

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

in many ways. It simply does not provide the efficiency, and in many instances the intended effect of the regulations as they were originally drafted. It drains family income, it chokes small businesses, it denies jobs.

The Small Business Administration has estimated that small business owners spend nearly 1 billion hours a year filling out and completing Government forms. This, at a cost of millions of dollars. Turning this tide, restoring some balance and efficiency to the regulatory process is really what this legislation is all about.

I think it is important we understand what this legislation does and what it does not do. I intend to review that. Before I do, let me provide a couple of examples as to why I think this legislation is necessary.

Perhaps the most important reasons it is necessary is the negative impact the current system has had on our society, on the American family, on those who are seeking to hold meaningful employment. According to a 1993 study conducted by Citizens Against Government Waste, Federal regulations cost the American household \$4,000 a year; roughly \$400 billion annually. A former OMB official placed the cost even higher, at \$500 billion annually, or \$5,000 for the average American family.

A popular statistic thrown out in this town every year, particularly in the spring, is how long the average American has to work through the year to pay their Federal and State taxes. The date is now approximately May 5th. If you add on their share of the regulatory burden, you push that date even farther forward, into mid-July.

Many advocates of the status quo, those who would keep the current system of regulations as they are, rejecting this reform process, argue that this legislation will jeopardize our public health. I do not think this is correct. The legislation we are currently debating, and have debated all week, does not override existing health, safety or environmental law. The cost-benefit requirements of this legislation supplement, not supersede existing law.

This legislation does not seek to overturn the very real progress that has been achieved in many cases of public safety regulation. To the contrary, this legislation seeks to provide procedural reform that will ensure that the rules and regulations efficiently and effectively achieve the very goals they were designed to seek.

So I ask my colleagues, why should we not proceed with an effort to provide some efficiency in implementing regulations that are designed and intended to promote vital health and safety concerns for Americans? That is a goal we ought to embrace, not a goal we should resist.

There have been some charges concerning health emergencies, charges that this legislation would place public health in jeopardy in cases of emergency. The reality is that the cost-benefit analyses and risk assessments are

not required if they are impractical due to an emergency or health or safety threat, if they are likely to result in significant harm to the public or to our natural resources. Furthermore, on Tuesday this Senate adopted the Dole amendment by unanimous vote. That clarified the intention, in case there was any doubt, of this legislation to cover food safety emergencies in addition to all public health matters.

The legislation further provides the same protections where environmental management activities are concerned. Let me repeat, cost-benefit procedures do not apply where they would result in an actual or immediate risk to human health and welfare.

Where a petition for alternative compliance is sought, the petition may only be granted where an alternative achieves at least an equivalent level of protection of health, safety and the environment.

So in this Senator's opinion, and I think in the opinion of many Senators, this legislation is not a radical overhaul of Federal regulations. It is a procedural reform that is designed to ensure more effective, more efficient rulemaking. I think that is a common sense approach. I doubt if there is a Member of this Chamber who has not been besieged by his constituents back home, or her constituents back home, or by groups that visit us here in the Senate who point out the duplicative, cost-ineffective, procedural nightmare that they have to go through in complying with Federal regulations. Time and time again it has been pointed out to this Senator how one regulation by one agency countermands a regulation by another agency, leaving the individual to throw up his or her hands, saying which regulation am I supposed to comply with? To comply with one violates the other. It is a nightmare of bureaucracy in terms of filling out forms and complying with injunctions handed down by the various regulatory agencies.

A cost-benefit analysis is not an unreasonable request, to examine the benefit of a proposed regulation versus what will be the cost. It is information we ought to have when we assess the viability of rules and regulations and the procedure that produces those.

There has been a lot of talk by advocates of the status quo about their compassion, about justifying this legislation to constituents back home. I challenge Members to go back home to a town meeting, or local diner, and to stand up and make the argument for why the Federal Government should not engage in reform of its regulatory process. Why it should not impose a cost-benefit analysis in determining the viability of a regulation. Why we should not determine whether what is the most efficient and effective way to spend their tax dollars. I suspect they will run into a little opposition if they try to defend the status quo.

