

would like to enter into the RECORD an editorial from today's New York Times that correctly challenges the Republicans in Congress for their failure to keep their promises on environmental protection.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROMISES TO KEEP

As part of their budget agreement with President Clinton last May, Republican leaders in Congress pledged to provide funds to protect several particularly vulnerable pieces of the American landscape from further degradation. They would give Mr. Clinton enough money to carry forward the largest environmental rescue operation ever undertaken—the restoration of Florida's Everglades. They would also approve generous funds for Federal land acquisition that would allow Mr. Clinton to purchase a potentially ruinous gold mining operation near Yellowstone National Park and to acquire California's Headwaters Redwood Grove from a private lumber company.

So far, Congress has not lived up to its end of the bargain. This puts a special obligation on senior Republicans like the Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, and Senator Pete Domenici, who helped negotiate the budget deal, to remind their colleagues that their party may suffer if they break good-faith commitments. It also means that the Administration cannot relax its vigil. Indeed, Mr. Clinton might think about threatening to veto any spending bills that do not contain the promised funds—a weapon he used to good effect in the last Congress when Republican conservatives tried to dynamite the country's basic environmental laws.

The Yellowstone and Headwaters projects are especially at risk. The House has refused to provide a penny of the \$700 million in extra money promised for land acquisitions, including \$65 million for the mine and \$250 million for the redwoods. The Senate appropriations committee approved the \$700 million but then added a caveat that could doom the Yellowstone and Headwaters purchases. The purchases cannot be consummated, it said, until Congress passes separate legislation specifically authorizing them. That would throw the matter back to the Senate's Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which is full of people eager to deny the President an environmental triumph.

The truth is that no separate authorizing legislation is required. The Interior Department and the Forest Service, which would carry out the deals, have pre-existing authority to make the acquisitions as long as the money is there. Mr. Lott and Mr. Domenici must see this mischievous and unnecessary language for what it is—an opening for anticonservationist Republicans to torpedo Mr. Clinton—and make sure it is removed when the bill comes to a floor vote.

The news about the Everglades is much better, at least so far. The appropriations committees in both houses have provided full funding for the Interior Department's Everglades Restoration Fund—a \$100 million program aimed primarily at creating buffer zones between the Everglades and two of its greatest threats, the agricultural regions to the north and the exploding urban populations to the east. This is only a small down payment on the Federal share of a restoration effort that may eventually cost \$3 billion to \$5 billion. But it is an important start.

At the same time, however, both the Senate and House have denied the Administration more than half the \$120 million it requested for restoration projects to be undertaken by the Army Corps of Engineers in South Florida. The corps plans a massive replumbing project aimed at replicating the historic flow of clean water from Lake Oke-

chobee southward to the Everglades and Florida Bay. This is a vital part of the overall scheme and for that reason was specifically promised in the budget agreement. To honor their word, Mr. Lott, Mr. Domenici and their counterparts on the House side, should make sure that these funds are restored.

The Republicans keep saying that they want to spruce up their environmental credentials. Breaking pledges on matters of transcendent interest to environmentalists is not the way to go about it.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF HIGHLAND

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to your attention "Ten Years of Success", an anniversary celebration for the proud city of Highland, CA. On November 24, 1997, many people will be preparing to give thanks and commemorate our Nation's history of the day of Thanksgiving. The cold autumn air will bring in another different reason for the people of Highland to celebrate, as they will reach a great milestone in their own history, and ring in 10 years of existence as a city.

Do you believe in miracles?

The community and citizens of Highland certainly do. Many people, especially the so-called experts, warned in 1987 against incorporation of the community because they believed the proposed city was financially infeasible and would be bankrupt within the first 2 years of existence. I am more than pleased to report that the experts were wrong and the city of Highland is flourishing and growing with intensity. More importantly, the city is in relatively sound fiscal condition.

The future of the city of Highland, along with the successful maintenance of its fiscal approach, looks bright. If the past is any indication of the future, those who believe in the miracle and call the city of Highland home will be able to do so for many more years to come. May the next 10 years be even better than the past for the citizens of this great community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many proud people who call the city of Highland their home, in recognizing a decade of success. This November all of us will recognize that miracles never cease to flourish in the city of Highland.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall votes 298 and 299 on July 22, I would have voted "yea." In addition, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 319 and "yea" on rollcall vote 320 which occurred on July 24.

HONORING JEAN WILLIAMSON'S DEDICATION TO VOLUNTEER NURSING

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable woman. Jean Williamson has been a nurse at the Clearwater Free Clinic in Clearwater, FL, for 5 years. The clinic provides critical health services to many of my constituents in the ninth congressional district who otherwise would be unable to afford them. In fact, the clinic was able to treat over 7,000 patients last year alone—and that number is expected to rise this year.

