

pass if it had been considered on its own. Being able to cut that kind of unnecessary spending out of a bill is essential to be prudent in how we spend taxpayer money, to get the Federal budget under control, and to restore public faith in Congress. The line-item veto was supposed to be a way to deal with that. But while the diagnosis was right, the proposed remedy went too far—further than the Constitution permits. That's why it's been struck down in court.

Our bill is a better prescription—one that will work and that will pass constitutional muster.

Under our bill, whenever the President wants to cut a particular spending item in an appropriations bill, he would be able to require Congress to reconsider and vote separately on rescinding that item, under tight deadlines and without amendment.

So, like the line-item veto act, our bill would let the President throw a bright spotlight onto spending items and have Congress vote on them separately, up or down, without changes and in full public view. Since the wasteful spending we're trying to get at is the kind of project that would never pass on its own, this process will be a completely reliable and effective way to block that kind of waste of taxpayer money.

Our legislation is patterned after, but stronger than, the enhanced-rescission authority passed by the House in 1993. Unlike the 1993 bill, our approach does not let the Appropriations Committee come up with its alternative way to rescind the same amount of money that would be cut by the President's proposed rescission. Our legislation requires that the actual rescission proposed by the President—that one, without any amendment, and with no alternative to it—be voted on by the Congress.

Unlike the line-item veto, our bill is constitutionally sound. It does not attempt to give to the President the basic law-making authority that the Constitution vests solely in the Congress.

Constitutionally, the line-item veto act could not be effective—it wasn't real. This bill would give the President authority that could be used effectively—it is real.

The administration has said it will ask the Supreme Court to reverse Judge Jackson's decision striking down the line-item veto. I do not believe appeal will be successful. Judge Jackson's unusually emphatic opinion makes it clear that he was completely convinced that the line-item veto is profoundly unconstitutional. I'm confident the Supreme Court will agree.

We in the Congress ought to pass this new bill. That way, when the Supreme Court does sound the final death knell for the line-item veto act, we will have an effective, constitutionally valid alternative in place and ready for use. A majority of Congress wants a mechanism to cut out of appropriations bills that spending that could not withstand a separate up-or-down vote; the President wants that mechanism; a majority of the American people wants us to have that mechanism. This bill will give us that.

INDIA MUST STOP KILLING SIKHS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to wish the Sikh Nation a happy Vaisakhi Day. Vaisakhi Day is the birthday of the Sikh Nation, the anniversary of its founding by Guru Gobind Singh in 1699. The Sikhs have always been a tough, freedom-loving people, and I take this opportunity to salute them.

However, not everyone shares my enthusiasm for the Sikh Nation's love of freedom. From 1984 to 1992, according to the Punjab State Magistracy, which represents all the local judges in the state of Punjab, the Indian regime murdered more than 200,000 Sikhs. Since then, the Punjab Human Rights Organization reports that more than 50,000 have been murdered by the brutal Indian regime. That means that in excess of a quarter of a million freedom-loving Sikhs have been murdered since 1984 by "the world's largest democracy."

One recent case will illustrate the brutality of India's methods in occupied Khalistan. On March 15, a 26-year-old Sikh named Kashmir Singh, who was the publicity secretary of the Akali Dal—Amritsar—in the district of Hoshiarpur, was picked up in the middle of the night along with his father. The police threw them into a van. Somewhere down the road, Kashmir Singh's father was thrown from the van while it was still moving. Kashmir Singh was then tortured and murdered and his body was dumped at the Hoshiarpur district hospital at 4 in the morning for a post mortem.

The police falsely claimed that Kashmir Singh was killed in an encounter with the police. This claim is so ridiculous that even the pro-Government newspaper the Indian Express could not accept it. The Indian Express described the murder of Kashmir Singh as a cold-blooded killing.

Unfortunately, the murder of Kashmir Singh is not an isolated incident. It is part of a pattern of intimidation designed to put a fear psychosis in the minds of Sikhs both in Punjab, Khalistan and outside in order to scare them into dropping their demand for freedom. An ongoing incident which has been closely watched in this Congress is the case of Jaswant Singh Khalra, who was kidnaped by the police on September 6, 1995, after he published a report exposing the fact that over 25,000 young Sikh men have been abducted by the regime, tortured, and murdered, then their bodies have been declared unidentified and cremated. In many cases the family members have never been notified. The Punjab and Haryana High court described this policy as worse than a genocide.

Eighteen months after Mr. Khalra was kidnaped, Khalra's whereabouts remain unknown. The Khalra case and his findings are discussed in detail in a video released last year called "Disappearances in Punjab," produced by a Hindu human rights activist named Ram Narayan Kumar. Recently, Mr. Kumar was himself detained overnight at the Delhi airport when he attempted to fly to Austria to be with his wife. The regime even detained an American citizen, Balbir Singh Dhillon, for 9 months on trumped-up charges, apparently

because he advocates an independent Khalistan.

Mr. Speaker, these are not the tactics of a democracy. The oppression of the Sikhs, the Muslims of Kashmir, the Christians of Nagaland, the black "untouchables" known as Dalits—the aboriginal people of the subcontinent, the Assamese, Manipuris, and others continues at a feverish pace.

On October 7, 1987, the Sikhs declared their independence from India and named their independent country Khalistan. India has responded to the peaceful movement to liberate Khalistan by stepping up the repression.

This kind of repression is not acceptable in any country. It especially offends us when that country proclaims its commitment to Democratic values. In that light, it is appropriate for the United States to take measures to bring democracy to all the people of South Asia. We should publicly declare our support for an internationally supervised plebiscite on the question of independence for Khalistan, similar to the periodic votes we hold in Puerto Rico. The United States should also cut off all aid to India. These actions will begin to bring freedom to the subcontinent.

A SHOCKING TRAGEDY

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1997

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I am placing the Council of Khalistan's press release on a recent tragedy into the RECORD. Press reports have recently stated that in attempting to capture an alleged terrorist, Indian police officers killed two adults and a 3-year-old child. The death of a 3-year-old child must shock the conscience of the international community.

I call on the Indian Government to conduct a full and exhaustive investigation into this tragedy and to punish all those responsible. Justice delayed is, truly, justice denied. We must always remember, in the eloquent words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., that an injustice anywhere is an affront to justice everywhere. [From the Council of Khalistan, Dec. 17, 1996]

INDIAN REGIME MURDERS 3½-YEAR-OLD LABELS TODDLER "TERRORIST"

WASHINGTON, DC.—A story in the December 10 issue of *The Hitavada*, an Indian newspaper, reported that a 3½-year-old Sikh boy was murdered by the police, then the police claimed that he was a "terrorist" who was killed in an "encounter."

According to the story, the police murdered little Arvinder Singh, his father Jaswinder Singh, and the young boy's maternal uncle along the Grand Trunk Road to collect bounty money which was offered for the killing of militants. These Sikhs were not militants. The family has not been given the bodies because they were cremated. The police attached phony identities to the bodies of these victims using the names of known militants. Then they claimed bounty money for killing these militants. When the boy's grandfather brought a complaint against the police, Punjab and Haryana High Court Justice Iqbal Singh stated that a three-year-old boy could not be a "terrorist," according to the article. According to the *Hitavada* article, witnesses were coerced into supporting the police version of the incident by testifying that the bullets which killed these Sikhs did not come from the police weapons.