

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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, 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.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the amendment numbered 1487 to S. 343, the regulatory reform bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 311 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Gorton	McCain
Ashcroft	Gramm	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Hatch	Pell
Burns	Hatfield	Pressler
Campbell	Heflin	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Coverdell	Inhofe	Simpson
Craig	Johnston	Smith
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lugar	Warner
Frist	Mack	

NAYS—47

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hollings	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Jeffords	Robb
Chafee	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
Dodd	Lautenberg	Specter
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Exon	Levin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY. I rise to express serious reservations about S. 343, the regulatory reform bill. After listening to over a week's debate, I remain doubtful that a vote in favor of S. 343 would serve the best interests of the American people. While I support carefully crafted regulatory reform efforts like the Glenn-Chafee substitute, S. 343 does not meet my standards nor the standards of the people of New Jersey.

I doubt whether my constituents want new red tape requirements which would delay long-awaited regulations for food safety, drinking water quality, worker protections and pollution control. Even with the changes adopted during the last week, S. 343 is still a prescription for delay, duplication, and judicial gridlock.

S. 343 is not true reform. It is full of exemptions and special interest provisions unrelated to the basic bill or which give assistance to particular industries. Its provisions will swamp agencies with requirements for hundreds of new, costly, and time-consuming analyses and it will undermine needed health, safety and environmental regulations already on the books.

S. 343 is filled with new opportunities for endless rounds of judicial review. Yesterday, our colleague Senator JOHN KERRY stated that the bill still contained 88 new places for court intervention in the regulatory process, despite the efforts of many Senators to improve this aspect of S. 343.

S. 343 could result in the sunset of many regulations if agencies failed to review them accordingly to required time schedules. Even worse, the schedules themselves might be manipulated by special interests who could overload agency review agendas and tie them up until regulations expired.

Finally, S. 343 still includes language which favors the least cost and not the most cost-effective regulations—an affront to common sense which could result in missed opportunities for sensible regulatory revisions.

Mr. President, this country needs regulatory reform. Regulated businesses and individuals deserve the most flexible, cost-effective regulations agencies can craft while still providing the protections Congress has provided and all of us need. But it is also time for us to admit the real cause of many regulatory complaints—overly prescriptive and sloppily drafted legislation.

While this bill needs further work, I hope we can resume negotiations and produce a regulatory reform bill we all can support.

AMENDMENT NO. 1487

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I rise to express my support for the substitute regulatory reform amendment currently pending before the Senate. I commend Senator DOLE for putting together a measure that is balanced, fair and commands bipartisan support. Certainly, we need Federal regulations to protect the public

health and safety. But the rules must be reasonable. They must make sense. That is exactly what the Dole substitute amendment attempts to ensure.

Mr. President, when I talk with South Dakotans, few topics raise their blood pressure faster than when they describe their frustrating dealings with the Federal bureaucracy. Government is supposed to work for us, not against us. Yet time after time, I hear horror stories of Washington bureaucrats running amok, imposing complicated, costly and silly rules.

Our current regulatory system is too large, too complicated, too burdensome, and too expensive. Worst of all, it is rapidly growing out of control. In the first two years of the Clinton administration, almost 140,000 pages of new Federal regulations were published. This is excessive. There is no way small businesses, local governments, or farmers and ranchers in South Dakota can possibly keep up with the changes.

Our current system costs all of us dearly. According to Thomas Hopkins, an economics professor at the Rochester Institute of Technology and the former Deputy Administrator of the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, every American household spends about \$4000 of their hard-earned income annually to comply with Federal regulations. As a nation, we spend between \$500 and \$800 billion each year.

The overwhelming majority of Americans agree the Federal bureaucracy needs an overhaul. Last November's election was a clear indication for smaller, smarter government with less redtape. This legislation takes a big step in that direction. Its main provision simply would require that before major new regulations are enacted, Federal regulators must show that the benefits justify the costs. This is simple common sense. It would force Federal regulations to be reasonable. If a Federal regulator cannot show that the costs of a proposed rule are justified by the benefits, why should we allow it be implemented? Common sense says we should not. This is a sensible hurdle that newly proposed rules should be required to clear.

Mr. President, let me give two recent examples of ridiculous Federal regulations that demonstrate the need for this legislation. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, is charged with enforcing our Nation's safe drinking water laws. In an effort to enforce the law, the EPA zealously over interprets congressional intent. In effect, they rewrite the law "raising the bar" for municipalities by requiring excessively burdensome water standards without comparing the costs of their rules to the benefits they hope to achieve.

