that you launch an omnibus, cyber-civilization education program to guarantee the brainpower and leadership needed for our present and for the expanding future digitalized economy and high-tech world.

''At the heart of such a comprehensive initiative, we must set the all-important revitalization of the physical infrastructure of America's schools. These necessary brick and mortar creations will long endure not only as highly visible symbols of your overwhelming commitment to education but they will serve also as practical vehicles for the delivery of the kind of high-tech education required in the 21st century. To the working families who depend on public schools, it would be a resounding message that a vital segment of our Nation's children have not been abandoned.

''The message will also state that we are willing to make an overwhelming investment in a workforce which will help to guarantee the viability of Social Security. We are willing to make an investment in a massive student pool that provides the military with the recruits needed to operate a high-tech defense system. We are willing to make an overwhelming investment in a massive body that can produce the full range of geniuses, scientists, engineers, administrators, managers, technicians, mechanics, et cetera, necessary to launch and maintain a cyber-civilization.

''In other words, Mr. President, it is of vital importance that you carry your own movement to a highly visible apex. Please consider the fact that it is not by accident that the most brilliant American President, Thomas Jefferson, chose a message for his tombstone which only noted that he was the founder of the University of Virginia. If there had been no first model State university established by Jefferson, there would have later been no Morrill Act to establish land grant colleges in every State.

''The America of the year 2000 requires from you, Mr. President, a comparable pioneering act to guarantee its brainpower leadership in the world.''

Mr. Speaker, I submit the entirety of this letter for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 13, 1999.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: Let me begin with an expression of my deeply felt admiration of your leadership in a period cluttered with many more political perils than most citizens have realized. Your leadership has been the vital defense against an unprecedented right wing assault on the unique institutions and programs which extend the benefits of our democracy down to the ordinary men and women of our nation. When all others were traumatized by Newt Gingrich's blitzkrieg your maneuvers held his forces in check. Despite the petty problems highlighted by the partisan impeachment, Mr. President, you have already firmly established an impressive legacy. From many millions you already have the unwavering loyalty and heartfelt appreciation that you deserve. You have preserved the conscience of the country. That is a legacy that historians will eventually be compelled to acknowledge.

But, Mr. President, there is one more vital request we must make on your unique ability to fuse the practical with the idealistic. Now is the time for you to crystallize, solidify, concertize your legacy as the Education President with actions that will catapult our nation forward. I strongly advise, urge and plead that you launch an Omnibus CYBER-CIVILIZATION Education program to guarantee the brainpower and leadership needed for our present and expanding future digitalized economy and hi-tech world.

At the heart of such a comprehensive initiative we must set the all important revitalization of the physical infrastructure of America's schools. These necessary brick and mortar creations will long endure not only as highly visible symbols of your overwhelming commitment to education; they will also serve as practical vehicles for the delivery of the kind of hi-tech education required in the 21st Century. To the working families who depend on public schools it would be a resounding message that a vital segment of our nation's children have not been abandoned.

The message will also state that we are willing to make an overwhelming investment: in a workforce which will help to guarantee the viability of Social Security; in a massive student pool that provides the military with the recruits able to operate a high-tech defense system; in a massive body that can produce the full range of geniuses, scientists, engineers, administrators, managers, technicians, mechanics, etc. necessary to launch and maintain a global Cyber-Civilization.

All of the most brilliant and visionary education achievements of your administration may be merged and focused through these vital physical edifices: The NET-Day movement for the volunteer wiring of schools; The Technology Literacy Legislation; the Community Technology Centers; the Distance Learning pilot projects; and the widely celebrated and appreciated E-Rate for telecommunications. The lifting of standards, the improvement in school curriculums and the support for smaller class sizes are also initiatives that require the additional classrooms and expanded libraries and laboratories that school modernization will bring.

In other words, Mr. President, it is of vital importance that you carry your own movement to an ultimate highly visible apex. Please consider the fact that it is not by accident that the most brilliant American President, Thomas Jefferson, chose a message for his tombstone which only noted that he was the founder of the University of Virginia. If there had been no first model state university established by Jefferson, there would have later been no Morrill Act to establish land-grant colleges in every state.

The America of the Year 2000 requires from you a comparable pioneering act to guarantee its brainpower leadership in the world. You have the opportunity to bequeath a new system for public education. Highly developed human resources are clearly the key to power and prosperity in the century to come. To minimize the crippling waste of human potential there must be a broad sweeping public school system forever striving toward education excellence. The kingpin for the education improvement effort, the temples for the promotion of excellence are our school buildings.

Mr. President, an adequate and landmark modernization and construction program requires that we move beyond HR 1660, the Rangel Ways and Means payment of the interest on school bonds (3.7 billion over a five year period). For New York and numerous other states which require that voters approve all borrowing for school construction, this legislation will provide zero funding. I strongly urge that you revamp your position and support HR 3071, my bill which provides direct funding at a level commensurate with the magnitude of the problem of school wiring, security, safety, modernization and construction (110 Billion dollars over a ten year period).

