

Initially, dowry was a voluntary gift from the bride's family limited to household items, like kitchen implements and linens. Now the groom's family demands a large dowry upon marriage and later demands additional gifts of money, electronics, or cars.

While the National Crimes Bureau of India reported 5,199 dowry deaths in 1994, unreported estimates run as high as 11,000 to 15,000 Indian women murdered annually. In many cases, the family will pour kerosene over the bride and then kick her over a stove in the floor, setting her sari on fire. These deaths are then reported as kitchen accidents, not murders.

In 1961, the Indian Government enacted the Dowry Prohibition Act, and in 1986 made dowry death a crime. However, this law is riddled with loopholes which allow the majority of the perpetrators to be acquitted, leaving them free to remarry and start the vicious cycle again.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the Harvard Magazine that highlights this horrible practice. I urge the Indian Government to enforce its laws on dowry death and stop this abominable human rights violation.

INDIA'S BURNING BRIDES  
(By Kathleen Koman)

In November 1993, Sangeeta Agarwal, a young scientist with a doctorate in solid-state physics, was married in an elaborate Hindu ceremony. Five months later she was found strangled in her in-laws' house in Kanpur, India. Her husband, an accountant, is awaiting trial for her death. What went wrong? "I've been struggling with that question," said the victim's uncle, Sataya Agarwal, "and the one word that comes to mind is greed." He said that although his niece's in-laws received a substantial dowry at the wedding, they wanted more. The husband and his family expected a share of Sangeeta's pre-marriage earnings, and also demanded a car. Then they figured that if she were to die, they could also collect money from her life insurance, said Agarwal, "and I think that's what put them over the edge."

In many parts of India, grooms' families demand dowry and, if it is absent or insufficient, they may beat the bride and even strangle, poison, or burn her to death. Typically, they douse the woman with kerosene and push her over a small stove on the floor, igniting her sari. Later, in their statement to the police, the in-laws claim that the bride's death was a kitchen accident. The National Crimes Bureau of India reported 5,817 dowry deaths in 1993 and 5,199 in 1994. In reality, 11,000 to 15,000 women die each year because of dowry disputes, according to Rani Jethmalani, an attorney at the Supreme Court of India.

Jethmalani and Agarwal spoke at the First International Conference on Dowry and Bride-Burning in India, held this fall at Harvard Law School and sponsored in part by Harvard's Committee on South Asian Studies. In his opening remarks, Michael Witzel, Wales professor of Sanskrit, emphasized the need to draw world attention to dowry-related violence, and to explore the legal, social, religious, and historical aspects of the problem.

Dowry existed in the Vedic period (beginning about 1500 B.C.), said Witzel, but then it was a voluntary gift limited to household goods such as linens, pots, and pans. Women had to obey their husbands and their fathers-in-law, but they were inviolable; bride-burning was unheard of.

Today, the groom's family demands dowry at the time of marriage and coerces the

bride's family into giving additional money and items like jewelry and electronic goods long after the wedding. Recent studies suggest that this custom is spreading throughout Indian society. But it remains most prevalent in the well-educated, middle-class Hindu population. "The self-respect of the groom's family depends on attracting as large a dowry as possible," explained Julia Leslie, senior lecturer in Hindu studies at the University of London. "Even more disturbing is the balance of power implied by dowry. Both families seem to agree that it is necessary to pay the groom's family to take on the burden of the bride."

Bride-burning is not a crime committed solely by men against women. In many cases, the mother-in-law, who may herself have suffered dowry abuse when she was young, is the perpetrator.

Himendra B. Thakur, who founded the International Society Against Dowry and Bride-Burning in India, argued that bride-burning will cease if the young women of India refuse to marry as soon as the groom's family ask for dowry, or if the women leave the marital home at the first sign of abuse. But members of the audience noted that the women's parents often refuse to take them back, and they lack alternatives such as jobs and shelter.

Conference participants listed practical steps aimed at eradicating dowry and bride-burning. They include constructing residential training centers and apartment complexes for young women, forming support groups for students and parents opposed to the dowry system, and creating loan funds for students to eliminate some of the financial pressures that underlie the practice. Thakur, who wrote the 1991 book *Don't Burn My Mother!*, a fictional account of dowry death, said that novels, newspaper advertisements, and movies must be used "to convince the bride that instead of the option to marry with dowry and die, it is far better to remain unmarried and alive."

THE (INEFFECTUAL) LAW

The Indian government enacted the Dowry Prohibition Act in 1961, and in 1986 amended the penal code to introduce a new offense, now known as dowry death. But this legislation contains glaring loopholes and, because of lax enforcement, the majority of those accused of bride-burning are acquitted. Many remarry and obtain a second dowry with no apparent difficulty. And their mothers are free to torment the new bride. "What does it say about Indian society when families line up to offer their daughters to a man who has murdered his bride over a small refrigerator or television or scooter?" asked attorney Rani Jethmalani at the conference on dowry and bride-burning.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in rollcall vote No. 885 on December 22, 1995. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

UTAH'S CENTENNIAL

HON. ENID G. WALDHOLTZ

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 100-year anniversary of the day that Utah became the 45th State to join the Union. On January 4, 1896, President Grover Cleveland signed the document that granted Utah statehood, ending a nearly 50-year struggle and six failed attempts by Utahans to become one of the United States of America.

