

fire to much of the territory and killed perhaps thousands of people, many of them the pro-independence intelligentsia. Others have been rounded up and taken to West Timor, and tens of thousands have fled to the mountains, where they are in danger of starving.

Mr. Habibie's announcement that he would accept an international force took considerable political courage, as the idea is hugely unpopular with Indonesians and especially with its powerful military establishment. He agreed after several countries began to cut off joint training exercises, as well as military aid and sales, and important donors and the International Monetary Fund and World Bank suggested that they would condition further assistance on Indonesia's performance in East Timor.

The peacekeeping force, which requires the blessing of the United Nations Security Council, would be organized and led by Australia. Australian officials say they will provide about 4,500 of the anticipated 7,000 troops needed if Indonesia's military in East Timor is cooperative. They say they can get 2,000 troops to East Timor within 72 hours of United Nations approval.

President Clinton says that Washington does not anticipate providing ground troops for the mission, but that American support forces would assist with logistics, intelligence, airlift and coordination. Australia has maintained that American expertise is needed for these tasks, and this is an appropriate role for the United States.

Yesterday the Security Council met to hear a chilling report from a delegation of U.N. ambassadors that had just returned from East Timor, and to begin to negotiate the details of the force. Happily, Indonesia has retreated from earlier statements that the unit should contain only Asians. The world needs to keep up the economic and diplomatic pressure to convince Mr. Habibie that the force must be able to detain militia members or Indonesian soldiers who terrorize the population or menace peacekeepers.

President Habibie has already agreed to a commission to look into human rights violations. Those investigators must be able to work freely. Most crucial, Mr. Habibie cannot be permitted to stall. There will soon be nothing left of East Timor to save.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I, again, thank the majority leader for the opportunity to address this matter at this time, and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report S.J. Res. 33.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33), as modified, deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to FALN terrorists.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, 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. 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, parliamentary inquiry. It is my understanding that we are now on S.J. Res. 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. By unanimous consent, there are 2 hours of debate on S.J. Res. 33 equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I want to read the resolution to open this discussion. It is a joint resolution deploring the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to FALN terrorists:

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;

I am going to repeat that clause, Mr. President:

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 long-standing tenets of counterterrorism 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.

I commend the House of Representatives. It has already passed House Congressional Resolution 180: 311 voting aye, 41 voting no, and, in an unprecedented act, 72 voting "present."

I conducted a hearing this morning, the witnesses of which were former

New York Detective Senft, former New York Detective Pastorella, the president of the Fraternal Order of Police, Mr. Gallegos, and a son of one of the victims of the New York bombing at a restaurant, Fraunces Tavern, in New York, Mr. Connor.

It was a very moving hearing. The two detectives, one of whom, in the bombing in New York by this organization, has lost permanent sight in one eye, some 60 percent of his hearing, and has gone through, I guess, some 16 reconstructive operations. The other detective is permanently blind and has lost the majority of his right hand. They made rather poignant statements. They said that there would be no pardon for what they had suffered; there would be no clemency; that theirs were life sentences. Both nearly lost their lives. One still has metal particles in his stomach and shoulders from the bombing.

Mr. Connor, very movingly, talked about the notice that he and his mother received on his 9th birthday that their father, an innocent 33-year-old, who had taken a client to lunch, had died in the bombing.

It was sort of interesting; Detective Senft, 2 years ago, began writing the President about this matter, to which there has been no response. Several of the witnesses talked about having written the Attorney General and the White House, with no response. To me, it is hard to imagine that such a letter would come to the White House or to the Attorney General and not be responded to.

Lieutenant Senft over 2 years ago wrote and has yet to receive a response. Mr. Connor cited current law which requires that victims are to be notified of the release of prisoners in cases in which they were involved.

None—neither of the detectives nor the Connor family—have been notified at all.

One of the concerns that came out of the hearing was to embrace these questions so our committee, and the Judiciary Committee, can make appropriate inquiries as to what was done to advise these individuals. In the hearing they pointed out that the clemency advocates have had numerous meetings with the Attorney General's Office and others in the Government, but those who would oppose it have had none, and requests to have these meetings have gone without response.

The representative of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who was to have testified on behalf of the Government to try to explain how this policy would not be incongruous with Federal policy with regard to the handling of terrorists, at 9:30 last night, notified the committee they would not testify, that they had been instructed not to testify by the White House.

So the inquiries over the last 2 weeks to give the administration an opportunity to air their view of this circumstance and how it interacted with U.S. policy with regard to terrorism

went unheeded, and neither the State Department nor the Justice Department nor the Federal Bureau of Investigation would even make a witness available on behalf of the committee to air the Government's view with regard to this act on the part of the President.

