

Temple in Amritsar, whose sanctity has become a main contention in the struggle between Sikhs and the Indian Government. According to the New York Times, "Sikh religious leaders held an emergency meeting and denounced the move, vowing to prevent any further intrusion into the complex. They charged that 200 innocent pilgrims and temple employees had been seized and that furniture and records had been ransacked. The last time police entered the temple was May, when security forces routed 200 militants who had been sitting in for months". The worst of these plunders occurred in 1984 when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi sent the army into the Golden Temple, resulting in the death of allegedly 20,000 people.

The Washington Post on December 29, 1986, reported "Much of the Punjab already is governed under measures that resemble martial law: troops and police can search and shoot at will, the Army can be called in at any time. 'this is a democracy but how long can it stay a democracy if it constantly resorts to nondemocratic practices?' one observer remarked after a recent trip to the Punjab."

On January 16, 1987, it was reported in the Washington Post that the "Indian security forces conducted a highly realistic mock hijacking of an airliner today that fooled many people into thinking it was a genuine terrorist action by Sikh militants. The exercise ended peacefully at an airport in west central India, but not before spreading alarm throughout the country." The article continued "There, according to various reports, the purported hijackers issued a number of demands in the name of a Sikh extremist group." The Toronto Globe and Mail on November 21, 1985, suspected the hand of Indian intelligence, or people directly under their control, was responsible for the bombing of an Air India 747 in which 329 innocent lives were lost. The Sikhs were again blamed, although no one has been arrested. Both incidents were followed by series of reprisals from the Indian Government against the Sikhs. These accusations serve only to heighten tensions and increase distrust between the Hindu and Sikh populations.

The vast majority of Sikhs are hard working and peace loving people. They do not advocate violence in resolving disputes with the Government. A close study of Sikh history indicates that the Sikhs have not submitted to oppression in the past, they are not submitting to it now, and they will not submit in the future. I believe the Indian Government should press for peaceful solutions to the problems in the Punjab. To repress the entire Sikh population in retaliation for the violent acts of a few will only increase the number of militant Sikhs.

NUCLEAR TEST

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1987

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United States conducted its first nuclear test of 1987. In many ways, this test, code named "Hazebrook," is an explosion which will be heard "round the world."

The Soviets had warned that the first United States nuclear test of 1987 would result in an

end to the Soviet unilateral testing moratorium, which had lasted 18 months. Thus this latest test will undoubtedly unleash a new round of testing in the Soviet Union, allowing the nuclear monster to breed new and more dangerous weapons.

Many of us had written letters to the administration, imploring it to postpone this test and prove to this Congress and to governments around the world that this administration is, indeed, interested in arms control.

By conducting this nuclear test the administration has slammed the door on meaningful negotiations for a verifiable, mutual nuclear test ban, which I might point out every other administration since Eisenhower has sought to negotiate. By slamming this door, the administration has sent a clear message to Congress: It is up to us to negotiate for the country. I stand prepared to take up where we left off last year—to eliminate funds for nuclear testing if the U.S.S.R. will also halt nuclear weapon tests. I feel certain that a majority of my colleagues will join me.

PROF. JAMES M. BUCHANAN

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1987

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare privilege for me to welcome to the U.S. Congress a distinguished economist and the 1986 Nobel Laureate for Economics, Prof. James M. Buchanan. Tomorrow evening Prof. Buchanan will be the guest of honor at a reception here in the Capitol hosted by the Tennessee congressional delegation.

A native Tennessean, Professor Buchanan presently serves as general director and university distinguished professor at the Center for Study of Public Choice at George Mason University. As Americans, we all share a sense of pride in another Nobel laureate from our great Nation. Tennesseans are especially proud of the remarkable accomplishments of Dr. Buchanan whose family's roots run deep in the history of our great State. Professor Buchanan is the grandson of Tennessee's only Populist Governor, John P. Buchanan, attended Rutherford County public schools, received his bachelors degree from Middle Tennessee State University and his masters degree from the University of Tennessee. He is truly a product of the Volunteer State.

