And most importantly, we were empowered, we felt stronger, we fostered a sense of community, and we saw that we could make a difference in peoples lives.

Neighborhood watch groups have proven to be an effective and economical approach to providing a better and more secure society for ourselves and our children.

Giving people in neighborhood watch groups a $50 tax break will support the many citizens already involved in crime prevention and encourage more community participation.

I ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation. Working together—and only by working together—can we truly start to reclaim our streets.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the 1996 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Act is a clear, non-nonsense declaration of what this Republican Congress stands for. Time and time again the American public tells us that the main concern is crime, and for too long this concern has fallen on deaf ears. In our Contract With America we promised to act on that concern and I am proud to stand here today and say to the American people ''We have taken action.''

The Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Act reflects the priorities of the American public. We have slashed wasteful bureaucracies, we have downsized low priority programs, and we have cut foreign aid and put the money back in America. Why should taxpayers pay for international efforts to stop killing abroad when in their own backyard people are murdering each other? We can't fight a war abroad until we've won the war at home. Make no mistake about it, this is a war. Crime in America has killed millions and ruined the lives of many more. Our anticrime initiatives represent a major offensive in this war against crime. We recognize that crime cannot be defeated by politicians and bureaucrats in Washington. It is up to the local communities and States to lead the assault and that is why we have given them the means to fight crime directly, in the best way they see fit. This is only the beginning, we have a long fight ahead, but one we are committed to winning.

INTRODUCTION OF THE YELLOWSTONE BRUCELLOSIS-FREE MANAGEMENT ACT

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Yellowstone Brucellosis-Free Management Act to provide a comprehensive and practical strategy to address the problems of brucellosis in the Yellowstone.

Yellowstone, our Nation's first national park, represents the true flowering of the idea of public lands set aside for the use and enjoyment and education of all the American people. It is unsurpassed in scenic beauty and natural features and remains today of America's outstanding wildlife sanctuaries, little altered by human settlement.

Yellowstone provides refuge for rare and endangered species such as the threatened grizzly bear, the rare mountain lion and wolvering, bald eagles and trumpeter swans, the Yellowstone cutthroat trout and arctic grayling. The public lands surrounding Yellowstone offer complementary scenic vistas, recreational opportunities and outstanding wildlife habitat.

This greater Yellowstone area represents the largest undeveloped land of wilderness quality in the lower 48 States, and it includes the largest free-ranging herds of elk and bison in the world.

However, it is those herds, and particularly the bison, which have raised concerns about the risks of brucellosis which is carried by some animals in both herds. The dilemma is how do we protect the delicate wildlife interrelationships, the unique genetics of Yellowstone's wildlife and yet address the potential threat of brucellosis in the wildlife population and its possible transmission to livestock outside the park and resulting economic consequences to the livestock industry.

My legislation protects livestock producers from that threat and the harm of unfair economic sanctions by establishing a comprehensive framework for the National Park Service to address and manage and control brucellosis in the Yellowstone area.

For far too long, the bison-brucellosis controversy has swirled with hearsay, unsubstantiated claims and fear. This bill replaces fear with facts, rumor with research, supposition with science and, most important, it replaces talk with direct and specific action to remove the threat of brucellosis.

In the short term, this bill sanctions the interim bison management plan signed by the U.S. Forest Service, the State of Montana and Yellowstone National Park. It concurs with the need for a long term environmental impact statement in the form of a bison management plan. It also establishes the Yellowstone Brucellosis-Free Management Area with special regulations to provide economic stability in terms of the brucellosis-free status for the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho as long as the interim plans are in effect within the Yellowstone area.

One of the most important features of the bill is the prohibition on unfair or arbitrary sanctions imposed by APHIS on other States or livestock producers of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho because of the presence of brucellosis in wildlife within the Greater Yellowstone area.

In the long term, the bill directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to cooperate with the States of Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming in seeking the elimination of the diseases brucellosis from the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem. To accomplish this goal, the bill provides strong direction and authority for science-based management of the diseases.

The bill provides recognition of the facts that American Indians have long-standing spiritual and cultural ties to the American bison and, as such, have shown an interest in participating in the disposition of surplus bison for subsistence or to restore herds on American Indian lands.

Mister Speaker, this is a good bill for Montana's livestock producers. It protects their legitimate interests at the same time it provides for proper long-term management of Yellowstone's bison. This is a good bill for the bison. This is a good bill for the Yellowstone.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the 179 Members of this body who signed on to my letter asking Speaker GINGRICH to preserve the Legal Services Corporation [LSC]. Additionally, I would like to thank those Members—AMO HOUGHTON, STEPHEN HORN, DAVID SKAGGS, HOWARD BERMAN, JACK REED, and CONNIE MORELLA, among others—who personally talked to other Members of Congress to help stave off further cuts to the Legal Services Corporation.

