

that for the week ending April 19, the United States imported 7,300,000 barrels of oil each day—712,000 barrels fewer than the 8,012,000 barrels imported during the same period a year ago.

This is one of those rare weeks when less oil was imported in 1996 than in 1995. Nevertheless, as the box scores I regularly insert into the RECORD indicate, the trend is steadily upward.

Americans now rely on foreign oil for more than 50 percent of their needs, and there is no sign that this upward trend will abate. Before the Persian Gulf war, the United States obtained 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970's, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody interested in restoring domestic production of oil—by U.S. producers using American workers? Politicians had better ponder the calamity that will result if and when foreign producers shut off our supply, or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the United States.

THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today we commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, a horrendous crime against humanity which cannot be denied.

Beginning on April 24, 1915—81 years ago today—the declining Ottoman Empire undertook a systematic effort to kill or drive out the Armenian people. By 1923, more than 1 million Armenians perished as a result of execution, starvation, disease, the harsh environment, and physical abuse. Others were driven from their homeland.

The terrible tragedy that befell the Armenian people was the first systematic genocide in this century. Unfortunately, it was not the last. The Nazi Holocaust, Stalin's purges, and the killings of Cambodians by the Khmer Rouge are all further examples of brutality and death carried out in the name of the state. In Bosnia, American leadership and united international diplomacy and intervention has finally brought an end to the genocidal ethnic cleansing, though ethnic divisions there will be long in healing.

We mark this date in history because it is so important that we remember. We must remember the Armenian genocide and other abuses of state authority against ethnic minorities. We must remember all of the victims of crimes against humanity. Our memory, our vigilance, is essential to ensuring that these acts do not happen again, to Armenians or any other group.

The Armenian people and their culture have survived. The Armenian-American community is thriving in a land where cultural and ethnic diversity are increasingly valued. And the collapse of the Soviet Union gave rise to an independent, democratic Armenian state.

So let us remember the Armenian genocide, let us be vigilant to prevent such crimes in the future, and let us celebrate the Armenian people, who have overcome this tragedy to thrive in independent Armenia and in America.

GOLDEN GAVEL AWARD RECIPIENTS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased today to announce the Senate's Golden Gavel Awards for the 104th Congress.

Each Congress, one important tradition we have is to honor colleagues who preside over the Senate for more than 100 hours. As all Senators know, presiding is frequently a difficult, thankless, and tiring task.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the Golden Gavel recipients today for their tireless efforts. I know that all Senators join me in congratulating our colleagues.

The recipients are as follows: Senator MIKE DEWINE, Senator ROD GRAMS, Senator BILL FRIST, Senator JOHN ASHCROFT, Senator RICK SANTORUM, Senator FRED THOMPSON, Senator SPENCE ABRAHAM, Senator CRAIG THOMAS, Senator JON KYL, and Senator JIM INHOFE.

CHILD LABOR—NOT WITH THE RUGMARK LABEL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a year ago this month, a young child labor activist, Iqbal Masih, was killed in his village in Pakistan. In 1994, when Iqbal traveled to the United States to receive the Reebok Human Rights Award, he also met with the students at Broad Meadows Middle School in Quincy, MA. After Iqbal's death, the students at Broad Meadows decided to honor his memory by building a school in Iqbal's village.

Earlier this month, the students announced that they have raised \$100,000 for a school which will be built by Sudhaar, a nongovernmental organization in Pakistan. Their dedication and commitment to Iqbal's dream assure that he will live on in the hearts and minds of all those who will have a better chance in life because of the school they are building. Armed with the advantages of education, these children in Pakistan will be able to improve their own lives and the lives of their families, their communities, their country, and even our common planet.

Last November, one of the recipients of the Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award was Kailash Satyarthi, head of the South Asian Coalition on Child Servitude, an independent nongovernmental organization dedicated to the eradication of child labor and bonded labor in the carpet industry.

Mr. Satyarthi and his colleagues have established what is known as the Rugmark label, to identify carpets which have not been made with child labor. They are urging consumers to

purchase only carpets which carry the label.

