that balancing the budget is more important than keeping our young people afloat, and going to college. They've been really selfish in that.

Congressman Sanders: Let me ask you another question. We have heard from a number of the panelists today a great concern, and it was interesting to see so many people stand up, and say, ''Yes, we are going to need help from the government or from some other source in order to go to college.'' Given that reality, is it your judgment that the students themselves have been effective politically in fighting for more federal aid to education. Have they done as good job in making their concerns known to their elected officials?

Answer: I think a lot of them are not really at an age to make an impact, because of their age, they're not old enough to vote, and really vote for the candidates that will help raise the financial aid. President Clinton is trying the best he can, but with the Congress being so closed-minded in some respects, we don't really have a say.

SUPPORT FOR HIA DATABASE CENTER

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1996

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during our debate on H.R. 3517, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1997, to express my strong support for the establishment of a site database center at the Harrisburg International Airport (HIA), in Middletown, PA. Located on the immediate and surrounding grounds of HIA (the former Olmsted Air Force Base) is a Superfund Site, designated in 1984, the existence of which is due directly to the activities that took place during the operation of Olmsted Air Force Base from 1917 to 1967. For the last 13 years, an intense effort has been undertaken at the local, State and Federal level to determine the nature of the hazardous waste left by the Air Force when it closed Olmsted, the origins and locations of its spread, and remediation of the waste, all within the dictates of the Superfund designation and with the goal of getting HIA deleted off the Superfund list by the end of this year.

My involvement with the HIA Superfund Site has been since 1983 when it was thought, erroneously we now know, that an inclusion on the Superfund list would be the fastest, cheapest and best way to clean up the waste left by the Air Force. How wrong we were in that thinking is another, longer story. But, in the years since HIA was put on the Superfund list, the Air Force, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (the current owner of the land), local, regional and private entities, our late U.S. Senator John Heinz, former Senator Wofford, current Senators SPECTER and SANTORUM, and this Member of Congress (along with many others too numerous to mention at this time) have sought to make the cleanup at HIA a model site cleanup program for other Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) across the United States to emulate.

As part of the cleanup effort, funds were dedicated in several Defense Appropriations bills to provide for a full cleanup of the site. All parties have understood that full cleanup meant that following Superfund delisting the land in question should be available for public and private development. Throughout the cleanup process, volumes of data have been collected from the several environmental investigations conducted for the final remedy and delisting of the site. A crucial part of the current delisting effort and any post-delisting development that occurs is the interpretation and management of this data. Remediation cannot occur under Superfund without the requisite interpretations of site data. Post-Superfund developers must know what happened on the site, and any future environmental questions that arise at HIA must refer back to the data from the current cleanup effort. When all the current participants have left the site, the only reliable reference source will be a database.

Unfortunately, as we near the end of the long march to delisting, a serious bar to full cleanup has arisen: the maintenance of a useful site database. The Air Force, through the Army Corps of Engineers, refuses to either maintain, or pay for the maintenance of, a site database. The Air Force is wrong in their refusal. From the very beginning, in my many meetings with various Secretaries and Under Secretaries of Defense regarding HIA, it was fully understood that post-Superfund site maintenance would include a managed database, and appropriations were made with the database in mind.

In fact, the Department of Defense, as recently as this year, has stated its support for the type of post-remediation followup the database would provide. In a February 22, 1996 letter from Sherri W. Goodman, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security), she cites her support for the annual report to Congress of the Defense Environmental Response Task Force (DERTF), which she chairs: ''The purpose of the DERTF is to study and provide findings and recommendations for expediting and improving environmental response actions at military installations being closed or realigned.'' Further, Section 3.3 of the DERTF Report states: ''Effective measures must be in place before transfer of property to ensure adequate protection of human health and the environment.'' And, in the same report, Section 3.4—Liability For Subsequent Response Actions: ''However, further cleanup may be required if the land use changes and the original remedy, although protective for the anticipated land use, is not fully protective under the new land use.''