No one is challenging the President's right and power to grant the clemency. To the extent they say, well, it is a constitutional power, et cetera, that is a smokescreen. What we are trying to understand is what its effect is on U.S. policy with regard to terrorism.

Interestingly—to comment just a moment or two more on the hearing—I posed the question to the witnesses that the President has endeavored, in his clemency finding, to draw a distinction for these 16 terrorists, indicating they themselves did not actually throw or place the bomb.

These were conspirators. These were planners. Senator SESSIONS so eloquently stated the other day that one of the reasons they did not get to do that is they were caught with all these weapons in their van. In other words, if you are an unsuccessful terrorist, you have a higher standing under U.S. law than if you are a successful terrorist.

But when the question was posed to the panel, Mr. Gallegos, who is president of the Fraternal Order of Police, said: Wait a minute. What kind of question are we introducing to the adjudication of criminal activity? He said: For example, if you are the get-away driver in a bank robbery—you did not actually rob the bank—under U.S. law you are as guilty and subject to as much of a punishment as the man who walked into the bank.

I mentioned the other day on the floor, under this theory of separation of degree, why is Bin Laden a No. 1 fugitive for the United States? He didn't drop the bombs in Kenya and Tanzania. He was a conspirator, as these people were. I asked the question—and I will turn to my colleague—what this did to the morale, and New York Detective Senft said it undermines every active-duty law enforcement officer. He said, as damaged as he is permanently in life, he took solace that the perpetrators who attacked him were in prison. It has been a devastating fact for him to know that clemency can be granted for that kind of activity. All of the law enforcement officials said these decisions were particularly devastating to men and women on America's front line protecting citizens day in and day out from these kinds of hostilities and violence.

With that, I yield up to 15 minutes of our time to the Senator from Texas, Mr. GRAMM.

Mr. DURBIN. May I inquire of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. COVERDELL. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. May we have some understanding of how the time will be allocated? It is my understanding that, generally speaking, we have an equal amount of time on a side, and 1 hour is allocated to this debate. Senator

CONRAD is here on the Democratic side; he would like to speak for 10 minutes. I see the Senator from Georgia has at least two colleagues interested in speaking. Could we reach some kind of agreement as to how we will proceed?

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Illinois, that is a perfectly legitimate question. My idea is to go to the Senator from Texas, back to your side, and then back to our side. After the Senator from Texas has 15 minutes, of course, which will be counted against our side, it will be about 10 minutes and 10 minutes back and forth.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time of the Republican side has been used to this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Another 15 minutes from your side will mean you have consumed 30 minutes of your 1 hour of debate before we have spoken. So can we agree that after 15 minutes we would have the remaining time until 12:30?

Mr. COVERDELL. With one exception. Senator KYL has come to the floor and asks that we give him some opportunity in that timeframe. I ask the Senator from Texas if he might limit his remarks to 10 minutes so we can accommodate Senator KYL.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I have the obligation of chairing a nominations hearing in the Judiciary Committee at 2 o'clock, which I am sure my colleagues on the other side would like to move forward on, since all of the nominees appear quite qualified and presumably could move forward.

I ask unanimous consent that I may take 30 seconds to express my support for what the chairman is doing and then put a statement in the RECORD. That would be satisfactory from my standpoint.

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

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of attending the subcommittee meeting this morning, and I heard witnesses who are victims of the terrorists who were given clemency. It was a heartbreaking experience, frankly, because at the conclusion of it one understands that we haven't closed a chapter by doing this. In fact, the President has probably opened a new chapter. I believe there will be additional terrorism as a result of the clemency that he ordered. I hope that will be addressed by this Senate, working together with the administration, so we can continue a policy which has been effective heretofore, and that is making certain that terrorists are hunted down, prosecuted, and incarcerated so they can't commit terrorist acts again.

To the extent the President's actions in this case were different from that past policy, they should be condemned, and we as a Senate should make sure it doesn't continue in the future. So I commend the chairman of the sub-

committee for holding his hearing. I indicate again that the Judiciary Committee will have its hearing tomorrow and will have more to say about this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, Senator GRAMM is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wasn't aware that there was an agreement. Can we restate it so there is a clear understanding? The Senator from Texas will speak up to 15 minutes; is that correct?

Mr. GRAMM. I have been recognized for 15 minutes, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Senator's side will have the remaining time.

Mr. DURBIN. We will try to maintain the floor until 12:30, which I understand we have agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me remind everyone how we came to this point under the leadership of Senator COVERDELL. A resolution was introduced condemning the President's decision to grant clemency to 16 terrorists who were part of a wave of violence and death across the country that started in the mid-1970s and ended when these terrorists were incarcerated. We sought to bring that resolution to a vote on the floor of the Senate. Our Democrat colleagues, using their rights under the rules of the Senate, objected. We were forced to file cloture to force the consideration of this resolution, and that cloture motion carried. Now we are in the process of debating a resolution where Congress, in this instance, takes the strongest action it can under the Constitution, and that is condemn the President's actions.

The President is given, under the Constitution, the power of pardon. There is nothing we can do that would override that constitutional prerogative. But while the President has the right to pardon, I believe the President is profoundly wrong in pardoning these terrorists.

Now, I wish I had the ability of our President to articulate so clearly and to put a human face on so many of the public policy issues he discusses because there is a very real human issue involved here. It started with a bombing of historic Fraunces Tavern in Manhattan.

This is the front page of the New York Times from Saturday, January 25, 1975. In this article, in excruciatingly painful and bloody detail, it outlines how a bomb was set the day before, how it decimated this restaurant, injured 44 people, killed 4 people, decapitated 1 person. These were innocent people who just had the bad luck to go to lunch at this place, at that time on Friday, January 24, 1975.

Some of my colleagues may have read a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, written by two sons of a man who had the bad luck of going to lunch that day in that tavern. Basically, they put a human face on that one brutal

murder. The picture they drew was that of a young man who grew up in a very poor family. Actually, he grew up in a Puerto Rican neighborhood in New York and worked his way up to be successful. Today, both of his sons are investment bankers. So in that sense, he was successful. But he died—and he was 33 years old—because a group of brutal murderers, calling themselves a “liberation army,” planted a bomb that day in New York that took this man’s life, took him away from his family. The FALN—this terrorist group—claimed responsibility and, in fact, left a note near the bomb scene outlining their grievances.

They said they had grievances. So they injured 44 people and brutally murdered four people.

That started a reign of terror—the greatest terrorist assault in the history of the United States of America in our homeland among our people, innocent people. This reign of terror continued until these terrorists, now pardoned by the President, were arrested and incarcerated.

Our President says, and I quote, talking about these terrorists:

They had served very long sentences for offenses that did not involve bodily harm to other people.

It is true that while they are the core, or were the core, of this terrorist organization, while they were its leadership, and while they were arrested and convicted for engaging in terrorist activities—they were convicted of things such as unlawful storage of explosive materials—it is also true that the terrorist attacks ended when they went to jail.

So you can say they weren’t convicted of these specific, brutal tavern murders in New York. They weren’t convicted of the bombing on New Year’s Eve in 1982 when a New York City police headquarters and other sites were bombed, and in the process you had victims who were blinded in both eyes, who lost five fingers on their right hand, who lost hearing, who required 13 major surgical operations on their face alone, and had 20 titanium screws put in place to hold their face together. They weren’t convicted of those particular crimes, but they were leadership, the core, of the organization that claimed credit. Those crimes ended when they went to prison.

They were part of the leadership of that organization. They were accessories whether they were there and planted the bomb or not; we do not know, we may never know, but they were accessories before and after the fact as part of FALN. Yet the President says they were nonviolent.

If you are going to put a human face on it, you would have to go back and talk to these police officers who have been blinded, and who have had their faces destroyed. You would have to talk to the children and grandchildren of these people who were murdered in the tavern in New York.

I call that violence. I call that a fundamental assault on the American peo-

ple. This is not a violence where someone is selected for retribution, wrong as it may be, for an act they committed. This is violence against people who had nothing to do with this desire to see Puerto Rico an independent nation. These were people living their lives, routinely going about their business, who certainly didn’t know about this group, or if they knew, they weren’t in any way involved.

So to say that these people were non-violent, who were the core of this terrorist organization that planted 130 bombs that killed and maimed across America, is an outrage.

While I know our President has no shame, he ought to be ashamed of that statement.

What are we doing? We are here because the President of the United States decided, based on pleas made by various individuals and groups around the country to grant a pardon—clemency—to these people who were leadership of a group that planted 130 bombs in America over a 7-year period and that brutally killed and maimed our fellow citizens.

I don’t understand the President’s action. The FBI was reported to be opposed to it. The Justice Department and the prosecutors who were involved were opposed to it. Maybe I should take the Justice Department out. I don’t know. They probably have not heard about it yet. But the prosecutors who were involved were opposed to it. Law enforcement officials across the country were opposed to it. It was supported by some political leaders of the Puerto Rican community in New York.