On a trip to New York more than a year ago, as your guest aboard Air Force One, I had the privilege of chatting with you about education issues and problems. When you asked my opinion of the growing endorsement of vouchers among African American parents, I replied that our public school reforms were moving too slowly and sometimes even lurching backwards with the results that large numbers of parents have lost hope.

Mr. President, the trip was much too short and when we ended our brief exchange you invited me to forward a more thorough statement of views and vision on the education challenge. Although I have had the pleasure of speaking to you in group meetings since that discussion, I have not until now attempted to offer a thorough summary of my position on the need for an overwhelming campaign to greatly improve public education in America. A massive school construction initiative must be placed at the core of this campaign for a CYBER-CIVILIZATION Education Program.

Sincerely Yours,

MAJOR R. OWENS,
Member of Congress.

CONVICTED MURDERER SEEKS EXECUTIVE CLEMENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I was moved by an article that I read about an individual by the name of Leonard Peltier. Mr. Peltier is currently in the penitentiary, Federal penitentiary, for the assassination of two FBI agents. He has been in prison for 25 years.

I need to be fair to all of my colleagues here and give you some disclosures. First of all, I used to be a police officer. As a result of being a police officer, over the years and especially during the time of my tenure as a police officer, I developed a very close relationship with agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Over the years, I have also developed a great deal of respect for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But I must also tell my colleagues that over these years I have also had an opportunity to carefully scrutinize the Federal Bureau of Investigation, because, you see, I think it is a very important agency for our country. But I think the integrity of the agency is also very, very important.

In the past, I have been very critical of the Federal Bureau of Investigation when they messed up. I can give you an excellent example, Ruby Ridge. The agents involved at Ruby Ridge in my opinion should have been immediately

terminated. What happened at Ruby Ridge I will not repeat this evening but I will tell you that the command officer from the Federal Bureau of Investigation was not terminated, in fact the command officer was put on a paid leave of absence for 1 or 2 years and retired and received in my opinion no punishment at all.

I am also looking with a very careful eye at the Federal Bureau of Investigation's role at the Waco, Texas goof-up. That, too, is a very tragic situation in the history of our country, and I think unfortunately, there will be revealed within the report about the incident at Waco, Texas, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation misstated their role, understated their contribution, so to speak, or their involvement in the situation at Waco, Texas.

So I am not necessarily in lockstep with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But I can tell you, when I look at all of the law enforcement agencies I have seen over the years, and as a former law enforcement officer, I have had the opportunity to be involved with many of them, at the very highest, when you look at the picture as an average, the Federal Bureau of Investigation comes out at the very top. And I think it is incumbent, Mr. Speaker, colleagues, of every one of us when we see an attack launched against the Federal Bureau of Investigation that is launched without justification, or when we see an action being taken against the Federal Bureau of Investigation without justification, we have a commitment to step forward and say something about it.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my comments, I saw an article the other day about this individual. This gentleman's name is Leonard Peltier. I saw today in fact an article in the USA Today. The article is Indians, FBI Face Off in Washington. First of all, I am not sure why the author of the USA Today article uses the word Indians in a broad or general descriptive form. In my particular district, which is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado, we have the Indian tribal lands, and I have yet to hear from any of the leaders of those Indian tribes, of which I work with very closely on projects such as the Animus LaPlata, the kind of appeal that may be suggested by all Indians as a result of this particular article. It is my opinion that the Native American involvement in this case is limited. And it is also my opinion that if you sit down with the average Native American in this country and you look at the facts of this case, that there will be very few Native Americans who would step forward and say that this particular convict is a political prisoner.

I think this is a stage being set by the defense attorneys for this convict. Actually using the word convict is somewhat gentle. He is not a convict, he is a murderer, and he is a cold-blooded murderer. He killed two FBI agents in cold blood. Now, 25 years ago, as one defense attorney would suggest, is something that enough time has passed by that perhaps he has served his time for this violent and horrible crime. I will quote exactly from the USA Today.

Peltier, that is the convict, the murderer that I am talking about, has been in prison as long as anyone responsible for similar crimes should be in, attorney Carl Nadler says. Can you believe this? Let me repeat what this defense attorney says. Peltier has been in prison as long as anyone responsible for similar crimes should be in prison. What he is suggesting is that 25 years is enough time for somebody to serve that goes out and in cold blood assassinates two officers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Well, I stand here tonight, colleagues, in deep disagreement with this defense attorney. And I urge that all of my colleagues on the floor take time to review what is going on in the month of November in regard to this case. Now, why have I suggested the month of November? Well, apparently this murderer's defense team has put together a little political show and tell, and they call November the month of publicity or the month to get reprieve for this convicted murderer. What I mean by that, it is this month that they are submitting papers to the President of the United States requesting that clemency be granted to Leonard Peltier, a convicted murderer.

A couple of days ago, I read an open letter. This open letter is a joint letter authored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association located in New Rochelle, New York and the Society of Former Special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation located in Quantico, Virginia. The above organizations, which are professional, nongovernmental associations, represent over 20,000 active duty and former FBI agents. I was so moved by this letter that I ask my colleagues to follow me closely this evening as I read verbatim that open letter to the American people.