Mr. Speaker, how can the Department of Defense in one publication express a need for and responsibility of site maintenance in the future and then deny such maintenance as is proposed with the site database for Harrisburg International Airport with the site database? And, to further weaken the DoD position on the HIA database, I offer that the Pennsylvania State University (PSU) at Harrisburg, which also serves as the Pennsylvania State Data Center, has proposed to manage and maintain the HIA site database for five years for under $123,000. Mr. Speaker, this is a public entity, a professional data center, and an on-site location which has offered to manage a database for five years for a price the Department of Defense would probably charge for one year (and not do nearly as well).

Mr. Speaker, the facts are these: the Department of Defense made a commitment to this Member of Congress and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to manage and maintain this database; the Department of Defense has stated this year in a Report to Congress its commitment to post-cleanup development and database management at its waste sites; the Pennsylvania State University has offered the best database management service at the best location for the best price. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Committee on Appropriations could have easily been persuaded to require the Department of Defense to fund this site database. We hope that the Department of Defense, and the Air Force and Corps of Engineers in particular, will see that the PSU database offer is the proper—and best—way to proceed and will make available the $123,000 for the PSU-managed database from the appropriations it has already been given by the Congress to fully clean up the HIA/Olmsted site.

KHALISTAN SYMPOSIUM AT LONDON SCHOOL SHOWS KHALISTAN MOVEMENT IS GAINING MOMENTUM

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1996

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, the Khalistan Society at the London School of Economics recently sponsored a seminar on the subject of freedom for the Sikh nation in an independent Khalistan. The keynote speaker was Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, president of the Council of Khalistan, who has been vigilant in leading his people in the struggle for freedom. Other participants included British Member of Parliament Max Maddon and Mr. Rahman of Amnesty International. The Khalistan Society works to promote a free and independent Khalistan among the students and faculty of the London school. The London school is one of the world's most prestigious institutes, and this seminar is a significant step forward in the movement to liberate Khalistan.

The Sikh nation has suffered greatly under Indian tyranny. The Indian regime has killed over 150,000 Sikhs since 1984, as well as tens of thousands of Kashmiri Muslims, Christians in Nagaland, and other peoples throughout the subcontinent. No Sikh has ever signed the Indian constitution. In the past few days, a Khalistani American was arrested in India and charged with possessing a gun and drugs, which there is good reason to believe were planted on him. This is a standard tactic of the Indian police. In February 1995, Sikh human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalra released a report that showed that the Indian regime had abducted, tortured, murdered, and cremated more than 25,000 Sikhs. For having released this report, Mr. Khalra was himself abducted by police while washing his car in front of his house on September 7, 1995. Despite international protest, the Indian Government refuses to release Mr. Khalra. His whereabouts remain unknown. I call upon the new Indian Government to release Mr. Khalra and all the other Sikh political prisoners languishing in Indian jails, some under now-expired emergency laws.

The Sikh nation has a tradition of self-rule. Sikhs ruled Punjab from 1710 to 1716 and from 1765 to 1849. When America was fighting for its independence, the Sikh nation was

ruling itself independently. Punjab was the last part of the subcontinent to fall to the British. During India's struggle for independence, overwhelming majorities of those killed and jailed were Sikhs. When India achieved its freedom, three nations were to receive power. The Muslims received Pakistan, the Hindus got India, and the Sikh leadership cast its lot with India on the promise that Sikh rights would be respected and no law affecting those rights would pass unless they consented to it. Of course, those promises have not been kept. The collapse of the corrupt Congress Party, which has ruled India since independence, provides an opportunity for a new direction in Indian politics. I hope that the new government will respect human rights and let the Sikhs and the other occupied peoples of the subcontinent live in freedom. The breakup of India is inevitable. The handwriting is on the wall. Only a free Khalistan will allow the Sikh Nation to live in peace, freedom, prosperity, and dignity.

I am introducing Dr. Aulakh's speech to the seminar into the RECORD along with a press release issued by the Khalistan Society.

SIKH NATIONAL IDENTITY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR AN INDEPENDENT KHALISTAN

(By Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh)

Ladies and gentlemen, students, fellow Sikhs: I want to thank you for providing me this opportunity to come to the London School of Economics and talk on issues facing the struggle for an independent Khalistan.