Legal services is literally the last line of defense against destitution for many deserving Americans. Last year, LSC-funded programs provided assistance to over 50,000 women seeking protection against abusive spouses, 240,000 elderly seeking help ranging from fraud to Medicare, 2,600 veterans seeking help with veteran's benefits, and 9,000 abused and neglected children. There are many in this country who would find themselves trapped in disastrous often life-threatening situations were it not for legal services attorneys.

I would also like to make several points about the contention that the private bar could somehow replace legal services attorneys. I began my career in public service running the Oregon Legal Services Program for the elderly. I came away from my experience with a strong belief that there is a critical role for the private sector to play in providing legal assistance to the poor.

During the time I worked with Legal Services, I organized hundreds of private attorneys to assist in expanding access to the courts for

the elderly. Today, 250 private attorneys donate time to the senior law centers in Oregon. In Portland last year, these attorneys donated 1,640 hours. More than 1,000 lawyers in Oregon, and 130,000 lawyers nationwide participate in pro bono activities organized by legal services programs.

However, I know most of the attorneys I worked with would agree that in spite of their hard work, they could not even begin to fill the shoes of the legal services attorneys who could give full time attention to the problems of seniors. The American Bar Association estimates that less than 20 percent of the legal needs of the poor are met. Even with current funding and massive involvement by the private sector, LSC-funded programs are forced to turn away 43 percent of eligible clients. Most legal aid programs turn away women in divorce cases unless they are in danger of their lives from an abuser, and they turn away eviction cases unless the family will go homeless.

Second, the legal problems of the poor, and in my experience, particularly the poor elderly, often require a depth of expertise and a time commitment that is rarely available on a pro bono basis by private attorneys.

Cases that legal service lawyers take up for older Americans range from navigating the bureaucratic maze of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security to working through problems with consumer fraud, age discrimination, pension income, property assessments, and wills and probate.

The fact of the matter about legal services is that in most communities they are the only knowledgeable advocate for poor people who find themselves up against a convoluted Federal bureaucracy or abusive members of their family or community. For every anecdote about a legal services attorney taking up a questionable case, there are a thousand where they helped a poor person just get a fair shake.

Again, I would like to thank the many Members of Congress who recognized the importance of legal services in ensuring this country provides equal justice for all, and fought to ensure the continuance of this program.

The Members who signed onto my letter are the following: STEPHEN HORN, AMO HOUGHTON, FRANK PALLONE, JIM MORAN, TIM JOHNSTON, MILLER, BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS, SHERROD BROWN, MIKE WARD, JOHN SPRATT, JOSE SERRANO, DICK GEPHARDT, SAM GIBBONS, ROBERT TORICELLI, ROBERT MENENDEZ, LOUIS STOKES, RONALD DELLUMS, CHARLES RANGEL, CHARLES SCHUMER, OWEN PICKETT, HAROLD FORD, NITA LOWEY, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, SAM FARR, ANDY JACOBS, ELIZABETH FURSE, HOWARD BERMAN, JOHN BALDACCI, RICK BOUCHER, BOBBY RUSH, BOB CLEMENT, BOBBY SCOTT, JIM FOX, PETER TORKILDSEN, JOHN EDWARD PORTER, GLEN POSHARD, JAMES LEACH, ALAN MOLLOHAN, JERRY COSTELLO, JIM CHAPMAN, KAREN THURMAN, BRUCE VENTO, MARTIN FROST, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, NANCY JOHNSON, MAXINE WATERS, MICHAEL FORBES, ALBERT WYNN, CORRINE BROWN, SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, JOHN DINGELL, ROBERT MATSUI, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, JACK QUINN, EARL HILLIARD, SANFORD, BISHOP, RICK LAZIO, MARCY KAPTUR, STEVEN SCHIFF, FLOYD FLAKE, SCOTTY BAESLER, TONY BEILENSON, ANNA ESHOO, EARL POMEROY, GARY ACKERMAN, CAROLYN MALONEY, TIM ROEMER, MARTIN OLAV SABO, JOHN OLVER, WILLIAM CLAY, ZOE LOFGREN, EVA CLAYTON, CARDISS COLLINS, BEN CARDIN, BARNEY FRANK, ROSA DELAURO, BOB BORSKI, SIDNEY YATES, L.F. PAYNE, ELIOT L. ENGEL, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, STENY HOYER, KAREN MCCARTHY, DALE KILDEE, NEIL ABERCROMBIE, BOB FILNER, PETER DEUTSCH, TOM FOGLIETTA, PETER DEFAZIO, RICHARD NEAL, PATSY MINK, LYNN RIVERS, JAMES TRAFICANT, BILL LUTHER, NICK RAHALL, PAUL MCHALE, JANE HARMAN, HENRY GONZALEZ, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, CHAKA FATTAH, CARRIE P. MEEK, JOHN LEWIS, PETE PETERSON, WILLIAM COYNE, HARRY JOHNSTON, PETE STARK, NORM DICKS, PAT WILLIAMS, DAVID BONIOR, VIC FAZIO, ROBERT ANDREWS, WILLIAM JEFFERSON, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, PETER VISCLOSKY, BART STUPAK, MAURICE HINCHEY, JACK REED, PAUL KANJORSKY, MARTIN MEEHAN, NORMAN MINETA, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, THOMAS BARRETT, JERROLD NADLER, BILL RICHARDSON, ESTEBAN TORRES, BERNARD SANDERS, LLOYD DOGGETT, THOMAS SAWYER, TONY HALL, KEN BENTSEN, DAVID SKAGGS, HAROLD VOLKMER, GERALD KLECZKA, NORMAN SISISKY, ED PASTOR, SAM GEJDENSON, JAMES CLYBURN, NANCY PELOSI, BOB WISE, LUIS GUTIERREZ, KWEISI MFUME, JIM MCDERMOTT, RON COLEMAN, BARBARA KENNELLY, MELVIN WATT, PATRICK KENNEDY, XAVIER BECERRA, GEORGE BROWN, ALCEE HASTINGS, CHET EDWARDS, LYNN WOOLSEY, ED MARKEY, HENRY WAXMAN, WALTER TUCKER, DICK DURBIN, PAT SCHROEDER, GERRY STUDDS, TOM MANTON, ED TOWNS, MAJOR OWENS, JULIAN DIXON, JOHN BRYANT, LANE EVANS, JIM OBERSTAR, JOE KENNEDY, DAVID MINGE, NYDIA VELAZQUEZ, LEE HAMILTON, CONNIE MORELLA, FRANK RIGGS, SOLOMON ORTIZ, FRANK TEJEDA, RAY THORNTON, DONALD PAYNE, CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, BEN THOMPSON, BLANCHE LINCOLN.