There are many agencies that have been highlighted during the debate this

week. There are many that we hear complaints about. Perhaps the one I receive the most complaints about from individuals that I represent is OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Regularly, constituents walk into my office with fistfuls of compliance requests and stories of the nightmare of administrative litigation proceedings, complaining, not only about the process but about the ineffectiveness, the inapplicability, and the duplicative efforts of many of the regulations they are asked to comply with.

A roofing business owner in Indiana wrote to me. He said we have these forms, the material safety data sheets, MSDS's, required by OSHA. He said, and I quote from his letter:

Materials have an MSDS's that were never intended to be encompassed by the regulatory standards. It has gotten to the point that almost every product in America comes with an MSDS. Products like sand and compressed air, dishwashing detergent, glass cleaner, baby oil, powder, shampoo, all have MSDS's.

To carry this product, to use this product, to manufacture this product, if you store this product, you have to fill out this sheet.

He tells the story about an OSHA compliance officer who illegally searched his foreman's vehicle. He writes: He searched our foreman's vehicle and found a small plumber's propane torch in the vehicle.

It was the employee's personal property. It had nothing to do with the company. This was his personal property. It is not even used in the roofing business. The label had fallen off that propane torch. The foreman tried to explain to the OSHA compliance officer that this was his personal property. He even produced an MSDS sheet. The company was fined \$825 because the label had fallen off the propane torch, a product not even used in the business of the employer. Yet, the employer was fined.

Another individual from Indiana talked to me about the fact that they had some chalk stored. I believe they used the chalk for certain purposes not necessarily related to the product that they were manufacturing. Yet, they had to fill out the MSDS forms. It was not acceptable to fill out one MSDS form labeling the chalk. But because the chalk came in red, blue, green, yellow and different colors, they had to have separate forms for each color of chalk.

I can go on and on with these stories. In the interest of time, I will not do that.

But the point is that we have an overzealous, an overregulatory process at work in America today that is placing costs and burdens on business, and particularly small business, that is denying job opportunities and competitive advantage to these businesses.

I think every Member understands how the regulatory process grows and mushrooms and continues to ignore the desire and need for efficiency in imposing what had been determined to be

necessary health and safety regulations but imposing it in a way that thwarts the very purpose of the rule in the first place.

Mr. President, I hope that we are not derailed in the process of responding to the very clear call of the American people that we clean up the act of the Federal Government here in Washington. We have been given a somewhat historic opportunity to do that. Items that Americans, our constituents, have been complaining about for decades now have an opportunity to be vented in this Congress and reformed in this Congress.

People have lost faith in our ability to apply commonsense solutions to the problems that they face. They have seen an insensitive, uncaring, ineffective government impose law after law, and regulation after regulation on their livelihoods, on their businesses, on their families, and on society as a whole.

They have lost faith in government which reaches into every corner of their lives, stealing from them the very hard-earned wages that they have worked so long to accumulate. They have lost faith in a government that is suffocating their access to opportunity and to the American dream, the hope of starting and running a successful business, the opportunity to benefit from the jobs of a strong economy, the opportunity to pass along to their children the hope of a better life than they have had.

This legislation does not accomplish all that we must. But it is a critical start. If we cannot reform the regulatory process that is suffocating America, there is little that we can do to respond to the very genuine calls for a reformed Congress and a reformed way of doing business.

Mr. President, I hope we can move forward. We spent a week now, long days and long nights with no end in sight, with amendment, after amendment, after amendment. But I hope we can expedite this process and move forward. This is an important piece of legislation. It has been discussed, deliberated, and talked about for years. Now is the time that we need to move forward and enact it.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to bring this debate to a reasonable close so that we can exercise our final vote on whether or not we believe that the regulatory process needs to be fixed, needs to be reformed, needs to be made more efficient and effective for this Nation.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). The Senator from Minnesota.

