ranking member of the Government Operations Committee, who has worked on this bill in this area of the law a significant amount, said:

Any bill on the subject of regulatory reform to be deserving of support must pass the test that is twofold: Number one, does the bill support the reasonable, logical, appropriate changes to regulatory procedures that eliminate unnecessary burdens on businesses and individuals? Number two, does the bill maintain the Government's ability to protect the health, the safety, and the environment of the American people? If the answer to both those questions is yes, then the bill should be supported.

That says it all. I congratulate and applaud Senator GLENN for this statement because that is what it is all about.

Mr. President, I believe that after the Government has acted on a problem, and there is a need for the Government to act on that problem, after time has passed I think it is important that we in Government look at the action that was taken by our prior Government. We have to reexamine I believe for efficiency, and because of that we need a periodic review. We do not have that. We should have that.

I have introduced legislation previously that said if Congress authorizes a program, we should reauthorize that program every 10 years, or it should fall. The reason I believe that is important is we have had some really unusual things happen in this Chamber that I am aware of.

It was just a year ago that I offered an amendment to do away with the Tea-Tasting Board—I repeat, the Tea-Tasting Board, costing almost $0.5 million a year, which had been going on for 60, 80, 100 years. We did not need it anymore. But it was just going on and on and on, like the battery you see on television. Had we had something in place that would have mandated a reauthorization of that program, the taxpayers' money would not have been wasted.

We had another program. During the Second World War it was important for soldiers to have wool. When wool gets wet, you can still stay warm with it. We did not have the synthetic products we now have. It was found during the Second World War we were not raising enough wool and mohair. As a result of that, we made special provisions that there would be a subsidy for people that would grow wool and mohair. This went on for 50 years. There was no need for it anymore. It was only recently that we terminated that program.

It should have been reviewed on a periodic basis. That is what we need to do with laws, and we need to do the same with regulations. Once a regulation is promulgated, there is no reason it should be there forever. There should be some way to reexamine that regulation that has been promulgated. That is what I am going to look for in the legislation that is now before this body.

Mr. President, I chaired a subcommittee when the Democrats were in the majority, a subcommittee in the Environment and Public Works Committee. It was the Subcommittee on Toxic Substances Research and Development. I chaired this subcommittee for a couple of Congresses. We had some really interesting hearings there. We had hearings that dealt with lead in the environment. And clearly as a result of those hearings, we focused attention on the need to do something about lead in the environment. We had physicians testify that it was the most dangerous condition for young children in America. Lead in the environment affected all people, no matter what race and no matter what economic strata they came from. We focused attention on this. As a result of that, legislation was passed that was directed toward taking lead out of the environment.

Mr. President, we held hearings on composite materials. These are the plastics that are used on airplanes like the Stealth fighter plane. We learned that in the workplace, this substance was killing people and making thousands of people sick. As a result of the hearings which we held, regulations were promulgated, workplaces were changed, and work conditions were changed. We needed to use composite materials. But we needed to do it safely.

We held hearings on fungicides and pesticides on foods learning that some of them were dangerous. As an example, hearings were held on a substance called alar, a substance to make apples, cherries, and grapes stay on trees longer than they normally would. This substance is now not used in the United States.

We held a significant number of hearings, Mr. President, on TOSCA. This is a program that we have now in effect that is old and needs to be updated. It has not been yet.

My only reason for pointing these things out is to suggest that in the areas I have mentioned, and in other areas such as lawn chemicals where we found people were getting sick, and we heard testimony before the committee that people died as a result of improper application of these substances and a lot of people got sick, that we have to be very careful that we do not throw the baby out with the bath water.

We have problems with too many regulations. But we must have a framework in place that allows protection of people in the workplace, in the marketplace, so that we can enjoy life with clean air and clean water. The regulations must be such that we can protect people but yet not make the rules so burdensome that people cannot conduct business.

This Congress has already had consideration of regulations. The House put a moratorium on all regulations. This body felt that had gone too far. Senator NICKLES, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, and I introduced an amendment. Basically, what the amendment said is that if a regulation has an impact of more than $100 million, this body and the House would have the opportunity for a legislative veto. That regulation would not go into effect for 45 days. During that 45-day period, we would have the opportunity to review that. If we did not like it, we could wipe that regulation off. It would not become effective. If it had an impact of less than $100 million, it would become effective immediately, but we would have 45 days to review that regulation. If we did not like it, we could rescind it.

This is a reasonable, sensible approach to regulatory reform. I am happy to see that the version submitted by the majority through Senator DOLE has this approach in it.

That submitted by my friend, the senior Senator from Ohio, also has a provision similar to this in it. I think that is important. It recognizes that this body by a vote of 100 to nothing adopted the Reid-Nickles amendment.

In sum, Mr. President, we need a sensible approach to regulatory reform. I think that we should all keep in mind what Senator GLENN has said. I think we would acknowledge what he said is right.

Any bill on the subject of regulatory reform to be deserving of support must pass a test that is twofold. No. 1, does the bill provide for reasonable, logical, appropriate changes to regulatory procedures that eliminate unnecessary burdens on businesses and on individuals? And, No 2, does the bill maintain the Government's ability to protect the health, the safety, and the environment of the American people?

That should be the goal that the majority and the minority work toward on this legislation. Let us not form gridlock. Let us work to improve the way that the American public must deal with these regulations and in the process protect what people want protected the most, and that is food, water, and working conditions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I understand that ends this session tonight.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 9 a.m. Tuesday, July 11.

Thereupon, at 6:51 p.m., the Senate recessed until Tuesday, July 11, 1995, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 30, 1995:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

ERNEST W. DUBESTER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 1998. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RICHARD HENRY JONES, OF NEBRASKA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LEBANON.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 10, 1995: