

## REPUBLICAN BUDGET PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are at a real interesting time. We are in the home run stretch of the legislative session. We are in a position on the budget that we are negotiating with the President because of three different reasons. Number one, we had the 1997 budget agreement. That agreement was a bipartisan agreement, over 300 Democrats and Republicans alike joined forces to say, let us put some fiscal order, some discipline in this place. The President signed off on it. Now even though it is a bipartisan agreement, it seems like only one party is responsible for carrying out that agreement. That party is the Republican Party.

Number two, we do not want to spend Social Security money. Now, do not take my word for it as a Republican. This is John Podesta, the Chief of Staff at the White House. He works for Bill Clinton. Here is his exact statement: "The Republicans' key goal is to not spend the Social Security surplus." I am glad, suddenly the White House is saying things right and we are very glad about that. Indeed, if you look at this smaller chart, that is exactly what we have been able to do. In the past, the Democrat controlled Congress and under Republican control, Social Security money has been taken for general purposes. But this year, zero. A historic moment. We have not raided Social Security. Very important.

The third reason we are in this position is that the President had promoted a tax increase as a way to fund a lot of new programs. On a bipartisan basis, this House, 419-0 voted against increasing taxes. So right now we are in a situation where the only way to continue the 1997 budget agreement and not raid Social Security is by reducing spending a mere one cent on a dollar.

I am a father of four, Mr. Speaker. I have two teenagers and two smaller children. We have to every month sit around and decide are we going to fix the washing machine, are we going to buy new tires. I guess we will have to postpone that vacation or that trip to Atlanta one more time in the fancy hotel, but we are used to doing that. But when Libby and I sit around the table and cut our budget, out of \$5, we have got to look for 2 or \$3. All we are saying to the Federal Government is cut out a nickel out of \$5 or one cent out of \$1. We have heard from Democrats tonight, that cannot be done.

Let me give my colleagues a few suggestions. The FDA has a pizza inspection program. If you buy cheese pizza, the FDA inspects it. But if you buy pepperoni pizza, the U.S. Department of Agriculture inspects it. I do not know, but in the private sector we would say, let us combine that. Or how about this. The President went to Afri-

ca with 1300 of his closer Federal employee friends, spent \$42.8 million. Or how about when he went to China, he spent \$18.8 million and took 500 of his closer friends. Cutting out 1 percent would mean 50 of them would have to stay at home the next time he goes to China. The next time he goes to Africa, 13 would have to stay at home. That does not sound so bad to me. But we keep hearing how harsh this is.

How about the program in Washington, D.C. where the Federal Government spent \$6.6 million on a staffing company to help the government get people from welfare to work, \$6.6 million and they were supposed to place 1500 people. One year later and \$1 million later, they had only placed 30 people out of 1500. They spent \$1 million to do that.

□ 1930

That is waste. And, you know what? I would like to pop the bubble of the Democrats and the big spenders up here. The Federal Government does not have any money. Let me repeat it: The Federal Government does not have money. It is the people's money. We hard working taxpayers send our money to Washington. It is not the Federal Government's money, it is sent to them by hard working taxpayers. So I believe that we in Washington have to be very careful on how we spend that.

Now I want to say one thing that is just kind of interesting. Here is a statement by Secretary Babbitt when a reporter said is there no more waste in government in your department? Secretary Babbitt, who is Mr. Clinton's appointee for the Department of Interior, the guy in charge of the National Parks, he said, "Well, it would take a magician to say there was no waste in government." Amen to that. "We are constantly ferreting it out. But the answer is otherwise, yes, you have got it exactly right." From the President's own folks, yes, there is waste in government, and we can cut it out and save Social Security.

#### NO CLEMENCY FOR CONVICTED MURDERER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, the Leonard Peltier Defense Committee has announced that in November 1999, it is the Freedom Month for Leonard Peltier. I used to be a former police officer and I take this personally.

This committee intends to deliver to the President of the United States a petition asking him to grant clemency to Leonard Peltier.

Leonard Peltier is currently serving consecutive life sentences in a Federal penitentiary for the ruthless murder of two FBI agents. To commute the sentence of Peltier and allow him to be re-

leased would be a tragic injustice. The Members of the FBI Agents Association and the Society for Former Special Agents of the FBI want the President and all Americans to be aware of all reasons why clemency should not be granted to Peltier.

June 26, 1975, was a hot dusty Thursday on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in southwestern South Dakota when two young FBI agents arrived from their office in Rapid City. It was about noon when the agents pulled into the Jumping Bull compound area of the remote reservation seeking to arrest a young man in connection with a recent abduction and assault of two young ranchers.

Observing Peltier's vehicle, the two agents pursued it. Unknown to the FBI agents, one of the three men in the vehicle was Leonard Peltier, a violent man with a violent past. He was a fugitive, wanted for attempted murder of an off duty Milwaukee police officer.

Knowing these cars pursuing him were FBI cars, Peltier and his two associates abruptly stopped their vehicle and began firing their rifles at the agents. Surprised by the sudden violence, outmanned and outgunned and at an extreme tactical disadvantage, the agents were wounded and defenseless within minutes. One of the agents suffered a severe wound, having his arm blown off. The other agent was hit in the left shoulder and the right foot. Both agents were clearly at the mercy of Peltier and their associates.

Not satisfied with the terrible injuries that they had just inflicted, Peltier and the other two men walked down the hill toward the ambushed and wounded agents. Three shots were fired from Peltier's rifle. One of the agents was still conscious, kneeling and apparently surrendering, was shot in the face directly through his outstretched hand. He was shot right through his hand. He was trying to surrender. He died instantly. The unconscious FBI agent who was lying there with severe injuries was shot twice in the head at close range. He also died instantly.

Following the murders, Peltier fled the reservation. In November 1975 an Oregon state trooper stopped a recreational vehicle in which Peltier was hiding. Peltier fired at the trooper and escaped. But found within that recreational vehicle was one of the weapons from the FBI agent with Peltier's fingerprints on the bag which contained the weapon.

When later arrested in Canada by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Peltier remarked that had he known those were mounted police officers and they were there to arrest them, he would have immediately blown them out of their shoes. These are not the comments of an innocent man, and they portray a very violent man who, without mercy, assassinated two FBI agents.

Peltier in 1977 was finally brought to justice and he was found guilty on both counts of the murder of these FBI

agents. He was sentenced to two consecutive life sentences.

While incarcerated in a Federal prison, a rifle was smuggled in to Peltier. He shot his way out of prison and several days later, after assaulting a ranger and stealing his truck, he was finally recaptured. He was tried and convicted of escape.

Peltier has since appealed his various convictions on numerous occasions. Every time he appeals his conviction, the courts turn him down. The United States Supreme Court has had his case twice. They have turned it down twice without comment.

The record is clear: There are no new facts. These are only old facts, and they have not changed. This man is guilty of murder in cold blood of two FBI agents and he should not be released from jail, Mr. President.

Peltier openly states he feels no guilt, remorse or even regret for the murders. Peltier has lived a life of crime. He has earned and deserves a lifetime of incarceration. Peltier is a murderer without compassion or feeling for his fellow man and in turn he deserves no compassion.

Mr. President, there is no justification for relieving Peltier from his punishment. Our judicial system has spoken in this case again and again and again and again. Leonard Peltier is a vicious, violent and cowardly criminal who hides behind legitimate Native American issues. Leonard Peltier was never a leader in the Native American community. He is simply a thug and a murderer with no respect for human life. Our citizens on and off the reservation must be protected from murderers like Peltier.

Mr. President, since Leonard Peltier could not fool the Federal courts, he is now trying to fool you and the public. Do not let it happen. Turn down that request for clemency.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

#### THE COST OF EDUCATING OUR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I welcome my colleague from Colorado here tonight as we talk about educating our children.

