

whom are former U.S. Government officials and staff, to present their case in Washington. Meanwhile, our free trade policies have literally opened the doors to foreign investment, while an archaic law allows agents of foreign governments to work in secrecy.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act [FARA] of 1938 requires foreign agents to disclose their connections with foreign governments, foreign political parties, and other foreign principals to the Foreign Agents Registration Unit at the Department of Justice. However, according to General Accounting Office [GAO] reports, FARA is plagued by unclear language as to who is required to register, weak investigative and enforcement provisions, and loopholes.

GAO's July 1990 report entitled, "Foreign Agent Registration: Justice Needs to Improve Program Administration," finds that only 775 foreign agents—out of thousands—actually bothered to register under FARA. Since the 1990 report, neither the Justice Department nor Congress has rectified this breach of security. As a result, I have introduced H.R. 452, the Foreign Interest Representation Act.

The GAO report found several problems with current law:

The Foreign Agent Registration Act was originally enacted to target Nazi and Communist propaganda in the 1930's and 1940's. The term "foreign agent" was originally used to identify foreign principals in America who were spreading foreign propaganda and organizing political activities. With the end of the cold war, however, the emphasis has shifted from political propaganda to free trade and the global economic competition. FARA, however, remains unchanged. Thus, many individuals and law firms representing foreign interests are exempt from registration under the act.

My bill, H.R. 452, substitutes "representative of a foreign interest" for "foreign agent," thus broadening the definition and closing a loophole. Likewise, the term "political propaganda" has been dropped in favor of "promotional or informational materials." Several other term substitutions were made in this manner.

FARA provides certain exemptions to registration including commercial activities. Moreover, representatives of foreign interests are not required to notify the registration unit to claim an exemption. As a result, it is difficult for the unit to determine who should and who should not be registered.

Under H.R. 452, any person who engages in political activities for the purpose of furthering the commercial, industrial or financial operations of a foreign interest would no longer be exempt. In addition, representatives of foreign interests will now be required to notify the Attorney General.

Furthermore, H.R. 452, establishes a test to determine what constitutes foreign control. Entities that are more than 50 percent foreign owned would be presumed to be foreign controlled and required to register. Entities with 20 to 50 percent foreign ownership would also be considered foreign controlled, but the presumption could be rebutted with evidence. Less than 20 percent foreign ownership would not require registration. Both provisions help to clarify the law and will lead to an increase in registration.

Timeliness of foreign agent registration and reporting remains a problem. Of the 28 registration statements reviewed in the GAO re-

port, a whopping 68 percent had not registered on time.

Currently, registrants must submit updated disclosure forms every 6 months after the initial registration. This system has made it almost impossible to know who is registered and whether the registration is up-to-date. H.R. 452 requires follow-up registration forms to be filed in January 30 and June 30 of each year. The Justice Department, however, would be given the authority to waive this provision, on a case-by-case basis, for entities whose fiscal year does not follow the calendar year.

Finally, harsh criminal penalties under FARA are another reason the Justice Department has shied away from enforcement of the act. Under H.R. 452, any person who has failed to file, has omitted facts, or has made a false statement regarding the facts, will be fined a minimum of \$2,000, up to \$1,000,000, depending upon the nature and duration of the violation. Furthermore, the Justice Department would be given the authority to subpoena individuals for testimony and records.

The bottom line is, the American people have a right to know who is getting paid by foreign interests to influence the U.S. Government. If you support an end to secrecy through uniform reporting and penalties for noncompliance, I urge you to cosponsor H.R. 452, the Foreign Interest Representation Act.

SIKH LEADER S.S. MANN ARRESTED FOR MAKING SPEECH; CALLED FOR FREE KHALISTAN; SIKHS SHOW SUPPORT FOR FREEDOM

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the brutal oppression of the Sikh nation by the Indian regime continues. Simranjit Singh Mann, a very prominent Sikh leader, was arrested on January 5 under India's draconian Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act, known as TADA, after he made a speech in which he called for a free and independent Khalistan by peaceful means. The speech was given December 26 at an annual Sikh observance commemorating the martyrdom of Guru Gobind Singh's sons. After telling the crowd that Khalistan is the only issue facing the Sikh nation, Mr. Mann asked the crowd of 40,000 to 50,000 to raise their hands if they supported a free Khalistan. The attendees all raised their hands if they supported a free Khalistan. The attendees all raised their hands in a clear demonstration of the Sikh nation's support for a free Khalistan.

When India held state elections in Punjab, Khalistan, in February 1992, only 4.3 percent of Sikhs there voted, according to the newspaper India Abroad. Nearly 96 percent stayed away, despite the military's effort to drag voters to polling places at gunpoint. This is a clear reflection of the Sikh nation's desire for freedom.