Mr. President, on the anniversary of Iqbal's death, Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, has urged all Americans to honor the Rugmark label. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shanker's appeal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1996]

KNOTTED RUGS

(By Alert Shanker)

The murder of Iqbal Masih, a year ago this week, forced many Americans to look at a problem they would have preferred to avoid: child labor in developing countries. Iqbal was a world-famous human rights activist. He was also a young Pakistani boy whose mother had sold him to a rug maker when he was four. Iqbal eventually freed himself, and by the time he was murdered, at the age of twelve, he had helped free 3,000 other bonded child laborers. That is probably why he was murdered. But many millions of children in Pakistan, India, and other developing nations continue to work as gem stone polishers, glass blowers, and makers of matches, fireworks, clothing and hand-knotted rugs, often conditions that are unspeakable.

Children who knot rugs are crowded into filthy, poorly lit shops that have minimal ventilation for as many as 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. They are often chained to their looms, and they risk being beaten or even killed if they try to escape. Many die anyway because of horrible conditions under which they work. Manufacturers consider young children to be desirable "employees" because they work hard and put up with pay and conditions that adults would not tolerate. The children receive no more than a couple of cents a day for their work; many get nothing.

A number of developing nations—India and Nepal, for example—have laws on the books banning child labor. Nevertheless, you hear some people using hard-nosed economic arguments to justify exploitation of children. They say that if child labor is what it takes to bolster the economy in a developing country, that's the price the country has to pay. And it's really nobody else's business anyway. But many of these countries also have very high unemployment among adults. Why shouldn't companies hire adults so that parents can support their children instead of having to sell them into bondage?

However, we don't have to wait for the companies making hand-knotted rugs to get religion (or for countries that are dragging their feet to start enforcing their child labor laws). These rugs are an important export item, and people who buy them can have a big say about the conditions under which they are made. The traditional weapon used by people who want to protest economic injustice is the boycott: Don't buy the product. But a boycott only punishes, and it often punishes those who act responsibly as well as those who don't.

An Indian child advocate named Kailash Satyarthi had a better idea. He established a nonprofit foundation that allows consumers to identify and buy hand-knotted rugs that are not made with child labor. Rugmark, as the foundation is called, inspects companies that apply for certification and vouches for the fact that they are not using child labor to make their hand-knotted rugs. Inspectors also pay surprise visits to Rugmark-certified companies to make sure they continue to abide by their commitment to use adult

labor only. Consumers can recognize Rugmark rugs by a label that only they will carry.

Rugmark, which is now two years old, has signed up and certified 15 percent of the companies producing hand-knotted rugs in India. A number of others are moving toward certification, but the process is complicated and many carpet makers are understandably hostile to the idea of losing a cheap, excellent, and plentiful supply of labor. So far, the total production of Rugmark rugs has gone to Germany, where the country's largest mail order firm and several large department stores have agreed to carry them. But Rugmark has recently opened up shop in Nepal, with the support of 70 percent of the carpet manufacturers there. These rugs will soon be available for import to the U.S. It's up to American consumers to start talking to stores and catalog companies that carry hand-knotted rugs. They should let the businesses know that they do not want rugs made by children, and they should urge them to put pressure on the importers they deal with.

This coming week, the first Rugmark-certified rugs imported to the U.S. will be auctioned off at a ceremony commemorating the anniversary of Iqbal Masih's death last year. If American consumers do their part, these rugs should be the first of many.

CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 735

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, 1 year ago last week the American people were forced to experience the unimaginable when terrorists placed a bomb in a Federal building in Oklahoma City, killing 168 innocent citizens, some of them children. In response to that grisly deed, as well as the earlier bombing of the World Trade Center in New York City, and the downing of Pan American flight 103 over Scotland, the United States Senate passed S. 735, the "Comprehensive Terrorism Prevention Act," on June 7, 1995. The measure, I think it is important to note, was supported by 91 Senators, myself included.

I supported that bill because I believed it was a good piece of legislation that went a long way toward helping law enforcement agencies combat the rising scourge of domestic terrorism. It was an effective measure with many important provisions—important crime-fighting tools—specifically designed to thwart this growing menace. Our goal, or so I thought, had been to stop domestic terrorism before it could happen; to let terrorists know that they were going to be put down before they could carry out their cowardly acts.

When S. 735 left the Senate last June, there were provisions in the bill that would have permitted Federal law enforcement agencies to pursue known or suspected terrorist groups with the same means that those agencies now employ when pursuing organized crime, or murderers, or bank swindlers. And, as I said, those provisions were endorsed by 91 Senators.