The topic tonight came out of a process that for some of us began in 1995, where we began a process that was called Education at a Crossroads, where we took a look at the definition of education here in Washington, we took a look at what worked and what was wasted in the Federal programs,

and also what worked and what was wasted at the state and at the local level, and really came to a decision to review some of the information and the documentation that we gathered since 1995 based on a press conference that the Secretary of Education gave last week.

As many of our colleagues know, we are embarked on a plan this year for the second year in a row to try to make sure that we spend no Social Security dollars on general fund expenditures. It looks like we did that in 1999, or came very, very close, for the first time in 40 years, and what we want to do is duplicate that for 2000, so we have embarked on a plan that said we are going to look for a 1 percent savings.

Last week the Secretary of Education came out and said, "If you try to find a 1 percent savings in my department, you cannot find it. It is not there, and any reduction in expenditures in education will come off the backs of our children."

We went to the Education Department on Friday, and there are just two things that I would like everybody to remember as we put this in context, two things. If you remember only two things out of this whole night, other than that we are trying to save 1 percent, remember these two things:

The first is that the Department of Education's books are not auditable. The first is the Department of Education's books are not auditable. We will talk a little bit more about that. But we have got a secretary from a department that has responsibility for \$120 billion of taxpayer money, and he is blasting Congress. But when he goes back to his own department and three Congressmen go over there and ask him and his colleagues and say can you kind of tell us where and how you spend the roughly \$35 billion in appropriations that we give you on an annual basis and the \$85 billion of loans that the Department of Education manages, can you kind of tell us how you manage the taxpayers' dollars, the response is, "I am sorry, but for the last year that we had auditors in taking a look at our books, our books are not auditable."

It means they cannot tell you. The auditors cannot look at the books with any degree of certainty and say that the money that came from the American taxpayer, went through Congress, was entrusted to the employees and the leadership at the Education Department, they cannot tell us where or how that money was spent and that there is no waste, fraud and abuse.

My experience in the private sector tells me any organization that does not have the financial control systems in place to ensure that their books are auditable probably has some waste, fraud or abuse going on. So, number one, the books at the Department of Education, \$120 billion agency, does not have books that are auditable.

The second thing that I would like to just put in context, everything else

that we do tonight is in context of this secretary is going out and saying that this Congress is stopping the raid on Social Security on the backs of our children. Sorry, Mr. Secretary, even when we find that 1 percent savings in the Department of Education, this Congress, yes, this Republican-led Congress, has appropriated \$100 million more for the education of our children than what this President even asked for in his budget.

We recognize and we are willing to invest in our kids' education, but we are not going to invest in programs that do not work or that move decision making to Washington; or, Mr. Secretary, when we give you another \$100 million, you bet we are going to come down to your agency, we are going to help you manage your agency, because you have not been managing it, because you cannot even tell us where the dollars go.

I will yield to my colleague from Colorado, just remembering those two things in context: Their books are not auditable, and Republicans are investing more in education than what the President even asked for in his budget.

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank my colleague from Michigan. I wanted to just first of all tell him how much I appreciate his efforts as chairman of the committee, the oversight committee that is entrusted with the responsibility of, just as the name implies, overseeing government operations, specifically in the area of education. He has been diligent in that regard, and I just want to commend him for that. This is another example of where people like my colleague can truly make a difference for all Americans, for Americans all over the Nation.

As I listened to my colleague's reference to the Secretary of Education and how he responded to the request to reduce expenditures by 1 percent in the next fiscal year, and he said that that would be impossible, it could not be done, that if it happened, it would come off the backs of children, you have to think to yourself, really and truly what goes through someone's mind when they actually have to say something like that, when they know fully well that anyone listening, anyone, except perhaps other Members of the cabinet who have all been given the same script, they all say the same things, they cannot find the 1 percent savings. But what do they think America thinks when they say that? Does anyone out there believe that no one in the government of the United States can find 1 percent savings without hurting the actual people that they are given charge to take care of? I do not want to say take care of. Does anyone believe that cannot happen?

□ 1945

And with this happening at the same day, as I say, this is a script everyone must be getting. All members of the cabinet, I am sure, have been told that they have to say there is no savings.