

WALTER AND HELEN LUCAS CELEBRATE 50 YEARS IN BUSINESS

HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1996

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my hearty congratulations to Walter L. Lucas, Jr., and his wife, Helen Lucas, of Shelbina, MO, who are celebrating their 50th year in business. Walter and Helen were married on July 26, 1940. After serving his country during World War II, Walter returned to Shelbina to start Lucas True Value Hardware in Shelbina. On March 6, 1946, Walter and Helen opened the doors of their hardware store and they have been providing quality service to their customers for over 50 years.

Walter has also devoted his considerable talents to helping his friends and neighbors in Shelbina. In 1956, he established the Walt Lucas Outstanding Scholar Athlete Award as a way to honor academic and athletic excellence by local high school students. Walter has also worked closely with the Boy Scouts, where he has served as a Cub Master and a Scout Master. In addition, Walter served as the president of the Shelbina Chamber of Commerce and he is active in the Shelbina First Christian Church.

Walter and Helen are shining examples of why small business owners are the backbone of our economy. Not only have they prospered economically, they have helped many of their friends and neighbors through their involvement in the community, and I wish to congratulate them on their success in business and in life.

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage.

Ms. Velázquez. Mr. Speaker, too many Americans are worrying about how they are going to pay for their children's education and their parents' health care. Yet, instead of working for real change, we are voting on legislation that will do little more than increase the amount of hate and division in this country.

The Defense of Marriage Act, H.R. 3396, will ban homosexual marriages. Proponents of this destructive legislation argue that same-sex marriage is an assault on the sanctity and integrity of heterosexual marriages. The argument is irrational. Homosexual couples do not influence heterosexual marriage choices. Marriage protection proponents also argue that this legislation promotes tradition and family values. These arguments are strikingly similar to those raised less than 30 years ago in resistance to repealing miscegenation laws.

Like its hate-driven predecessor, the Defense of Marriage Act sends a dangerous message to society. We are legitimizing hate and discrimination. Intense prejudice against

lesbians and gay men remains prevalent in our society. Homosexuals are victims of extensive discrimination, prejudice, and violence due to their sexual orientation.

Discrimination against gay people in such critical areas as employment and housing remains widespread in many jurisdictions. Even more alarming, high rates of antigay violence or hate crimes abound. Society communicates particular values and attitudes to its members in many ways, but primarily through laws. Instead of working to reduce discrimination, this body is pushing legislation that will reinforce intolerance and hostility toward gay people.

Discrimination against homosexuals is unfair, unjust and appalling. Let's end this charade! I urge my colleagues to vote for fairness and equality and oppose this shameful legislation.

MARY MASI IS HONORED

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1996

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a house of worship not only brings sustenance to its parishioners, it draws sustenance from them. In Mount Vernon, Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church has given aid and comfort to its parishioners for a century and for 40 of those years Mary Masi has been office manager and church secretary, giving of herself to help her church and her fellow parishioners. In that time the church has had eight pastors and it was Mary Masi who provided the continuity for them serving as a link from the past to the future. She is always the first to volunteer for church events and is usually the driving force behind them. She is a member of many church organizations and for Mount Carmel, Mary Masi has become a symbol of loyalty, unselfishness, and devotion on whom the church and its parishioners have come to rely. I offer her my congratulations for her years of giving to her church and her neighbors.

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage:

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3396, the so-called Defense of Marriage Act, and ask my colleagues to reject this mean-spirited legislation.

The proponents of H.R. 3396 would have us believe that this legislation is necessary to save the institution of marriage. The real purpose of H.R. 3396 is to create a wedge issue for Republicans for the upcoming elections.

In a shameless attempt to divide the American public, the Republican Party is espousing official bigotry. It is promoting discrimination against individuals who seek the same responsibilities and opportunities other Americans seek when they form a lifelong union

with someone they love. It is scapegoating a segment of our society to fan the flames of intolerance and prejudice. And it is doing this to try to improve its standings in the polls.

Discrimination against people who are gay and committed to one another does nothing to defend marriage or to strengthen family values. It does, however, continue to deny them legal rights that married couples simply take for granted—inclusion in a spouse's health insurance plan, pension and tax benefits, the ability to participate in medical decisions, and the right to visit a dying spouse in the hospital.

Our Nation's families deserve better from their leaders than this cynical effort to raise fears and create divisions for political gain. They need leaders who will recognize the true needs of families and who are willing to work for adequate healthcare, access to educational opportunities, a decent wage, and a livable environment.

