

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 citi-

zens; 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 Har-

ney 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, and then we get to the

end of the year and we act as though there is some magic budgetary goblin running around eating up money and we invent these tricks to try to figure out how to break the budget, while we still tell constituents we balance it. It is pretty outrageous. We use every budgetary gimmick we can find: forward funding, emergency designation, baseline budgeting. You name it, you have heard it. Now we have "13th month."

For those of you who may be listening or watching right now, when you hear those terms, my advice would be to hang on tightly to your wallet because the story is, if a Democrat has a vision, it is probably focused right on your wallet, and that is what is happening now. They are having fun with this 13th month, but they have that luxury because they are in the minority. I suppose you can say, technically, so am I, but on this point I am siding with the Republicans. They didn't invent budgetary gimmickry.

Insofar as this Congress intends to use smoke and mirrors to secretly fund more rather than less unconstitutional programs, I don't intend to be a part of it. Our Founding Fathers would be ashamed of this whole debate for several reasons:

No. 1, they didn't intend for us to balance our budget using accounting tricks and elongated fiscal years.

No. 2, they didn't intend for us to burden our children with trillions of dollars in debt—trillions.

No. 3, they didn't intend for us to spend billions of dollars on education programs that should be handled at the State and local level.

My colleague, Senator GORTON, has been very instrumental on initiatives to try to bring that spending back to the State and local level where it belongs. So as perhaps the only non-partisan person in the Senate right now, let me offer a solution. It is pretty simple. I have a way that we can support the Constitution, balance the budget, and not use any budgetary tricks at all. It is very simple: Don't spend the money.

The Department of Education is billions of dollars worth of unconstitutional infringements on State and local authority. Don't spend the money, if the Democrats don't want the Republicans using budgetary tricks, the Republicans don't want to break the budget caps, and the founders don't want us funding unconstitutional programs. So let's abolish the Department of Education. Then we can go back home to our school districts and say: You now have the constitutional authority you had in the first place to educate your children the way you choose—home school, private school, public school, whatever. By the way, you have more money to spend and the budget is balanced.

Very simple. Nothing complicated. So let me say the best way to end all the budgetary gimmickry is don't spend the money.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Denise Matthews, a fellow on the staff of the Appropriations Committee, be granted the privilege of the floor during the debate on H.R. 2084 and the conference report thereon.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have now cleared the following request.

I ask unanimous consent that no further amendments be in order to the pending Interior bill other than the managers' amendment or amendments on motions relative to the Hutchison royalties amendment.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I should like to make the following announcement. We will have that managers' amendment—I think there is only one that is possible; it may be in two sections—ready within the next half hour or so to present. It does represent an accommodation of the requests of many Members, with the understanding of all Members.

I think it will take only a very few minutes to present and to have it accepted. At that point, we will have only the Hutchison amendment outstanding. The majority leader has reserved the right to ask for reconsideration of the cloture motion that was defeated yesterday. I suspect when he chooses to do that, we will in a relatively short period of time finish debate and dispose of the Hutchison amendment one way or another and then go to final passage of the Interior appropriations bill.

That means, as far as I am concerned, I am going to vacate the floor

at this point. Whenever the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation wants to start his bill, he can do so. I will ask him for the right to interrupt at some point when I am ready with the managers' amendment and present it then. I see no reason to keep the Senate from moving forward now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2084

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate H.R. 2084, the House-passed fiscal year 2000 Transportation appropriations bill, that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and the text of S. 1143, as modified by striking sections 321 and 339, be inserted in lieu thereof, that the amendment be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that points of order against any provision added thereby be preserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I object temporarily. I believe strongly that this legislation impinges in the area of jurisdiction of the Environment and Public Works Committee, and we will be discussing that further on. I do thank Senator SHELBY for the time he has given us in connection with this overlapping jurisdiction—I should not even say overlapping jurisdiction—we think is impinging upon the areas that belong within the jurisdiction of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

However, despite the fact that we have had numerous meetings—our staffs with his staff, myself to some extent with Senator SHELBY—we have not been able to resolve these issues. I believe the unanimous consent request that the Senator has just propounded will solve the problem as far as moving into the major difficulty in jurisdiction I will outline later.

I know the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee is here, and he also has some difficulties with the jurisdiction that has been assumed by the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not, I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair and my colleagues for a very brief statement.

Those of us who were here and those of us who were not here but certainly