most of the stations along the highway, Risse said. 

Traditionally, employers have been re-

responsive government, and the need for re-
duced fees for various services. These fees may have been intended to cover the costs of providing those services, but they often go beyond what is necessary to cover those costs. In some cases, the fees are costing governments more than they are generating in revenue. This can lead to increased costs for taxpayers and reduced services for the public. It is important for governments to carefully consider the fees they charge and ensure that they are fair and reasonable. They should also be transparent about how they are using the fees collected.

Finally, another provision of the Red Tape Reduction Act is that the regulation must be clearly and concisely written. This is important because the regulations that are written in a way that is difficult to understand can make it difficult for businesses to follow them. The Red Tape Reduction Act requires that regulations be written in a way that is clear and easy to understand. This will help to ensure that businesses can comply with the regulations and avoid costly mistakes.

The Red Tape Reduction Act has been a success. It has helped to reduce the number of regulations that are being created and to make the regulations that are in place more understandable. This has helped to reduce the burden on businesses and to make the regulatory process more efficient. It has also helped to reduce the costs of regulatory compliance for businesses.
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Mr. BOND. Mr. President, five years ago today the Congress, without dissent in the Senate, took a historic step in reining in the federal government’s regulatory machine and protecting the interest of small businesses. My Red Tape Reduction Act, what others call the Red Tape Reduction Fairness Act, ensured that small businesses would be given a voice in the regulatory process at the time when it could make the most difference: before the regulation is published as a proposal.

This act provides a number of provisions that have proven to make the regulatory process more attentive to the impact on small businesses, and consequently more fair, more efficient and more effective. Perhaps the best known of these provisions is the requirement that OSHA and EPA convene panels to receive comments from small businesses before their regulations are proposed. This gives these agencies the unique opportunity to learn up front what the problems with their regulation may be, and to correct these problems when it will cause the least difficulty. This has resulted in significant changes being made, and in one case, even a rejection of a regulation because they recognized that the industry could deal with the issue more effectively on their own.

Experience with this panel process had proven to be an unequivocal success. The former chief counsel for advocacy of the Small Business Administration stated that, “Unquestionably, the SBREFA panel process has had a very salutary impact on the regulatory deliberations of OSHA and EPA, resulting in major changes to draft regulations. What is important to note is that these changes were accomplished without sacrificing the agencies’ public policy objectives.”

Another provision of the Red Tape Reduction Act that was just exercised, was the Congressional Review Act, which gave Congress the ability to invalidate those regulations determined to be truly egregious and beyond repair. Thankfully, we had this measure available to halt the highway.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, March 28, 2001, the Federal debt stood at $5,734,570,704,080.99, Five trillion, seven hundred thirty-four billion, seven hundred four thousand, eighty dollars and ninety-nine cents.

One year ago, March 28, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,733,742,000,000, Five trillion, seven hundred thirty-three billion, seven hundred sixty million, seven hundred four thousand, eighty dollars and ninety-nine cents.

Five years ago, March 28, 1996, the Federal debt stood at $5,071,792,000,000, Five trillion, seventy-one billion, seven hundred ninety-two million, seven hundred ninety-two million.
Ten years ago, March 28, 1991, the Federal debt stood at $3,460,731,000,000. Three trillion, four hundred sixty billion, three hundred seventy-one million.

Fifteen years ago, March 28, 1986, the Federal debt stood at $1,981,783,000,000. One trillion, nine hundred eighty-one billion, seven hundred eighty-three million, seven hundred forty-four thousand, eight hundred dollars and ninety-nine cents, during the past 15 years.

IN MEMORY OF ROWLAND EVANS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the best example of the free press was Rowland Evans and the best brief on this outstanding man was from his partner, Robert D. Novak, in the Washington Post, Thursday, March 29. I ask consent that the brief be included in the RECORD for his friends that knew him and for the millions more that were informed by his writing.

The brief follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 2001]

ROWLAND EVANS, REPORTER

(By Robert D. Novak)

On Monday morning, Dec. 17, 1982, I returned from my honeymoon and found multiple phone messages from Rowly Evans on my desk in the Wall Street Journal’s Washington bureau. Evans, a reporter for the New York Herald-Tribune, asked me at a subsequent lunch to collaborate with him in a daily newspaper column.

The goal was a product short on ideology, long on reporting, fast on opinion. The first column was on May 15, 1983, and ran in this space under our double byline until Evans retired from the column 30 years later. Over the years, I fear, we became political. But we promised ourselves that every column would contain some information, major or mundane, never previously reported.

We kept that promise, thanks to Evans’s energies. Several obituaries noting the death of Rowland Evans from cancer on March 23 described him as a conservative. More appropriately, he should be remembered as a reporter and a patriot.

His model was the column written by the Alsop brothers—Joseph and Stewart—who combined dogged reporting with a passion for the security of the United States. Like Joe Alsop, Evans belonged to the Washington black-tie dinner parties, still flourishing when our column began.

Rowly snagged stories on the Georgetown party circuit, including an exclusive on U.S. plans for an electronic wall to protect south Vietnam from North Vietnamese bombing, featuring unscripted, fast-cut and fast-talking, featuring relentless interrogation of sources, Senators, Cabinet members and anonymous sources. We saw what I called ‘dinner-conference‘ and ‘lunch or breakfast at the Metropolitan Club found ourselves facing a questioner who insisted on answers. He traveled everywhere for stories, covering the Vietnam, Six-Day and Gulf wars, often at great physical risk.

Readers who thought they could spot the principal author of our columns would be surprised to learn that I was not responsible for “Reassessing Goldwater,” published on April 9, 1964. Since at that time I had close contact with Sen. Barry Goldwater, it was assumed that I had written the column disputing the conventional wisdom that Mr. Conservative was dead for the Republican presidential nomination. After much shoe leather reporting, Evans came to the conclusion that Goldwater quite likely would be the nominee.

He flourished when reporting on national security, using all sources both prominent and shadowy. He was ahead of everybody in forecasting the breakdown of Soviet satellite rule in Poland and Czechoslovakia. In 1974 he correctly called another exposed Soviet cheating on arms control agreements that U.S. officials tried to ignore. Evans considered that work the high point of his journalistic career.

Nothing he did ever caused more trouble than his tough reporting on Israeli intran-