In 1984 I was working as a research scientist in Boston studying the genetics of mycoplasmas, the reactivation of the herpes virus and the biology of cancer and AIDS. Nineteen eighty-four was also the year the Indian government attacked the Golden Temple and 38 other Gurdwaras throughout Punjab. Twenty thousands Sikhs were killed. The Akal Takht was destroyed. Nineteen eighty-four was also the year two Sikhs assassinated Indira Gandhi for ordering the desecration of the Golden Temple. In response, high-level politicians in the ruling Congress (I) party fomented the massacre of Sikhs throughout India. Crazed Hindu mobs slaughtered 40,000 Sikhs and destroyed millions of dollars of Sikh property. Two years later, in 1986, I left my job at Harvard Medical School and dedicated myself to attaining freedom for the Sikh nation.

Nineteen eighty-four marks a watershed year for the Sikh nation. It was a year of rude awakening, a year Sikhs awoke to the reality that as a nation we were no longer safe under Indian rule. But during the past 12 years of my involvement with the struggle for Sikh freedom, I have come to see very distinctly that 1984 did not occur in a vacuum. Sikhs have been agitating for some of their most fundamental rights as a nation since the British pulled out of the subcontinent in 1947. Furthermore, it is plainly evident that nothing in Sikh history suggests that Sikhs would be remotely satisfied under the rule of a foreign power. Let me make it perfectly clear that the Sikhs are an independent nation. This is our identity. We were wrong to join India after partition in 1947. We were lied to; we were duped, we were manipulated and we have paid dearly. Today we want our freedom, and this is fully consistent with our national character.

The first Sikh Guru Nanak, lived in the 15th century, a time of immense turmoil. He witnessed the brutality of the Mughal invaders who had swept down through Afghanistan into the northern subcontinent, terrorizing the local populations. According to the Sikh historian Harbans Singh, Guru Nanak's voice offered ''the only strongly vocal protest in India against the invasions of Barbar, founder of the Mughal dynasty.'' Guru Nanak also spoke out against the social evils of the caste system which promoted vast inequality among fellow human beings. Guru Nanak recognized all humanity as one and knew that the free life was the only life worth living.

The succeeding nine Gurus of the Sikh faith further developed what Guru Nanak set into motion. When the tenth Sikh Guru, Guru Gobind Singh, baptized the Sikhs into nationhood in 1699, he specifically commanded all Sikhs to stand up to tyranny no matter where it exists. Guru Gobind Singh, too, knew the importance of maintaining one's freedom, and he was certain to pass this legacy on to the Sikh nation. Every morning Sikhs pray ''Raj Kare Ga Khalsa: The Khalsa Shall Rule.'' After the death of Guru Gobind Singh, Banda Singh Bahadur swept through the Punjab, defeating the forces of the Mughal rulers who had earlier outlawed the Sikhs, placing a hefty bounty on severed Sikh heads. Banda Singh's rule lasted from 1710 to 1716.

Wars with the brutal Muhgals followed Banda Singh's rule. The Sikhs fought valiantly against great odds. During the lowest periods of those days, Sikhs rallied together to chant ''Raj Karega Khalsa: The Khalsa Shall Rule.'' It wasn't until 1765 that the Sikhs reestablished their kingdom under the Khalsa Misls, who were later consolidated by Maharajah Ranjit Singh in 1799. Ranjit Singh's rule was characterized by an enlightened form of government that recognized the equality of all citizens regardless of religious affiliation or social class standing. Indians today choose to forget that the territories held by the Sikhs extended from the borders of China and Tibet in the North to the deserts of Sindh in the South and from Afghanistan in the North-West to the river Ganga in the East. Indians also seem to forget that it was the Sikhs who halted the foreign invasions from the North-West of the subcontinent that had been going on for thousands of years.

The point in all this history is to show that Sikhs have forged for themselves an independent national identity. According to the UN charter, a nation is marked by one or more of the following characteristics: common descent, common tradition, common heritage, common culture or common language. The Sikhs qualify on all counts. Current attempts to define Sikhs as less than a nation are thinly veiled attempts to keep Sikhs from attaining their rightful place in the international community.