Through his work, Dr. Buchanan has made us think. He has been a pioneer in expanding the scope of economic theory through the application of traditional economics to political decisionmaking and public administration. No matter where one stands on the political spectrum, Dr. Buchanan's development of the public choice theory must be acknowledged as a promising step forward toward a better understanding of how we, as individuals and as a society, make choices. In particular, the application of public choice theory provides us with a clearer understanding of the causes of our mounting Federal debt. All of us in the Congress can learn from Professor Buchanan's profound insights.

Professor Buchanan has undoubtedly shed light on our own political economy by making the principles of traditional economic theory a part of everyday public policy decisions. I am

confident that James M. Buchanan's contributions will continue to help us make wise decisions in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have Professor Buchanan, a Nobel laureate and MTSU's most distinguished alumnus, join us this evening.

TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL FORUM FOR BLACK PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1987

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the National Forum For Black Public Administrators, who will be holding their annual conference in Philadelphia on April 12-15, 1987.

The National Forum For Black Public Administrators is a group worthy of our notice. It is a national association of black public administrative leadership that includes city and county managers, chief administrative officers, agency directors, corporation executives, other professionals, deans and students of public administration and applied disciplines and members of other supporting professions.

The National Forum For Black Public Administrators serves as a strong network which coordinates a flow of information; as a magnet to address the special problems of its constituency, provides regional and national forums to focus on timely issues and concerns, to promote, strengthen and expand the roles of minorities in public administration and to work closely with other public interest groups to develop effective connections between providers and recipients of government services and programs.

The NFBPA also provides a national clearinghouse of materials and information, workshops, forums and seminars for members, a leadership training program and a fellowship/internship program for graduate students of public administration or allied fields.

I am very pleased that the National Forum For Black Public Administrators has chosen to meet in Philadelphia for its annual conference and I ask this body to join me in commending this organization for the services they provide their members and the community at large.

HATE CRIME STATISTICS ACT

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1987

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by Congressmen CONYERS, GLICKMAN, and MINETA in introducing the Hate Crime Statistics Act, a bill to require the collection and publication of statistics on crimes of hate. This bill is identical to legislation that passed the House by voice vote on July 22, 1985.

Each year, hundreds of acts of violence and intimidation are committed against groups and individuals in every region of the country because of their race, religion, or ethnic background. Unfortunately, today it is impossible to measure the extent of this problem. We do

not know the number, location, or types of crimes that are motivated by racial, religious, or ethnic hatred. We suspect that such crime is on the rise, but without more specific information, we cannot take the positive steps we must take to end such violence.

The Hate Crime Statistics Act will be a significant step in this direction. The bill directs the Attorney General to collect and publish data about crimes motivated by racial, religious, or ethnic hatred. Making statistics on crime of hate available to State and local authorities, as well as to the public, will go a long way to make possible concerted community actions against hate crimes.

Crimes motivated by sheer hatred are personal tragedies for the victims, for the community in which they happen, and for our society at large. Incidents like these should never occur. But before we can act to prevent them, there is so much more we need to know. We need to know whether these events are isolated incidents or evidence of a more pervasive problem. We need to measure actual extent of these crimes. We need to know if there are patterns in such crimes.

Without such data, law enforcement officials are handicapped in their efforts to adequately measure trends, develop enforcement strategies, and assign manpower to the areas of greatest need.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is one way to demonstrate our commitment to eradicating these crimes of hate. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting early passage of this legislation.

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE FROM 1915-1923

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1987

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to lend my support as an original cosponsor of the resolution which would designate April 24, 1987, as "National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide From 1915-1923."

For the last several years, many of my colleagues and I have supported the Armenian genocide resolution in an effort to officially commemorate Armenian Martyrs Day and to honor the 1.5 million people of Armenian descent who were killed from 1915-23 by the Ottoman Turkish Empire. The fact that this tragedy occurred over 70 years ago does not obligate us to forget this incident and to set it aside. Rather, I believe that we need to be reminded of this tragedy—to demonstrate the resilience and strength of the Armenian people and to prevent this type of tragedy from occurring once again.

The Armenians are a proud people who have contributed significantly to this Nation and to their communities. We should not deny them the opportunity to recognize and observe Armenian Martyrs Day, not only for their sake, but for humanity's.

