

the Medicare payment since coinsurance is subtracted out in order to determine the Medicare payment. Furthermore, since the Medicare payment is calculated as if coinsurance is 20% (rather than 18%), the Medicare payment would go down by more than the increase in the coinsurance payment (which is based on a lower percentage).

SIKH LEADER WRITES ON
REPRESSION OF CHRISTIANS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1999

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, there has been a recent wave of attacks by Hindu Nationalists on Christian churches, prayer halls, and schools. This has followed the killings of priests, the raping of four nuns by a Hindu mob described by the Hindu Nationalist VHP as "patriotic youth." Just this week, more churches have been attacked. No action has been taken to stop the religious violence. This situation has made it clear to the world that India's claims of democracy and secularism are fraudulent.

In this light, it was encouraging to see a letter in the January 18 issue of the Washington Times by Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the council of Khalistan, that addresses this issue. We all know Dr. Aulakh to be a tough and fair advocate of independence for the Sikhs in Khalistan, who have also come under the tyranny of Indian "secularism." I would recommend to my colleagues that they read Dr. Aulakh's letter. It will give them a lot of information on the reality of religious repression in India. As Dr. Aulakh wrote, "These attacks show that religious freedom in India is a myth."

Christians, Sikhs, and Muslims have suffered at the hands of India's ruling elite. As the letter shows, they are all being murdered by the Indian government. That government has paid more than 41,000 cash bounties to police officers for killing Sikhs. Meanwhile, Amnesty International and other independent human-rights monitors have been kept out of India since 1978, even longer than Communist Cuba has kept them out.

A country that kills its minorities for their ethnic or religious identity is not a fit recipient of American support. As the only superpower and the leader of the world, we have a duty to do whatever we can to support the cause of freedom in South Asia.

We should cut off American aid and trade to India until human rights, including religious liberty, are secure and regularly practiced. We should declare India a violator of religious freedom and impose the sanctions appropriate to that status. And to ensure the safety of religious and political freedom in South Asia, we should declare our support for the 17 freedom movements within India's borders. We can start by calling for full self-determination for the Sikhs of Khalistan, the Muslims of Kashmir, and the Christians of Nagaland. These steps will help bring the people of South Asia the kind of freedom that we in America enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce Dr. Aulakh's letter in the January 18 Washington Times into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 18, 1999]

INDIA CONTINUES TO RESTRICT RELIGIOUS
FREEDOM

(By Gurmit Singh Aulakh)

Thank you for your editorial ("Mother Teresa's children," Jan. 10) exposing more than 90 attacks on Christians since the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) came to power last year. These attacks show that religious freedom in India is a myth.

Just when we thought the recent wave of attacks on Christians in India was over, your editorial exposed the burning of two more churches by Hindu mobs affiliated with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, part of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, a militant Hindu nationalist organization that is also the parent organization of the ruling (BJP).

It is not just Christians who have suffered from persecution and violence in the hands of the Indian government. Sikhs and Muslims, among others, have been victimized as well. In August 1997, Narinder Singh, a spokesman for the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the center and seat of the Sikh religion, told National Public Radio: "The Indian government, all the time they boast that they're democratic, they're secular, but they have nothing to do with a democracy, they have nothing to do with secularism. They try to crush Sikhs just to please the majority."

The Indian government has killed more than 200,000 Christians since 1947. It has also murdered more than 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, over 60,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988 and tens of thousands of other religious and ethnic minorities. The most revered mosque in India has been destroyed to build a Hindu temple. Police murdered the highest Sikh spiritual and religious leader, Akal Takht Jathedar Gurdev Singh Kaunke, and human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalra. There are police witnesses to both of these crimes. The U.S. State Department reported that between 1992 and 1994 the Indian government paid more than 41,000 cash bounties to police for killing Sikhs. Plainclothes police continue to occupy the Golden Temple. There have been more than 200 reported atrocities against Sikhs since the Akali/Dal/BJP government took power in March 1997.

It is not just the BJP that has practiced religious tyranny in pursuit of a Hindu theocracy in India. Many of these incidents came under the rule of the Congress Party. No matter who is in power, the minorities in India suffer from severe oppression. The only solution is to support self-determination for the peoples and nations of South Asia, so they can live in freedom, peace, prosperity and security.

India is not a single country; it is a polyglot empire that was thrown together by the British for their political convenience. Its breakup is inevitable. As the world's only superpower, the United States has a responsibility to make sure this process is peaceful, as it was for the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. Otherwise, a Bosnia will be created in South Asia.