Quite frankly, I don’t understand that. Many of these terrorists weren’t even from Puerto Rico. They were born in the United States of America.

Yet somehow, despite the fact that Americans were killed and maimed, these terrorists are given special status, seemingly because they could identify a cause, a cause, interestingly enough supported by only 2.5 percent of the people who voted in the December 1998 plebiscite in Puerto Rico.

We will never know why the President did this. If he did it to court political support for Mrs. Clinton running for the Senate in New York, it turned out to be a bad deal. It turned out to be something that probably was harmful and not helpful.

But let me tell you why I am concerned, which goes beyond politics.

What the President did was lower the cost for committing acts of terrorism in America. He lowered the cost for committing acts of terrorism in America by pardoning people who participated in a reign of terror that, as far as I am aware, is unparalleled in America’s history.

If we are going to pardon people who brutally murdered innocent citizens, who maimed and mutilated police officers, then what is the penalty for terrorism?

The President says President Carter urged him to pardon them.

It is very interesting to note when these acts of terrorism accelerated. In fact, the police headquarters in New York City was bombed 3 years after then-President Carter pardoned the Puerto Rican terrorists who came into this sacred temple of American democracy—the Capitol Building—when there was a quorum call on in the House of Representatives and stood in the House balcony and shot and wounded Members of the House of Representatives. In fact, there is still a bullet hole in the ceiling of the House of Representatives. There is still a bullet hole in the drawer of the Republican leader’s desk from that day in 1954.

President Carter decided in 1979, 4 years after the Fraunces Tavern bombing, to pardon the Puerto Rican terrorists—which is an inaccurate media description because many of these people were born on the mainland of America—who in this great temple of democracy assaulted civilization itself. He pardoned them and let them out of prison.

Three years later, this terrorist group bombed New York City police headquarters, the Manhattan office of the FBI, and the Metropolitan Corrections Center in New York.

Here is the point. Jimmy Carter, as President, lowered the cost of committing terrorist acts. Those terrorist acts accelerated after that pardon in 1979.

Now the President has pardoned the members of the very group that claimed credit for those acts, and who were convicted, among other offenses, of storage of explosives and conspiracy to make bombs. So, obviously, they were planning more attacks and more bombing. They claimed credit for the bombings in New York—the bombing of the police headquarters, the killing of innocent citizens, the mutilation of police officers.

Now the President has pardoned them. I would like to conclude with these points.

The President and his spokesman on many occasions have said that fighting terrorism is the No. 1 objective of his administration, that the greatest threat we face in the world today is the threat of terrorists. Obviously, there is some other objective somewhere that is of a higher order because for some reason the President pardoned these terrorists.

I think it was a terrible mistake. I believe the American people will hold President Clinton accountable for it. I want to know how the process occurred and whether the process outlined in law was followed. Whatever the process was, the decision was wrong. I believe we should condemn it in the strongest possible language.

I hope we get strong bipartisan support. I hope we don’t have in the Senate what we saw in the House when some Democrat Members of the House didn’t vote yes and didn’t vote no. The best they could do is to say they were there that day, and they voted “present.” I don’t think this is an issue

where Members want to vote "present."

I want people to know I think it was an absolute outrage that the President did this. He ought to be ashamed of it. The American people ought to hold him accountable. The Congress, in the strongest action we can take in this matter, is deploring the President's action.

I thank our colleague from Georgia for his leadership on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, on the subject that has been discussed by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Georgia, I think the President did make a mistake. I don't think it was appropriate to extend clemency to these people. I hope this is an issue that we can address by resolution and make clear where the Senate stands. We are going to have an opportunity to do that.

FISCAL YEAR

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this morning I got up and, as is typically my habit, I opened up the Washington Post to see what was there. I turned first to the sports page to see how my Baltimore Orioles performed. I got good news there. That was a welcome addition to my morning.

On the front page of the Washington Post I was very surprised to see this headline: "GOP Seeks to Ease Crunch with 13-month Fiscal Year."

I have heard of some gimmicks in my time. Now we see our friends on the other side, who are not able to meet the legal requirement that they pass the appropriations bills on time by October 1, have resorted to a new concept. Instead of having a 12-month year, we will have a 13-month year.

I think our friends are going off on a tangent that should not be pursued. I think this would be a profound mistake. The last thing we need to do is solve our fiscal problems by creating a fiction of a 13-month year. That isn't what we need to be doing. We need to address directly and forthrightly the problem we face in trying to avoid raiding the Social Security trust fund. Let's do it honestly. Let's do it directly. Let's not engage in the fiction of creating a 13-month year in order to resolve the fiscal challenges facing this country and this Senate.