In 1996, Jean earned the title "Volunteer of the Year," for her tireless efforts on behalf of the patients she serves. Perhaps not surprisingly, she is again likely to receive this accolade.

This year, Jean gave up her summer to serve as the interim executive director of the clinic. She was compelled to do so after the previous director resigned to take a national office. This selfless act has permitted the clinic's board to carefully search for the right replacement and has made the transition period far smoother than it otherwise would have been.

However, I believe the greatest tributes come not from the words of outsiders, but from those who work closely with Jean. One of her colleagues described her as, "one of the most dedicated and conscientious volunteers anywhere . . . she has set an example few can follow." It was because of people like Jean that Congress recently passed H.R. 911, legislation to protect volunteers from frivolous lawsuits which arise out of their service. I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of this important bill to protect people like the volunteers of the Clearwater Free Clinic.

Mr. Speaker, in an age when volunteerism has declined, I would like very much to congratulate Jean for her unselfish and outstanding work at the Clearwater Free Clinic. She serves as a shining example for other volunteers around the country. I would ask that our colleagues join me in wishing her continued success with her work at the clinic and, indeed, with all of her future endeavors.

IN MEMORY OF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE NORMAN BLACK OF HOUSTON

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Houston colleague Mr. GENE GREEN and myself, I rise to honor the memory of a valued and respected member of the Federal judiciary and a constituent, Senior U.S. District Judge Norman W. Black, and chief judge emeritus of the southern district of Texas, who passed away on July 23, 1997. As much as the community of Houston loved and respected Judge Black, his family has suffered an even greater loss.

Judge Black was an institution in Houston, a city he truly loved. He was born and raised in Houston, attending the city's public schools before attending the University of Texas for his bachelor and law degrees. He was an active citizen of the Houston community, a member of several civic and professional organizations including the Houston Philosophical Society, Congregation Beth Israel, and many, many more. His legacy of good work will be missed.

Judge Black was recommended to the bench by my uncle, Senator Lloyd Bentsen, and appointed by President Carter in 1979. He had previously served as a Federal magistrate in Houston for 3 years and had practiced law before that. He stepped down from his post of chief judge of the southern district last December, as required, upon turning 65. But he remained active, maintaining senior status in order to remain on the bench to handle his own cases and fill in as needed for other judges around the district.

Judge Black will be remembered not only for his position, but for the manner in which he served. He was a Texas gentleman, presiding on the bench as an even-tempered and courteous man of justice. He was one of the best-liked jurists on the Federal bench. He consistently received the highest ratings in the Houston Bar Association's annual poll. He will be remembered for his legal mind as well as his duty to the people he served. He had the compassion and understanding to recognize how his decisions impacted the lives of real people. He was, indeed, one of our very best.

Judge Black revered the law and recognized its importance. As an instructor at the University of Houston Law School and an adjunct professor at South Texas School of Law, he taught students to show respect and dignity for the law. He criticized "Rambo-type" attorneys who fought endlessly over minor points and impugned the integrity of their colleagues, calling them bad role models for young lawyers. He always recalled that when he began practicing law in the 1950's, young lawyers strove to be more like "Perry Mason"—polite, dignified and dedicated to serving their client.

Judge Black was more than just a great judge; he was also a great Texan, a loyal friend, a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. We offer our sincere condolences to his wife, Berne, his two daughters, Elizabeth Berry of Houston and Diane Smith of Austin, and his entire family. We feel their loss as we mourn the passing of Judge Norman Black.

JOHN BRADEMAs ADDRESSES CYPRUS ISSUE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in a long while there is reason for guarded optimism in Cyprus.

A few weeks ago Cyprus President Clerides and Turkish Cypriot Leader Ruff Denktash met in New York under the auspices of the United Nations. Another round of face-to-face talks, the first in over 2 years, is planned for later this summer.

The Clinton administration's appointment of Richard Holbrooke as U.S. Special Envoy for

Cyprus is the best signal yet that the administration intends to give high priority this year to a settlement in Cyprus and moving Greek-Turkish relations forward.

It has always been my firm belief that only high-level and sustained United States attention will convince all parties to try to resolve the Cyprus issue.

In this context, I believe that Members will read with interest an excellent speech on "The Cyprus Problem: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Role of Congress" by our distinguished former colleague in the House of Representatives, Dr. John Brademas.