Each year it seems, state and local officials are told last year's water standards are no longer good enough. They are forced by the EPA to perform costly new tests for presences in their water supply. Unfortunately, the EPA

frequently relies on questionable evidence to show why the changes are necessary. For many rural communities in South Dakota, excessive drinking water standards threaten to break their small budgets.

Recently, the EPA has proposed yet another standard—one that would require communities to regulate sulfate levels in drinking water supplies. This proposed standard has been made despite the fact there is no valid scientific showing of harm resulting from higher levels of sulfate. Congress instructed the EPA to study this issue. However, instead of evaluating the health risk of sulfate in drinking water, the EPA proposed a sweeping rule to allow no more than 500 milligrams of sulfate per liter of drinking water. When promulgating the proposed rule, the EPA did not consider the costs of compliance. They have not explained or justified the supposed benefits the rule attempts to attain. They also have not given any reliable scientific basis for this rule.

The costs of enacting the proposed sulfate regulation would be enormous. It would affect roughly one-quarter of all the water systems in South Dakota—108 of the 483 water systems in the State. The South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources, DENR, which opposes the EPA's proposed sulfate rule, has estimated the costs of compliance for those water systems would be \$40 to \$60 million. That is just the initial cost of compliance—not including operation and maintenance costs. Small, rural communities in South Dakota should not be forced to pay such a high price to enforce a regulation that has no valid scientific justification.

Let me put these figures in real terms we can all understand. The largest of the 108 affected communities is Madison, SD, with a population of 6,395 people. Currently, the average water bill for each household in Madison is \$13.75 per month. According to the South Dakota DENR, if the proposed rule is enacted, the additional cost to each household would be about \$10 per month. That would mean an average monthly water bill of \$23.75, or a 73 percent increase over current bills. Remember, this figure is for the largest of the affected communities, which presumably would be the most able to absorb the costs of compliance.

Let us take Big Stone City, SD, as another example. With a population of 670 people, Big Stone City has the median population of the 108 communities in South Dakota affected by the proposed rule. Currently, the average monthly water bill per household in Big Stone City is \$9.80. If the EPA has its way, each household in that community would see its water bill rise \$27.50 for a total monthly bill of \$37.30. That would be an astonishing 281 percent increase. Again, Big Stone City is the median size of the affected communities. Just imagine the impact the EPA's rule would have on communities smaller than Big Stone City.

Mr. President, what would these communities get in return for these shocking rate increases? Nothing. That is right. For years, South Dakotans have been drinking water containing sulfate with no apparent adverse health effects. The EPA has not been able to show scientifically that higher levels of sulfate in drinking water pose a real health threat to humans. The proposed rule would ensure drinking water has less sulfate, but that does not mean it is safer water. However, an EPA bureaucrat thinks the Federal Government should regulate sulfate. These plans are being made regardless of the enormous costs involved on small communities. This situation does not make sense.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier, clearly we need to take precautions to ensure the quality of our drinking water. However, common sense says, before spending billions nationwide to comply with a new regulation, we should ensure the benefits are worth the costs. The EPA should be required to demonstrate why it now believes sulfate is dangerous to human health. They should have to show how the benefits of their new rule justify the enormous costs it would impose on small communities like Madison and Big Stone City. That is what the Dole substitute would require of the EPA. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. President, let me give another example of a ridiculous Federal regulation that, several months ago, threatened farmers and ranchers in my State. The proposed regulation concerned the Endangered Species Act. Earlier this spring, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service considered listing prairie dogs under the Endangered Species Act, entitling them to numerous protections under Federal law, despite the fact there are 71 times more prairie dogs than people in South Dakota. Let me repeat that: in South Dakota, there are 71 prairie dogs for every man, woman and child—yet, earlier this year, Federal bureaucrats actually considered listing them as an endangered or threatened species.

Once a species has been listed under the act, certain uses of the land inhabited by the species can be prohibited until the condition of the species has improved to the point it can be taken off the list. Virtually, the entire western half of South Dakota potentially could have been affected. Fortunately, there are no longer plans to list the prairie dog as endangered or threatened. However, it still may be listed as a "candidate species" entitled to some level of Federal protection.

There are millions of prairie dogs in South Dakota digging even more millions of holes. Their holes are a real menace to cattle and horses. Ranchers are forced to destroy livestock which step in the holes and break their legs. Prairie dogs also eat grass and other vegetation, a sparse commodity in the western half of my State.

How can anyone believe prairie dogs are a threatened species facing possible

extinction? Farmers and ranchers in my home State do not understand this. I do not either. If this absurd rule had been enacted, killing prairie dogs would have been a Federal offense. Their population quickly would have grown far beyond their current numbers—causing more harm and destruction to South Dakota farmers and ranchers—all with the Federal Government's blessing. If the situation several months ago were not so serious, it would have been laughable.