As many of you know, I do not often read from notes when I speak from this podium, but I am going to be very careful this evening that I read this letter verbatim, because I think it is important that every one of us in this room have a clear understanding of the facts of this case before Peltier's defense attorney arrives here in Washington, D.C., sets up this political show and tell, and tries to convince through propaganda that for some reason this convicted murderer deserves clemency from the President of the United States.

We should not take this lightly. We had a very difficult situation about 1 month ago when clemency was given to the Puerto Rican terrorists.

□ 2300

As I pointed out from this House floor, you can look right up in the roof of this fine room and you can see the bullet hole, or I could walk over here to this desk drawer and show you the bullet holes through that desk from the Puerto Rican terrorists who entered this floor many years ago firing weapons.

Well, this case is somewhat similar, except in this case we know, we have the person who conducted two savage, cold blooded murders on these FBI agents.

Let me begin the letter.

June 26, 1975, was a hot, dusty Thursday on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in Southwestern South Dakota when two FBI agents arrived from their office in Rapid City. It was about noon when Special Agents Ronald A. Williams, age 27, and Jack R. Coler, age 28, pulled into the Jumping Bull compound area of the remote reservation seeking to arrest a young man in connection with the recent abduction and assault of two young ranchers.

Observing their suspect Peltier's vehicle, the agents pursued it. Unknown to Special Agent Coler and Special Agent Williams, 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 that the two vehicles pursuing him were occupied by FBI agents and believing they were seeking to arrest him on that attempted murder case, Peltier and his associates abruptly stopped their vehicle and began firing rifles at the agents. Surprised by the sudden violence, outmanned, outgunned, and at an extreme tactical disadvantage, Coler and Williams were both wounded and defenseless within minutes.

Coler sustained a severe wound, the force of the bullet nearly tearing his right arm off. Williams, wounded in the left shoulder and the right foot, removed his shirt during the hail of incoming rifle fire, and fashioned a tourniquet around the arm ofColer, who had by then fallen unconscious.

Agents Coler and Williams were then at the mercy of Leonard Peltier and his associates. But there was to be no mercy for these fine young law enforcement officers.

Not satisfied with the terrible injuries that they had inflicted, Peltier and the two other men walked down the hill towards the ambushed agents. Three shots were fired from Peltier's rifle. Williams, kneeling and apparently surrendering, was shot in the face directly through his out extended shielding handled. He died instantly. Coler, who was still unconscious, was shot twice in the head at close-range. He died instantly from those shots.

The crime scene examination testified to the brutality of the ambush. Coler and Williams had little chance to defend themselves. They had fired only five shots. In contrast, over 125 bullet holes were found in into the car.

Following the murder, 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. Coler, the FBI agent who had been assassinated earlier on, his revolver which was stolen when he was murdered, was found in a paper bag under the front seat of the recreational vehicle. Peltier's thumb print was on that bag.

When arrested later in Canada by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Peltier remarked that had he known the Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers were there to arrest him, he would have blown them out of their shoes. These are not the comments of an innocent man and they portray the true

character and the violent nature of Leonard Peltier.

In April 1977 a jury convicted Peltier of the murders of those two FBI agents, Coler and Williams. A judge sentenced him to two consecutive life sentences. While incarcerated in the Lompoc, California, Federal prison, and, with outside assistance, Peltier shot his way out of jail using a smuggled rifle to make his escape. Several days later, after assaulting a rancher and stealing a pick up, Peltier was captured. He was tried and convicted of escape and of being a felon in possession of a firearm.

Peltier has since appealed his various convictions numerous times. Each time the Federal courts have upheld earlier legal decisions. The United States Supreme Court has twice denied Peltier review without comment.

The record is clear: There were no new facts. There are no new facts. The old facts have not changed, and Peltier is guilty as charged.

Several times on national television Peltier has admitted to firing at the two agents. In his most recent public interview, Peltier has even reluctantly conceded what he had previously denied, that he had in fact gone down to where the agents were executed. Still, he openly states that he feels no guilt, no remorse, nor even any regret for the murders.

Leonard Peltier has lived a life of crime. He has earned and deserves a lifetime of incarceration. Leonard Peltier is a murderer without compassion or feeling towards his fellow man. In turn, he deserves no compassion.

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

Mr. President, since Leonard Peltier could not fool the Federal courts, he is now trying to fool you, to fool the public. He is shading and hiding the facts and playing on sympathy. He and his advocates want to confuse the fact of his guilt with matters completely extraneous to that fact. Do not let him get away with it, Mr. President. Sympathy is appropriate only for dead heroes and surviving families. Do not let their sacrifice be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, that was somewhat of a lengthy letter, but as you can tell, it is a subject that should be dear to every one of our hearts in this room, to the heart of every American out there that believes in law and justice, to every law enforcement family out there that currently has someone in law enforcement or has had a member of their family in law enforcement.