When the State of Deseret, as it was formerly known, achieved statehood, the Union gained some of the most beautiful, varied landscape and spectacular scenery in the United States. From the rugged mountains of the High Uintas, to the fantastic display of rock architecture in the high deserts, Utah has always attracted those who appreciate its unique beauty and splendor. But, its not only Utah's great beauty that distinguishes our State, it's the people—they are friendly and warm, and, as the State nickname as the Beehive State accurately describes, they are industrious, hard working, and enterprising.

In our 100 years, Utahans have made the State prosper and grow, creating a successful metropolitan area while, at the same time, retaining its warmhearted, hometown feel, making it one of the most liveable States in the Union. As a Utahan, I am proud to join with the people of Utah in celebrating our 100-year anniversary of statehood. We have truly made the desert bloom, and Utahans and the entire country can take pride in the beauty and accomplishments of our 45th State.

CLINTON'S BUDGET

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this member commends to his colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on January 5, 1996.

BUDGET BALL IS IN CLINTON'S COURT, AND PUBLIC KNOWS IT'S HIS PLAY

Finally the public seems to be beginning to see through President Clinton's rhetoric on the federal budget impasse.

For too long, public opinion polls indicated that Clinton was being rewarded for refusing to negotiate with congressional Republicans over a seven-year balanced budget agreement. In a Nov. 19 ABC News poll, for example, 49 percent of the respondents approved of the way Clinton was handling the budget dispute, while 42 percent disapproved.

In the most recent poll, however, the president's approval rating on the handling of the budget had dropped to 39 percent. His disapproval rating had risen to 56 percent. Fewer respondents blamed Congress—51 percent in November, 44 percent this week.

In November, 45 percent supported the statement that Clinton was "honestly trying to resolve the budget issue," while 52 percent said he was "just playing politics." This week, 33 percent still viewed him as a sincere budget negotiator, while 66 percent said he was playing politics.

Congressional Republicans have given significant ground in an effort to reach a budget compromise. Clinton has given them no

credit for this movement, instead battering them with emotional claims that their budget would cause serious harm to the poor, the weak and the underprivileged.

House Majority Leader Dick Arney of Texas has called attention to congressional Republicans' significant concessions. At one time, he said, they had pushed for \$101 billion in savings on welfare programs over the seven years. Now they are willing to settle for \$65 billion. Originally, they targeted 300 government agencies for elimination. Now the goal is about 30.

A major element of the GOP budget plan was a \$354 billion tax cut. Arney noted that Republicans have allowed the tax cut to be scaled back to \$245 billion.

Pete du Pont, a former Republican presidential candidate, has pointed out that the House Republicans—the same people painted by Clinton as zealous, unbending revolutionaries—have already given up more than half of their pro-growth tax cuts. He said that in all likelihood they will give up half again to get a budget deal.

That's something you don't hear when Clinton tromps into the White House press briefing room to trash the Gingrich Republicans. And it's not something the television networks point out when they fill their newscasts with sobbing federal workers who can't pay their rent.

Arney demonstrated that congressional Republicans have made "a good-sized mountain" of concessions. Still, the president lays the full blame for the government's being without a budget and partially shut down at the feet of House Republicans. He whines that he is being blackmailed by intransigent Republicans in the House who place politics ahead of the national interest.

The government is shut down because the president vetoed a budget bill that included the funds to pay the federal workers now on furlough. Clinton is pressing Republicans to approve another continuing resolution to fund the government through Jan. 12. They've already been there, done that. The national interest, not to mention our children's security, would be best served by enactment of a balanced budget—not another stopgap spending measure. To resolve the impasse, it will take a president who quits posturing and makes concessions of a magnitude similar to those made by congressional Republicans.

## REMEMBERING GEN. DAN GRAHAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 1996

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this past New Year's Eve, America lost a true patriot. Gen. Dan Graham, the father of SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, passed away that day. I want to share with our colleagues a column in today's Washington Times by Paul Weyrich which tells about the life of Dan Graham and his mission for a strong defense to protect the national security of the United States.

THE MISSION OF A TRUE PATRIOT

(By Paul M. Weyrich)

About six weeks ago, I received a newly published book with a personal note from the author hoping that I would find it useful. I read through the book and dropped the author a note suggesting that he appear on my program, "Direct Line," to discuss the book. I received no reply and yesterday I found out why. Gen. Dan Graham passed away on New Year's eve.