These examples show why people in my home State are fed up with the Federal regulatory process. I am too. Is it any wonder why we believe the Federal bureaucracy is out of control and must be reined in? South Dakotans certainly want safe drinking water, safe food and a clean environment. But they also want Federal rules that are reasonable, understandable and flexible to allow as much compliance as possible.

That is why I support the Dole substitute amendment. If it were enacted the EPA could not implement its proposed sulfate rule until it can show that the benefits of the rule justify the enormous costs involved. Again, is that too much to ask?

In addition to benefiting consumers, this legislation also would have a positive impact on small businesses in my State. The current level of regulation from Washington puts an incredible burden on small businesses. Over-regulation chokes businesses in paperwork, stifles innovative ideas and undermines the ability of American businesses to compete in international markets. I have talked to many small businessmen and women who believe due to the sheer number of regulations, the complexity of the rules, and the different standards of enforcement between areas of the country and even between different inspectors, it is impossible for them not to be in violation of some regulation at any given time. This situation is not acceptable.

We greatly need to move the Federal bureaucracy away from the "gotcha" mentality many have toward American business. Regulators should not see themselves exclusively as "super-cops," as many do, waiting to pounce on any business that violates some regulation in the most technical way. Regulators need to develop a cooperative relationship with businesses. Both should work together to find innovative and cost-effective ways to comply with the spirit of the law as intended by Congress, rather than with hyper-technical regulations.

American business is not the enemy. The vast majority of small businesses are run by fine, ethical businessmen and women who want to obey the law, not skirt it. They want to be good corporate citizens. They do not seek ways to bend or break the law. They work hard to treat their employees fairly.

They spend considerable amounts of money to provide a safe workplace for them. They do this not because the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, or the Department of Labor require such action. They do it because it makes good, sound business sense. After all, satisfied employees are productive employees.

Judging from the enormous amounts of new Federal regulations continually being issued, however, you might think each American business spends all its time devising ways to bend or break the law. Every aspect of business life increasingly is being regulated. That has to stop.

Mr. President, to conclude, let me again state my support for the Dole substitute. The country needs less regulation from Washington. No one in my home State thinks there are too few Government regulations. No small business has asked me for more Government paperwork to fill out. No farmer or rancher has requested yet more restrictions on how they can use their own land.

The country needs less regulation. South Dakotans know Washington cannot regulate away our problems. Too many rules are on the books and not enough common sense is in the system. In short: Federal rulemaking needs an overhaul. The Dole substitute amendment would help reduce the number of rules generated by Washington. It would establish a sensible hurdle for new regulations: the costs must be justified by the benefits. That is simple common sense. The regulatory system cannot continue as it has been promulgating rule after rule with little concern for their practical effect. Is that asking too much? I urge my colleagues to support and vote for this legislation.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act of 1995 is a response to the belief that our executive branch agencies have become unreasonable in their regulation of the behavior of businesses and individuals. This is a powerful idea whose influence has, until recently, been underestimated. No longer. This is the third time this year that the Senate has considered legislation to restrain such Government action.

On January 27, 1995, the Senate passed S. 1, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, which requires Congress to acknowledge, by recorded vote, the costs imposed by Federal laws on State and local governments, as well as on the private sector. President Clinton signed the unfunded mandates on March 22, 1995.

Just 2 months later, the Senate passed S. 219, the Regulatory Transition Act, which established a 45-day review period for congressional review of regulations. Conferees are now attempting to reconcile that bill with the House-passed legislation, which places a temporary moratorium on Federal rulemaking.

The same concerns have prompted the Senate to take up the Comprehen-

sive Regulatory Reform Act of 1995 now before us. A central element of this bill is the requirement that agencies justify their actions through risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis. This is not a new idea, although it is given unprecedented emphasis in this bill. I first introduced legislation to require risk assessment of environmental regulations in 1991, and I have introduced similar legislation in each succeeding Congress.

All of these bills have been based on the simple proposition that decision-making by Federal agencies ought to be informed by the best available science. Of course, science cannot be the sole basis of agency decisions, for there are limits to scientific knowledge, and what we do know is imprecise. Yet science must be taken into account. We must have the humility to acknowledge what we don't know, but also the good sense to make use of what we do. That was the approach taken by the legislation I introduced in previous years, and it was the approach of the Johnston-Baucus-Moynihan amendment that passed the Senate as part of the Safe Drinking Water Act reauthorization bill in May 1994. That amendment would have required EPA to conduct risk assessments and cost-benefit analyses for all major regulations. EPA would have been required to certify that the benefits of a rule justify the costs and that no regulatory alternative would be more cost-effective in achieving an equivalent reduction of risk. Unlike the measure before us, last year's legislation would not have superseded existing law, and EPA's analyses would not have been subject to judicial review.

