heard it once, we have heard it five times from the bully pulpit of the White House in the last 6 months: And oh, by the way, to all you Americans who did not catch my sleight of hand, I want to release a bunch of terrorists who were accused and found guilty of violating Federal firearms laws and give them clemency.

Mr. President, the American people and this Congress are simply not that dumb. We know you live a double standard and that you speak it oftentimes for political purposes. And on this one you got caught. But, because of the power of the office, you moved ahead and done it anyway.

For that I am sorry and wish we could pull that back. But at least, as a Senate, we can speak loudly, as the House did, and force this President to be honest with the American people, if not for just a moment because he has not been honest with us.

So, Mr. President, if you want to offer clemency, when somebody is found guilty of the misuse of Federal firearms laws, then do not come to this Senator or this Senate and ask for more Federal firearms laws with which you can play.

I find myself on the floor more often than I would like defending the second amendment. But I find it necessary and responsible as a Senator who takes an oath of office to uphold our Constitution because I believe the second amendment is, in fact, a constitutional right in this country. But I have been very cautious in directing or steering the Senate in the crafting of new Federal firearms laws to make sure that we do not take away from those fundamental constitutional rights, and yet the President wants sweeping new power in those areas and then wants to arbitrarily and politically decide when to forgive and forget.

Sorry, Mr. President, this time you do not get it both ways. Fool me once, my fault; fool me twice, no, I think not. That is what is happening. I am glad the American people have finally caught on.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEPLORING THE ACTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT CLINTON REGARDING GRANTING CLEMENCY TO FALN TERRORISTS—Continued

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the future quorum calls be charged to the minority side.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on S.J. Res. 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution, as modified, pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 273 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Feingold	Mack
Ashcroft	Feinstein	McConnell
Baucus	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Bayh	Frist	Moynihan
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Murray
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Reed
Boxer	Hagel	Reid
Breaux	Harkin	Robb
Brownback	Hatch	Roberts
Bryan	Helms	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hollings	Roth
Burns	Hutchinson	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inhofe	Schumer
Chafee	Inouye	Sessions
Cleland	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerry	Specter
Craig	Kohl	Stevens
Crapo	Kyl	Thomas
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dodd	Leahy	Torricelli
Domenici	Levin	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lieberman	Warner
Durbin	Lincoln	Wyden
Edwards	Lott	

NAYS—2

Akaka	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Gregg	McCain

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33), as modified, was passed.

The preamble, as modified, was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

Whereas the Armed Forces of National Liberation (the FALN) is a militant terrorist organization that claims responsibility for the bombings of approximately 130 civilian, political, and military sites throughout the United States;

Whereas its reign of terror resulted in 6 deaths and the permanent maiming of dozens of others, including law enforcement officials;

Whereas 16 members of the FALN were tried for numerous felonies against the United States, including seditious conspiracy;

Whereas at their trials, none of the 16 defendants contested any of the evidence presented by the United States;

Whereas at their trials none expressed remorse for their actions;

Whereas all were subsequently convicted and sentenced to prison for terms up to 90 years;

Whereas not a single act of terrorism has been attributed to the FALN since the imprisonment of the 16 terrorists;

Whereas no petitions for clemency were made by these terrorists, but other persons sought such clemency for them;

Whereas on August 11, 1999, President William Jefferson Clinton offered conditional clemency to these 16 terrorists, all of whom have served less than 20 years in prison;

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and 2 United States Attorneys all reportedly advised the President not to grant leniency to the 16 terrorists;

Whereas the State Department in 1998 reiterated two longstanding tenets of counter terrorism policy that the United States will: ''(1) make no concessions to terrorists and strike no deals''; and ''(2) bring terrorists to justice for their crimes'';

Whereas the President's offer of clemency to the FALN terrorists violates longstanding tenets of United States counterterrorism policy; and

Whereas the release of terrorists is an affront to the rule of law, the victims and their families, and every American who believes that violent acts must be punished to the fullest extent of the law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That making concessions to terrorists is deplorable and that President Clinton should not have granted clemency to the FALN terrorists.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak briefly as in morning business.

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

THE PEOPLE OF RURAL OREGON AND THE STEENS MOUNTAIN

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, last week I spoke in this Chamber of the damage that has been inflicted by this administration upon the people and communities of rural Oregon. I spoke specifically about communities such as John Day and Roseburg, communities where the failure of this administration to keep its word with regard to timber harvests has brought

great harm to families, communities, schools, and to their roads.

I am grateful to this Senate and the Senator from Washington for his leadership on this issue and voting last week to put the interests of children and families above a survey of fungus, snails, and slugs.

I return to the floor today to share with my colleagues a story about another rural Oregon community, one that is facing an uncertain future because of possible actions by this administration.

I traveled this past weekend to the community of Burns, OR, in Harney County. Harney County is small in population and large in area. About 8,000 people live in this county. It is roughly the size of the State of Massachusetts. It includes part of the largest Ponderosa pine forest in the whole Nation. It includes over 100,000 head of beef cattle on vast open ranges. It includes the Steens Mountain.