Now Mr. Mann, a former Member of Parliament, again faces charges under TADA as well as sedition charges. Will the almost 50,000 Sikhs who raised their hands also be declared terrorists by the brutal Indian regime?

India calls itself the world's largest democracy. Do these actions sound like the acts of

a democracy? In fact, they sound more like the workings of North Korea, Cuba, or any other dictatorship you can name. If making a speech is terrorism, the word is drained of any meaning I recognize.

The oppression of the Sikhs must end. The Sikh nation wants its freedom. It is time for India to withdraw its occupying troops from Khalistan and allow Khalistan to achieve its full independence by peaceful means. Until India is willing to allow the Sikh nation to vote on independence, it cannot call itself democratic. Until India recognizes the fundamental liberties of all people living under its rule, it should receive no aid or trade from the overburdened taxpayers of the United States or any civilized nation.

Only freedom for Khalistan will ensure peace and freedom in the region. It is time for India to withdraw from Khalistan and all the other nations it is oppressing. It is the duty of the United States to support the cause of freedom. We should impose sanctions on India and cut off its aid until India is willing to live by the principles of freedom which define democratic nations. We must take strong measures to support human rights and self-determination for everyone.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ANNOUNCES CHANGES

HON. RICK LAZIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1994, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] Henry Cisneros announced that he planned to dramatically alter the manner in which the Department operates. He admitted that HUD was a bureaucracy more attentive to process than to results, was slavishly loyal to nonperforming programs, and did not trust the initiatives of local leaders. To correct these problems, he presented a plan, called the HUD Reinvention Blueprint, to restructure HUD's programs in an unprecedented fashion.

After reading the blueprint, which is still conceptual, I was pleased to see that the Secretary adopted many Republican ideas. For example, it proposes to shrink the Federal Government, to reduce micromanagement, and to return power and responsibility to State and local jurisdictions.

I told the Secretary that I welcomed his ideas and that I wanted to work with him to change the way housing, especially low-income housing, is provided in this country.

Nevertheless, I also told the Secretary that, as the new chairman of the Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee, I planned to review in toto all HUD's programs.

My reasons for this review are based on reports which question HUD's capacity to administer its more than 200 programs. For example, the National Academy of Public Administrators [NAPA] has recommended that HUD's programs be reduced to 10 by the year 2000 or be eliminated. HUD's inspector general [IG], in her most recent report to Congress, found that HUD needed to be more proactive and

aggressive to correct its problems, especially in light of their magnitude and complexity. The HUD blueprint proposes to consolidate only 60 programs into 3—leaving unanswered the question of what becomes of the remaining 140 programs.

Congress must do a top-to-bottom review of HUD programs. Most require major overhaul—a process that involves rewriting statutes and reducing Federal regulations. Therefore, as part of my review, I intend to find ways in addition to the blueprint, to reform, consolidate, streamline, and if appropriate, eliminate outdated housing programs.

As part of this review, I am looking at new approaches to administering HUD programs in a cost-efficient, yet people-friendly manner so that as many families as possible can get housing. I intend to explore various options to deregulate programs so that States and local jurisdictions are provided with all the authority they require to operate independently—both financially and administratively. It is my feeling that unless localities have unfettered discretion to operate their programs, with the fewest possible attached strings, deregulation is illusory.

Finally, I want to review HUD's budget. Every Member of this House is aware that all Federal agencies must tighten their belts in order to reduce the budget deficit and pay for the middle-income tax cut. HUD cannot be excused from this effort.

It is my intention to work with HUD and with my former chairman, HENRY GONZALEZ, for whom I have great respect, as the committee reviews the proposals in the blueprint, particularly insofar as they are based on Republican efforts over the last 12 years. I welcome many of the blueprint's core ideas as a beginning, but intend to take a hard look at them and to expand upon them, so that they become in actuality what they appear to be in concept.

RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES CONTROL ACT

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Restricted Explosives Control Act, a consequential piece of legislation that I sponsored in the 103d Congress.

Not only does my legislation require a Federal permit for all purchases of explosives, it also dictates that all applicants must submit a photograph as well as a set of fingerprints along with their permit application. The bill defines "restricted explosives" as: high explosives, blasting agents, detonators, and more than 50 pounds of black powder.

In addition, the legislation will not unduly burden legitimate explosives purchasers. The bill establishes a 6-month grace period, before the measure is implemented, to enable people to obtain Federal permits from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms [ATF].

During the holiday season of 1993, four mail bombs exploded in western New York—taking five innocent lives. Current law enabled those accused in the murders to buy the deadly dynamite in Kentucky, simply by providing false identification, completing a short form furnished by the ATF, and promising not to cross State lines.