Our amendment was modest enough, but predictably it had opponents, including some members of the Clinton administration and certain representatives of the environmental community. They seemed to view the issue only in absolute terms, being of the view that requiring cost-benefit analysis and risk assessment would bring about the dismantling of environmental regulation by requiring EPA to consider risks and costs over environmental health and safety. Over the last 4 years, it has been our repeated experience—mine—to hear such complaints from environmental groups. Indeed, it is well known that opposition to risk assessment was significant enough last year to help kill the EPA Cabinet bill and the Safe Drinking Water Act reauthorization. Note well. Had the Environmental Protection Agency in 1994 accepted risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis as part of its mandate, it would be a cabinet department today.

Let me give one example of the sort of analysis some have chosen to apply to risk assessment proposals. On May 21, 1991, Joseph Thornton, a policy analyst with Greenpeace, testified before a hearing of the Environment Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology on the "Risk Assessment: Strengths and Lim-

itations of Utilization for Policy Decisions." This is what he said:

Greenpeace and communities who have experienced risk assessment first hand are united that risk assessment endangers the environment, public health, and the democratic process as it is now practiced. The major real world use of risk assessment has been to approve pollution. . . . Even when [it has] been used for the purpose of setting priorities, quantitative risk assessment is a flawed, uncertain, and subjective process that is subject to political pressures from those who have the most resources, and the most influence. (Emphasis supplied.)

This was not untypical of attitudes we encountered. The terms of the debate even began to take on a curious doctrinal cast: It became fashionable at one point to refer to risk assessment as one element of an Unholy Trinity. According to Mr. John D. Echeverria, a National Audubon Society attorney quoted in the New York Times on February 7, 1994, the Unholy Trinity is comprised of proposals on risk assessment, unfunded mandates, and Government takings of private property. And so I suppose I should not be surprised that, despite the fact that my League of Conservation Voters record has frequently risen above 90 percent, and despite having once been Chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, I have never, in 19 years on the committee, received a letter of commendation from the environmental community, a community not the least averse to plastering congressional walls with plaques. As an advocate of risk assessment, I am viewed with suspicion.

Not surprisingly—it is an old story—the legislation now before the Senate is far more prescriptive than anything advocated in the past by this Senator. The controversy that accompanied any discussion of risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis as recently as a year ago has all but disappeared. Today, even opponents of the Dole-Johnston bill are quick to state they favor the use of sound cost-benefit analysis and risk assessment in environmental decisionmaking. A year has passed, an election has intervened, and now we are faced with the Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act of 1995. One wonders whether the opponents of the early efforts by the Senators from Louisiana, Montana, and New York may be a bit wistful about the opportunity they passed up last year. Clearly, the terms of the debate have changed. The Senate has changed. We never seem to learn that the failure to recognize the need for sensible, incremental change invites radical change.

Although the Dole-Johnston compromise significantly improved the earlier drafts of this legislation, it does in my view overreact. I share many of the concerns of my colleagues and hope further amendments will be accepted to improve the bill. At this point, I would like to set forth the principles that have guided my votes on this important legislation.

As I have said, I do support the appropriate use of cost-benefit analyses and risk assessments in major rule-making. However, I recognize that risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis are imperfect tools. Even in the best analyses, significant uncertainties exist. More important, any legislation that would impose a cost-benefit test must recognize that other factors including values, equity concerns, and policy judgments are equally important or even dispositive factors in the decisionmaking process.

These points were well illustrated during our debate on the acid rain provisions of the Clean Air Amendments of 1990. Cost-benefit considerations were important elements of the debate. However, in the end Congress made policy judgments based in large measure on the unquantified and unquantifiable value we place on our natural environment. We decided, for instance, that some regions of the country, such as upstate New York, should not be forced to bear a disproportionate impact of acid rain pollution. We now know that the actual costs of the acid rain program are less than one-third of most estimates at the time, and that we still do not understand the ultimate impact of acid deposition on the environment. That experience illustrated the limitations of cost-benefit analysis as a rigid decisionmaking tool, and it ought to be a lesson to us.