Let's work together on the real challenges we face as a nation. Let's not allow our Republican leaders to create scapegoats to distract the public's attention from the failure of this Congress to address issues the American public cares about.

I urge my colleagues to stand up to bigotry and discrimination. I urge you to vote against this mean-spirited legislation.

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY BOARD ON ARMS PROLIFERATION POLICY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, over many years the United States and the international community have made important progress in arms control, especially concerning weapons of mass destruction. But there has been little progress in controlling or containing the proliferation of conventional arms.

Therefore, I welcome the recent report of the Presidential Advisory Board on Arms Proliferation Policy, issued on June 25. Its findings and recommendations provide fresh thinking on the question of conventional arms control, and merit careful study by both Congress and the executive branch. I commend the work of Dr. Janne E. Nolan, the Board's Chair and the Board's other members—Edward Randolph Jayne II, Ronald F. Lehman, David E. McGiffert, and Paul C. Warnke.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the report's summary and recommendations. The text follows:

SUMMARY

Advisory Boards such as ours invariably grapple with broad mandates, changing circumstances, and widely diverse interests concerned with the substance of Board charters. As we have noted, our approach has been to review and offer recommendations on both policy and process. We have endeavored to review the Administration's current policies regarding conventional arms control, and have commented only where we concluded it appropriate. We are under no illusions as to our limitations in addressing but a few of the myriad interests and issues of great concern to the various parties concerned with arms proliferation policy.

At the core of our recommendations is our belief in the value, indeed the necessity, of strong U.S. leadership in the quest for more

effective arms control in the nation's interest. This leadership must come from the top, involving the President, his Cabinet, and the Congress. As we have stated, within the Executive Branch that initiative requires in the first instance, more policy-oriented interagency coordination and execution of policy, which in turn requires a strong focal point of administration leadership. We believe that leadership can and must come from the National Security Council's longstanding interagency process. That NSC-led process, in addition to selecting and implementing the kind of advanced conventional arms restraint regime postulated here, must also address the thorny question of governmental process the Board has highlighted. There is no doubt that how we make policy and how we make individual arms or technology transfer decisions is absolutely critical to achieving U.S. arms control goals.

We believe that it is of great importance to reemphasize a point about focus. The Board's recommendations for both policy and process are built on a long-term commitment to improvement and progress, rather than on any discrete preferred regime or proposed organizational realignment. The world struggles today with the implications of advanced conventional weapons. It will in the future be confronted with yet another generation of weapons, whose destructive power, size, cost, and availability can raise many more problems even than their predecessors today. These challenges will require a new culture among nations, one that accepts increased responsibility for control and restraint, despite short-term economic and political factors pulling in other directions. While the image of a "journey" has become almost trite in today's culture, it is just such a concept that perhaps best describes the strategy for success in achieving necessary restraint on conventional arms and strategic technologies, and the resulting increase in international security.

The Administration has in recent months, in parallel with the Board's deliberations, taken steps such as the Wassenaar Arrangement, which could be the key to more enduring and comprehensive successes in restraint and control. Leaders in the Administration and in the Congress should be heartened to know that there is no shortage of individuals, in and out of government, whose energy and commitment can contribute to the ongoing effort. We are proud to have been a part of that dialogue, and are committed to continuing our participation. We summarize here the major recommendations put forward in our report:

Effective restraint requires international cooperation. U.S. leadership is essential to this end.

The fundamental principles of national security, international and regional security, and arms control must be the basis for international agreement. The inevitable economic pressures that will confront individual states should not be allowed to subvert these principles.

Sustainable, multilateral negotiations over an issue as controversial as arms transfers are best served by beginning with modest objectives that can be expanded over time. The Wassenaar Arrangement represents the most practical and promising forum to date in which to address the dangers of conventional weapons and technology proliferation.

New international export control policies are needed for a technology market where there are numerous channels of supply and where many advanced technologies relevant to weapons development are commercial in origin. This requires augmenting controls on the supply of a technology, with a greater emphasis on disclosing and monitoring end-use.

U.S. arms transfer policy can and should be developed and executed separate from policies for maintenance of the defense industrial base. It is not only appropriate but essential that the United States and other nations handle legitimate domestic economic and defense industrial base issues through such separate policies and actions, rather than use them to abrogate or subvert arms control agreements for particular weapons and technologies.