□ 2310

If we let, if we let this kind of violent assassin out of prison after serving only 24 years, it will in my opinion be a crippling blow to the message that we need to send to the law enforcement in this country.

That message really is fairly simple. That is that you work as a law enforcement officer to provide, as your duty, peace and justice in our system, and that when peace and justice are attacked in our system, our system has a price, it has a consequence, it has a punishment. It is the only way we can uphold the integrity of our system of law enforcement is to have a zero tolerance or a limited tolerance of any type of direct attack against our system of peace and justice.

The assassination of two Federal Bureau of Investigation agents, no matter how many years ago, is a direct attack against the legal and justice process in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join with me in attempting to be persuasive with the President of the United States and the American public in saying how important it is that this political charade being put on by the defense attorneys for this convicted assassin, that this kind of show be stopped, that this kind of show be denied their goal. Their goal, of course, is to let this convicted assassin walk the streets of America again.

Do not let him hide under the shield of being a Native American. That is a disgrace to the Native Americans. Do not pull Native Americans down to the level of this convicted killer. Do not affiliate this convicted killer with the Native Americans in this country. That is an insult, in my opinion, if we do.

Do not forget the facts of the case. Just so that I can remind the Members, let me go through the facts again in a little briefer form than the letter.

Two FBI agents were assassinated. They attempted to pursue a vehicle which contained this suspect, at the time suspect, now a convicted killer, Leonard Peltier. They were wounded. They were disarmed by the wounds that they had. In other words, they could not fight back. They didn't have any weapons left to fight back with. They were not physically capable. One the FBI agents was unconscious. The other FBI agent was rendering first aid to the unconscious FBI agent.

This convicted killer, who by the way was a fugitive from justice for the attempted assassination of an off-duty police officer in Milwaukee, walked up to these two FBI agents and executed them in cold blood. He was later stopped in a recreational vehicle. In that vehicle they found one of the deceased agent's pistols in a paper bag. That bag had evidence, Peltier's fingerprints on it.

Peltier was captured in Canada. He was convicted of two counts of murder for these FBI agents. He escaped from the Federal prison. Do not let people tell us this guy is a nonviolent guy. He was in Federal prison and he shot his way out of Federal prison. Think of the last time since the John Dillinger days or Bonnie and Clyde and so on that somebody shot their way out of the Federal prison. That is who this individual is.

Now today, now today he is in front of the American people, in front of the President of the United States, asking for mercy. Look, 25 years ago may seem like a long time to some, but it has been a real long time for the families of those young FBI agents that were assassinated in cold blood.

In conclusion on this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, let me ask for Members' support in standing up strong for the law enforcement community of the country, in standing up strong for the families and the agents and professionals of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in standing up strong for the concept of peace and justice within the boundaries of our country.

Let us all have our voice heard, that in the United States of America, if you assassinate a police officer, or, just as soon, two Federal Bureau of Investigation officers, you will pay a price and we will stick with the punishment that we deal out. We are not a bunch of patsies. Do not come back to us and think you are going to get a free walk 25 years later after that kind of action.

If we fail to do this, if we fail to do this, we are sending the wrong message out there and we are crippling justice and peace in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to do an update on a couple of other subjects this evening while I have the opportunity to visit with the Members.

As Members will recall, about 2 or 3 weeks ago, maybe a month ago, there is a museum in New York City called the Brooklyn Art Museum. The Brooklyn Art Museum, it was discovered, with taxpayer dollars, with taxpayer dollars, was sponsoring an art exhibit that depicted, among other things, a portrait of the Virgin Mary, which is one of the holiest symbols of the Catholic religion throughout the world and of Christianity throughout the world, this art museum was allowing in this art exhibit, with taxpayer dollars, this portrait of the Virgin Mary with elephant dung, as they say, crap, as I say, thrown all over the portrait. Can Members imagine that?

How long do Members think that type of art exhibit would have been tolerated or should have been tolerated in this country at taxpayer dollars if it was an exhibit of Martin Luther King, for example, or if it were an exhibit of an outstanding Jewish rabbi, for example, or if it were an exhibit of some other outstanding leader that meant so much to a religious organization anywhere in this world? They would not put up with that.

But for some reason, there seems to be some justification out there by some people that an attack on Christianity should be separated from an attack, say, on Martin Luther King, or an attack on the image of a Jewish rabbi, and so on and so forth.

What happened is that the mayor of New York City, Mayor Rudy Giuliani, I think had some guts. He stood up and he said, we are drawing the line. That has gone too far. There is a strong freedom of expression in this country. There is a First Amendment in this country, but there is a balance that we have in this country.

Just the same as under the freedom of speech we do not allow individuals to go into a theater and yell ''fire, fire, fire,'' we do not allow that. That is not a violation of your First Amendment rights, but we do not allow you to go into a theater and do that. We draw a line. This thing is not carte blanche, this First Amendment, to do anything that you feel like doing, especially when you do it with taxpayer dollars.