Thank you for exposing the true nature of India's "secular democracy." Exposing these brutal practices will help bring true freedom to South Asia.

HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF H. RES.
611—IMPEACHMENT RESOLUTION

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1999

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution, to these articles of

impeachment, and to these unfair, partisan proceedings which deny Members the right to vote on the alternative of censure.

Mr. Speaker, we are all disappointed by the President's actions. The President himself has admitted that he acted improperly and then misled the public, his family, his staff, and others about those actions.

This debate today, however, is not simply about whether the President did something wrong, or even whether he did something illegal. Rather, the issue before us today is what, if any, action Congress should take in response. Specifically, the Members of the House are being asked whether we believe that President Clinton's actions were so egregious that he should be impeached and removed from office. I do not believe that these misdeeds merit impeachment.

Impeachment is a statement by Congress that the President is unable to carry out the responsibilities of his office, or that he cannot be trusted to do so. The Constitution specifies "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors" as the proper grounds for impeachment. Impeachment, by removing the nation's highest elected official, nullifies a vote made by the American people—in President Clinton's case twice—and I believe that it should only be undertaken in the most dire of circumstances. Impeachment has historically been understood to be an option that should only be exercised when continuation of the President in office presents a clear and serious threat to our nation or our constitutional form of government. I do not believe that the President's offenses reach the threshold for impeachment.

Rather, I believe that censure of the President by the House and Senate is a more appropriate punishment. Censure would reflect for all time Congress and the public's disapproval of the President's behavior, and it would balance the need to punish the President with the public's desire to have him finish out his term.

Some have suggested that censure would allow the president to escape punishment for his misdeeds. That isn't the case. Others argue that censure of President Clinton, like the censure of President Andrew Jackson, could be overturned and would therefore be meaningless. To them, I can only observe that Americans are not fools. I believe that Americans in coming years will judge President Clinton, as well as the Members of the 105th Congress, wisely and with the perspective that only time can bring to this contentious issue. Let us hope that each of us here today will be able to meet history's more objective scrutiny.

Consequently, I will vote today against impeachment. It is unfortunate and unfair that my colleagues and I will not be given the opportunity to vote on a censure motion. I believe that we should have that choice. The Republican leadership is apparently afraid that a number of their Members, if given the opportunity, would vote for censure and against impeachment.

I will vote in favor of any procedural motions to allow a vote on censure, but I have little hope that such efforts will prevail. The majority leadership has made it known that all Republicans must support procedural votes on impeachment and censure, and that they will face serious repercussions if they do not toe the line. That is unfortunate. Every Member should be allowed to freely vote his or her conscience on an important question like this.

History will long remember what we do here today. These may be the most significant votes that we ever cast. They may be the votes by which many of us are remembered, and they will likely define our own individual legacies as well as the President's. I urge my colleagues to bear that in mind when they vote today.

IN MEMORY OF CHRISTINA WILLIAMS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1999

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart and profound sadness. I am overcome by the emotions I feel as both a father and a Member of Congress.

On June 12, 1998, Christina Williams disappeared from her California neighborhood. Now seven months of waiting and worry have come to a sad end. This weekend we will bury Christina.

Our community knows now that what should have been a perfectly innocent, completely safe activity for a 13-year-old—walking the family dog—turned into something so horrible, so unimaginable, that we tremble to think of the fate that Christina met.

The coming weeks and continuing investigation will provide some answers. But we must ask greater ones.

Each and every one of us must ask what we can do to make this world a safer place for children. As an elected official, I know there are limits to what the law can do and the tragedies it can prevent. But I vow before you today that I will do all I can as a Congressman, a citizen and as a parent.

One of my first tasks is to thank the countless volunteers who have come to the aid of Christina's family during this tremendously painful ordeal. My heart is with the friends, relatives, community members and law enforcement officials who now face this tragedy after such dedication.

Yet our greater responsibility remains. We must join Christina's parents, Alice and Michael, and the Williams family in the great challenge that lies before them. Those who loved Christina have vowed to make her memory a call to action. To turn their anger and pain into a mission to make our country a safe place to raise loved, secure children.

My fellow Members of Congress, you must pledge that our federal government will do everything in its legislative and fiscal powers to bring a halt to crimes against children, especially those whose whereabouts are still unknown. Only then will every parent and every child live in a world made safer by Christina's ordeal.

To all watching us today, I ask for your continued prayers for the Williamses and the extended family that is the Central Coast of California. And I ask you to join us, when it is time to move from the mourning and grief, in the challenge that lies before us.