Arms and weapons technology transfers should take place without the price-distorting mechanism of government subsidies or penalties. The R&D recoupment charge, which is inconsistent with the federal government's treatment of sunk investment costs in any other area of policy or budget expenditure, should be eliminated. Arms exports should not receive subsidized financing; rather, the effort should be to eliminate such distortions internationally.

There should not be governmental constraints on direct and indirect offsets other than the review, under established standards, of any arms/technology transfer involved. The overall economic and employment impact of foreign trade is highly positive, and any attempt to dictate or curtail pricing, workshare, or "countertrade" agreements between buyer and seller is counterproductive.

The current fragmentation of U.S. government controls on transfers leads to great inefficiency and uncertain policy implementation, to the detriment of proliferation controls on the one hand and to the disadvantage of legitimate U.S. commerce on the other. Administration, information systems, and routine decisionmaking should be consolidated. An integrated management information system should be developed as soon as possible for use by all agencies involved in the export control process. In the longer run, statutory revisions to integrate the entire process in a single office should be pursued.

Within the U.S. government, the NSC should give substantially greater priority to leading and improving the interagency arms export control process.

The Administration should increase the intelligence community's focus and capabilities to understand and monitor conventional weapons and technologies developments and transfers.

68-YEAR-OLD SIKH LEADER BRUTALLY BEATEN IN INDIA

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1996

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when we debated my amendment last month to freeze development aid to India, a few of my colleagues had the audacity to suggest that India had cleaned up its human rights problems. They said that reports of continuing human rights abuses were questionable.

Mr. Speaker, everyone who follows human rights developments around the world knows that India's abuses against Sikhs, Kashmiris, and others continue unabated. Some defenders of India praised its government for letting its notorious "TADA" law expire last year. This law, the "Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act," gave the Indian Government blanket authority to arrest almost anyone and hold them in prison for 2 years without filing any charges. My colleagues will be interested to know that, even though the law was not renewed, tens of

thousands of Sikhs continue to be held in prison without charge in Punjab. Asia Watch has reported that "virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured." This says a great deal about the rule of law in India.

Now I would like to inform my colleagues about an incident that occurred at the airport in New Delhi just 2 weeks ago. A 68-year-old Sikh, a citizen of England who had to get off an international flight because of heart problems, was severely beaten by India's intelligence service. His injuries were confirmed by the Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture in London.

Dr. Jagjit Singh Chohan was traveling to Bangkok from London. He was experiencing an acute heart condition on the flight, so during a layover in New Delhi, he was taken off the flight in a wheelchair to receive medical care. Instead, Dr. Chohan, who has been a peaceful advocate of an independent Sikh homeland called Khalistan, received a severe beating.

India's immigration officials refused to allow him to go to a hospital. While he was being held at the airport, roughly 20 officials from the Research and Analysis Wing [RAW], India's intelligence service came into the waiting area and beat this elderly man with their fists, kicked him, and whipped him with a leather belt. The beating lasted for about 10 minutes. He was then put back on the plane without any regard for his injuries or his problems and sent on to Thailand.

Dr. Chohan was quickly returned to London, where he was examined by Dr. Forrest of the Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture. Dr. Forrest identified 28 separate injuries. In his report, the Doctor reported, "there was scarcely an area of his body that could be touched without causing pain."

Mr. Speaker, the beating suffered by this 68-year-old man is just one example of the types of abuses suffered by the Sikhs of Punjab, the Muslims of Kashmir, the Christians of Nagaland, and others. Young men are picked up by security forces and disappear forever. Young women are gang-raped. Thousands are tortured.

A prominent Sikh human rights activist, Jaswant Singh Khaira was arrested 10 months ago and has not been seen since. Despite the change in governments, his whereabouts are completely unknown. Many believe that he is being tortured in one of the many prisons in Punjab. These abuses happened under the Rao government. They are continuing under the new government. And they will continue to happen until the United States and other governments around the world take a strong stand against them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report from the Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I urge all of my colleagues who opposed my amendment to freeze our aid to India to pay close attention to the reports of human rights abuses that continue to flow out of India and really think hard about their position on this issue. India is not going to end its wide-scale abuses until we take a very firm stand and send a very strong message that they will not be tolerated.

MEDICAL REPORT ON DR. JAGJIT SINGH
CHOHAL

(By Dr. D.M. Forrest, MB ChB, FRCS.)

I am a retired Consultant Surgeon. Until the end of 1987 I held Consultant appointments at three London Teaching Hospitals,