The mayor came under heavy criticism by the very elite that were dealing with the Brooklyn Art Museum, the board of directors, who I think were acting very pompous in somehow defending this disgraceful work of art, not a work of art that is just controversial, that brings up lots of discussion, but a work of art that hit at the very integrity of a large religious group throughout the world, that was the maximum type of insult that you could throw at that particular religion, and did it with American taxpayer dollars.

Why do I keep bringing up the fact of American taxpayer dollars? Because therein lies the distinction as to whether or not this is an issue under the First Amendment of our Constitution.

Under our Constitution, frankly, had the United States taxpayer dollars not been used to fund this portrait of the Virgin Mary of which dung was thrown all over it, had taxpayer dollars not been used, I am afraid to say that this would have been probably protected, or would have been protected under the First Amendment. We can tolerate that.

It is horrible, and I cannot imagine, for example, why the First Lady, Hillary Clinton, stood up for this thing. She said, however, in her comments that while she would not go see it, but she certainly stood up for the right to go around and exhibit this with taxpayer dollars.

I understand where some would say it is a First Amendment right if there is not taxpayer dollars being used, although I can tell the Members that the press in this country and the liberal left in this country would not have stood for 2 seconds if it were Martin Luther King or a Jewish rabbi or some other celebrated figure being treated in that fashion. But the key here is taxpayer dollars.

□ 2320

The point here is very clear, and I think the citizens of this country, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to go out and ask our constituents, do the citizens of this country really think it is a justified and constitutionally protected right under the Constitution to fund this kind of art with taxpayer dollars or should this type of art be denied the access of taxpayer dollars and allowed to be funded in society with private dollars?

Remember that my objection tonight, and the mayor of New York City's objection to this art, was not that the art should not be shown. Now, it is disgraceful. Do not get me wrong. I do not condone this kind of art, but there is a constitutionally protected right to show this art without taxpayer dollars. That argument has some legitimacy but that was not the debate that is being carried forward here.

What the mayor said, what I said and, Mr. Speaker, what I think most of our constituents believe is that this kind of art, i.e., the Virgin Mary with dung splashed all over her, with taxpayer dollars, has gone over that line. You draw a line. You have gone over that line. Do not use taxpayer dollars.

The Brooklyn Art Museum in New York, they could easily fund this through other monies. They just want to try and make an issue. What they want to do is open that door so that taxpayers in this country will have to pay out of their hard-earned dollars, will have to use those taxpayer dollars, to let the so-called art community, especially the elite of the Brooklyn Art Museum, fund anything they would like, no matter how offensive, no matter how derogatory it is. That is wrong. This art museum knows that it is wrong.

Well, there has been a new step, a new report to update you on, and that is that a Federal court judge this week actually came out and said that the art museum has a right to use taxpayer dollars to exhibit this type of art, i.e. the Virgin Mary with dung thrown all over her in very obviously a disgraceful fashion intended to be as derogatory as possible, not only towards Christianity but towards one of the most important symbols of Christianity.

I am telling you, Federal judge, you made a mistake. You are wrong. There is not a constitutionally protected provision that says you can use taxpayer dollars in this country to fund that kind of art. Why do you not use some common sense? Why do you have to offend the people of Christianity? Why do you do an all-out attack? You would not do it with Martin Luther King and the black community. You would not do it in the Jewish community with some rabbi of theirs. You would not do it with some other type of religious entity or important entity in this country with their leader.

Why are you doing this? Why do you decide to use taxpayer dollars to offend every Christian in the world? It is wrong. You have got a temporary victory from this Federal judge but in the end I think the mayor of New York City, one, had a lot of guts to do what he did and, number two, I think he is going to prevail.

I also think that the general opinion in this country is, look, that kind of art, as violent and as horrible and as disgraceful as it is, is protected but not with the use of taxpayer dollars.

Our constituents, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, are in any way about to buy the argument that we ought to take the tax dollars out of their paycheck every week and put a percentage of that towards the funding of this kind of art.

THE FALL OF THE BERLIN WALL

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening we have covered two topics so far. The first topic is the attempted request, well, not the attempted request but the actual request by an assassin, by a convicted murderer of two Federal Bureau of Investigation officers, Leonard Peltier, the convict is submitting to the President of the United States for clemency. I am in hopes with my colleagues that they join me in urging the President to deny that.

The second issue that we have discussed tonight is the Brooklyn Art Museum and the fact that they use taxpayer dollars to fund an art exhibit of the Virgin Mary, a portrait of the Virgin Mary, with elephant dung or elephant crap thrown all over the face of the Virgin Mary.

The third topic, however, is kind of we are changing engines here. I want to talk about, instead of the negative implications of a convicted assassin asking our President to let him walk from prison, get-out-of-jail-free card, instead of talking about the Brooklyn Art Museum and the prima donnas who want to use your taxpayer dollars to fund that kind of obscene art, I want to shift to an accomplishment of this country. Actually it is an accomplishment that should be celebrated, it was celebrated throughout the world, and a lot of credit of this accomplishment goes to the people throughout the world.

