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 protestors 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 word 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 expletive-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

the more money that can be left in the private sector. More jobs are created and prices are lower the more money that is left in the private sector.

The most economical, most efficient way to spend money, the biggest bang for the buck so to speak, is to leave more money in private hands. This is because even though there is waste and inefficiency in the private sector, it pales in comparison to the waste and inefficiency within government, especially the Federal Government.

This has been proven all over the world throughout history. The countries with the best economies and the greatest progress have always been and continue to be the Nations with the lowest percentage of their total national income going to the government. The opposite is also true. The countries with populations closest to starvation or the lowest standard of living have always been countries where the government has taken most of the money, such as Cuba, several African nations, the former Soviet Union and others.

Also, big government produces a very small, elite class at the top and a huge starvation or under class. Probably the thing big government is best at is wiping out the middle class and creating huge differences between the rich and the poor. A small government such as in the U.S. prior to the mid-1960s produces a huge middle class. This is just part of why it is so important to pass President Bush's tax cut. The people are paying in a huge tax surplus. They not only deserve some of it back, but everyone will be better off and our economy will be stronger in the long run if we can get more money back into the private sector.

I realize that some big corporations are mad at the President now because his plan has no corporate tax breaks but is going entirely for individuals. However, the average person today is spending almost 40 percent of his or her income in taxes of all types, Federal, State and local; gas taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, income taxes, excise taxes, Social Security taxes. The GAO reports that 80 percent of the people now pay more in Social Security taxes than in income taxes. Also, most estimates are that people pay another 10 percent in regulatory costs, things that government makes businesses do that are passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

This means that even here in the United States almost half of the average family's income is going to support government or pay the costs of things ordered by the government. This is not only enough, it is too much, and this is why President Bush and millions of others feel that it is time we started giving some of this tax surplus back to the people who paid it.

Mr. Speaker, also just like government's appetite for money can never be satisfied, one can never satisfy government's appetite for land. One of the most important things we need to do to ensure future prosperity is to stop government at all levels from taking over more private property.

□ 1545

The Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman has said, ''You cannot have a free society without private property.'' Over the years when government has taken private property, it has most often taken it from lower- and middle-income people and small farmers.

Today, Federal, State, and local governments and quasi-governmental units and agencies now own about half the land in this Nation. The most disturbing thing is the rapid rate as which this taking has increased in the last 40 years.

Environmentalists who have supported most of this taking should realize that the worst polluters in the world have been the socialist nations, because their economies do not generate enough income to do good things for the environment, and that private property is almost always better cared for than public property, and at much lower cost.

There is a very dangerous plan, Mr. Speaker, being pushed by some liberal elitists and wealthy environmental extremists called the Wildlands Project. This project envisions taking 50 percent of the land now in private hands into wilderness. If people do not think their property would ever be taken, they should just look around at all the land around them that government has already taken.

We do not need more industrial parks, for example, where land is taken from small farmers or lower- or middle-income people and then given later to big multinational corporations, or land is taken from poor people and used for some project that enhances its value and then sold for big prices to rich people later on.

We had a policy of no net loss of wetlands. What we need now is a policy of no net loss of private property, requiring government to sell off some of its land to private owners for every new acre they take from lower- and middle-income people.

Private property, Mr. Speaker, is a very important part, a basic part of the freedom we have always treasured so highly in this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE 107TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules for the 107th Congress for the Committee on Education and the Workforce for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE FOR THE 107TH CONGRESS

RULE 1. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS: VICE-CHAIRMAN

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the second Wednesday of each month at 9:30 a.m., while the House is in session. When the Chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, he will give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect; and no committee meeting shall be held on that day.

(b) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the staff director of the committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the staff director of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) All legislative meetings of the committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage. No business meeting of the committee, other than regularly scheduled meetings, may be held without each member being given reasonable notice. Such meeting shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the vice-chairman, or the Chairman's designee.

(e) The Chairman of the committee or of a subcommittee, as appropriate, shall preside at meetings or hearings, or, in the absence of the Chairman, the vice-chairman, or the Chairman's designee shall preside.

RULE 2. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) Subject to clauses (b) and (c), committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The questioning of witnesses in both