Returning to the Dole-Johnston bill, we reached a consensus last week on two major issues. First, we recognized the tremendous resource burden that risk assessment and cost benefit analyses impose on agencies, and we changed the definition of major rule to \$100 million rather than \$50 million. This is a move in the right direction. However, the adoption of another amendment, which extends the definition to include rules that have a major effect on small business, may recreate the problem we were trying to correct. Second, we clarified our intention that the legislation should not impose a supermandate. That is, it should not override existing law. This does not mean we are entirely satisfied with existing laws, but it recognizes that we will not suddenly attain to vastly more intelligent and effective regulations by this single piece of legislation.

I disagree with those who view regulatory reform legislation as a simple answer to the problems accompanying our current health, safety, and environmental statutes. Problems do exist—with Superfund, with the current interpretation of the Delaney clause, and elsewhere. To achieve true comprehensive regulatory reform, we should move forward with current efforts to reauthorize and improve important statutes such as Superfund, the Clean Water Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act.

I also have continuing concerns with the judicial review and lookback provisions of the Dole-Johnston bill. Regulatory reform should not provide ex-

pansive opportunities for technical and procedural challenges, as much as K Street might wish. We should not turn the courts into arbiters of the adequacy of highly technical cost-benefit analyses and risk assessments. For example, section 634 of the Dole-Johnston bill would allow interested parties to petition agencies to review existing risk assessments and would subject agency decisions on petitions to court challenge.

Do we really expect courts to decide whether the agency or industry interpretation of the data should prevail? Do we really think we can legislate, and litigate, good science? Let us clearly and unambiguously limit judicial review only to final agency rule-making actions.

Further, while I agree that the periodic review of existing rules is an important element of regulatory reform, the lookback process should be constrained to focus on the most significant opportunities for improvement. We need a process that is controlled by the agencies, using clearly defined criteria, with adequate opportunity for public comment—not one controlled by special interests or the courts.

I am pleased that the comparative risk principles which I have proposed on earlier occasions have been incorporated in both the Dole-Johnston bill and the Glenn-Chafee alternative. However, as I have said before, the use of comparative risk to help set agency priorities must recognize the limitations of current methods and provide for continuous development of the discipline. I therefore strongly support the recommendation in the bill that a nationally recognized scientific body be asked to evaluate the state of the science and identify opportunities for improvement of this important science policy tool.

Finally, it ought to be said that many of the problems with our current system cannot be solved by the application of cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment, or any other device. Recently, we received a major study conducted by the National Academy of Public Administration, "Setting Priorities, Getting Results." The report makes a number of recommendations for improving environmental decision-making. As we debate the appropriate role of risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, we should heed this admonition:

Risk analysis is not a cure-all. The members of Congress and other decision-makers who have displayed a strong desire for more objective and precise quantitative estimates of environmental risks and of the costs and benefits of environmental protection will be disappointed. The unfortunate reality, that EPA and Congress must confront, is that neither risk assessment nor economic analysis can answer most of their crucial questions about environmental problems. The tools can only approximate answers with varying degrees of certainty, and the answers often cannot be reduced objectively to a few numbers. The objective findings of science are essential components of EPA's decisions, but wholly insufficient as a base for environmental policy-making.

The report goes on to state, "Despite these problems, summaries of costs or benefits are useful if they encourage analysts or decision-makers to think rigorously about what impacts and values should be included."

This is the core of what we need to accomplish in regulatory reform legislation: greater scientific rigor in agency thinking and decisionmaking. Let us acknowledge that with this legislation the task of creating a more effective national effort to improve the Nation's health, safety, and environmental quality has just begun.

Mr. HATCH. 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.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have 53 votes. We need 60. I understand tomorrow we will have an additional four votes on this side of the aisle to make 57, 3 short of the 60.

I am trying to determine whether or not we want to go with this bill, whether we want to set it aside for a period of time, or set it aside forever.

I have been talking with the distinguished Democratic leader. It is my suggestion that if nobody objects, we stand in recess until 4:15 to give the principals involved a chance to go off somewhere to see whether or not they believe any more of these major issues can be resolved, which might move the bill along.

I think, rather than just sit in a quorum call for the next hour, we will stand in recess, unless the Democratic leader has some objection to that.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I think that is a very good idea. Obviously, we are at a point where we have to work through what remains as significant differences between the two sides. I think an opportunity over the next hour to discuss those differences and determine whether or not they are reconcilable is a very good opportunity for both sides. I will encourage it and think that this is probably the best plan.

RECESS UNTIL 4:30 P.M.

Mr. DOLE. So, Mr. President, let me ask unanimous consent that we stand in recess until 4:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senate stands in recess until 4:30, this date.

Thereupon, at 3:10 p.m., the Senate recessed until 4:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to