When people look back to the accomplishments of this century, they are going to look at one accomplishment which will stand out for many, many centuries to come, and that is the fall of the Berlin Wall. Recently, I had the opportunity to watch the tape on Ronald Reagan. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of us to watch it. It is put out by the Public Broadcasting System, PBS, on the presidency of Ronald Reagan and it talked about Reagan's great leadership, and I will again disclose that I am a strong admirer of President Reagan, about the difficult transition period he went through in taking this country through a buildup in arms, a buildup in military defense, in order to accomplish a build-down; that how President Reagan, throughout his entire life had one goal, and that is to bring down the destructive society of Communism.

It was interesting the pressure he went through, even within our own boundaries of this great country, about his concept of how to bring down that Berlin Wall.

Now many of those critics, some of who sit on this floor, some of who sit in other chambers of political leadership throughout this country, who criticized President Reagan, we can now look back and see what a feat. Not just with President Reagan but what a feat President Reagan and what a role he played in bringing down that Berlin Wall.

Now, why do I bring it up today? Because in one week, on November 9, on November 9, will be the tenth anniversary of bringing that wall down. Whenever I see pictures of that wall in the history books or I see it in some other type of periodical, I think of President Ronald Reagan standing there and saying, ''Mr. Gorbachev, tear that wall down.''

□ 2330

What a fascinating time of history and how neat it is that we were able to bring that down. Look at what has happened since. Look at what has happened in Germany. Look at what has happened in Europe. Look at what happened to communism.

Now, there are some tough times still ahead for the countries of Russia and so on. There is a lot of peace and justice that needs to be brought into the country of Russia.

As my colleagues know, one of the big failures of the society today in Russia, in my opinion, is the failure of their justice system, the mob over there. But the fact is, despite all of these painful headaches and this long journey towards capitalism and freedom, it will arrive. It will come to the station. Some people think it is late. But it will arrive at the station due in a large part to the leadership of this country and large part due to the leadership throughout the free world 10 years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues have not had an opportunity, I would urge them to take a look at this week's Newsweek. I did. It has an article in there, excellent article written by Newsweek, about the Berlin Wall. I would like to go through. What it did is it picked up some of the conversations during those few critical days of the fall of the Berlin wall. It brings out some of the conversations as reflected by memos written at the time between the President of the United States, George Bush, and the German Chancellor Kohl. I will like to repeat some of those because I think they are pretty fascinating.

This is a conversation that took place between West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and President George Bush. October 23, 1989, just a little over 10 years ago, 9:02 in the morning. Tens of thousands of East Germans flee via Hungary. Others seek sanctuary in the West German embassy and the Prague. Demonstrators calling for freedom take to the streets of major German cities. Kohl phones Bush to describe the situation, and here is how the conversation took place.

Kohl: The changes in east Germany are quite dramatic. None of us can give a prognosis. There is enormous unrest among the population. Things will become incalculable if there are no reforms. My interest is not to see so many flee Germany because the consequences there would be a disaster.

I am also concerned about the media coverage that, crudely speaking, holds that Germans are now committed in their discussions about reunification and that they are less interested in the West. This is absolute nonsense. Without a strong NATO, none of these developments in the Warsaw Pact would have occurred.

President Bush in response: I could not agree more. We are trying to react very cautiously and carefully to change in East Germany. We are getting criticism in the Congress from liberal Democrats that we ought to be doing more to foster change, but I am not going to go so fast as to be reckless.

November 10, 1989, 3:29 in the afternoon. The previous night the world had watched transfixed as the East Germans stormed the wall.

Kohl to President Bush: I have just arrived from Berlin. It is like witnessing an enormous fair. It has the atmosphere of a festival. The frontiers are absolutely open. At certain points, they are literally taking down the wall and building new check points. This is a dramatic thing, a historic hour. Without the United States, this day would not have been possible. Tell your people that.

President Bush: First, let me say how great is our respect for the way West Germany has handled all of this. I want to see our people continue to avoid especially hot rhetoric that might, by mistake, cause a problem.

Kohl to the President: Thank you. Give my best to Barbara. Tell her that I intend to send sausages for Christmas.

November 17, 1989, 7:55 in the morning, Bush and Kohl discussed the Soviet reaction. They are concerned that Moscow, which still has 390,000 troops in East Germany may panic.

Kohl: I had a long conversation with Gorbachev. Of course the Soviets are concerned. I told Gorbachev that if East German leader Egon Krenz does not carry out reforms, the system will fail.

President Bush: It is important that the Germans see that they have the support and the sympathy of their allies. In spite of congressional posturing, the United States will stay calm and support reforms. The excitement in the United States runs the risk of forcing unforeseen action in the U.S.S.R. or East Germany. We will not be making statements about unification or setting any timetables. We will not exacerbate the problem by having the President of the United States posturing on the Berlin Wall.

February 13, 1990, 1:49 in the afternoon. The East German regime has agreed to free elections in March and Kohl has just returned from a visit to Moscow. Both he and Bush are worried that Gorbachev will demand a neutral Germany as a price for unification.