---

#### BOSNIA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to take the floor. I do not know quite how to

do this. I may not do it very well. I do not know whether my words will accomplish anything. But sometimes, you know, you just feel like you should speak on the floor of the Senate. That is what comes with the honor of being a U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, on the front page of the Washington Post today—this just needs to be recognized on the floor of the Senate—there is a headline, "For Ousted Bosnians, a Trail of Tears."

Under that headline, "Serbs Force Thousands of Muslims in Harrowing Journey."

Then there is a picture of older men, women, and children, a Bosnian woman wheeling what I gather would be, Mr. President, her elderly father in a wheelbarrow. And the first paragraph reads, "Bedraggled, hungry and scared, thousands of Bosnian Muslims flooded into a swelling makeshift refugee camp with little food, water or medicine today after a harrowing journey into Muslim-held territory from the fallen town of Srebrenica, now occupied by Bosnian Serbs reveling in their victory."

Mr. President, another article in the Washington Post is headlined, "Serbs Start Expelling Muslim Civilians From Seized U.N. Conclave," with pictures of women and children herded into refugee camps.

Mr. President, these pictures send chills down my spine. I am the son of a Jewish immigrant born in Odessa in the Ukraine who lived in Siberia in Russia. I am an American Jew, and these pictures send chills down my spine, along with the reports that the Serbs are taking all young men, boys 16 years of age, away from their families. I do not know where they are taking them to. But they are taking them away to find out whether they are guilty of "war crimes."

Mr. President, I do not know exactly what it is the international community should do. But I am convinced the international community has to do something.

Mr. President, it is as if the world has not learned anything in the last half a century. We really are talking about genocide of people.

I will not talk about the position a number of Senators took several years ago in calling for action. I took such a position. Normally, I do not talk about intervention, international military intervention, but several years ago several of us came to the floor and said it had to happen. That is beside the point.

Mr. President, I was thinking about this this morning, and I was talking to my wife, Sheila. We have been debating the regulatory reform bill, and it is extremely important. I have been involved in the debate about the rescissions bill. All of us care about our work, and all of us give everything we have, whether we agree or disagree. The Presiding Officer and I, who are good friends, are good examples; we do not agree on all issues. But I am trying to figure out, for God sake, what in the

world is the world going to do? What is the civilized international community going to do? We see people just expelled, expunged, young men taken away from families to see whether they are "guilty of war crimes." Elderly and children, 1-year-olds put on trains—to go where? What is going to happen to these people?

Sometimes, in the history of humankind, silence is betrayal. I do not think we can be silent about it. I wish to God I knew exactly what the international community could do. The fact that there are no good choices does not mean we still should not choose some course of action. I do not mean any easy fix, Mr. President. I do not mean something where we essentially turn our gaze away from the rape and torture and murder of innocent people.

So, Mr. President, I just wanted to take a few minutes to speak to these pictures. If my father, Leon, was alive—he is no longer alive—he would say that there exists on the part of humankind an enormous capacity for good but also, unfortunately, an enormous capacity for evil. It is that parallelism that makes it all so complicated.

I assume that next week in this Chamber we will be talking about what is now happening in the former Yugoslavia. I do not know what the focus of the debate will be. I know there are several resolutions, but I think it has to be more than resolutions and amendments. The international community cannot turn its gaze away from this. This is genocide. We should have learned some lessons over the last half a century. I do not think we can go about our normal business just because it is long distance, somewhere away. These are all of God's children.

I yield the floor.

---

#### INHUMANITY IN BOSNIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am on the floor for the same reason that my colleague from the State of Minnesota is here. I have stood silently by for a long time now because I have the same feeling that a lot of us have, one of desperation, despair. I was forced to think about this as a result of the statement given yesterday by the Senator from the State of Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] a man who understands war, a man who spent more than 5 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam, a man who spent more than half that time in solitary confinement. So I figure that when Senator MCCAIN talks about war, I should listen. Senator MCCAIN did not use the Washington Post. He used the New York Times as an illustration. I went and looked at the New York Times after he brought it to my attention. It showed a mass of humanity, but if you looked closely at the picture there were uniformed troops in there. Who were those troops? They were U.N. troops. My friend from the State of Minnesota today made the same statement.