CRIME STOPPERS RESOLUTIONS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1999

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution recognizing the success of Crime Stoppers worldwide.

Originally beginning in Albuquerque, New Mexico 23 years ago, today there are over 1,000 Crime Stoppers chapters throughout the world. Crime Stoppers International was established to support a worldwide network of Crime Stoppers programs. It provides a forum for leadership and training as well as fosters cooperation and information exchange between local Crime Stoppers programs across the globe.

Crime Stoppers is based on the principle that "someone other than the criminal has information that can solve a crime." Crime Stoppers combats the three major problems faced by law enforcement in generating that information: fear of reprisal, an attitude of apathy, and reluctance to get involved. By offering anonymity to people who provide information and by paying rewards Crime Stoppers combats these problems leading to arrest of the criminal.

This formula has resulted in a commendable record of success. Crime Stoppers programs worldwide have solved over half a million crimes and recovered over 3 billion dollars worth of stolen property and narcotics.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the success of Crime Stoppers and applaud Crime Stoppers International in its work to bring Crime Stoppers chapters worldwide together to fight crime.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 1999

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1999

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, every year nearly 1.5 million women are the victims of domestic violence. Today I am proud to introduce the Violence Against Women Act of 1999. I am joined by Congresswomen CONSTANCE A. MORELLA and LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, along with 89 other original co-sponsors. Together, we take the first step that will make America safer for women.

Nearly 5 years ago, Congress passed the original Violence Against Women Act. In the original legislation, funding was provided for battered women's shelters and rape crisis centers as well as establishing a domestic violence hotline. Now we must work to continue those commitments.

I am hopeful for passage of this legislation in the 106th Congress. Last year, significant portions of this legislation were unanimously agreed to by the House of Representatives as an amendment to the Child Protection and Sexual Predators Punishment Act of 1998. I feel confident that this Congress can see fit to not only follow that lead, but do even more for victims of sexual abuse, domestic violence and rape.

One of the key titles of this landmark legislation is Violence Against Women and the

Workplace. This section establishes a grant for a national clearinghouse and resource center to provide information and assistance to employers and labor organizations in their efforts to develop and implement responses to assist victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Also found in this section is a tax credit for businesses implementing workplace safety programs to combat violence against women as well as establishing Victim's Employment Rights which prohibits employers from taking adverse job actions against an employee because they are the victim of violent crime.

The legislation makes important strides in improving the lives of not only women, but children as well. Title II, Limiting the Effects of Violence on Children, provides grants to create safe havens for children of victims of domestic violence. Children who witness domestic violence are at a high risk of anxiety and depression, and exhibit more aggressive, anti-social, inhibited and fearful behaviors. This title helps to ensure that children are protected from the effects of witnessing acts of domestic violence. Also, this title will provide funds to train child welfare workers to recognize the signs of domestic violence and sexual assault in the home.

Title III of VAWA '99 works to prevent sexual assault against women. It establishes a National Resource Center on Sexual Assault as well as increases funds for rape prevention and education. This title also includes the language of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act which amends federal hate crimes legislation to permit federal prosecution for bias crimes based on gender, sexual orientation, or disability. Furthermore, language concerning the prevention of custodial sexual assault by correctional staff will make sexual conduct between all prison custodial staff and inmates a federal crime and establish measures to ensure that those convicted of such crimes are prevented from becoming correctional staff in the future.

The Violence Against Women Act of 1999 includes other important provisions such as the rescheduling and classification of date-rape drugs; establishing grants for improved legal advocacy and representation of victims of sexual violence; and provisions to protect battered immigrant women.

Nearly one in every three adult women experience at least one physical assault by a partner during adulthood. I urge my colleagues to join me in the fight to protect women from sexual abuse and violence. I encourage all Members to become a co-sponsor of this legislation and work towards passage of the Violence Against Women Act of 1999.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 1999

SECTION BY SECTION JANUARY 1999

TITLE I.—Continuing the Commitment of the Violence Against Women Act

Subtitle A. Law Enforcement and Prosecution Grants to Combat Violence Against Women—reauthorizes and amends STOP grants to increase funds and to ensure that domestic violence and sexual assault advocates are involved in planning and implementation of programs; proposes new formula—35% to victim services, 20% each to prosecution and law enforcement, 10% to state courts, and 15% discretionary with language to ensure that there will be no harm to existing programs.

Subtitle B. National Domestic Violence Hotline—reauthorizes funding for the National Domestic Violence Hotline; includes