Unfortunately, though, what started out last June as a very worthwhile effort, has this past week been reported back by the conference committee

disemboweled. In fact, this measure has been so thoroughly gutted that I do not see how anyone can honestly call it a terrorism "prevention" bill. Almost every provision designed to enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement officials, almost every provision designed to make it more difficult for the terrorist to operate, and almost every provision that was fashioned to put a stop to this type of activity, was simply sacrificed in conference.

Mr. President, consider this: The original Dole-Hatch bill, and the version that passed the Senate, contained language that would have added certain terrorist offenses to the current long list of crimes for which Federal law enforcement authorities can seek a wiretap. Using weapons of mass destruction, providing material support to terrorists, or engaging in violence at international airports—all of these were activities for which a wiretap could have been sought. But the language that would have added those crimes to the wiretap list was dropped by the conference committee. Consequently, what that means is that, right now, the FBI can institute a wiretap on someone suspected of bribing a bank officer, but not on someone who may be about to attack the New York City subway system with poisonous gas.

That is ludicrous. It simply boggles the mind. If this is supposed to be a bill to "prevent" terrorism, then how can we tie the hands of law enforcement authorities like that? What kind of message does that send to some deranged individual who may be plotting a terrorist activity? What does that say to those organizations that practice international terrorism and may be planning to target the United States? Chasing terrorists with fewer tools than we would use to apprehend someone suspected of bribing a bank official is not, in my opinion, the way to "prevent" terrorism.

When the Senate considered S. 735 last year, it added, by a vote of 77 to 19, a provision that would have allowed law enforcement authorities to obtain what are called multipoint wiretaps. In effect, these special wiretaps allow officials to target an individual suspect rather than an individual telephone. Given the rapid development of communications technology, it is nearly impossible for Federal officials to conduct meaningful investigations of suspected terrorists when all that person has to do is change telephones. Right now, a terrorist can move from his home phone to a car phone to a cellular phone and law enforcement officials—unless they can prove such movement is intentionally meant to thwart the surveillance—will be left in the dust. But the provision to allow multipoint wiretaps was dropped in conference.

Again, such action defies logic. How can we say that we are seriously working to prevent terrorism when we will not even allow officials to keep pace with the terrorists. What message are

we sending when we say that the only terrorists worthy of stopping before they act are those stupid enough to use a single telephone? This is not, I am sorry to say, prevention.

Mr. President, last June the Senate also adopted an amendment to S. 735 that would have allowed the Attorney General to request the technical and logistical assistance of the U.S. military in emergency situations involving biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction. Such authority already exists in the case of nuclear weapons. The amendment the Senate adopted merely extended that authority to include biological and chemical weapons.

I believe this was an important amendment because the Armed Forces of this Nation have special capabilities in this area, with individuals who possess the training to counter biological or chemical weapons. The police departments of our country and the fire departments of our country are not equipped to deal with these emergencies. They simply do not have the expertise to handle a biological or chemical weapons attack. So the Senate adopted the provision, by unanimous consent I would note, that allows for the technical expertise of the military to be used should a terrorist attack occur in which biological or chemical weapons are used.

But that provision, too, was dropped by the conference committee. Consequently, we have a bill that purports to prevent terrorism, but hamstringing Federal, State, and local authorities in any case involving biological or chemical weapons.

The citizens of New York City, or of Los Angeles, or of any city in this Nation should not be forced to suffer a nuclear attack from a terrorist organization before they can expect help from the Federal Government. The American people should not be told, as this bill implicitly tells them, that an imminent attack with chemical weapons is not serious enough to warrant the use of the military. The American people should not have to experience, as did the citizens of Tokyo in March 1995, a gas attack in a subway system before their Congress is willing to act.

Last, when S. 735 was passed by the Senate last year, it contained a provision that would have made it a Federal crime for any person to distribute material that teaches someone how to make a bomb if that person intends or knows that the bomb will be used to commit a crime. That provision, offered by Senator FEINSTEIN, was included in the Senate bill by unanimous consent. Not one of our colleagues stood up and objected to it. But, like many of these preventive tools, the Feinstein amendment was dropped by the conference committee.

It is simply absurd to expect this bill to negatively impact terrorists if the Congress is not even willing to prevent the distribution of what amounts to terrorist training manuals. How can