

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate the Most Reverend Edward M. Egan, Archbishop of New York, upon his elevation to the dignity of Cardinal. It is most fitting that Cardinal Egan is the successor of the late John Cardinal O'Connor. New York's new Cardinal is well aware of the legacy left by his predecessor and he is well prepared to continue and strengthen that legacy. He too is dedicated to the dignity of all peoples and to caring for those who are most scorned or ignored by society.

Cardinal Egan has the wonderful ability to nurture and develop a sense of social justice among his fellow Catholics. As was the case with Cardinal O'Connor, he understands and deeply respects the values inherent in a multicultural and multireligious community. He has a deep and abiding respect for and dedication to education.

As he assumes his leadership role in the great Archdiocese of New York, it is right for us to wish him success in making this great community a more human, more caring and more believing community of brothers and sisters.

I ask my colleagues to please join me and all the members of the Archdiocese of New York in congratulating the Most Reverend Edward M. Egan upon his elevation to the dignity of Cardinal.

REGARDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETROCESSION ACT

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 810 to retrocede the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland, minus the Federal portion of the city. The city has the bumper slogan of "taxation without representation." This bill will provide taxation with representation for the residents of D.C. I think that this would be a great move forward for the people of this community. It would give them access to all the services of the State of Maryland and also an opportunity to elect a Congressperson, to vote on two United States Senators and to vote on members of the State legislature in Maryland.

The retrocession would create the fourth largest regional market in the United States between Baltimore and Washington. Does it work? In Canada there is a prime example of how this proposal could and would work. Its capital, Ottawa, lies in the province of Ontario and sends representatives to the provincial parliament in Ontario as well as the federal parliament as part of the Ontario delegation. It works very well for our neighbor Canada and I think it would work very well for the United States. Most importantly, it would give the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote, to have taxation with representation.

Mr. Speaker, two hundred years have passed since District of Columbia residents lost their right to vote. Despite the ratification of the 23rd Amendment in 1961, which returned their right to vote for President, District residents still lack voting representation on the floor of Congress. To increase national awareness of this situation, the District recently changed the slogan on its automobile license plates to read "Taxation Without Representation."

Today, I am once again introducing a bill that I strongly believe is the best solution to this problem, especially given the failure of other alternatives. This legislation would return the District of Columbia, barring a small federal enclave, to the State of Maryland.

The District of Columbia was originally comprised of territory ceded by the states of Virginia and Maryland. The Virginia portion was retroceded back to that state in 1846. Under this bill, the remaining territory, excluding a small enclave encompassing the White House, Congress, the Supreme Court and most executive agencies, would be returned to Maryland.

Retrocession would be mutually beneficial for both the District and the State of Maryland. It would finally give District residents a voting U.S. Representative as well as two U.S. Senators. In addition, they would have further representation on the state level in Maryland. Beyond these political gains, District residents would stand to benefit from Maryland's larger and more established state infrastructure of facilities, services and assistance programs.

Maryland stands to gain as well. It most certainly would receive an additional seat in the House of Representatives, thus increasing its influence in Congress. Economically, Maryland would gain an area that boasts the nation's 2nd highest per capita income. Retrocession would create the 4th largest regional market in the country between Baltimore and Washington.

Canada offers a prime example of how this proposal could and would work. Its capital, Ottawa, lies in the province of Ontario and sends representatives to the provincial parliament in Toronto as well as the federal parliament as part of the Ontario delegation.

We need to come up with a practical and realistic solution to restore the full democratic rights of District residents. Efforts to give the District delegate full voting rights have not succeeded. I believe this legislation is the only reasonable option left to end Taxation Without Representation in the nation's capital.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETROCESSION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), in in-

roducing the District of Columbia Retrocession Act of 2001, H.R. 810. This legislation, long championed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), would provide an immediate, practical solution to a serious problem, the lack of full voting rights for citizens of the District of Columbia.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) first introduced this legislation in the 101st Congress and has renewed it in each succeeding Congress in an effort to return the District of Columbia, with the exception of a small Federal enclave, to the State of Maryland. The goal, which I strongly support, is to restore the basic rights of representative democracy to District of Columbia residents.

Residents of the District lost their voting rights in 1800 when Congress took control of areas ceded by the States of Maryland and Virginia to form the new Federal District as a permanent home for our national government. In 1961, a partial restoration of voting rights was provided by the 23rd Amendment to the Constitution. That amendment gave District of Columbia residents the right to vote for President but not for voting Members of Congress, either Representatives or Senators.

Since that time, there have been endless and fruitless talks about either statehood for the District or some other means to provide full and permanent representation in the House and with the Senate.

The legislation we are offering today would cut through this logjam by retrocession of a part of the current District as a Federal enclave containing the White House, Congress, the Supreme Court and most of the executive agencies.

The rest of the current District would be returned to the State of Maryland, just as the portion of the District west of the Potomac was returned to Virginia in 1846. By making this statutory change, we can restore full voting rights to every resident of the District of Columbia. Every resident would run and vote at least for one United States Representative and two United States Senators.

