

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

GRANTING CLEMENCY TO TERRORISTS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I had been presiding and listened intently to the debate that has been taking place. I have a couple of thoughts which I think have not been addressed.

For one thing, we recognize that this has to have been politically inspired, that you do not offer clemency to known terrorists without some type of motivation to do so. If one has been watching the media and if one has been listening to this debate, one has to come to the conclusion that it was politically motivated. There can be no doubt about that. Of course, there are a lot of Puerto Ricans in the United States and in some of the States such as New York, New Jersey, and Florida, perhaps, who could determine the outcome of a vote. So we have politicians catering to them.

I suggest to you, Mr. President, that while this is onerous enough, this is not happening in a vacuum because at the same time people are going after this voting block by offering clemency, something else is going on right now, something that not many people are aware of, and that is, for the last 57 years we have been able to use an island called Vieques off the shores of Puerto Rico as a bombing range, as an amphibious training base. This is classified and characterized by the Navy, as well as the ground troops, as an imperative area for our training and our readiness.

I guess what I am saying is, there is no place else in the Western Hemisphere we can use for this kind of training. It is high-altitude bombing training and also amphibious training. What this also means is when we are about to deploy a ship such as the U.S.S. *Eisenhower* they will not be able to train because of a moratorium on training on Vieques.

How does that relate to this subject at hand? It relates directly in that the reason we are having problems with the range which we have used successfully for 57 years and which is an imperative part of our state of readiness is that it is unique, but they have stopped us from doing it through a moratorium because of the people of the island of Vieques. There are only 9,000 residents on this island who are saying, all of a sudden: Well, we decided we don't want to have bombing on the far end of this island.

This island is over 20 miles long. The bombing range is way over on one side. There is a buffer zone in between that is a national park on which we have spent literally millions of dollars to satisfy that handful of people who want us to abandon the range.

What do we have going on right now? We have people who are running for high office—and I do not think there is any reason to mention who they are at this time—going in and holding press

conferences in Puerto Rico, saying: We want to stop the bombing that is taking place on this range; we want to deactivate the range.

Those individuals who are running for office in Puerto Rico are going one step further. Right now, there are four groups of protesters. These protesters are down on the firing range, walking around where there are live ordnances on the ground, picking them up, throwing them around, and someone is going to get killed. Consequently, having witnessed this, when I came back I wrote a letter and made a phone call to Janet Reno, our Attorney General, to insist she apply the law to these trespassers to stop them from doing that.

I do not know what her motivation is, but she refuses to do it, and she is selectively interpreting and enforcing the law. I suggest that the Senator from Utah was correct when he said the Attorney General is asleep at the switch while the White House is running the Justice Department. We are allowing the White House to run the Justice Department insofar as clemency is being offered to these terrorists, but also running the Justice Department by not enforcing the law in getting these people out of harm's way.

I can stand on the Senate floor today and say that I believe someone is going to be killed, and when that someone is killed, it is going to be the fault of our Attorney General and her boss, the President, because they are selectively not enforcing the law at this time.

While it is bad enough we allow terrorists to go unpunished—we turn them loose on society; we somehow fall into this mindset that punishment is not a deterrent to crime for political purposes—it is even worse, in my opinion, to take away the one thing that is necessary, the most significant, an important training area, from our military in order to prepare to defend America.

So I think this thing has gone far enough, and I do believe it is politically inspired. I do believe that was the reason for the offer of clemency. I do believe that is the reason so many politicians right now are saying: Fine, we'll go ahead and close the range.

One last thing on the range. I know this message will get out to the right places when I say it. It is true that the people and the citizens of the island of Puerto Rico would like to have this range deactivated. But they also at the same time want to keep our facilities that are so significant in making contributions to their economies, such as Roosevelt Roads.

As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I went out and told them I am going to do everything within my power—if they deactivate this range; and are successful in doing this, through the White House and the President's efforts—to do what we can to move those functions that take place in Roosevelt Roads, to deactivate that and bring those back to various installations in the United States that are only partially utilized.

So that is going out as a warning. I think it is time we take this whole thing very seriously and try, just for a while, to get politics out of this process which we have been discussing.

Lastly, yes, it is significant. We are talking about a President who has offered clemency to a bunch of people, some terrorists, who have inflicted crime on American citizens. When you stop and think about how the young people of America are looking at this and saying, "Well, I guess there's not anything wrong with participating in this kind of activity," this is morally wrong, and it should be stopped.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 5 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the other morning on the "Today" show—which many of us wake up and listen to as it relates to the morning news or the late-breaking events—there was a Puerto Rican terrorist who the day before had just been released from prison under the clemency that President Clinton had granted him.

During that interview, he was consistently asked if he was remorseful, if he was concerned about the lives of American law enforcement officers that had been taken by him and other terrorists such as himself. In all instances, he did not answer.

He went on to speak of the cause and the movement and why independence was more important than anything else—independence as it relates to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, not his personal independence. But never once did he speak in any tone that would suggest he was sorry, only that he was glad to be free. I think anyone who had been imprisoned by a court and found guilty would want that.

I listened to him and grew increasingly more angry—and I must use that word "anger"—at a President who is at this instant once again trying to have it both ways on an issue that I know the Presiding Officer and I are very concerned about—and that is the misuse of second amendment rights in our country by citizens of our country. And oh, by the way, that Puerto Rican terrorist is an American citizen, is a citizen of the United States by birth in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. He was not a foreigner who knew nothing about our law; he was an American citizen who violated a Federal firearms statute.

When I say I speak with a certain amount of anger in me that we have a President who is living up to his double standard reputation once again in the twilight days of his administration, he is coming to the American people and saying: Give me more Federal firearms laws so I can enforce them and make the streets of America safer. If we have

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