

IN MEMORY OF GEORGE MONROE
ALLEN

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 13, 1999, the State of Missouri lost a distinguished citizen. It is with great sadness that I inform the House of the death of George Monroe Allen of Harrisonville, MO.

Mr. Allen worked in the banking industry for 49 years. He served 21 years as president of the Citizens National Bank and then at the Commerce Bank of Harrisonville until his retirement in 1976. After his retirement Mr. Allen was elected State Representative of the 124th District of Missouri and served there until 1986. He also served with the Harrisonville Fire Department for 55 years, including 33 years as fire chief. An Army veteran, Mr. Allen served his country with distinction during World War II, earning the Bronze Star for Valor.

Mr. Allen was an active member of the community. He was a member of the First Baptist Church, member and past commander of both the VFW Post #4409 and the American Legion Post #42, Cass Masonic Lodge #147 A.F.&A.M., past president and member of the Kiwanis Club, Harrisonville Civic Association, and the Harrisonville Area Chamber of Commerce.

I know the Members of the House will join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his wife, Kathleen; his son, Nelson; his daughters, Linda and Trudy; his three grandchildren; and his great-grandson.

HINDU NATIONALISTS CONTINUE
TO ATTACK CHRISTIANS IN
"SECULAR" INDIA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed by recent reports that there has been renewed violence against Christians in India. First a missionary and his two very young sons were burned to death in their jeep, then another nun was raped. Now the bodies of two more Christians have been found in the state of Orissa. Hindu nationalism is on an out-of-control rampage in India!

The Sunday, February 7 issue of the Washington Times reported that the Archbishop of New Delhi, Alan de Lastic, blamed "mercenaries" for these hate crimes. He called on the government to take strong action to stop these things from occurring. These "mercenaries" are associated with organizations like the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP), a militant Hindu organization that comes under the militant, extremist Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the party that leads the governing coalition, is also part of the RSS.

Several Christian churches, prayer halls, and religious missions were destroyed in the last couple of months by Hindu extremists affiliated with the VHP. How can the Indian government be expected to take strong action

against the perpetrators of these vicious acts when the perpetrators are part of their own political network?

The violence forced many Christian congregations to cancel New Year's celebrations for fear of offending the Hindu militants, which could lead to further violence. Is this the secularism that India boasts about? Clearly, there is no religious freedom for these Christians in India.

Unfortunately, these are just the latest incidents of violence against Christians in India. Four nuns were raped last year by a Hindu gang. The VHP described the rapists as "patriotic youth" and called the nuns "antinational elements." To be Christian in secular India is to be an antinational element! At least three priests were killed in 1997 and 1998, and in 1997 police opened fire on a Christian festival that was promoting the theme "Jesus is the Answer."

Apparently, the Hindu Nationalists are afraid that the Dalits, or "Untouchables", the aboriginal people of South Asia who are at the bottom of the caste structure, are switching to other religions, primarily Christianity, thus improving their status. This undermines the caste structure which is the foundation of the Hindu social structure.

The Indian government has killed more than 200,000 Christians since 1947 and the Christians of Nagaland, in the eastern part of India, are involved in one of 17 freedom movements within India's borders. But the Christians are not the only ones oppressed for their religion.

India has murdered more than 250,000 Sikhs since 1984 and over 60,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, as well as many thousands of other people. The holiest shrine in the Sikh religion, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, is still under occupation by plainclothes police, some 14 years after India's brutal military attack on the Golden Temple. The previous Jathedar of the Akal Takht, Gurdev Singh Kaunke, was killed in police custody by being torn in half. The police disposed of his body. He had been tortured before the Indian government decided to kill him.

The Babri mosque, the most sacred Muslim shrine in the state of Uttar Pradesh, was destroyed by the Hindu militants who advocate building a Hindu temple on the site. Yet India proudly boasts that it is a religiously tolerant, secular democracy.

This kind of religious oppression does not deserve American support. We should take tough measures to ensure that India learns to respect basic human rights. All U.S. aid to India should be cut off and we should openly declare U.S. support for self-determination for all the peoples of the subcontinent. By these measures we can help bring religious freedom and basic human rights to Christians, Sikhs, Muslims, and everyone else in South Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I submit an article on the archbishop's statement from the February 7 Washington Times into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, February 7, 1999]

MERCENARIES BLAMED FOR ATTACKS IN INDIA

NEW DELHI—A prominent Catholic archbishop yesterday blamed "mercenaries" for a spate of attacks on Christians here and blamed the Indian government or tardy action against the perpetrators.