I ask that a portion Dr. Brademas' cogent remarks, delivered in London, England, on July 10, 1997, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

"THE CYPRUS PROBLEM: US FOREIGN POLICY & THE ROLE OF CONGRESS"

(By Dr. John Brademas)

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

Before I address myself to the issue of Cyprus, I must say a word about certain fundamental factors that characterize the American form of government. You may all be familiar with them but I assure you that many Americans are not.

First, we have a separation of powers constitution; second, our parties are decentralized, that is to say, by comparison with parties in a parliamentary system, undisciplined.

People know the phrase, "separation of powers," but too few understand its meaning. Some think that in the American system, Congress exists to do whatever a president wants it to do. But this is not the way the Founding Fathers intended the government of the United States to work and, you must all be aware, that in both domestic and foreign policy, Congress has in recent decades reasserted the separation of powers principle.

Another factor complicates matters: Presidents and Congresses are elected separately, by different constituencies and for different periods of service. The President, each Senator—there are 100—and each member of the House of Representatives—there are 435—has his own mandate and sense of responsibility to the people.

In our system, as distinguished from yours, the chief executive is not chosen from the legislative majority and, indeed, often does not even belong to the party controlling Congress. This is, of course, precisely the situation today with a Democrat in the White House and Republicans in control of both the Senate and House of Representatives.

THE AMERICAN WAY OF GOVERNING

So the American way of governing was not designed for peaceful coexistence between the executive and legislative branches. The result has been a process, over two centuries long, of conflict and accommodation, dispute and detente—and this is the case even when, as I shall illustrate with Cyprus, the president and both bodies of Congress are controlled by the same party.

Although service on the Education and Labor Committee meant that most of my legislative energies were directed to domestic concerns, I continued my interest of student days in foreign policy. As Majority Whip of the House of Representatives, I joined Speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd and other Congressional leaders for breakfast at the White House every other week with President Carter, Vice President Mondale and the president's top aides to discuss the entire range of issues facing the president and Congress, including foreign affairs.

Yet it was during the administration of President Lyndon Johnson that I became personally engaged in a foreign policy question: I made clear my strong objection to the military junta in Greece that came to power in 1967. Although then the only Member of Congress of Greek origin (and a Democrat), I testified against the Administration's request for United States military aid to Greece which, I reminded the House Foreign Affairs Committee, was a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The NATO Charter was created to defend nations that adhere to democracy, freedom and the rule of law; the military dictatorship ruling Greece, I asserted, supports none of these principles. The United States should, therefore, not provide Greece military assistance. During the years of the junta, I refused to visit Greece or to set foot in the Greek Embassy in Washington.

INVASION OF CYPRUS

In 1974, however, I found myself deeply involved in American policy toward Greece. In July of that year, the colonels engineered an unsuccessful coup against the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios. Although the coup precipitated the fall of the military regime and triggered the restoration of democracy in Greece, it was also the pretext for an invasion by Turkish military forces of Cyprus. The initial invasion, in July, was followed, in August, by Attila II, a massive intervention of 40,000 Turkish troops.

Because the Turkish forces were equipped with weapons supplied by the United States, Turkey's government was in direct violation of US legal prohibitions on the use of American arms for other than defensive purposes. And because American law mandated an immediate termination of arms transfers to any country using them for aggressive purposes, I led a small delegation of Congressmen to call on Secretary of State Kissinger to protest the Turkish action and insist that he enforce the law, i.e., order an immediate end to further shipments of American arms to Turkey. Kissinger apparently did not take us seriously and neither he nor President Gerald R. Ford took any action in response to our admonition.

TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO

Consequently, several of us in Congress, notably the late Congressman Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York, then Congressman Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland and I in the House of Representatives and Senator Thomas Eagleton of Missouri led a successful effort in late 1974 to impose, by Congressional action, an arms embargo on Turkey. We were strongly supported not only by other Democrats but by a number of leading Republicans.

In this unusual episode, my colleagues and I had active allies outside Congress. Not only did we, understandably, have the help of Greek American and Armenian American persons and groups across the country but also of many others who shared our commitment to the rule of law. The reasons my colleagues and I prevailed were straightforward: We were better organized politically both within Congress and in the country at large and we had a superior case, both legally and morally. It was this combination of factors that brought what was a remarkable victory.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

President Clinton's appointment last month as his Special Envoy for Cyprus of Richard Holbrooke, architect of the Dayton Accords and a diplomat of wide experience, is, I believe, a significant indication of the priority the President and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright have assigned to Cyprus.

Indeed, last month, before talks in Washington with Cypriot Foreign Minister