LEGISLATION AMENDING THE STATE-FEDERAL CONSULTATION PROVISIONS OF OCSLAA

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1987

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the State-Federal consultation provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act amendments [OCSLAA]. This legislation is identical to an amendment which was originally contained in the fiscal year 1986 budget reconciliation bill (H.R. 3500) which was later deleted because of objections by the Senate.

This legislation would clarify and strengthen the States consultative role in offshore leasing and development decisions and is of long-term importance to the orderly development of energy resources from our Nation's Outer Continental Shelf [OCS]. Section 19 of the OCSLAA was designed to give States "a leading role in OCS decisions." However, the section currently gives the Secretary of the Interior too much discretion to discount the recommendations of the States. This disregard of the States interests and unwillingness to conclude effective negotiations has increased pressure for congressionally imposed moratoria and has inspired extensive litigation.

This bill would rectify this situation by compelling the Secretary of Interior to give greater weight to State recommendations. The Secretary would also be required, when determining the national interest, to equally weight the need for oil and gas exploration, development and production and the need to protect other living and nonliving resources and uses of the coastal zone. Even with these changes, substantial discretion would rest with the Secretary.

Finally, this legislation would substantially reduce the controversy surrounding the Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program by providing an impetus for the early settlement of disputes at the lease sale stage between the States and the Federal Government. The result would be a more predictable process which would benefit all parties.

This legislation would add no new step to the OCS leasing process and would achieve the original intent of Congress by providing effective State-Federal consultation on the use of the OCS. The legislation would also lead to more effective negotiations between the States and the Department of Interior which would reduce the need for congressional intervention in the form of continuing moratoria.

THE CALIFORNIA OCEAN SANCTUARY ACT

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1987

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Congresswoman BARBARA BOXER in announcing the introduction of sweeping new legislation to protect California's coastline and Outer Continental Shelf from further degradation. We were dismayed

yesterday to receive yet another unacceptable draft of the 5-year plan for offshore oil leasing from Secretary of the Interior Donald Hodel. In response to this and in an effort to forever protect one of California's greatest natural resources, our bill creates a 200 mile wide ocean sanctuary which would be protected from any further oil, gas or mineral exploration or extraction. In addition, the sanctuary would be protected from ocean incineration and dumping.

Continued exploration and drilling for offshore oil and gas presents one of the most significant environmental risks facing Californians today. These activities permanently disrupt the ecosystems on the ocean floor, contribute to air pollution which is already above Federal standards in areas such as Los Angeles, and create the added risk of new oil spills.

California's coastline is vital to tourism and recreation, industries which are so important to California's economy. The beaches located in my district are the most heavily used recreational beaches in the country. Our measure would protect the intrinsic quality of California's coast as well as the viewshed.

Commercial fishing is threatened by the administration's attempt to unbridle oil and gas lease sales and by the pollution of offshore dumping. Both commercial and recreational fishing would prosper under this new legislation.

The oil and gas industry has yet to provide any conclusive rationale for widespread exploration and drilling. Exploration off the coast of California in many cases is cost prohibitive, especially in today's world market where oil prices have fallen significantly. And there is evidence which suggests the potential recoverable reserves within the Outer Continental Shelf would do little to protect the United States in the event of an oil shortage. Despite this, California continues to make its contribution to U.S. nonrenewable energy reserves, serving as the second largest domestic producer of offshore oil today.

The administration has demonstrated time and again its commitment to the oil and gas industry, rather than to our national security and our energy needs of the future. In 1986, the administration has proposed a 53-percent reduction in the filling of the strategic petroleum reserve, a 60-percent reduction in the energy conservation research program and a 40-percent reduction in funding for alternative energy sources. And yesterday Donald Hodel released a draft of the 5-year plan which ignores all bipartisan concerns about leasing. There has been a longstanding bipartisan effort to reach a reasonable compromise with the administration and the oil industry. I have been involved in goodfaith negotiations for several years and have seen little sincere interest on the administration's part to reach a fair resolution.

As a result Mrs. BOXER and I today offer this measure as a new approach to send a clear message to the White House that we are serious about protecting California's coastline. While this is a comprehensive measure, we are very serious about continuing the dialog with the administration to reach an agreement. We believe this bill clearly establishes the parameter of our efforts and can be a vehicle for facilitating new dialog.