the appeals process. In this case, however, the appeals process only made the situation much worse.

Before the first appeal, the SCS had already changed its initial wetlands classification of 14.2 acres to 10.8 acres. The SCS area office confirmed this designation during the first appeal. At the second appeal, the State SCS office decided that the wetland was actually 17 acres. And at the final appeal level, at the SCS national office, the wetland was determined to be 28.2 acres.

Mr. President, as you can see on this chart, this farm was cropped from 86 years. But then, through no fault of the farmer, the SCS decided there was a wetland on this land. And this wetland apparently was expanding rapidly—from 10.8 acres to over 28 acres in less than 2 years

Keep in mind that nothing had happened during this time that actually changed the size of the wetland. The farmer did not farm the land. The drainage system was not expanded. And no additional water was present in the area.

The only difference was the way each level of the agency interpreted the wetland regulations. And undoubtedly, the lack of common sense contained in the underlying regulations caused this confusion within the agency.

All of this sounds ridiculous until you consider that a real price is paid by our citizens who are subject to these regulations. The farmer in Greene County, IA will lose thousands of dollars in future income because the bureaucracy decided that he could not farm his land. Even though this land had been farmed continuously for the past 90 years.

It is cases such as this that undermine the faith that Americans have in their Government. It is cases such as this that motivate the electorate to throw out a party that has been in control of Congress for the past 40 years. And if S. 343 will help just one person like the farmer in Greene County, IA, then the Senate should pass this bill and the President should sign it into law.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request that I think will get us to the Boxer amendment. I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks of myself and Senator MURRAY—I will not be very long—the Johnston amendment be laid aside and that Senator BOXER be recognized to offer her amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. Reserving the right to object. And I appreciate my friend from Utah working on this issue of the environmental cleanup, and I hope we will successfully do it. I note that we have been on the amendment for about 3 hours and that it is not a delay coming from this side. I simply mention that to say that I hope we will be able to get time agreements from now on and be able to move expeditiously. We made great progress today so far. And we will continue.

Mr. HATCH. I appreciate that.

Mr. GLENN. Reserving the right to object. I wonder if it will be possible to get a time agreement. Will the Senator give us any idea how much time it will take? We are going to try to—I will tell everybody I would like to get time agreements on everything that comes out from now on.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think Senator BOXER——

Mr. GLENN. We have to wait on the time agreement. She can go ahead and proceed. I will not object to the UC.

Mr. HATCH. Can I reverse the UC, because I understand Senator MURRAY is only going to take 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. GLENN. Senator BOXER has to come to the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Senator MURRAY is going to speak on Superfund. Why do I not reverse that, have her speak first, I will speak second, and then Senator BOXER can offer her amendment.

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

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah. I simply rise today to support the Johnston-Baucus amendment that strips the Superfund provisions from this bill. It touches on one of the most pressing issues facing my home State of Washington: the cleanup of the tons of nuclear waste that is contained at the Hanford Reservation.

The bill before us specifically targets Superfund sites and subjects activities costing more than $10 million to immediate cost-benefit analysis and risk assessment. This assessment will be required even where agreements have been reached and cleanup has already begun. All cleanup would come to a screeching halt so that the Government could analyze the benefits of cleaning up toxic waste.

Hanford cleanup has come under intense and justified scrutiny by this Congress. Its critics have railed that it has cost billions of dollars and has resulted only in reams of documents, not any actual cleanup. This bill would only exacerbate those problems. Cleanup that is finally getting underway would stop while the Department of Energy conducted potentially dozens of more analyses on the benefits of cleaning up the nuclear waste that today is seeping toward the Columbia River.

Mr. President, there is a lot we do not know about the risks of radioactive waste. We do not know how to clean it up, where to store it, or how fast it migrates, or any number of things. Because so much is unknown, a detailed generic cost-benefit analysis and risk-assessment process would be endless and very costly.

Let me add, however, that while I do not support the cumbersome approach taken in the current bill, I do believe the Hanford site and other Superfund sites will benefit from a cost-benefit analysis. In fact, I will encourage us to move toward a bill that incorporates risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis into the decisionmaking structure at Hanford. We should try to develop a bill that requires consideration of costs but does not impose inefficiencies or unnecessary taxpayer-funded analytical costs that result only in reports, but we should not do it on this bill.

Finally, I would like to remind this body that the Department of Energy is facing tremendous budget cuts and possibly elimination. Burdening it with this review process while at the same time demanding that it improve the pace of its cleanup and reduce costs is a recipe for disaster in my home State.

This bill is not the place to make the reforms most of us believe are necessary to improve Superfund. The place to make those changes is in reauthorization of CERCLA before the authorizing committee with its indepth knowledge of this important law.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Johnston-Baucus amendment to strip the Superfund provisions from this bill. Both current and future citizens who live near our Nation's nuclear waste facilities will thank you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

RACIST ACTIVITIES AN OUTRAGE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am going to divert from this bill for a minute on a matter that I consider to be of extreme importance. I have been reading some accounts in the newspaper, and I would like to take a moment to address something that deeply distresses me.

According to certain press reports, several current and former Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearm agents participated in a so-called good old boys roundup, an event that is alleged to have involved hateful, racist conduct.

As many of my colleagues are no doubt aware, this event involved hundreds of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agents. When African-American agents tried to attend the event, however, they were turned away. According to various news reports, participants at the event displayed blatantly racist signs and sold T-shirts displaying, among other things, Dr. Martin Luther King's face behind a target and a picture of an African-American man sprawled across a police car with the words ''Boys on the Hood.''

Apparently other things were available for sale that are, frankly, too despicable to even be mentioned on the Senate floor. I can only express my outrage and anger that such activities of this type could occur in America and especially when law enforcement officials are involved.