Once this measure is enacted, never again will an individual be able to walk into an explosives dealer's office, quickly fill out a short Federal form, and walk out with dynamite or some other type of high explosive.

The Restricted Explosives Control Act is endorsed by the Institute of Makers of Explosives, the very people who manufacture explosives. The bill also is endorsed by the National Rifle Association.

This legislation is a solid proposal that will prevent such tragedies. The fact is that current law allows for dynamite and other explosives to be sold over the counter. The Restricted Explosives Control Act must be implemented without delay so that we may close that deadly loophole in Federal explosives law.

HONORING DR. PAUL MICHAEL KAZAS

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of serving in this legislative body is the opportunity we occasionally get to acknowledge publicly outstanding citizens of our Nation.

I rise today to honor Dr. Paul Michael Kazas, a model citizen. I congratulate Dr. Kazas for his recent election as president to the Woodhaven Residents' Block Association. If he brings the same dedication that he has brought to his other pursuits, then there is little doubt that this organization will blossom and grow.

Dr. Kazas belongs to some 20 civic professional organizations, and actively serves on five different board of directors. While others lead and leave the work to others, Dr. Kazas is never afraid to get his hands dirty. He cleans the traffic islands from Park Lane South to 91st Avenue on Woodhaven Boulevard; he was involved with repainting the nearby Interborough Parkway Overpass; he became a certified street pruner so that the community could receive a \$15,000 grant from the New York State Department of Environment Conservation to plant trees on Jamaica Avenue. He is truly a remarkable individual.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in commending Dr. Kazas for his tireless work. He is worthy of our recognition for making Queens County and the city of New York a better place in which to live.

NO MORE TAXPAYER SUBSIDY FOR WESTERN EUROPE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the biggest single mistake we are making in public policy today is to continue to spend far more on the military than is necessary. We have not responded responsibly to the collapse of the Soviet Union and our victory in the cold war. In particular, we continue to act

as if Western Europe is in need of subsidy for its defense from the American taxpayers.

During our recess, on December 3, Jack Beatty, senior editor at the Atlantic Monthly, wrote an excellent essay in the Boston Globe pointing out the irrationality of our current policy. I was flattered to read Mr. Beatty's forthright assertion that "NATO is an exorbitant anachronism" and I ask that his very persuasive essay be printed here. I hope that Members will read and think about it as we prepare to vote on the fiscal 1996 budget.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 3, 1994]

NATO: IT'S TIME THE EUROPEANS FOUND
THEIR OWN WAY

(By Jack Beatty)

NATO is an exorbitant anachronism. Widely regretted by columnists and editorial writers, the current rift among the NATO allies over Bosnia should instead be seen as a welcome development, a chance to reorder national priorities. We can no longer afford to defend countries with higher standards of living than our own against a vanished threat. The Cold War is over, but the peace dividend has been swallowed up by NATO.

We continue to spend \$75 billion to \$100 billion annually on the defense of Western Europe—this largely to maintain the 150,000 US troops stationed there. The Clinton administration wants to cut that force by 50,000 by 1999. What is the rationale for keeping 100,000 troops in Europe into the next millennium? To repel any future Russian invasion of Lithuania. Unbelievably, that was the sole European case offered in the seven possible war scenarios leaked from the Pentagon two years ago.

We have no treaty commitments to Lithuania. For 50 years we tolerated the Soviet occupation of Lithuania without harm to our national well-being. Lithuania is to Russia as Haiti is to us, a small country within a big country's sphere of influence. Yet the Pentagon expects US taxpayers to fork over more than \$50 billion every year to preserve a free Lithuania.

Military welfare to Europe should be as hot a political button as domestic welfare to women and children, and perhaps it would be if the British, Danes and Germans we are saving from the costly inconvenience of defending Lithuania all by themselves were—how to put it?—stigmatically nonwhite. But with the elites of both parties under the platitudinous spell of the foreign policy establishment, it will probably take a third party to raise the issue.

Counter-arguments? Two are usually cited. First, we would lose influence within the alliance if we had no ground troops stationed on alliance soil. Second, only isolationists could advocate abandoning the forward-deployment strategy taught by the bitter experience of two Europe-made world wars.

Lose influence within the alliance? What influence? The Clinton administration's fruitless efforts to change alliance policy on Bosnia shows how little influence we have. To be sure, we might have had more if, like the British and French, we had dispatched peace-keepers to Bosnia, a place with no peace to keep. But influence at the price of folly is a bad bargain.

The idea that we should "lead the alliance," that the European powers have grown soft behind the generous welfare states our defense spending has let them afford, has surface plausibility. Certainly the British and French have not shown much spine in Bosnia. But unpack that word "lead" and you'll find it means something like this: If we continue to spend more to defend Europe than the European countries spend to defend themselves, and if we are willing to station