In addition, Representative HAL ROGERS, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, made clear early on that he would not support the elimination of the Legal Services Corporation and for that, and for his patience and kindness, we are grateful.

SIKHS DESERVE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the attention of the House to an extremely sensitive situation in India. In a time when civil rights abuses around the world are being condemned, the treatment of the Sikhs by the Indian Government should not go unnoticed.

This shameful treatment has included documented cases of rapes of young women, the beating of old men, and the murder of young boys. Innocent Sikh people have also been subjected to imprisonment without trial, and this practice has been occurring for more than a decade.

The Sikhs are being persecuted in their own homeland. They live in fear everyday, and the freedoms we take for granted simply do not exist in this part of India. Those Sikhs that have the coverage to speak out against these abuses are often arrested and held for no reason.

The imprisonment of innocent Sikhs is made worse by the unfair treatment they receive once in prison. This despicable treatment all too often leads to the murder of innocent prisoners. Many times these deaths go unreported by police, and the bodies are cremated and, therefore, go unclaimed.

I believe this situation deserves and demands the attention of this body. Just as we have supported democratic reforms and the right to self-determination in Eastern Europe, I believe we should support independent and self-determination for Khalistan. The behavior of the Indian Government should not be tolerated, and their treatment of the Sikh people should be condemned.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

PUNJAB (TREATMENT OF SIKHS)

Mr. Terry Dicks (Hayes and Harlington): I wish to bring to the attention of the House the continuing persecution of the Sikhs living in their homeland, the Punjab—an issue that I have brought before the House on three previous occasions in the 12 years that I have been a Member of Parliament.

I noticed that nearly 30 hon. and right hon. Members were in the Chamber to listen to a debate about Bosnia, about which British people are not really interested because it is not of direct concern. We now have a debate—at least, a statement—about the position in a Commonwealth country, and the 30 people who were in the Chamber at 10 o'clock have almost all left. I find that surprising and disappointing.

Sikhs in my constituency and throughout the world are worried for relatives and friends who continue to live in that part of India. The rape of young women, the beating of old men and the murder of young boys, together with the imprisonment without trial of thousands of innocent people, have been taking place for more than a decade and continue to this day.

Living in fear in part of everyday existence in the Punjab. The freedom that we take for granted in Britain does not exist in that part of India.

Recent evidence obtained from police files shows that bodies of police suspects murdered in police custody have been cremated as ''unclaimed'' and that that practice has continued since 1984. The documents that I have with me were given by or bought from police authorities in the Punjab. They list names of people relating to the bodies that have been cremated; yet the Indian authorities denied the existence of such records.

The Indian Express carried a front-page story in its edition of 3 February 1995, in which it said that during the three years 1991–93, the Punjab police dumped about 426 bodies for cremation as ''unclaimed'' on the Patti Municipal Committee. In many cases, the relatives had not been informed even though the bodies had been identified.

In the same region last year, another 17 ''unclaimed'' bodies were sent by the police for cremation. Why cremation? Because burnt bodies cannot be examined later for evidence of torture or other abuse.

Police sources have disclosed that, although some of those so-called ''missing persons'' may have died as a result of torture while in police custody, others may have been eliminated because they had some evidence of police brutality—in other words, they had witnessed what was going on and they had to be put away together with those who were murdered as suspects.

A local human rights group brought that position to the attention of the Indian high court, but its action was dismissed on the grounds that only relatives of murdered individuals could be party to any litigation.