Mr. President, it means something to me and I think every American—it means something—for a person to be a law enforcement officer. Among other things, it means that the American people have placed their trust in that law enforcement officer. It means that they represent the people, all the people. And it means that they have taken an oath to uphold and enforce the law, and if we cannot rely on law enforcement officers to do that, upon whom can we rely?

That any American, but especially any law enforcement officer who holds a sacred trust, would engage in these racist activities is an outrage, and it must be condemned. To be an effective law enforcement officer, you must have the trust and the respect of our people. Indeed, law enforcement officers take an oath to defend the community. When law enforcement officers engage in racist activities, they betray the trust of the people and they disgrace the uniforms that they are empowered to wear.

This is not only a concern of African-Americans, this is a concern to all Americans. We have a right to expect that our law enforcement officers will treat all citizens equally. If the press reports are true, and these officers engaged in hateful racist conduct, not only must their actions be condemned, but they should be dismissed from their positions, for no one in whom the people's trust is placed should be allowed to destroy that trust by engaging in such hateful behavior.

No doubt some of the participants will say that they were aware of what was going on but did not directly participate. I would ask them, What were you thinking? If you were at a party and people were selling drugs, would you not do something as a law enforcement officer? Those who would stand by while others engage in this kind of conduct are no less guilty than those who turn their heads when crimes are committed on the street. We simply cannot tolerate any sort of racist conduct on behalf of our law enforcement officers, not of any sort by any law enforcement officers.

I hope Director Magaw will take swift action to determine whether these allegations are true and, if so, to dismiss those who are involved.

Similarly, I would tell State and local law enforcement agencies to purge themselves of agents who would violate the people's sacred trust by engaging in such hateful activities. This is America. We are one Nation under God. We are a Nation that guarantees liberty and justice to all people. When one citizen is mistreated regardless of race, color, or creed, all citizens should be outraged. And when a person clothed with the authority of the people engages in hateful conduct, that person's conduct must be condemned by the people. We simply cannot condone racial discrimination in any of its vile forms.

Having said that, I have to say almost all law enforcement officers are good, decent people, but those who betray the public trust by displaying deplorable judgment and terrible prejudice, they forfeit that trust.

Let me be clear that this is not the voice of political correctness. Being a law enforcement officer is a public trust, because public-safety matters of life and death are in the hands of law enforcement officers. The overwhelming majority of our law enforcement officers are really good people. But if someone authorized to wield a gun in the name of the law can organize and find comfort at gatherings such as the one I have described, that person does not deserve the people's trust.

Faced with a threatening situation, or the perception of a threat, can we be confident that such an agent would not react based on prejudice if the situation involved an African-American or some other minority person?

This is not a matter of concern only to African-Americans, I might add. Prejudice is not so readily limited. But I would not want someone exhibiting such terrible judgment and prejudice enforcing the law with respect to me either. If it is determined that these various officers have done these things and that these accounts are true, then, I reiterate, those law enforcement agents who knowingly participated ought to be fired. They ought to be terminated. We should not have them in positions of trust among the people. They should certainly not wear the badge of the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Bureau.

Having said that, I hope that the director will get behind this, find out exactly what the true facts are, determine who the people are who are culpable and responsible for this kind of activity. I think they should be fired on the spot.

It is just one of those things that you just cannot tolerate in a society as great as ours.

I yield the floor.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I know there has been a unanimous-consent agreement. Do we have any time agreements or just consent to start something?

Mr. HATCH. We did not have any time agreements because the Senator from California was not here. Now that she is, we would like to work out a time agreement.

Mr. GLENN. If the majority leader will yield, we are going to try to get time agreements for everything coming to the floor from now on. I hope we can get 15 minutes a side for everything that comes to the floor. We are going to propose that. I hope people listening can think about this and agree to it. We have been wasting time with people talking, and also on various subjects that do not have anything to do with the legislation that we are considering here. So I hope everybody can come up with time agreements, if possible.

Mr. DOLE. In some cases, there may be second-degree amendments on either side. So it may take a bit longer than 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader, if he will yield on that point, I feel very strongly that I want to have a vote on my amendment. If there is going to be a second-degree, I will not agree to a time agreement. I will be happy to agree to 15 minutes on each side, but if there is a second-degree, I cannot agree because there is no way for me to get a vote on my underlying amendment. It is a problem for me.

Mr. GLENN. I think that would be the general attitude all the way through this thing. Unless we know what is coming up on the second-degree amendment, we are not likely to agree to a time agreement on it. If we can agree to these things without second-degreeing everything——

Mr. HATCH. But we do not even know the form of the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. We do not even know what the first-degree amendment is.

Mr. HATCH. That is the way the Senate operates.

Mr. GLENN. Then maybe we cannot get time agreements.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, at 11 o'clock, we said we were going to start mowing them down around here, and I know the Senator from Louisiana was surprised when I filed cloture. But, frankly, I was surprised when he offered an amendment to knock out Superfund. I did not know that was going to happen. So there has been a double surprise here. We are trying to come to grips with that amendment.

In the meantime, I think there has been agreement to go to the amendment of the Senator from California. But to suggest that we cannot get time agreements and you cannot offer second-degree amendments, then I think we are going to be in real trouble, because both sides always reserve the right to offer second-degree amendments. It seems to me that it is something we need to work out before we start.

Mr. President, the liberal opponents of commonsense regulatory reform must be celebrating after watching some of this week's reports on the evening news, and reading some of the stories and columns in some of our most distinguished newspapers.

Last night, a report on ABC's ''World News Tonight'' claimed Republican supporters of regulatory reform are ''on the defensive.'' And it is no wonder, considering how the media have fed the American people a steady diet of phony claims that we are out to promote tainted meat and unhealthy food.

Liberal New York Times Columnist Bob Herbert a few days ago took a page