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

reads: ''The U.S. acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China.''

I have always been puzzled by the ''One China'' policy. It is a complete abstraction; it simply does not comport with reality. It might serve the interests of the hegemonists in China, but it is an unrealistic as it is outdated.

When Mao Tse-tung's Communists seized power in China in 1949 and established the People's Republic of China [PRC], ''Generalissimo'' Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists fled to Taiwan and established the Republic of China [ROC] on Taiwan. According to Mao, the PRC consisted of China, Taiwan, Tibet, and Mongolia. According to Chiang, the ROC consisted of exactly the same territory, i.e., China, Taiwan, Tibet, and Mongolia. Until 1972, the United States and most countries around the world chose to recognize the ROC regime as the sole, legitimate government of the whole territory.

When President Nixon and Henry Kissinger went to China in 1972 and shifted recognition from Taipei to Beijing, they substituted one abstraction of reality for another. The rise of the Soviet Union to superpower status had necessitated a Sino-American relationship; the United States perceived the need for a powerful ally in the area, able to counter the Soviet threat. Indeed, on February 28, Nixon and Mao concluded the aforementioned Shanghai Communique. It completely neglected the rights and wishes of the people of Taiwan.

Today, with the recent tension in the Taiwan Strait it is becoming more and more clear that the ''One China'' policy is an outdated and untenable relic of the cold war. It therefore needs to be abolished.

Constructive ambiguity, strategic ambiguity, and even tactical ambiguity are terms that arise when our relationship with Taiwan is being discussed. To prevent the recurrence of the recent crisis in the Taiwan Strait, we cannot afford to be ambiguous in our China policy; it is time to acknowledge reality. There is one China and one Taiwan; the United States and the rest of the world should adjust their policy to current reality.

The people of Taiwan have fought long and hard to establish a democracy on their island. The world should respect their choice. And if their wish is recognition by the rest of the world of their status as separate from China, then the United States, as the leader of the free world, should take the lead in that process.

Mr. Chairman, we can make a beginning by acknowledging that Taiwan is not a part of China and scrap once and for all the outdated and unrealistic ''One China'' policy.

LEONARD LOCKE HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1996

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my close personal friend and neighbor, Mr. Leonard Locke. On May 30, 1996, Leonard will celebrate his 80th birthday. It is my pleasure to join with his family, many friends, and neighbors in wishing Leonard a very happy birthday.

Mr. Speaker, Leonard Locke was born not too far from where we both live today in the Alden section of Nanticoke. After graduating from Newport Township High School, Leonard proudly served his country in the 76th Division of the 385th Infantry during World War II. He earned five battle stars during his active duty in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Germany.

After the war, Leonard opened a neighborhood grocery store in the Alden section of Nanticoke. During the 40 years that Leonard ran the store, he was always a friend to all his customers and his neighborhood. Ten years ago, Leonard retired to enjoy the pleasures of life.

Leonard Locke was an active member of the business community participating as a director of Wyoming Valley Distributing Co. for 20 years, as well as its secretary for 15 of those years. Also in this connection, he lent his business expertise with the United Retail Grocers Association of Northeastern Pennsylvania serving at times as the organization's president and secretary.

Leonard has been a registered Democrat since 1937, and has been proud to serve as a Democratic committeeman in my own ward, the 10th ward of Nanticoke. Upon his retirement, Leonard took an active role in local government serving as a Nanticoke City Councilman in charge of accounts and finance.

Leonard is an active member of the American Legion Post 350 of Nanticoke and a member and past president of Tatra of Luzerne County.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Nancy and I have been neighbors of Leonard Locke since 1979, During the many years that I have known Leonard, I have always enjoyed walking in my backyard and sharing his wonderful friendship and cheerful salute, ''Hi neighbor!'' My wife and I are extremely pleased to the have the opportunity to wish Leonard Locke a happy and healthy 80th birthday.

TRIBUTE TO AUGUST G. ERDMANN, CITY OF MILWAUKEE FIRE CHIEF

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1996

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in tribute to August G. Erdmann, fire chief, city of Milwaukee, who will soon retire after serving the Department for 32 years, the last seven as chief.

Chief Erdmann, a life-long resident of Milwaukee, graduated from Custer High School and earned an associate degree in fire science from the Milwaukee Area Technical College.

Throughout this distinguished career, Chief Erdmann has served on the board of directors of the American Red Cross and the Foundation for the Milwaukee Fire Education Center Survive Alive House, the latter which strives to educate the public, especially our youth, about fire safety. His leadership on the Emergency Planning Committee and the State of Wisconsin Hazardous Materials Regional Response Team is to be commended. Chief Erdmann also served as the chairperson of the Combined Giving Campaign, soliciting contributions to local charities, and has provided direction and leadership to make financial resources available for the Fallen Fire Fighter Memorial.

Chief Erdmann's retirement, as you can certainly see by his involvement in many projects, will undoubtedly leave a void at the Milwaukee Fire Department and in our community as a whole. However, his retirement will also now allow him to spend well-deserved time with his wife, Nancy, their children, and grandchildren.

Best wishes, August, and on behalf of the citizens of Milwaukee, whom you have protected and served so diligently over your long career, thanks for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL MALCOLM O'NEILL

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1996

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the military will lose one of its most stellar leaders. After 24 years of outstanding service to the Nation, Gen. Malcolm O'Neill will be retiring. While we wish General O'Neill and his family the best, we will personally regret his retirement and sorely miss his leadership.

It was only 2 years ago that I came to personally know and closely work with General O'Neill. As Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization [BMDO], General O'Neill was one of the first Department officials to meet with me after I took the helm as chairman of the House Research and Development Subcommittee.

As the administration's spokesperson on missile defense matters, General O'Neill was not in a position to support all of the missile defense initiatives supported by the Republican majority—but that never deterred him from remaining accessible, providing us with the facts and most important, from sharing his candid thoughts on proposals from both sides of the aisle. His technical expertise and impartiality are unparalleled. I very quickly came to rely on his judgment, and routinely sought his input on program and policy issues.

While there are major differences remaining between the administration and Congress on missile defense, it is a real tribute to General O'Neill that we were able to reach the level of consensus that we did on this issue. We are no longer talking about if we should have missile defenses, but when we will have missile defenses. We are no longer arguing whether it is prudent to defend against missile threats, but whether we should prioritize theater defenses at the expense of national defense. We are no longer arguing whether it is feasible to defend against incoming missiles, but what option we should pursue.

I have developed a close working relationship with General O'Neill, and perhaps more than any Member of Congress, I will regret his retirement from military service. He has served with integrity, dedication, valor and distinction as an officer in the U.S. Army. Although he has served in numerous and varied posts in his career, his extraordinary performance in one of the toughest department posts shows his true mettle. In fact, I thought so highly of Mal that I drafted a letter—signed by many House Members, including the leadership, urging the Department to discourage his retirement and to retain him as Director of BMDO.