

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.

What happened was that Ukrainian police, and I am quoting from an international news report, launched an early morning strike on opponents of President Leonid Kuchma, swiftly pulling down a makeshift tent camp which had become a focus of protests against that country's leader.

I might add, having just returned from that country, those demonstrators were peaceful; they were living in freezing temperatures, in tents; and they have a right to assemble; they have a right to speech; they have a right to express their opinion.

The news report goes on, as police tore down the tents, demonstrators tried to wrest back meager belongings which were dumped into lorries. Those resisting were manhandled into the back of unmarked gray trucks. Several protesters waving the blue and yellow Ukrainian national flag threw themselves desperately in front of the vehicles before being dragged away. Four hundred police arrested 100 peaceful demonstrators. The demonstrators, who have braved months of freezing temperatures and alleged harassment in one of the most potent symbols of resistance against that country's President, vowed not to give up.

Two hundred people, bystanders, watched as officers rapidly dismantled the camp. They were shouting, shame on the police. Most seemed stunned by the action against the peaceful tent dwellers.

I have some pictures here from the international press showing the arrest of peaceful demonstrators.

Now, politically I may not agree with some of those demonstrators in terms of their ideology. Some may be of the far right or the far left. It really does not matter. They have a right to assemble. The government of Ukraine is saying, well, the courts of Ukraine ordered them to be dismantled because they were assembled in a part of the city where they did not have a permit. Having been there, I can say they were large sidewalks. They were not bothering anybody. It was in a median strip.

The question is, why would that government choose to forcibly remove these demonstrators at this time?

Our delegation, having just returned from Ukraine, spent over 2 hours with the President of that country offering the President the help of the West and getting at the bottom of what was causing the demonstrators to assemble, and that is the beheading of a journalist in that country and the possible implication of the President of that nation in that terrible act.

We offered the President advice, saying that transparency in investigation, objectivity in investigation, could raise the confidence level of his own people and, in fact, all freedom-loving peoples. We received his assurance that freedom of assembly would not be marred, that freedom of speech would be able to continue, that freedom of press would be allowed.

We said we would come back here to Washington and offer a resolution in which we would support those principles being maintained in that country as it emerges into a more democratic arrangement, and yet today we hear about this awful act in that country.

Now, as we develop this resolution, as Members of this body, we are going to find a stronger resolution because we believe that regardless of an individual's views, one cannot compromise freedom of assembly; one cannot compromise freedom of speech; one cannot compromise freedom of press.

I would urge in the strongest possible terms the government of that nation to find a central place in which these demonstrators might be allowed to express their opinions. They were not even talking. They were merely staying in tents in cold weather.

The government says, well, there were no toilets in the area. Let me say, respectfully, in many places there are no toilets in that country.

It is important that freedom be allowed to emerge. The West has to be a strong voice for freedom of assembly, the very principles that allow a democratic nation to emerge. Again, we would offer to the President of Ukraine all of the institutions that this country has to offer, with our friends in the OSCE, the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe; to have a thorough and impartial investigation; to raise the confidence level of citizens of Ukraine and citizens of the free world everywhere that investigations are being pursued thoroughly, completely, in a fair-minded and open manner.

To do this, to take this action, is a terrible, terrible sign to the West, and we ask that government to please provide an area for people to freely demonstrate.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 1, 2001]

UKRAINIAN POLICE TEAR DOWN ANTI-KUCHMA TENT CAMP

KIEV.—Ukrainian police launched an early morning strike on opponents of President Leonid Kuchma on Thursday, swiftly pulling down a makeshift tent camp which has become a focus of protests against the country's leader.

To cries of "Shame, shame" and "Kuchma out!" from bystanders, some 400 policemen took about an hour to surround and evict around 100 occupants from some 50 tents on Kiev's elegant Kreshchatyk street.

The camp was set up in December by protesters demanding that Kuchma investigate the mysterious death of a journalist, which has triggered a huge scandal in Ukraine.

The United States and European Union have expressed concern over the case and Kuchma's office published a letter from George W. Bush, during the Ukrainian leader to pursue reform and respect the rights of individuals.

As police tore down the tents, demonstrators tried to wrest back meager belongings, which were dumped into lorries. Those resisting were manhandled into the back of unmarked gray trucks.

Several protesters waving the blue and yellow Ukrainian national flag threw themselves desperately in front of the vehicles before being dragged away.

The demonstrators, who have braved months of freezing temperatures and alleged harassment in one of the most potent symbols of resistance against Kuchma, vowed not to give up.

"We'll put them back up. I can't say right now how quickly, but we'll be back," said a visibly-shaken Yuri Lutsenko, one of the leaders of the Ukraine Without Kuchma movement.

Around 200 people watched as officers rapidly dismantled the camp, several shouting "Shame on the police." Most seemed stunned by the action against the peaceful tent-dwellers.

Lutsenko, whose movement includes opposition parties, rights groups and ordinary citizens, said 40 protesters were arrested. Police spokesman Olexander Zarubytsky said 15 people had been charged with preventing officials from carrying out their duties.

The scandal was sparked when journalist Georgiy Gongadze, who was critical of Kuchma's rule, went missing. It intensified when a headless corpse was found outside Kiev in November.

CASE OF THE HEADLESS CORPSE

Kuchma's involvement was alleged when opposition politicians published tapes in which a voice similar to his was heard giving orders to "deal with" the reporter.

Austrian experts said on Wednesday that they could not verify that the voice was Kuchma's.

But the International Press Institute, a press freedom group, said that after nearly two months of deliberation it seemed hard to believe that the hundreds of hours of explosive-strewn recordings had been faked.

Kuchma denies all involvement but this did not prevent the U.S. and European statements of concern, as well as those from international human rights groups.

The Ukrainian president's office said the letter from Bush urged Kuchma to pursue reform and respect the rights of individuals. It also said the United States was ready to help Ukraine get through its current difficulties.

The tent dwellers, whose eviction had been ordered by a Kiev court, accused police of violating their freedom.

"You should have more respect for the constitution," one shouted as he was carried off by around 20 police.

"It is unbelievable, I am an invalid and he is pushing me around," said Vitaly Yushevich, who was pulled out of his tent by a burly police officer and bundled out of the camp.

Police said the protesters' belongings would be returned.

"We are carrying out the court's orders. . . . All the tents' occupiers will be able to claim their property back later," said a police officer at the scene.

GOVERNMENT'S DEMAND AND APPETITE FOR MONEY CAN NEVER BE SATISFIED

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we see on an almost daily basis here in the Congress that government's demand or appetite for money can never be satisfied. I believe if we gave a department or agency twice what they were asking for, they might be happy for a short time but they would soon be back crying about a shortfall in funding. However, the message we need desperately to get out is that everyone is better off