None of his friends, even those who had worked closely with him over the years, knew just how critically ill Gen. Graham was in recent weeks. We had known for some time that he was suffering from cancer and for the past few months that he was unlikely to recover. But Dan Graham was never one to whine or complain. In fact, the only time I ever saw Dan Graham truly upset was at the funeral of his first wife, to whom he had been married most of his adult lifetime, and who was the mother of their two sons and five daughters. This nation owes Gen. Graham a great debt of gratitude.

I had gotten to know Gen. Graham more than 20 years ago. He was chief of Defense Intelligence during the Ford administration. The Democratic Senate, then controlled by nearly a two-thirds margin, forced him into premature retirement because he wasn't politically correct on Vietnam. He was never bitter, even though he had every reason to be. He continued his work for a strong defense on the outside, just as he had done so ably from the inside for more than 30 years in the Army.

It was in the early 1980s that Gen. Graham began to talk about new breakthroughs in technology. The breakthroughs would permit an effective missile defense system to be constructed to defend this country from a massive attack from the Soviet Union or from a surprise attack from some rogue leader. We were going to build a primitive version of such a system in the early 1970s, but President Nixon bargained that right away.

I know almost nothing about technology and certainly had no knowledge about this sort of development, but Gen. Graham gave me the full briefing anyway and then asked for my help to find a home for his project, called "High Frontier." I called Ed Feulner, the president of the Heritage Foundation, and explained that Gen. Graham was assembling a group of scientific experts who intended to advocate a new type of missile defense system. Ed quickly agreed that Heritage would welcome the project as part of its public policy activities, and thus was born what we now call SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Gen. Graham soon found a willing listener in one President Ronald Reagan, who in 1983 delivered a nationwide televised address that shook the leaders of the Kremlin. Mr. Reagan committed the United States to research and deploy a defensive missile system. Critics, in an effort to kill the project, quickly labeled it "Star Wars." But given the popularity of George Lucas' trilogy, that label only enhanced it.

Despite near crippling opposition from the Democratic Congress, SDI made significant advantages under the Reagan administration, to the point where Soviet leaders were convinced that the United States was serious about deploying it. Some Soviet military leaders with whom I spoke early in this decade said that this shift in U.S. strategy was a contributing factor to the demise of the Soviet Union. SDI received only lip service from President Bush, despite the fact that Russian President Boris Yeltsin, in his first appearance as the leader of that nation, urged the United States and Russia to work together to develop SDI for the good of all mankind. Bush advisors were not enthusiastic about SDI because deployment would have required a change in the so-called MAD strategy, Mutual Assured Destruction, to which the United States has clung for decades. Still, SDI limped along and made modest progress.

When Bill Clinton took office, he all but killed SDI. The Republican controlled Congress, just a few weeks ago, passed a defense authorization bill that would have required deployment of a modified missile defense

system by the year 2000. That was Gen. Graham's finest hour and thank God he lived to see it.

Unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed the bill precisely because he said it would have required the construction of that missile defense system, which he did not want. So despite a decade and a half of work by Gen. Graham, this country remains unprotected from a missile attack. Still, the issue won't go away.

There would have been no issue at all, and the technology developments which have resulted in drastically reducing the cost of an SDI system would not have occurred at all, but for the dogged determination of Daniel Graham. In literally thousands of meetings, public and private, Gen. Graham pushed this idea. It was Gen. Graham who convened a special meeting at my office to encourage opposition to John Tower as Secretary of Defense under then President-elect Bush on the grounds that Sen. Tower was an opponent of SDI. In Secretary Dick Cheney, Graham found someone much more to his liking.

All of this aside, Dan Graham was a decent, religious, family man who had an endearing sense of humor and was terrific at getting people, even opponents, to work together. He could be tough as nails if he opposed you on policy grounds, but Dan Graham was never mean spirited. He always handled opposition with great dignity, which was part of his military training.

This nation owes Dan Graham a great deal. And one day soon, we will have a system to protect us against some fanatic or deranged leader who wants to blow up part of America to make a point. When that day comes, and it almost came a few weeks ago, it will be because of the good work of this one time deputy director of the CIA. All of us who love America will miss this true patriot.

## SUPPORT OF OVERRIDING VETO FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of this conference report.

Putting this bill together has been a difficult process, and it's safe to say that no one gets everything they would like to see in the bill. But on balance, the conference report represents the best effort and fairest bill possible.

At the last meeting of the conferees, we made considerable movement to address the concerns about the measure expressed by the administration.

Among other things, we put back into the bill a clean mining patent moratorium; we increased funds for Indian tribes; we gave the Park Service funds for the Mojave Desert. All in all, we made considerable movement to alleviate the administration's problems with the bill. Nevertheless, the President vetoed it.

This bill includes real compromises. But apparently the President wants things his way or not at all. For instance, those of us who support responsible mining in our country have tried to move forward on mining law reform. We are willing to negotiate royalties and payment for patented land. So we have included a clean patent moratorium.

But we did not go far enough for the President.