The Sikhs ruled Punjab until they were annexed by the British in 1849 at the conclusion of the Anglo-Sikh Wars. The Sikhs were the last nation on the Indian subcontinent to fall to the British and the record shows that the British recognized the Sikhs as a sovereign, independent nation. Indeed, if not for the treason of a few highly place Dogras who betrayed the Sikh nation by sabotaging the Sikh army in return for British favors, the Punjab may never have fallen into British hands. Sikhs were also the first nation on the subcontinent to raise the cry of freedom from the British. It was the Sikhs who suffered the overwhelming number of casualties during the struggle to oust the British. Though the Sikhs at the time comprised 1.6% of the population on the subcontinent, 85% of those hanged by the British were Sikhs; 80% of those exiled were Sikhs; and 75% of those jailed were Sikhs.

In 1947, when the British pulled out of India, three nations were recognized to receive the transfer of power: the Muslims, the Hindus and the Sikhs. The Muslims took their share in the newly created Pakistan; the Hindus took current-day India and the Sikhs opted to join their share with the Hindus under solemn assurances by Jawarhar Lal Nehru and Mohandas Gandhi that the Sikh nation would lead an autonomous existence in the north. Gandhi personally guaranteed that no law would be passed in the new India that was unacceptable to the Sikh nation. In 1950, however, when it came time to sign the constitution, Sikhs found the document contrary to their interests as a nation, making no allowances whatsoever for their free existence. The Sikh delegates at the Constituent Assembly refused to sign the document. To this day no Sikh has signed the Indian constitution. Later the Sikh representative Master Tara Singh was jailed by Nehru for agitating for the implementation of promises made to the Sikh nation. When asked why he would not honor the commitments he made to the Sikhs, Nehru is reported to have replied as follows: ''I shut my ears when someone speaks to me about honoring the promises made to Sikhs during the independence movement.'' Sadly, the history of the Sikh nation since the ratification of the Indian constitution is the story of Sikhs struggling for their most basic rights as a free and independent nation.

Which brings us around again to 1984. Earlier I mentioned the Indian government's military assault on the Golden Temple which took place in June of 1984. The Indian government has offered a great deal of empty reasons why it attacked the Golden Temple, but the plain truth of the matter is that Indira Gandhi and the Congress Party simply wanted to show Sikhs who was boss. Mrs. Gandhi simply did not want to hear anymore about Sikh rights or the unfulfilled promises of freedom. She was also afraid that sooner or later Sikhs would simply take the freedom that they deserved and reclaim their homeland. Therefore, she planned the assault of the Golden Temple on the day of the martyrdom of the fifth Sikh Guru, Guru Arjan Dev—a day when she knew the temple complex would be filled with observant pilgrims. She also coordinated the assaults on 38 other Gurdwaras throughout Punjab. Over 20,000 Sikhs were killed in June of 1984.

Indira Gandhi and the government of India had envisioned this military operation as a solution to their problems, a way to get the Sikhs off their backs. But the strategy backfired. Whatever complacency had fallen over the Sikhs was lifted. The attack on the Golden Temple made Sikhs reflect on their tradition. Sikhs recalled their tradition: ''Khalsa Bagi Yan Badshah: Either the Sikhs are ruling or they are in rebellion!'' On October 7, 1987 the Sikh nation formally declared itself independent forming the separate country of Khalistan. Sikhs have not given up their dream of reclaiming their independence. We fully expect to achieve the liberation of Khalistan by 1999, the 300th anniversary of the Sikh nation.

During the past 12 years, over 150,000 Sikhs have been killed by Indian government forces. According to respected human rights activists in Khalistan, the number of Sikhs who have ''disappeared'' or who have been illegally killed in extrajudicial murders may exceed 100,000. The extent of India's campaign against the Sikhs is staggering. Also staggering is the extent to which the Indian government will go to cover-up its brutal campaign of genocide against the Sikhs.

Take the case of Sikh human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalra. For years Sikhs have been alleging that Indian police have been abducting Sikhs, torturing them, killing them and then cremating their remains as ''unidentified bodies'' in order to cover-up any evidence of police responsibility. Mr. Khalra was the first to bring concrete evidence to these allegations. He visited three

municipal cremation grounds in Amritsar District and counted up the bodies listed as ''unidentified.'' His findings are astounding. Police have murdered and cremated 6,017 Sikhs in Amritsar District alone. Over 25,000 were killed in the same way throughout the rest of Khalistan.