New Delhi Archbishop Alan de Lastic, in a scathing attack on national and state governments, called for justice for the growing

number of Christian victims of murder, rape and battery in India.

A nun was raped Wednesday night in the eastern state of Orissa where Australian missionary Graham Staines and his two young sons were burnt to death in their car by a Hindu mob on January 22.

The rape and the Staines' murders followed a spate of anti-Christian violence in the western state of Gujarat over Christmas.

Radical Hindu groups linked to Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee's ruling BJP party have been blamed for inciting the attacks.

IN HONOR OF THE 25TH WEDDING
ANNIVERSARY OF JAMES AND
CLARE CLARK

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 25th wedding anniversary of my life-long friend, James Clark, and his wife, Clare. Jimmy and Clare Clark were married on February 15, 1974.

Jimmy and I grew up together in Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania, and his wife, Clare, grew up just a few blocks away from my wife, Mary, in Wilmington, Delaware.

Jimmy and Clare have devoted many years of their lives to public service. Jimmy and I served together as members of the Viscose Fire Company in Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania. We fought fires together, and established a bond of friendship and trust that can never be broken. He followed in my footsteps, first as a member of the fire company, and later as chief of the company. He later went on to become Chief of the Borough of Marcus Hook Fire Department.

Clare previously worked for the Wilmington, Delaware Bureau of Police, and served the Viscose Fire Company for many years as a member of the Ladies Auxiliary.

Jimmy currently is employed by Epsilon Products Company in Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania, and Clare is employed by Christiana Care in Wilmington, Delaware.

Jimmy and Clare are terrific people, dedicated to their family and concerned for their neighbors and friends. They are leaders in their community. America needs more people like them.

Mr. Speaker, in this era where we seem to have rediscovered the importance of marriage and family, it is all together fitting and proper for us to honor this couple on the achievement of this significant milestone. I am proud to represent the Clarks in the United States Congress, and I ask you and my colleagues to join with me in congratulating them on the 25th wedding anniversary.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PAMELA
CRUZ AND MATTHEW COPUS

HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pamela Cruz and Matthew Copus, who have achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in their

community. Pamela and Matthew have been named New Mexico's top two student volunteers in the 1999 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

The program that brought these young role models to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by the Prudential Insurance Company of America in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. This program is the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, with more than 50,000 young people participating.

I applaud Pamela and Matthew for their initiative in seeking to make their community a better place to live, and for the positive impact they have had on the lives of others. They have demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserve our sincere admiration and respect. Their actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

I am proud that these two outstanding young people are from the district which I represent, the first district of New Mexico and encourage them to continue to be leaders involved in the improvement of their community.

STATEMENT ON THE
IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1999

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need to say anything about the facts of this case. The thousands of pages from the Independent Council say it all, and anyone who still thinks there's enough in there to convict the President on Purgery or Obstruction of Justice charges should read them again. I can't add anything to the case the White House council presented, so I won't try. I'm not going to talk about Constitutional Law, except to say that I don't see how the President can be removed from office in this case even if the charges could be proven. While President Clinton is guilty of bad behavior and lack of moral judgment in this issue, he didn't put the country in jeopardy. Instead, I'll tell you about the political lynching that's been going on, how we got here, and why we can't seem to get back to the issues of the people of America.

Ever since I can remember, I have regarded the United States House of Congress with a kind of awe. Throughout my political career I've been impressed by the Representatives on both sides of the House and held them in very high regard. That is, until I was elected as a member of the House, walked through its doors for the first time, and became witness to the most hateful and vicious attack on our Democracy that this country has ever seen; the hijacking of the American Govern-

ment. The Conservative Republicans wanted nothing less than the total destruction of their political enemy, the nationally elected President of our United States. Maybe this sounds partisan, but I'm not here to make friends or win any popularity contests with my fellow Congressmen, I'm here to do what my people asked me to do—represent them. I won't pretend that I am not a staunch Democratic supporter of the President. I'll just give you a little history, tell you what I've seen, you be the judge.

It started in 1992, when a Southern, pro-choice, environmentally minded moderate won the Presidency. The Republican minority in Congress were stunned. This Democratic President did not attempt to win their approval by advocating their issues. In fact, he made hard and fast enemies while he picked apart their proposals and vetoed them. They shouldn't have taken it so personally because the reality is, he didn't make friends with the Democrats either! But it was back then that they decided they had to get rid of him.

