

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

sincerely what Teddy Roosevelt said. I have quoted Teddy Roosevelt a few times on this floor. To paraphrase, he said Americans have a responsibility to critique the President more than any other person in America. To not do so is both base and servile.

My friend also knows that I have spoken out about the leadership of Presidents of my own party. President Reagan busted the budget with his defense spending. I questioned his wisdom and leadership in cracking down on welfare queens while letting welfare queens in the defense industry squeeze through the cracks. I questioned President Bush when he proposed raising taxes in 1990. He promised he would not, but he did; and I criticized him.

Now I am criticizing this President, President Clinton, for failing to set a good example across the board. It is a pattern. It is pervasive. It encourages more cynicism by our people.

If we want to set a good example for the young people of this country and for the next generation, if we want to stop the growing cynicism in this country toward our elected leaders and our institutions, then we must begin by setting higher standards of conduct for ourselves. We must set a good example for our country.

When we do not, Mr. President, when we do not do that, it is precisely because of a failure of moral leadership. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, we are in morning business and entitled to address the Senate for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, in just a few moments we are going to return to the immigration bill. We have orders for votes on various amendments. Then, hopefully, we will have the legislation that will be open for amendment. I intend at the earliest possible time to offer an amendment on increasing the minimum wage. I would be more than glad to enter into a time limitation so that our side would have 30 minutes and the other side would have 30 minutes. It seems to me that the 13 million families that will be affected by the minimum wage are entitled to have at least 30 minutes of the U.S. Senate's time in order to make their case before the U.S. Senate, and it seems to me that they are entitled to a decision by the U.S. Senate as to whether we are going to provide some economic justice and decency for those Americans who have been left out and left behind on the lower rung of the economic ladder—who are working hard, trying to provide for their families, and still existing in poverty.

Mr. President, I think the urgency for offering that amendment is just

emphasized once again by what the leader in the House of Representatives talked about just yesterday, that he, Mr. ARMEY, as the House majority leader, has indicated his continued opposition to the increase in the minimum wage. What he is basically talking about is a brand new entitlement program, the elimination of the earned income tax credit, which is a lifeline to working families, particularly working families with children. All of us understand that the earned income tax credit, which Ronald Reagan himself said was the best poverty program, provides help and assistance for working families with children. The minimum wage makes a difference for those families. For the individual or couple who does not have children, the increase in the minimum wage makes the greatest difference to them.

But what Mr. ARMEY is talking about is the elimination of the earned income tax credit. He says we will develop a program. Who will run it? The IRS, the Internal Revenue Service. They are going to be the ones who run a new entitlement program.

Now, Mr. President, he says this will save \$15 billion. You know where that \$15 billion is going to come from? It will come from those who benefit from the earned income tax credit, who are the neediest working families in this country.

The increase in the minimum wage will provide \$3.7 billion a year to these families. So, in effect, what he is saying is we will take the earned income tax credit away from those families, we will put in the Internal Revenue Code a subsidy program, and the subsidy program, which will be paid for by Federal taxpayers, generally will be contributed to by other workers.

Mr. President, it is about time we had a clear vote and a clean vote on the increase in the minimum wage. We have a bipartisan group here in the U.S. Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have supported the increase in the minimum wage. We are going to take the first opportunity that presents itself, after the disposition of these votes, to offer that with a time limit so the American people will be able to find out who is on their side.

I would hope that we would be able to work that out as a matter of comity, but we are going to continue to press that issue as we move through with this legislation and other legislation until we have an opportunity to speak for those 13 million families that are, today, being left out and left behind.

There is no excuse for the majority leader not to schedule this program. We would not need to offer this amendment if we were given a reasonable time to debate this on a clean bill and do it at any time of the day or evening that the majority leader wants to do it.

Let us have at least an opportunity to speak to this issue. Mr. Majority Leader, do not deny us economic justice for working families.

Mr. LOTT. Noticing that the manager of the bill is not on the floor yet,

I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended for 10 minutes so I may address some comments to the ones just made and speak briefly about this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, I will not object as long as my friend and colleague will somehow be recognized during consideration of morning business.

Mr. DORGAN. Parliamentary inquiry. My understanding was that morning business was already extended 10 minutes by the unanimous consent, agreed to by the Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY. If that is the case, the Senator from Mississippi is asking the 10 minutes be added to that time?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator. First, Mr. President, is that correct, it had already been extended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business closes at 10:10.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was supposed to be accorded 15 minutes for my remarks. I have to make these remarks this morning. I appreciate if it could be extended. I was on the list. Could I follow the distinguished Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could inquire of the Chair, does the distinguished Senator from North Dakota desire time also?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. LOTT. How much time is he interested in?

Mr. DORGAN. Eight minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended until 10:30.

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

Mr. HATCH. Could it be in this order: the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, then the Senator from Utah, then the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LOTT. I modify the unanimous consent to that effect.

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

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleagues for working with us as we get that worked out.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we are here today going to take up legislation that I hope will pass before the end of this legislative week. It is very important legislation. It is major immigration reform.

We have a problem in America with illegal immigration. We are not controlling our borders. We have illegal immigrants in this country that are taking advantage of the taxpayers of this country. There needs to be some changes. There needs to be some relief in the way we handle immigration in America, particularly as it applies to illegal immigrants.

This legislation has already been delayed a week now while we argue over