For having publicized his findings, Mr. Khalra was himself abducted by police on September 6th in front of his home in the presence of witnesses. Prior to his abduction, the Superintendent of Police threatened Mr. Khalra at a press conference saying ''We made 25,000 disappear. It would not be hard to make one more disappear.'' On October 19, 1995, sixty-five Members of the U.S. Congress sent a letter to Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao demanding Mr. Khalra's release. To this date his whereabouts remain unknown.

The Sikhs are not the only nation suffering under the boot of Indian repression. The Muslims of Kashmir claim that Indian has murdered over 43,000 Kashmiris since 1988. The Christians of Nagaland claim that India has killed over 200,000 Nagas since 1950. This level of oppression points to a profound decay eating away at the foundation of India. According Rajinder Puri of the Times of India, the Indian government is ''a rotten, corrupt, repressive and anti-people system.'' The only way the government of Indian can hold the country together is by oppression—by brute force, fear and intimidation. If this sounds a bit like the former Soviet Union, the comparison is an apt one. And like the Soviet Union, India is destined to disintegrate.

Let me make it clear that India is not a democracy. It is a conglomerate of nations held together by the nexus of oppression. The Sikhs want out. The Kashmiris want out. Nagaland wants out. There's trouble in Assam. There's trouble in Tamil Nadu. The millions of the so-called ''black untouchables'' are some of the most oppressed people on the face of the earth. People are starving to death while India spends billions of its World Bank money on developing nuclear weapons and repressing freedom movements. The Indian political system is the most corrupt in the world. One third of Prime Minister Rao's ministry has been indicted on corruption charges and has been forced to resign. If Hindus aren't killing Sikhs, they are killing Muslims. Mosques are being destroyed. Children are being exploited as sex slaves. Wives are set up in flames if they fail to bring large enough dowries. Last year a five year old untouchable girl was blinded by her school teacher when she drank from a pitcher reserved for upper caste Hindus only. In December the Chandigarh Tribune reported that a Sikh man was killed by Indian police when they tied his legs to two jeeps driving off in opposite directions, tearing him in half. I remember the report about police torturing a little Sikh girl by covering her in molasses and pouring ants on her. Please tell me, why on earth would Sikhs want to live in a country like this?

India is not only bad for the people held under its rule. India has also proven itself an irresponsible member of the international community. India refuses to sign the Nonproliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. India has persistently claimed that its nuclear research is for peaceful purposes only, but leading nuclear experts have confirmed that India is secretly building an atomic powered submarine. (See Washington Times, Dec. 9, 1994). India has also test launched the Prithvi II ballistic missile and the Polar Satellite Launch Vehicle, both of which are capable of delivering nuclear warheads. India has been detected smuggling heavy water, a substance needed to manufacture plutonium, out of European countries in violation of international regulations. According to the British documentary, ''Nuclear India,'' the government of India spends 25% of its research and development budget on nuclear research and only 2% on education.

From 1986 to 1991, India was the world's largest importer of major weapons and remains one of the largest today. In 1994, reports emerged that India was preparing to arm Iran. India persistently votes against the United States and the West in the United Nations. In fact, just recently when the United States sponsored a resolution to bring China under the scrutiny of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, India sided with China to block the move. India is also smuggling CFC gas into the United States, which has been banned since January 1st. According to the U.S. Custom Service, CFC gas smuggling has become its number two problem behind illegal drugs—and India is one of the primary culprits! Add to this list a long history of intellectual property theft on the part of Indian manufactures—especially in the field of pharmaceuticals. Indeed, the Washington Times reported on May 3, that the United States has placed India on its trade watch list. It certainly appears that India is doing its level best to distance itself from the decent behavior of legitimate countries in the community of nations.