In addition, they would have the representation at the State level in Maryland. In addition, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) rightly points out that the D.C. residents would gain other benefits by becoming a part of Maryland's established economic and educational infrastructure and judicial system. The District would be able to reduce and streamline its bureaucracy to eliminate duplicating functions that the State of Maryland already performs for its citizens. At the same time, Maryland would gain economically and politically from retrocession.

District residents pay at least \$1.6 billion in personal and property taxes and the Baltimore-Washington area would become the fourth largest regional market in the country.

In addition, Maryland would gain at least one seat in the House of Representatives, extending its influence in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that other benefits come from this legislation. Under the current arrangement, Congress exercises extensive oversight and even direction of District of Columbia governmental activities. Due to its unique status, the District has never attained the full powers and rights of a city and it has never been covered by the authority we accord to every State. The ambiguous status given to the District, under current arrangements, invites both internal confusion and uncertainty and external interference from Congress. We need to end the unnecessary difficulties that this creates by giving the District the full powers of a city within the full rights of a State. This legislation would achieve that goal and it could do so immediately.

It does not require passage and ratification of a constitutional amendment or the surmounting of any other impossibly high barrier to a solution. This is a sound and sensible approach that would benefit all concerned. I urge my colleagues to support it.

When my great grandfather came from Ireland to the District of Columbia, he could not vote then, but in the 1870s the District was permitted to vote, and for about 3 years he marched down there with top hat and tails because he was so proud to have the franchise. We do not have that franchise and we need to do it for the people that live within the District of Columbia, and we need to return that portion that was given from Maryland back to Maryland.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN SAYS ABUSES GETTING WORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, within the last week, a report investigating the state of human rights in Pakistan was released showing that no significant improvements have been made to restore a democratic government in that country. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence that seems to suggest that General Musharraf will put off national elections perhaps until January 2003, the deadline required by the nation's Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to the House floor numerous times over the last couple of years to voice my strong opposition to a 1999 coup that ended democratic rule in Pakistan. In October 1999, Pakistan Army Chief Musharraf led a coup against civilian Prime Minister Sharif and then proclaimed himself the nation's chief executive. Musharraf also suspended Pakistan's constitution as well as its representative bodies, including the

National Assembly and the Senate. Musharraf says he will abide by the Supreme Court's deadline to return the nation to democratic rule, but I do not believe that January 2003 is soon enough.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress should voice its opposition to the Pakistani coup. We should go on record and collectively state that we will not tolerate the overthrow of an elected government. I cosponsored a resolution back in 1999 with former Congressman Sam Gejdenson of Connecticut that would accomplish this goal. The resolution was approved by the Committee on International Relations less than a month after it was introduced and less than a month after the coup. Unfortunately, after passing in committee the legislation was never seen again and never came to the floor of the House for a final vote.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed that the 106th Congress never went on record in opposition to the coup in Pakistan, and I would still like this Congress to do so in light of these latest reports. The ability of the military to seize power away from an elected government should not be tolerated.

The human rights report, released this week by the State Department, which included some documentation collected by the independent group, the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, said that, quote, citizens continued to be denied the right to choose or change their government peacefully.

The report also included disturbing news that the Musharraf regime has taken, quote, steps to control the judiciary and to remove itself from judicial oversight. This so-called control over the judiciary could explain the reason why the nation's Supreme Court gave Musharraf 2 years to rule.

Another concern, Mr. Speaker, was that human rights abuses, which have been a problem in Pakistan for years, have not improved, even though goals were set at a conference on human rights at the beginning of last year. I should point out that Musharraf was very critical of human rights abuses that occurred under Sharif's watch, but after more than a year in office, Musharraf has not made any significant changes.

Mr. Speaker, other major human rights violations are also taking place across the border by General Musharraf and his government in India's state of Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan's role in sowing death and destruction has been going on for years, but received world attention in 1999 when Pakistani military leaders, many of whom were involved in that year's coup d'etat, precipitated a major crisis by unleashing an attack against Indian positions in the area of Kargil, along the Line of Control that separates Indian and Pakistani controlled areas of Kashmir. Pakistan's actions were condemned by the United States and the international community, and Pakistan was forced to essentially withdraw. Over

the past 2 years, the attacks by Pakistani forces on Indian army positions have continued, causing casualties on both sides and threatening the stability of the entire South Asia region.

Another State Department report, released last year and investigating terrorism around the world, notes that "Kashmiri extremist groups continued to operate in Pakistan, raising funds and recruiting new cadre." It blames these groups for numerous terrorist attacks against civilian targets in India's state of Jammu and Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned that Pakistan is becoming a breeding ground for terrorists and the training of terrorist activities. That same State Department report looking at terrorist activities around the world found that the locus of terrorism directed against the United States continued to shift from the Middle East to South Asia.

Mr. Speaker, each of these reports sheds light on what is really going on in Pakistan. It is important that we not only be aware of these situations but also be willing, both the new Congress and the new administration, to call upon the current government in Pakistan to change the situation.

□ 1530

PERMISSION TO MOVE REMARKS

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my 5 minutes follow the 1-minute speech of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), since we are talking on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROSS. addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WHITFIELD. addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, FREEDOM OF PRESS CANNOT BE COMPROMISED IN UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to report to my colleagues and to our country indeed on an extremely troubling event that occurred early this morning in the nation of Ukraine, the most important strategic nation in Central Europe today.