classified as a wetlands.

These are things people understand. These are issues of frustration that

have been expressed time and time again. But we find ourselves embroiled in a controversy on this legislation that has gotten beyond the ability of the general public to grasp why we are not getting on it and making the corrections that are needed.

We passed a bill that would put consistent procedures for risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis in place for all agencies and make agencies accountable for the actions taken in reliance on those agencies.

Why does this procedure lead to fairness and common sense? Very simply, because they ensure that regulations will direct our limited resources to the substance or activities that are most likely to harm us and prevent that harm in a cost-effective way. It is simply that simple.

We find that we have an ally in this process. Let me quote from the statement of the President. I have this chart here, Mr. President, which I will read very briefly. It is from the President. I quote:

The American people deserve a regulatory system that works for them, not against them: a regulatory system that protects and improves their health, safety, environment, and well-being and improves the performance of the economy without imposing unacceptable or unreasonable costs on society; regulatory policies that recognize that the private sector and private markets are the best engine for the economic growth; regulatory approaches that respect the role of State, local, and tribal governments; and regulations that are effective, consistent, sensible, and understandable. We do not have such a regulatory system today.

Those are the words of our President. But in spite of what the President, what the Congress and what the American people all know, this legislation has been bogged down in discussions designed to play on emotions. It has become complex. It has become almost a lawyer's delight to deliberate the application.

We went through it the other day on the issue of the Mammogram Quality Standards Act. We all know that this legislation would not in any way have interfered with the promulgation of the rules under that act.

I have had some familiarity with that, Mr. President, because my wife and a group of women in Fairbanks, AK in the mid-1970's started a breast cancer clinic. They purchased a mammogram machine, and, as a consequence, provided free services to the women of interior Alaska for an extended period of time. However, 2 years ago, under the Mammogram Quality Standards Acts procedure, that particular machine became outdated. And in order to comply with the quality standards, it was necessary that a new machine be ordered.

So a number of us got together and raised approximately \$150,000 and bought a new machine. This year we are raising some more money to buy a mobile mammogram machine. This is done without any Federal Government assistance of any kind, and provides

the service to the women of the interior who are on the road systems of Alaska, and it will be further extended to the villages because this unit will fit inside the National Guard C-130 aircraft. So when they go into the villages, the vehicle can be backed out and made available to serve women that otherwise would not be available for this type of care.

So the point is, Mr. President, that we have a system under the Mammogram Quality Standards Act that works. Not only does this legislation that we are contemplating have an exemption for health emergencies, but it also specifically recognizes that risk and cost-benefit analysis should only be done at the level of detail necessary, taking the need for expedition into consideration.

So, as a consequence, we found ourselves spending a good deal of time debating whether or not—by not excluding mammograms—we were somehow risking the health of women in the United States. And while that argument was voiced extensively on this floor, there was absolutely no justification in my mind, or others who have examined the application of existing laws and regulations that were covered under this legislation, that indeed these services were in jeopardy.

So what this bill does, Mr. President, under Executive Order 12866 issued in 1983, there is a requirement for cost-benefit analysis for major regulations and the use of risk as a basis for regulating.

There are 25 high priority actions which were initiated this past March to reinvent environmental regulations in recognition that the current regulatory system is broken.

Further, after several years of no action, the Environmental Protection Agency recently decided to change a longstanding food safety policy related to residual levels of pesticides that treated flour and tomato paste as ready to eat. EPA has already compiled a list of obsolete, duplicative, or unnecessary regulations and obtained concurrence from States on planned revisions and terminations that would eliminate 16,000 pages from the Code of Federal Regulations.

The administration is planning a project known as XL that would, for the first time, allow pollutant trading among different media such as air and water, as part of the President's plan to emphasize market-based regulation.

A high-level Clinton administration working group has crafted a far-reaching set of proposed administrative, regulatory and legislative changes to reform cleanups under Superfund and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, including provisions that elevate the consideration of risk and cost in cleanup decisions.

EPA has launched a major effort to review, streamline, and offer new flexibility for states in implementing the agency's Clean Water Act Permit Program. This is considered a key proposal

in the initiative to modify or delete duplicative, burdensome, or obsolete rules.

EPA is moving to pare back routine inspection and enforcement requirements, particularly for industrial wastewater and hazardous waste disposal facilities, to shift agency resources to focus enforcement efforts on high risk facilities or activities.

EPA has changed its position from a December preproposal and decided not to regulation low-level radioactive waste storage sites already overseen by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, a position taken by six Senators that such regulation would be a wasteful duplication of effort.

A major Clean Air Act rulemaking was initiated in January to allow States to automatically implement broad trading programs in emission reduction credits on the open market. In addition, a model rule allowing banking of credits is under consideration.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that each of these proposals covers areas addressed already in S. 343, so one has to ask why are some Members of this body, why are some of those at the White House fighting this legislation when we all know that we need this bill. The American people know we need this bill. We also know that we should not have to stand here and continually recite day after day, hour after hour, horror stories and examples of regulatory excess to get this legislation passed. We all know it has to be done, and it should be done without further delay.

So it is my hope that the leadership on both sides of the aisle can get a handle on this legislation and recognize that the American people want efficiencies in Government; they want efficiencies in regulation; they want efficiencies in oversight; and they want to be able to understand the process that is occurring. They want it based on fairness, and they want it based on common sense, and they want it now.

I thank the Chair. I wish my colleagues a pleasant weekend.

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. 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.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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