James Brady, the former U.S. Secretary of State, has called the Indian subcontinent the most dangerous place in the world. War is nearly always imminent. The stockpiling of arms and nuclear weapons is a daily occurrence. Contrast this reality with the vision of a free Khalistan in a newly liberated South Asia, free from the bullying domination of the Indian government. A free Khalistan would serve as a buffer nation between India and Pakistan, thus reducing the potential for armed conflict between the two countries. Khalistan would also agree to the nuclear non-proliferation efforts currently being made by the international community, thus promoting a nuclear free South Asia. And unlike India which depends on IMF loans and U.S. assistance to feed its people (while secretly spending billions on developing nuclear weapons and crushing freedom movements), an independent Khalistan will cultivate economic self-sustainability. Indeed, Khalistan is uniquely situated for economic prosperity. Currently, Sikhs are responsible for 26% of the Indian GNP. The Sikh work ethic is legendary in South Asia. Our doctors, scientists, scholars, financiers and engineers are among the best in the world. Agriculturally, Khalistan could sustain itself with just a fraction of its yield, exporting the rest. Currently, Sikhs supply 73% of India's wheat reserve and 48% of its rice reserve. Remember that Sikhs make up only 2% of the total population in India. A free Khalistan has the foundation for a long overdue South Asian success story.

Unfortunately, the past 12 years of brutality at the hands of the Indian government has pushed the movement for a free Khalistan almost entirely underground. Those Sikhs who are brave enough to stand up and vocally advocate Sikh freedom are shot down without a second thought. Through the terror tactics promoted by former Chief Minister Beant Singh and former Chief of Police K.P.S. Gill, the Indian government has instilled a fear psychosis on the population of Puniab. According to Indian journalist, Iqbal Masud, ''The Beant-Gill duo committed mass incarceration and disappearance and called it 'normalcy.'" Sikhs want the world to know, however, that the only ''normalcy'' in Punjab is the silence of a nation suffocating under the strangle hold of Indian repression.

It is the Sikhs outside of Khalistan who can truly raise the voice of Sikh freedom without fear of brutal retaliation. On April 27, over 15,000 Sikhs in New York City did just this when they shouted the Jathedar of the Akal Takht of a speaker's podium when he refused to raise the slogan of ''Khalistan Zindabad.'' The current Jathedar of the Akal Takht has refused to fullfil the duty of his office by starting a mass-movement for Sikh freedom. The Sikhs in New York showed their displeasure for his kind of weak leadership and assuaged any doubts that the grassroots of the Sikh nation stands firmly in support of Sikh independence.

Working in the international community, the Council of Khalistan has had tremendous success in bringing to light the brutality of the Indian government. Due to our efforts, two bills are currently pending in the United States Congress. House Concurrent Resolution 32 seeks to formally recognize the Sikh nation's right of self-determination. House Resolution 1425—''The Human Rights in India Act''—seeks to cut U.S. aid to India if the government of India continues its campaign of brutality against the Sikhs and other nations and people held under Indian repression.

The Council of Khalistan has also managed to get 51 Members of the U.S. Congress to send a letter to the U.S. State Department demanding that the visa of Mr. K.P.S. Gill be denied if he attempts to enter the United States as part of the Indian field hockey team during the Summer Olympics. I ask you, if 51 Members of the U.S. Congress can stand up against the greatest murderer of Sikhs in the modern era, what is preventing the Jathedar of the Akal Takht and the members of the Akali Dal from doing the same?

The current Sikh leaders in Punjab are uniformly corrupt. The Akali Dal leadership has long ago surrendered to the Government of India. In 1992, 96% of the Sikh population in Punjab boycotted the elections under the Indian constitution. This was a clear mandate for Khalistan. Look at the situation today. The Akali Dal has obviously failed miserably in delivering on that mandate. Just last week Akali politicians participated in elections under the Indian constitution as if the past 12 years had never happened. This crisis in leadership is what makes Sikhs outside of Khalistan so important. It is the job of Sikhs in the West to stand up and tell the Indian government that Sikhs do not want elections. The only thing Sikhs want is independence. If a plebiscite were held in Khalistan today, over 95% of the Sikh population would vote for independence.

The current political situation in India will give the Sikhs a perfect opportunity to seize freedom. It is clear that the Congress party is greatly weakened by rampant corruption. No single party will emerge dominant from last week's elections. A weak coalition will be formed. In the past, Sikhs were able to seize control of the Punjab during weak governments in Delhi. We can do it again. It will take courage and sacrifice, but the only way we will liberate the Sikh nation is by launching a nationwide *shantmai morcha*—a peaceful mass-movement for the liberation of Khalistan. We need to protest by the hundreds of thousands; fill the jails; boycott the Indian government completely and form a Khalsa Raj party for the freedom of Khalistan.