Kohl to the President: The situation continues to be dramatic. Between January 1 and today, 80,000 have come to the West from the East. That is why I suggested a monetary union and an economic community. We will have to urge the government that comes in after March 18 to go through with these.

Let me say a few words about my talks in Moscow. Gorbachev was very relaxed. But the problems he faces are enormous, nationalities, the food supply situation, and I do not see a light at the end of the tunnel yet. We also discussed that the two German states should be working together with the four powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the U.S.S.R. I told Gorbachev again that neutralization of Germany is out of the question.

Bush: Did he acquiesce or just listen? How did he react?

Kohl: My impression is that this is a subject about which they want to negotiate but that we can win that point.

March 20th, 1990, 8:31 in the morning. In the March elections, the East Germans overwhelmingly support reunification and democratic change by voting for a coalition of parties led by Kohl's Christian Democrats.

Bush to Kohl: Helmut, you are a hell of a campaigner.

Kohl: Thank you. The results are very important for the NATO question.

Bush: Helmut, your firm stand on a united Germany remaining a full member of NATO is great. We need to continue holding firm. This is vitally important for European security and stability and for the United States.

May 30, 1990, 7:34 in the morning. Gorbachev is due in Washington for his first visit since the fall of the wall. Bush and Kohl discuss that agenda.

Bush to Kohl: I am getting ready for Gorbachev's big visit.

Kohl: That is why I am calling. One thing that is very important for Gorbachev to understand is that, irrespective of the developments, we will stand side by side. And one sign of this cooperation are the links between us by the future membership of the united Germany and NATO without any limitations. You should make this clear to him, but in a friendly way. A second point, we can find a sensible economic arrangement with him. He needs help very much. He should also know that we had no intention of profiting from his weakness.

Bush: I will assure him that we are side by side. We want him to come out feeling that he has had a good summit.

July 17, 1990, 8:48 in the morning. Kohl briefs Bush on his most recent visit to Moscow.

Kohl: George, first of all, Gorbachev is in excellent shape. He is aware of his special situation and of his responsibilities. And he is aware he has to act quickly to get through pluralism to change society and to get through the necessary legislation by the end of this year.

□ 2340

''I told him there would be no chance to receive western aid if he does not get these reforms through. We also discussed extensively his determination

to pursue the modernization of his country. He said something I had never heard before. He told me his grandfather was tortured and imprisoned under Stalin. His wife said her grandfather was liquidated under Stalin. It is remarkable.''

One other interesting thing. We talked about German-U.S. relationships in our one-on-one. I told him that this relationship was of great importance, and I told him that if the Soviets tried to undermine it, this would affect German relationships with the USSR. His reply will be of interest to you. He said that they learned a lesson, that it was wrong to try to make the United States withdraw from Europe, and that they had not succeeded in this in the past.

Finally, he impresses me as a man who knows himself well and who has a sense of self-irony. He has burned all his bridges behind him. He cannot go back and he must be successful.

August 3, 1990, 9:56 in the morning, nearly a year after the Wall falls, East and West Germany are officially reunited.

Bush: ''Helmut, I am in a meeting with members of our Congress and I am calling on this historic day to wish you well.''

Kohl: ''Things are going very, very well. I am in Berlin. There were one million people here last night at the very spot where the Wall used to stand and where President Reagan called on Mr. Gorbachev to open this gate. Words cannot describe the feeling. American presidents from Harry Truman all the way up to our friend George Bush made this possible.''

The Berlin Wall did not come down in a day. It did not come down in a season. What is interesting about these conversations that I just related to you is it is kind of symbolic of the effort that our country made to see that communism fell and that the non-free people of this world were able to enjoy freedom as we have enjoyed our entire life. But it was not without a price.

President Reagan went on a massive military buildup. His concept to build up in order to build down turned out to be correct. But during this massive buildup, he received a lot of criticism. Frankly, the Russians were worried about President Reagan.

I reviewed this tape from Public Broadcasting, and I hope my colleagues take time to take a look at it, it is fascinating. Whether you are Republican or Democrat, this time period sets aside those partisanship contests to take a look at the biggest threat to the world, and that was communism and how this president, President Reagan, really took us right to the brink and the Russians blinked and the Russians disarmed and the Russians allowed that Wall to be taken down.

They pulled out of Hungary. They pulled out of Poland. And today in our history, most of the countries in this world enjoy the freedom that we enjoy as Americans. In 100 years from now, it is my prediction that every country in the world will have some form of capitalism, that the days of communism, even the days of socialism will be days long past. It gives us a lot to be proud of in America.

Colleagues, I know that as United States congressmen we are privileged to be up here to represent what I think is the finest country in the history of the world. And the reason that we came out of this so well, the reason that we have stood strong for such a long time is that we understood America does not have to apologize for being free. America owes nobody in this world an apology for standing up for the abused people of this world.

But the United States of America owes no apology to anybody in this world for strength that we maintain with our defense. Because we understand that if we do not have a strong defense, if we are not the toughest kid on the block, we are going to be in a lot of fights.

