

and we move it around real fast and you are supposed to guess where the pea is. What this is is a shell game so that the American people will never understand what is happening here, except for the truth is right here, by creating this fictitious 13th month.

□ 0915

The people who thought it up ought to be ashamed of themselves. I do not know how they can go around and say that they are fiscally conservative and throw rocks at people like me who they call liberals.

I paid one of these off. I did what I had to do to be fiscally responsible. It makes me angry to see people starting down this road and if they lose control in here or lose control in the Senate, then suddenly it will be the Democrats' problem, we will have to fix it. And I object to that, and I object very strongly.

I think every Member ought to read this article and ask themselves do they want to be put in that kind of a box. Because at some point they have to pay it off. That debt is out there, and it has got to be paid; and by increasing it by 12 to \$16 billion, we do not fix anything; we just make it worse.

So I urge everyone, Mr. Speaker, to read that article. And I will put this article in the RECORD so that we can have it there and everybody can see it and remember when we decided to start down this stupid path. There is no excuse for this. There can be an honest budget discussion in here, but it is going to require that the majority party talk to the minority party, have conferences, talk about what the issues are.

It can be done, but it is going to have to take both sides working together. And if it does not happen that way and we start down this path, they are on their own. I am against it from the very first day I see it in the paper.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1999]

GOP CONSIDERS 13-MONTH FISCAL YEAR

(By Eric Pianin)

As they struggle to live within tough restrictions on how much they may spend, Senate Republicans have found another creative way to shoehorn popular domestic programs into next year's budget: declaring the coming fiscal year 13 months long instead of the usual 12.

By creating this fictitious 13th month, lawmakers would be able to spend \$12 billion to \$16 billion more for labor, health, education and social programs than they otherwise would be permitted under budget rules. Because the additional funds would not be technically released until immediately after the fiscal year ends, they would not count against the overall limits on federal spending next year.

"We all know we engage in a lot of smoke and mirrors," said Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee with jurisdiction over the programs. "But we have to fund education, NIH, worker safety and other programs. It's a question of how we do it."

The proposal—which has been embraced by Senate leaders—highlights how difficult it is

for congressional Republicans to cut spending and live within tight budgets without resorting to what many experts describe as fiscal gimmickry. With the government awash in surpluses, there is certainly the money to pay for extra programs next year. But to do so would require breaking existing spending limits and, more than likely, dipping into extra money generated by the popular Social Security program—something both parties have pledged not to touch.

As a result, GOP lawmakers have struggled to find ways of spending money without technically breaking those limits. For instance, lawmakers already have classified spending on farms and the 2000 census as "emergency" spending not subject to existing rules. All told, lawmakers already have exempted nearly \$28 billion in proposed spending next year from the existing budget limits.

The 13th-month gambit promoted by Specter has been used before on a smaller scale, but fiscal experts expressed concern that Congress would simply be putting off its day of reckoning by employing it on so large a scale.

"It avoids the problem, it doesn't solve the problem," said Robert Reischauer, former director of the Congressional Budget Office. "We will have spending caps in 2001 and 2002 as well, so all you've done is postponed and magnified the problem."

"They're degrading themselves and degrading the budget process by resorting to these budget gimmicks," added Robert L. Bixby, policy director of the Concord Coalition, a budget watchdog group.

While it is far from clear whether House Republicans or the White House will go along with the plan, the Senate's so-called "advance funding" proposal underscores lawmakers' desperation in trying to pass the largest and traditionally most contentious spending bill without breaking the budget deal that President Clinton and Congress agreed to in 1997.

Spending in the Labor-Health-Education bill includes funding for health and human services programs, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), job training, Head Start for disadvantaged youth and Pell grants for college students. Last year Congress could not come up with a bill that was acceptable to the administration until the last minute, when GOP leaders and the president negotiated a giant package that included nearly \$20 billion of additional spending for domestic programs. GOP leaders felt burned by the arrangement and have vowed to avoid such a deal this year.

Not counting mandatory entitlement programs, spending for Labor-Health-Education programs totals roughly \$92 billion this fiscal year. For next year, House leaders have essentially used the Labor-HHS bill as a piggy bank to finance other spending bills and have set aside only \$73 billion for the bill itself, a cut of roughly \$19 billion. Senate leaders have set aside a little more, \$80.4 billion, for those programs.

If such reductions were sustained, House Democrats have warned that across-the-board spending cuts of as much as 32 percent would be required on education programs, Head Start, NIH grants, Job Corps, AIDS research and scores of other programs. Republicans and Democrats alike agree that the bill will have to be beefed up substantially—probably to this year's levels—to win passage and the president's signature.

The bill as it is set up right now falls impossibly short of funding levels that are necessary to ensure even basic services in education, health and labor," said Linda Ricci, a spokeswoman for the Office of Management and Budget.

In the House, Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) is leading an effort to try to iden-

tify \$16 billion or so of offsetting reductions in mandatory programs and other areas to finance the additional Labor-Health-Education programs, but so far he has reported little progress.

Rep. John Edward Porter (R-Ill.), Specter's counterpart on the House Appropriations Committee, has grown frustrated with the process and contends that Congress and the administration must face the reality that the 1997 budget agreement is no longer practical.

"I still believe in the end the caps are going to have to be raised, and the question is whether you do it honestly or whether you put into place all kinds of gimmicks, including emergencies and forward funding and the like," Porter said.