Our work is cut out for us, but the Sikh nation is a proud and fiercely independent nation. Our history has forged in us an unconquerable desire for freedom. We possess a well-founded and deeply imbedded national identity. We are a strong nation with a long tradition of resistance to tyranny. We are a freedom loving people and we want to live in peace so that we may develop to our fullest potential. We will never be deterred from the

path of freedom, and Khalistan will be ours. Sikhs are looking forward to 1999, the 300th anniversary of the Sikh nation. On that day Sikhs will proudly hoist the Sikh flag high above the Golden Temple and thank Guru for the long awaited blessing of freedom in a sovereign, independent Khalistan.

INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE KHALISTAN SOCIETY: SPEAKERS EXPOSE INDIAN STATE REPRESSION, SUPPORT SELF-DETERMINATION FOR KHALISTAN

LONDON.—The movement for Punjab's national independence received a historic boost today, as the Khalistan Society launched its Inaugural meeting here at The London School of Economics. Three invited speakers, Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President, Council of Khalistan, Mr. Max Madden, British Member of Parliament, and Mr. Asad Rehman, a representative of London based Amnesty International, stressed the moral imperative to hold India accountable for extensive and continuing human rights violations against the Sikh people and other minorities in India. They also urged the massive British Asian community to mobilize its resources to protect the rights of those fighting for freedom in India-occupied Punjab.

Mr. Max Madden told audience members of his trip to Punjab in 1991, when he visited Sikh villages and a Punjabi jail, speaking to literally hundreds of people who had suffered human rights abuses by Indian police forces. ''I met a father whose 12 year old daughter was abducted by policemen, raped repeatedly, and eventually killed. Policemen warned the father that were he to pursue a case against the officers involved, his 7 year old daughter would face the same fate.'' He recalled meeting Mr. K.P.S. Gill, former Punjab Chief of Police, who he described as ''the epitome of evil.'' Mr. Madden reiterated the right of the people of Punjab to self-determination, and congratulated The Khalistan Society for its efforts to highlight human rights violations against the Sikhs in Punjab. He told the audience, ''Because of my human rights activities, the Indian High Commission refuses to grant me a visa to visit India.''

Mr. Asad Rehman stressed the need to put human rights on the agenda of governments in South Asia. He detailed the violent and anti-democratic tactics used by India to crush political dissent, and drew comparisons between such tactics used in occupied Punjab and other parts of India. He stressed the importance of peaceful self-determination in Punjab, stating, ''Everyone must have the right to express their political beliefs freely, whatever they may be, without fear of imprisonment, torture or death.''

Dr. Gurmit S. Aulakh strongly denounced the Indian government for its continuing policy of state repression against Sikhs in Punjab, Muslims in Kashmir, and Christians in Nagaland. He spoke of the case of Mr. Jaswant Singh Khalra, a Sikh human rights activist in Punjab who has recently ''disappeared'' and is feared to be dead. Dr. Aulakh detailed the history of the Sikh struggle for freedom, and articulated his vision of a Khalistani state. ''Khalistan will be a buffer state between India and Pakistan, and will sign Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaties, thereby increasing regional peace and security. We will also operate on a 'one man, one vote' policy. In a free Khalistan, there will be no human rights violations, and minorities will be treated equally.''

STATEMENT BY DAVID SMITH REGARDING CAMPAIGN FINANCING

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1996

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by David Smith, a high school student from Brattleboro, VT, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people:

A couple of days ago, I heard two men laughing about the term, ''representation of the people,'' claiming that the people are no longer really represented. Unfortunately, I'm beginning to agree with this, because I have a problem believing that a politician is going to think about me—the average voter—when the oil and gas industry gives Congress $17–18 million annually; when the health industry gives $68.8 million, when the banking industry gives $42.1 million; and that's just to name a few. Our government is overrun by the influences of special interest groups, industries, corporations, unions and other bit spenders.

