

## PROGRAM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the regulatory reform bill tomorrow at 9:45 a.m. Further amendments are expected to the bill tomorrow; therefore Senators should expect rollcall votes throughout Tuesday's session of the Senate.

## ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. HATCH. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that, following the remarks of Senator REID, the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the unanimous-consent request be modified so I be allowed to speak for such time as I may consume. I will try to do it as quickly as possible, but I do not want to be bound by the 10 minutes when there is no one else here on the floor.

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

The Senator from Nevada.

## REGULATORY REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in 1969 the Cuyahoga River in Ohio caught fire. I repeat, the Cuyahoga River caught fire. This river was so polluted that it actually started burning.

As a result of this, Members of Congress and the President decided it was time we did something about the rivers and streams in this country. Following that fire, that is a river catching fire, the Clean Water Act was passed. It has been 25-plus years since that river burned. Since that time, there has been a reversal of how the rivers and streams were. Then, 80 percent of the rivers and streams were polluted. Now, about 20 percent of the rivers and streams are polluted. We have made a lot of progress with the Clean Water Act, and that is the subject of this discussion tonight.

We have heard a lot of talk lately about regulatory reform, and I think it is important, because there is no area in the Federal Government—and as far as that goes, State government—that causes people as much concern as regulations. They have not only had the laws to deal with, but in recent years the laws propound regulations and the regulations propound all kinds of business decisions that people have to make.

It used to be that when we passed a law, or a State government passed a law, the laws could, in effect, be administered differently. If a bureaucrat wanted to administer the law in one part of the country in one way and in another part of the country in another way because of the climatic conditions, or whatever other variances there may be, he was able to do that. But the courts have said that is not permis-

sible, that there must be, when a law is passed, rules promulgated so that law is enforced the same for everyone.

That has caused a lot of problems. We have heard, in recent days during the debate on this issue, a great deal about the pros and cons, for example, about threshold limits; that is, what dollar value should be in effect before a regulation is treated one way as compared to if it is under that threshold amount, should it be treated a different way. We have been barraged by declarations about rolling back existing rules, and this has caused areas of disagreement.

Within the framework of this debate, I have tried to find a commonsense approach to how we should approach this most important area of the law, namely regulation reform. All too often, in issues such as this, it seems that common sense becomes clouded with political agendas, Presidential campaigns, congressional campaigns; obscured, perhaps, by various ideologies and smothered in the shouting from the right and the left. Common sense requires a balance, I think, in reform; a look at what is reasonable and then legislation that does not harm the whole to benefit just a few.

I do not know any Members of this body who would refuse small businesses the opportunity to grow and prosper. I know I feel that way because most of the jobs in this country are created by small businesses, not the General Motors, not the Lockheeds, not the Aerojets, but, rather, small businesses—mom and pop stores. In fact, small businesses produce about 85 percent of the jobs in the United States. So we must be responsive to how small business performs in our country. The better they perform, the more jobs are available, the better our country performs.

I have consistently been an advocate and have encouraged the stimulation of small businesses. They assume the risks of the marketplace and, as I have already indicated, are the backbone of our economy. But the profit of the business community should not come at the expense of clean air, clean water, and clean food. We cannot approach all problems with a dollar figure as the principal determination in the cost-benefit analysis.

Mr. President, as with all of us, we have recently returned from our States. Recently being in Nevada, and having had a number of town hall meetings, I heard from many people expressing concern about a rolling back of regulations that put certain areas that they were concerned about at risk, especially the environment. They were concerned also about the cleanliness of food and, of course, the safety of workers. In fact, a recent poll in Nevada is very illuminating, as to how people in Nevada feel. Nevadans do not believe they are overregulated in the areas of health and the environment. In fact, when you ask the people of the State of Nevada, "Do you think that

laws and regulations relating to clean water are not strict enough? About right? Or too strict?" here is how the people of Nevada feel. Mr. President, 49 percent of the people in Nevada say that the clean water laws and regulations are not strict enough; 34 percent feel they are about right. Mr. President, that is about 85 percent of the people in Nevada who feel that the clean water regulations are either just right or not strong enough. Only 11 percent of the people feel that they are too strict.

Clean air—again, 44 percent feel that the clean air regulations are not strict enough. Remember, the State of Nevada has Las Vegas, it has Reno, and then the vast majority of the State, areawise, is rural in nature. This takes into consideration the views of rural Nevadans. Nevadans said that clean air rules and regulations and laws are not strict enough, to the tune of 44 percent. Twenty-five percent said they are about right.

Mr. President, with the environment, when you ask the question broadly, "Do you feel the laws relating to the environment are not strict enough, too strict, or about right?"—39 percent said they are not strict enough; 29 percent said they are just right.

Food safety: 43 percent of the people of Nevada said they are not strict enough, 43 percent said they are about right, and only 8 percent said that food safety regulations are too strict.

Workplace safety: Again, the same situation, not strict enough, and about right. Those figures come to about 65 percent.

The people of Nevada are very concerned about food, water, air, and the environment generally.

It is interesting, people in Nevada were asked the question—that is, people over age 60—"Would you be less likely to vote for someone that tampered with Medicare or less likely to vote for someone that messed with the environmental laws?" Seniors, people over 60 years of age, said, "We would be less likely to vote for someone that tried to weaken environmental laws."

So I do not think Nevada is unusual. I do not know statistically how other States feel other than what I read in the Washington Post newspaper yesterday, where a writer said that a recent Times-Mirror survey shows that although a large majority of respondents want most types of regulations rolled back, they make an exception for conservation rules. Seventy-eight percent said that Government should do whatever it takes to protect the environment. So it sounds to me, Mr. President, that nationwide the people feel the same as they do in Nevada.

I am not advocating the existence of any program, rule, or regulation that does not serve the public good. That would not serve anyone's purpose. In fact, it hinders more than it helps.

But I would like to look at what Senator John GLENN said when S. 343 was introduced. Senator GLENN, who is the