I forget the source of the quote. I think it was back in the early days of the country, Jefferson, maybe Washington, who said, ''the best way to avoid a war is to be prepared for war.''

The best way to protect freedom is to be strong. Every generation will be tested. Freedom will always come with a price and a cost. But in the end, if we pay that cost, if we stand up strong, as this country has done in the past, if we have great leaders like Ronald Reagan and many of the other great leaders this country has had, we can look to the next generation and we can say to that next generation, you too will enjoy a lifetime in the greatest country in the history of the world.

As you can tell from my remarks, I am proud to be an American. And so are every one of you. Next week I hope all of us take just a few minutes outside of our busy schedules and I hope we try and convince our constituents to take a few minutes out of their busy schedules and think of those days 10 years ago when that awful, terrible wall began to crumble. Think of those days when President Reagan stood up there, broad-shouldered, looking them right in the eye and said, Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall. Open up this gate.

Take a few moments next week on this tenth anniversary to think of the joy and the excitement and the happiness of those individuals in Germany who now were able to go across that border without being shot, without having to sneak through at night trying to get through the barbed wire.

I can remember 15, 20 years ago, even longer than that, when I was young about reading the Reader's Digest. It seemed to me that twice a year the Reader's Digest would carry a story in there about somebody in East Germany who had that taste of freedom, who wanted to live in a free world, who wanted a Democratic society. They would risk and their family would risk everything they had to get across that Wall.

I remember reading in a study of history when our American planes and our allies went into Germany and past the Wall to bring those in the Berlin airlift. What a great accomplishment that was.

And now, less than 10 years ago, whoever imagined that that horrible Wall would crumble as quickly as it did? You know, it was not a very strong structure. It did not stand up for very long, too long, but not very long. And that credit goes to the American leadership and the leadership of our allies in this world.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by just recapping the three things that I discussed this evening.

First of all, I beg my colleagues in here to carefully watch what is going on with this request for clemency by a convicted assassin of two agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This man, Leonard Peltier, will be requesting through a political horse and pony show with the President clemency to let him walk as a free man. He has got a very sharp defense team. But do not let that shield all of us from the fact that in cold blood he killed two FBI agents.

This man should never see the outside of a jail cell for as long as he lives. I hope many of my colleagues will join me in that effort in attempting to convince the President or help persuade the President to ignore that request.

Second of all, let me point out that to you, Brooklyn Art Museum, you are wrong. You will not be able to continue to defy, I think, the taxpayers of this country by using taxpayer dollars to fund your art exhibit of the Virgin Mary with dung slapped all over her. I hope at some point you prima donnas who serve on the board of directors at that Brooklyn Art Museum, I hope really seriously you have a moment to look in the mirror when nobody else is around and you ask yourselves the question, is it right?

□ 2350

Does what we did make me feel good? Have I completed my duty as a trustee of the Brooklyn art museum? Would I have done this to the great leader Martin Luther King? Would I have done this to a great leader in the Jewish community? Would I have done this to a great leader in the Buddhist community? Or should I just pick on Christianity and use taxpayer dollars to do it? The taste of art has gone too far when you use taxpayer dollars for that kind of effort. It is not a protected right in my opinion under the first amendment.

Finally, the day of celebration next week as we are running around this floor, we ought to take a few minutes and just remember what a great day in our history it was to see that Berlin Wall fall, to see those people in East Germany taste freedom, many of them for the first time in their entire life, and to see through the great leadership of the United States of America, through the response of the citizens of

the United States of America, through the strength of the military forces of the United States of America, we brought the taste of freedom to millions and millions of people, and we will as the United States of America preserve the taste of freedom for many centuries to come.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). The Chair must remind all Members to direct remarks in debate to the Chair and not to other persons in the second person.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3194. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon is amendment to the bill (H.R. 3194) ''An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–443) on the resolution (H. Res. 358) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3196, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–444) on the resolution (H. Res. 359) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3196) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION AGREEING TO CONFERENCE REQUESTED BY SENATE ON H.R. 3194, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–445) on the resolution (H. Res. 360) agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 3:30 p.m. on account of official business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a family medical matter.

Mr. BEREUTER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 12:00 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of offical business.

Mr. HULSHOF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHOWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BASS, for 5 minutes, November 9.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, November 5.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today and November 4 and November 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, November 4.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 440. An act to provide support for certain institutes and schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

S. 1844. An Act to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for an alternative penalty procedure with respect to compliance with requirement for a State disbursement unit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of ''Capitol Builder: The Shorthand Journals of Captain Montgomery C. Meigs, 1853–1861''; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of ''The United States Capitol: A Chronicle of Construction, Design, and Politics''; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 441. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the requirements for the admission of nonimmigrant nurses who will practice in health professional shortage areas.

H.R. 974. An act to establish a program to afford high school graduates from the District of Columbia the benefits of in-State tuition at State colleges and universities outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On November 2, 1999:

H.R. 2303. To direct the Librarian of Congress to prepare the history of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3064. Making appropriations for the District of Columbia, and for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.