That is what the Republicans have come up with. They point out in the story:

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.

What are we doing? We are going to create a 13th month to deal with the fiscal problems of the country? I don't think so.

Senator SPECTER is apparently one of the backers of this idea.

"We all know we engage in a lot of smoke and mirrors," said Senator ARLEN SPECTER, chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee, "But we have to fund education, NIH, worker safety and other programs. It's a question of how we do it."

I agree with it being a question of how we do it. The last thing we ought to do is create a 13-month year. If we want to cause a lack of respect of people in the country for the Congress, this is the way: Adopt the Republican proposal that the way to solve our fiscal problem is to create a 13th month.

I began looking at the calendar to try to figure out where we would add this 13th month, what we would call it. One thought that we had is that maybe we could have January, February, and then "Fictionary"—kind of a fictional 13th month. Maybe that could be the month: January, February, and Fictionary.

Or maybe we ought to have "Spend-tember," after September, or maybe before September. We could have "Spend-tember" for the 13th month.

There is something wrong with what our colleagues on the Republican side have come up with. Thirteen months? I don't think the American people are going to buy this. Everybody knows there are 24 hours in a day, 7 days a week, and there are just 12 months in a year. Search as we might, here is the calendar; there are only 12 months; there is no 13th month. That is not the solution to our problem.

If we started thinking of where we would add this month, some would advocate two Decembers. That would have a certain attractiveness. We would have two Christmases, all the retail sales twice. That is not a bad idea.

On this idea the Republicans have come up with for 13 months to solve our fiscal problems, my choice is to see 2 Octobers. I am a baseball fan. I could have the World Series twice. Others might have a different idea of where we could add a month.

I must say to our Republican friends, why stop at 13 months? If this is the way we are going to solve the fiscal problems of our country, let's go to 14 months, maybe add 15. Somebody in my office suggested we go to 24 months. That way, we would be able to double everybody's income in a single year. We would be able to have twice as much spending in a single year if we went to 24 months. I think we have real opportunities. If we keep adding enough months, we can completely avoid the Y2K problem altogether. Now this is a real opportunity, and I don't think we want to miss it.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the Senator, if he yields for a question, if we can extend the year to avoid the tough decisions on the budget and not only avoid Y2K, but we can repeat the month of December and have Christmas sales and inject in the economy a lot more life—and of course kids enjoy Christmas—perhaps the Republican leadership is onto something by extending the year an additional month for budgetary purposes.

Mr. CONRAD. There are lots of good ideas coming out on this idea to extend the concept that our Republican friends have come up with to go to 13 months in a year in order to solve our budget problems. The last time we made a major change in the calendar, it was made by the Pope. I am not sure what that says about those putting forward this proposal, other than I can't wait to see what they come up with next.

I don't think this is the solution to the fiscal problems of America; 13 months is not the answer.

Going back to the headline, it really is kind of stunning: "GOP Seeks to Ease Crunch with 13-month Fiscal Year."

One person who has commented on this in this morning's paper is Robert Bixby, head of the Concord Coalition, a budget watchdog group. He says they are degrading themselves and we degrade the budget process by resorting to these budget gimmicks.

The only disagreement I have with that is, this goes way beyond gimmick when all of a sudden we are going to take a 12-month year and make it 13 months to address the budget problems of the country. I think our Republican friends have gone off in the weeds. I hope they reconsider. This is a mistake.

If we start going in the direction of adding months, where is this going to stop? We have 12 months. Thirteen months? Fourteen months? Are we going to be able to solve all the problems of the country if we start to engage in fiction? That is not the direction we ought to take. Does my colleague from North Dakota agree?

Mr. DORGAN. If my colleague will yield, this is remarkable. I was eating Grape Nuts, actually, when I read that this morning. That is not always a pleasant experience unless you have plenty of sugar. And then you get the newspaper and you read a headline that says, "GOP Seeks to Ease Crunch With 13-Month Fiscal Year."

I am thinking to myself, I have been around this place for some time and have grappled with a lot of fiscal policy problems. If we had thought of this a long while ago, we would not have all of these problems. If you have a problem, just change the calendar.

That would raise of course the question of what to name this new month. I suppose if they were really serious they could do what all the sports stadiums do, and just sell the name. How much money could you raise with a Microsoft month or a US Airways month? I suppose there are all kinds of possibilities along this line. But I think most people would look at this and say that it is not very serious governance—when you have a problem you cannot fix you create another month and then pretend you fixed it.

Some State legislative bodies have a rule that they must adjourn by a particular time. So what they do occasionally, is to take a black cloth and cover