But you, the politicians, are also stuck, because the average House election is up way past $150,000; the average Senate election is up past $3.5 million. And that's average, which means that the backwater, small-time candidate has no chance of competing with the mainstream Republican or Democrat, because he or she has no corporate, big-spender backing. In short our campaign finance system is outdated, flawed, and full to the brim with loopholes. We need changes.

What I'm proposing today is a publicly financed system. My proposal starts in September, 8 months before an election, with candidates collecting low-dollar contributions. This is the only private money in my whole system; and, since it's low-dollar, it doesn't have any influence over a candidate. This seen money lasts until the first primary in February. To qualify for public financing, candidates must receive 20% of the vote. Parties may also qualify for public financing by getting 20% of the vote between two candidates, and sending their most winning . . . candidate to run. Candidates who receive the required vote will receive an account of money to work with.

In addition to monetary funds, the candidates will also receive radio and TV space. But instead of getting 45 second soundbites, candidates will receive 15 minute blocks, almost like ''informercials,'' and this will force them to really discuss in detail their platforms. And you can also get debates going, and really educate the public. Lastly, government will pay for one or two mass mailings per candidate. Winners of the national conventions will then be given money to campaign in the general election.

Now, how are we going to pay for this? The Working Group on Electoral Democracy estimated that a plan similar to this one would cost between $5–600 million annually. And I've devised two ways to pay for this: the first is a $6 flat tax on every taxpaying American. Unfortunately, the taxpayers don't really want another tax. So, an alternative plan would be a one dollar check-off box on tax returns for Congressional funding, right next to the one for Presidential funding. Also, a one percent shift in funds from the military to campaign finances, and last, the first national lotto game. Vermont alone already receives around $23 million in funds from various lotto games, and I think that a national lottery game could bring in at least half of the money needed to fund this campaign system.

What this system will do, is it will do 5 things: first, it will stop all public legislation from being influenced by the wealth of industries, corporations, all private money will be taken out of politics. Second, it creates a level playing field for all candidates, rich and poor candidates must have the same chance of being elected as everyone else, and voters must start to elect candidates on their merits, not on their money. Thirdly, it allows politicians to spend their time at politics, not at campaigning. I've heard that politicians spend between anywhere from 40–80% of their time campaigning. In this system, they would spend 5% of their time campaigning. [Fourth] it will allow politicians to get in touch with what voters want, not what the heavy contributors want. If they have to go to the grassroots to get their support, then there will be more talk about what the real voters want. Finally, it closes down all loopholes, so that no private money can influence the private system, and we will return to the ideal of ''representation of the people.''

Congressman SANDERS. Thank you. (Applause) You've touched on a very important issue. David, let me ask you a couple of questions. First, give us some examples, if you might, of the role that big money plays in influencing politics, influencing legislation. Do you have any examples that you might be able to provide?

Answer. Sure. A little while ago, the Legislature allocated money for the Pentagon to build new bombers. This was in spite of the Pentagon saying that, ''We don't want any new bombers, we don't want the money.'' The reason the money was allocated, was because of the influence of the corporations that make and help produce those bombers. They have such power, with their monetary funds that they can almost shape the way legislation works.

Congressman SANDERS: You're absolutely right, that is a very good example. Let me ask you the second question: recently the Speaker of the House went on a tour around the country, and he spoke at $10,000/plate fundraising dinners; $10,000/plate to have dinner with House Speaker Gingrich. Why would anybody pay $10,000—it was a very good dinner, no doubt—but other than the good quality food, and you think of another good reason why someone would want to go to dinner with the Speaker for $10,000/plate?

Answer. Sure. It was influence. By paying $10,000 to a candidate, you get influence over that candidate so they will better represent what you want. An example: if I was a politician and I came back to the office one day and there were 14 messages for me; 13 were from people I never heard of, and the last was from someone who has paid me $10,000 at a local charity the week before, the first person I'm going to call back is that big payer. So, by paying lots of money, we get more influence.

THE ''ONE CHINA'' POLICY

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1996

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when the status of United States relations with China and/or Taiwan is debated, references are often made to the ''One China'' policy. This policy dates back to the Shanghai Communique, which since 1972 has formed the legal framework of Sino-American relations. It