

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 COMPANY 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 hamstrings 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

anyone say that this legislation—absent the Feinstein amendment—is a serious effort aimed at prevention? How do we intend to stop a future terrorist from blowing up a Federal building if we will not even take away his instruction manual?

Mr. President, the provisions that I have highlighted here are just some of the provisions that I believe made S. 735, the Comprehensive Terrorism Prevention Act, a good, tough, worthwhile bill. But as I have noted, each of those was dropped from the final product. As such, we have been left with a measure that, in many ways, is simply untrue to its title. No longer, in my opinion, is this bill comprehensive, or directed at prevention. Accordingly, I was compelled to vote against the conference report.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we are in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Iowa we are in morning business with Senators allowed to speak up to 5 minutes each.

THE VOID IN MORAL LEADERSHIP—PART SIX

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday I continued my series of talks on this floor on the failure of moral leadership in the White House. I understand that sometime after I spoke—and I am sorry I was not here on the floor to politely listen to what he had to say—my friend from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, addressed my comments. So I would like to respond to his comments.

First, I want to echo what he said about our long friendship and relationship working together, particularly to protect the taxpayers' interests. And that cooperation includes not just saving billions in defense cost overruns and defective weapons, as he mentioned yesterday, it also included the work that he and I did in passing the taxpayers' bill of rights. That was a bill to protect our taxpayers and to give them more protections against the abusive practices of the IRS.

I have not known a Senator in this body who has been more dedicated to good Government than Senator PRYOR has been. When he retires after this Congress, we will lose not just a respected colleague and friend, but an effective consensus builder. I will miss his leadership and I know my colleagues will as well.

Yesterday my friend from Arkansas defended the President's record on the environment in the wake of criticism that I had raised. What Senator PRYOR said is fair enough. I do not have any problems with that, because the Senator has a right to protect his friend, the former Governor of his home State, when his record has been critiqued, as I have been doing in several speeches on the floor of the Senate.

Apparently my friend from Arkansas misunderstood my comments regarding Earth Day. I did not mean to take exception to the President celebrating Earth Day at our national parks. Earth Day should be celebrated. Environmental protection is and should be a very high priority, and the President should continue to show his commitments to this issue.

But put yourself in my position, or the position of a constituent from my State. I was referring yesterday to the director of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, who wrote a letter that I placed in the RECORD yesterday.

You can all read it. The director of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources is charged with protecting the environment in my State of Iowa. Yet, as he watched the President tout his environmental record on Earth Day, he is faced with the fact that the President's budget will result in the termination of many important environmental programs. So, for the director of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, he clearly sees President Clinton's actions falling far short of the rhetoric of the President of the United States.

However, I do find it interesting, Mr. President, that the Senator from Arkansas yesterday, in response to me, failed to address the main points of my remarks. You see, my point was not to critique the President's record on the environment. Rather, it was a troubling pattern that this President has in saying one thing and doing another. My point was also to explain why a pattern like that can be so damaging, because it does two things—first, it continues to nourish the climate of cynicism that has swept the country, and, second, it fails to set a good record for the country, especially for the young people. A country without leaders is a country without direction.

There is no more important attribute for a President, any President, than moral leadership. That is according to a former great President, FDR, former member of the same party as my good friend from Arkansas. I know Senator PRYOR has regard for the judgment and wisdom of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. What did FDR mean when he said moral leadership is the most important attribute of any President? He meant simply it is important for a President to set a good example, the kind of example that we would like to see set for our children by our teachers, by our community leaders, by our little league coaches, and, yes, even our parents.

I have laid out specifically in seven previous speeches where I thought our President has failed to set a proper example. The practice cuts across all issues, not just on the environment. It has happened on the budget, happened on Travelgate, happened on Whitewater, on AmeriCorps, and on combating drugs.

Simply put, the programs do not do what the lofty rhetoric says they do.

There is tremendous damage done with this false advertising. It erodes the ability of our Nation's leaders to lead and undercuts their moral authority to lead. That is when cynicism grows.

Mr. President, could I have 3 more minutes, please?

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object; I do not intend to object. There was an agreement to lay down the immigration bill at 10 a.m. So, if we can get an agreement to extend the morning hour, if the Senator would ask to extend the morning hour.

Mr. GRASSLEY. By 3 minutes? Five minutes? Ten minutes?

Mr. KENNEDY. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thought my friend from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, would have taken issue with my observations that the President has not set a good example for the country and for the young people. I thought he would take issue with some of the people I quoted who made other observations, and I would like to give some examples.

The observation that James Stewart made in his book "Blood Sport." He said the story of Whitewater is about the arrogance of power, about "what people think they can get away with as an elected official, and then how candid and honest they are when questioned about it."

Charles Krauthammer, a syndicated columnist, observed why the White House was covering up Travelgate and Whitewater even though there were not any crimes. In January, he noted that "the vanity of the Clintons is . . . that they are morally superior." He said, "The offense is hypocrisy of a high order. Having posed as moral betters, they had to cover up. At stake is their image."

The observation of Rouvain Benison, a Democrat, who was quoted in the Washington Post on March 24. He said, "Whitewater is a symptom, the lack of moral leadership, of moral integrity, strength, courage—all the good things in a person's character."

The observation of Eric Pooley of Time magazine. He wrote recently that, with this White House, "speeches are as important as substance and rhetoric becomes its own reality." He then quotes a senior White House adviser as saying, "Words are actions." In other words, it is not important what the President does; just listen to what he says.

These are all examples that I have given over the past months in speeches on the floor. I am merely compiling the observations of others, of respected, credible individuals. This is what I thought my friend from Arkansas would have responded to, because the important issue is moral leadership, leading by example, and the many instances—across the board—in which this President has failed to show such leadership.

My friend from Arkansas knows, Mr. President, that I take seriously and