In 1994, the Republicans succeeded in taking over the Congress with huge amounts of soft money from large corporations, rich special interest groups, and other ultra-conservative organizations. Even with their new Majority in the House, the President continued to win the political fights and continued to gain favor in the hearts and minds of the voters. While the new Majority tried to shut down the government, the President stood for issues of National concern such as education and social security. In effect, even though they had the House, they still lost. Now, they decided, it was time to make a move for the political assassination of their enemy.

With the right wing organization behind them, the House Conservatives tried a variety of tactics, each one unsuccessful. They sought to indict him as a criminal. They proceeded to dredge up and spin allegations of illegal involvement by either President or First Lady, (whitewater, travelgate, filegate, etc. . . .) They knew that with the right amount of pressure and enough fuel, they could get the Attorney General to grant their request for a Special Prosecutor (a Republicans zealot of their choice) to "get him". With the help of the media, (there's no news like bad news involving the President), they succeeded.

Just short of four years and forty million tax dollars later, not a single shred of indictable evidence was uncovered. This is incredible when you consider that EVERY stone had been unturned. This was also a serious problem for the Republican since they spent all that time and money with nothing to show for it and, in spite of the media storm they produced, the President's job approval rating was still climbing! Then BINGO! They got lucky.

In walks that paragon of American virtue that we all know and love, Ms. Linda Tripp, with juicy tales of her illegally taped conversations with the now famous Monica. Although this wasn't exactly the stuff that "High Crimes and Misdemeanors" are made of, it's still all they had, so they had to make it work. The new leader of the effort to destroy the President, the so-called "independent" council, devised a plan to work with the lawyers on the Jones civil case and use the illegally obtained information to set a trap for the President! By now, you know the rest of the story, so I won't get into the details except to say that no other citizen of this country would ever be subject to

such an outrageous and illegal bastardization of the American system of justice. It is only the right wing conspiracy, in justification of their destructive pursuit, who would have you believe this is simply "equal justice under the law".

From almost the minute the case was placed in the hands of the Congress it became clear to me that I was no longer part of a "Representative" body. The American people, the people who voted and sent us here, were left completely out of the process. Their "Representatives" decided to pursue their OWN agenda instead and, with the approval of their counterparts in the Senate, used their majority muscle and pushed it through the House. No debate, no opposing arguments considered, no witnesses needed. Don't be fooled by the political theater you saw on C-Span. That was just a show to have you think we were doing our constitutional duty. In fact, Mr. HYDE even told you at one point that we shouldn't be concerned with the President's "removal from office". He said that's not what impeachment means, and that a vote in favor of the Articles didn't mean that we thought the President should be removed from office. Did you believe that? Well it may be true. They don't have to actually remove him to destroy his presidency, and that IS their primary goal.

To be fair, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were interested in doing the right thing and giving this issue the level of consideration it warranted. You might have heard about this "secret evidence" that was "shown" to those undecided voters that "convinced" them to vote in favor of the Impeachment Articles. I can tell you that there was no evidence, but it certainly was secret. They were presented with threats that they would lose their special committee positions unless they towed the Party line. They obeyed, and two Articles of Impeachment were pushed through the House on a strictly partisan vote in spite of the President's consistently high job approval ratings.

Into the House of the Senate marched the 13 Conservative Managers, with their own special "rule of law" and their own version of "truth and justice", as self proclaimed "Representatives of the People". What people? Certainly not the majority of the American people. They continued to support the President. They don't want him removed from office. They know his character is flawed, and while the scandal is fund to watch on TV, they trust him to do his job because they know he has the best interests in his heart. In spite of the very best efforts to ruin him, the Conservative Republicans have failed.

This brings us to our current dilemma. The Conservatives have a problem. We need to end this and gain back the respect of the American people but how can THEY get out of this gracefully? How can the Conservative Senators save face for their Congressional counterparts? It seems that the Republicans finally have their exit strategy. They will refuse to exit. They will take their chances and keep this going as long as they possibly can with the hope that they will publicly destroy the President and the Democratic party. Even now, knowing that the President will not be removed from office by the required $\frac{2}{3}$ rds margin, they will attempt to use their 51% majority to continue beating their dead horse, allowing the House managers to run the show. If this goes on long enough, it doesn't matter if the