But Specter, Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) and other Senate leaders see virtue in a budgetary maneuver that would ensure adequate funding for education and other programs next year and that meets the letter—if not the spirit—of the budget law. Because the non-Social Security budget surplus is supposed to be even larger in the following year, such a move could also make it easier to finance ongoing government programs without dipping into Social Security reserves.

"If the money can be pushed off to expenditures in 2001, that would give us the latitude of using that year's surplus without breaking the caps," Specter said.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today the business of this House will focus on the question of campaign finance reform. It is indeed an important debate because the agenda of this Congress is being set by the special interest contributors that increasingly dominate our elections.

It is the American people who have to foot the bill for those special interests, and they foot it in many ways. Without a vote for genuine campaign finance reform, and that is the Shays-Meehan bipartisan campaign finance bill, which represents the only true reform, if it can be approved today without amendments. Without a vote for genuine campaign finance reform, pharmaceutical companies, who contribute to campaigns will determine whether our seniors ever get access to affordable prescription drugs.

Without a vote for genuine campaign finance reform, insurance companies will determine whether folks in managed care ever get their rights in a true, meaningful patients' bill of rights to hold the insurance companies accountable for their misconduct.

Without a vote for true and effective campaign finance reform, it will be the tobacco companies, who through their contributions determine whether we ever do anything to address the increase in nicotine addiction among our children.

Without an effective campaign finance reform embodied in the Shays-

Meehan bill without amendments, it will be the gun manufacturers through their contributions, who will determine whether we ever address the question of gun violence in our society.

And certainly, as we have seen in this abominable, huge trillion-dollar tax cut proposed by the Republican leadership, unless we get effective campaign finance reform, it will be the special interests here in Washington, who continue to write loopholes for themselves in our Tax Code, designing it as a more and more complex code where the ordinary, hard-working American family has to pick up most of the cost of Government and the special interests manage to avoid paying their fair share.

The debate in this Congress today on this bill will determine on whether or not we really require complete disclosure by the so-called independent campaigns when they are really campaigning with unregulated, undisclosed money for a handful of special interest candidates.

Secondly, it will eliminate the soft money contributions, the unreported, unregulated, unlimited contributions that these same special interests, the pharmaceutical companies, the insurance companies, the tobacco lobbyists dump into these campaigns to tie up the Congress and to control its agenda.

I believe that what we need to do is not just some slight housekeeping amendments, as have been proposed, to thwart the Shays-Meehan bill, but we need a clean sweep of the system.

If the Shays-Meehan bipartisan campaign finance reform has any defect, the defect is that it does too little, not that it does too much. But it does represent an important first step on a bipartisan basis to overcome the deficiencies in our current system, which permit a stranglehold through special interest contributions on the operations of this Congress.

Doris Haddock, a woman from New England, who has referred to herself as "Granny D," is 89 years old. She began a walk out in California. I believe she has about reached the Mississippi River, walking by herself across America, as an 89-year-old great grandmother, to speak out and draw attention to the need for reforming our campaign finance system and getting so much of this special interest money out of our system.

I would say to my colleagues that she has a better chance, a much better chance, of completing her walk step by step across the wide expanse of America, "from sea to shining sea;" she has a much better chance to accomplish that objective than this Congress does to ever escape special interest domination unless we reform our campaign finance system.

We need true, genuine reform. Without that reform, this Congress and its entire agenda will continue to be set largely on the basis of who gave how much to whom.

I believe that campaign finance reform, certainly the modest steps we

propose today in the Shays-Meehan bipartisan campaign finance reform, will not correct every wrong in this Congress. But without real, meaningful, comprehensive reform, the American people will continue to be wronged by the special interests that dominate this Congress.

Let us approve bipartisan reform today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O give us peace, O give us hope,
O give us light above.
O God, from whom all blessings flow,
We thank You for your love.
Bring us faith and give us hope,
And keep us always true;
That whatever path we walk,
We walk that path with You. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr.

UDALL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IMPORTANCE OF MINING INDUSTRY TO AMERICA AND ITS FUTURE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there are some Members of this body that would like to eliminate the American mining industry. However, many of them do not realize how important this industry is to America and to its future.

Without the mining industry, we would not have the system of transportation that enables America to get to work and be productive. In fact, we would not have a refrigerator that preserves and keeps our food cold and would not have a bed to sleep in or even a house to live in, not to mention that the combined direct and indirect economic impact of the Nation's metal mining industry amounts to more than \$112 billion per year.

The metal industry paid \$523 million directly to State and local governments, \$620 million in taxes and fees to the Federal Government, \$7 billion to other businesses for supplies and almost \$3.5 billion in wages and benefits. By the time this \$11.6 billion circulates throughout the economy, the metal mining industry directly had a \$112 billion impact on the Nation's economy.

Mining is not just about our quality of life, however, or the hard working families. It is also about the contributions it makes to medical advancements, our schools, neighborhoods, State and local and Federal Governments.

Mining is a partner with government, with communities all across America.

PASSING SHAYS-MEEHAN STRIKES A BLOW FOR DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to put democracy back in the hands of the people. Increasingly, the power of the special interests and big money have had their sway in the Congress. Now is the time to let the people's voices be heard. By passing the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform bill, we will be striking a blow for Democratic principles. Shays-Meehan will restore confidence in our democratic system. It will inject new integrity into the process and it will assure