I would like to speak to you about the Steens Mountain and what this administration proposes to do with it.

Let me begin by saying that to fly over the Steens Mountain, and to tour it on the ground and from the air, as I did last Saturday, is to see some of the most breathtaking scenery in this country or any other; and to stand on the ridgetops of the Steens is to view unspoiled vistas of the Kiger Gorge, the Alvord Desert, and other true national treasures. From its peak you can see the States of Idaho, Nevada, California, and nearly all of Oregon. It is a very special place.

The Steens Mountain has remained unspoiled for one simple reason: The people of Burns and Harney County love Steens Mountain. Through unique partnerships between the Bureau of Land Management and private land owners, who own almost 30 percent of the mountain, they have found a formula that has worked. Harney County residents take great pride in their stewardship of the mountain that one rancher referred to, to me, as a ''tough old girl.'' At the heart of their stewardship is the commonsense principle of multiple use.

Their pride is very justifiable. According to the Bureau of Land Management, over the past 30 years essentially 100 percent of upland and riparian conditions on the Steens Mountain that needed improvement has, in fact, been improved.

I traveled to the Steens in response to a trip that Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt made there several weeks ago. After touring the mountain and praising what had been accomplished by local citizens, Secretary Babbitt also announced that only Uncle Sam could be trusted with the future of the mountain. He said that before this administration left office, he wanted to designate the mountain as a national conservation area or as a national monument; no matter what had been done before and how well it looked, still we cannot trust local citizens; we need to trust those with the wisdom of the bureaucracy in the beltway. Such a designation, as he proposed, would have far-reaching impacts, not only on the future of the mountain but on the future of those who live and work in its shadow.

Such an announcement would run counter to the significant efforts of the Southeastern Oregon Resource Advisory Council. It is known locally as the RAC. The council is made up of individuals from conservation groups, resource groups, public bodies, and Federal agencies that have assumed the responsibility of exploring the proposal for a Steens Mountain National Conservation Area. This cooperative approach is the type of open and public process that I support and one that should be supported by this administration. But this group now labors under the certainty that, no matter what they decide, a decision has already been made here that the administration will make a designation.

I plan to meet with Secretary Babbitt in the very near future. I hope to do it with my colleague from Oregon and Congressman WALDEN who represents this area. When we do, we will share the frustrations expressed to each of us by citizens of Harney County when we have visited there. They have asked me why this administration is trying to impose a solution where there is no problem. The old adage that this is ''a solution looking for a problem'' has never been more true than when applied to the Steens Mountain.

They asked me why this administration does not trust them to continue with their excellent management techniques and innovative practices that have been at the heart of their stewardship. They asked me why this administration would be promoting a designation that would undoubtedly bring more visitors to the area, thereby harming the very environment they supposedly seek to protect. And they asked me if the Secretary's promise to work with them in the months ahead was real or whether this administration has already made up its mind.

I would also like to put on the Record the taunting that is being made to the administration by some members of the environmental community from organizations that support more Federal involvement on the Steens Mountain. It was said in the open, in the presence of the media, that Secretary Babbitt and this administration were being urged to find a legacy other than the impeachment scandal. They were literally saying: Grab private land, and you can grab a better legacy for yourself. They were urging a version of a domestic ''wagging of the dog.''

I pray that this is not so because this is not the basis for good land management. Oregon does not need such an insult as was being urged upon this administration by some in the environmental community.

The bottom line is that I believe the future of the Steens Mountain in Harney County is in much better hands with the folks who live there—folks such as County Commissioner Dan Nichols and ranchers such as Fred Otley and Stacey and Elaine Davies—than it is, than it ever will be, in the hands of Federal bureaucrats who reside within the beltway.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

THE ''13TH MONTH''

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, earlier today, there was quite a bit of colorful rhetoric and blustering on the floor by the Democratic Party about reports in the Washington Post today that Republicans were going to create a ''13th month'' to allow more spending on education and other programs.

Lest I be accused of partisanship, I think many of you know I am an Independent. So those who say I am going to speak on behalf of Republicans, I guess, would technically be wrong. I don't pretend to speak for the Republicans, and I am not privy to what was said in any meetings with the Republicans regarding the so-called 13th month. But let me speak for myself as an Independent and say I don't support a 13th month for any fiscal year.

But in their effort to be partisan and embarrass Republicans over what was probably a mischaracterization, in my view, in a liberal newspaper, my Democrat colleagues failed to address the key issue, which is, where do you come up with the money to fund all of these programs?

In their zeal to make partisan points and poke fun—and they did have a good time—they failed to offer any constructive solution. If you are going to poke fun and make jokes about the 13th month headline, what are your alternatives? My guess is they would prefer to use the same budget tactics they have been using for about 50 years. The result of those budget tactics over the past 50 years has been to run up the national debt to where it is almost $6 trillion, raid the Social Security trust fund, and in order to do it all raise taxes.

Every year, we do this. Every year, the train comes down the track and usually has a wreck. We spend, spend, spend, spend, and then we get to the