

disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived; that the joint resolution be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means (in opposition to the joint resolution) and a Member in support of the joint resolution; that pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion; and that the provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not otherwise apply to any joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam for the remainder the first session of the 107th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

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.

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

(Mr. HORN 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 Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ON THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1974 ILLEGAL TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to commemorate the 27th anniversary of the 1974 illegal Turkish invasion of Cyprus. I have commemorated this day each year since I have become a Member of Congress; and, unfortunately, each year the occupation continues.

The continued presence of Turkish troops represents a gross violation of human rights and international law. Since their invasion of Cyprus in July of 1974, Turkish troops have continued to occupy 37 percent of the island. This

is in direct defiance of numerous U.N. resolutions and has been a major source of instability in the eastern Mediterranean.

Recent events have created an atmosphere where there is now no valid excuse to avoid resolving this long-standing problem.

Peace in this region cannot happen without continued and sustained U.S. leadership, which is why I am heartened that President Bush, like his predecessor, President Clinton, is committed to working for reunification of Cyprus.

He recently stated, and I quote, "I want you to know that the United States stands ready to help Greece and Turkey as they work to improve their relations. I'm also committed to a just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus dispute."

I was also encouraged to read last week that the European Union considers the status quo in Cyprus unacceptable and has called on the Turkish Cypriot side to resume the U.N.-led peace process as soon as possible with a view toward finding a comprehensive settlement.

Now is the time for a solution. More than 20 years ago, in 1977, in 1979, the leaders of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities reached two high-level agreements which provided for the establishment of a bicomunal, bizonal federation.

Even though these agreements were endorsed by the U.N. Security Council, there has been no action on the Turkish side to fill in the details and reach a final agreement. Instead, for the last 27 years, there has been a Turkish Cypriot leader presiding over a regime recognized only by Turkey and condemned as "legally invalid" by the U.N. Security Council in Resolution 541 and 550.

Cyprus has been divided by the green line, a 113-mile barbed wire fence that runs across the island, and Greek Cypriots are prohibited from visiting the towns and communities where their families have lived for generations.

With 35,000 Turkish troops illegally stationed on the island, it is one of the most militarized areas in the world. This situation has also meant the financial decline of the once rich northern part of Cyprus to just one-quarter of its former earnings.

Perhaps the single most destructive element of Turkey's fiscal and foreign policy is its nearly 27-year occupation of Cyprus. We now have an atmosphere where there is no valid excuse for not resolving this long-standing problem.

Cyprus is set for movement into the European Union in 2004. I am hopeful that this reality will act as a catalyst for a lasting solution of the Cyprus challenge. EU membership for Cyprus will clearly provide important economic, political, and social benefits for all Cypriots, both Greek and Turkish alike. This is why both sides must return to the negotiating table without any conditions.

There is also a new climate of cooperation between Turkey's Ismail

Cem and Greece's George Pappandreou, and this is a very positive sign. More has been achieved in a year than what has been achieved in the past 40 years, but this cooperation needs to extend to the resolution of the Cyprus occupation.

While the U.S., the EU, Greece, and Cyprus have all acted to accommodate Turkish concerns, it remains to be seen whether Turkey will put pressure on Rauf Denktaş to bargain in good faith. Make no mistake about it, if Turkey wants the Cyprus problem resolved, it will not let Denktaş stand in its way.

Now is the time for a solution. It will take diligent work by both sides, but with U.S. support and leadership I am hopeful that we will reach a peaceful and fair solution soon.

Twenty-seven years is too long to have a country divided. It is too long to be kept from your home. It is too long to be separated from your family.

We have seen many tremendous changes around the world. The Berlin Wall came down. There are steps towards peace in Ireland. It is now time to add Cyprus to the list of places where peace and freedom have triumphed.

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

(Mr. BILIRAKIS 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. KIRK 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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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 California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION PROGRAM DESERVES OUR CONTINUED SUPPORT

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come here this evening and talk to my colleagues for a few minutes about the VA-HUD bill that is going to come up tomorrow and talk specifically about potential amendments that are going to be made.

It is important for us to lend our support to the overall NASA budget and, specifically, manned space exploration and those items that center around the International Space Station.

There has been an awful lot of talk in the last several weeks about potential cuts in the International Space Station because of the overruns that had been talked about for a long period of time. We are looking at building a facility that has never been built before and doing things that are absolutely new technology. The guesses in the expenditures of what it was going to take to create this facility have not always been right; and, unfortunately, we are facing more costs than what we originally anticipated.

Something has to be done about that. We hope we will find a way in our committees to ask the tough questions of the contractors and of NASA to make sure that we get a better handle on what is going to be spent in the future with regard to any space activity, whether it is manned or robotic.

But, right now, we are making some real serious decisions and potentially bad decisions with regard to the International Space Station. We are talking about taking parts of the International Space Station, such as the crew return vehicle, which allows a full crew of seven people to do the science necessary to get a return from our exploration in space.

If we stop the construction of the crew return vehicle, then we will only be able to accommodate three to six people on the International Space Station. If we did six, a total of two Soyuz return vehicles, one commander for each vehicle, that would dramatically reduce our ability to do the science that we have built the International Space Station for in the first place.

A lot has been done, and we have succeeded in getting significant amounts of monies put into the appropriations bill, which will be considered tomorrow in the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies appropriation bill.

Some of those amendments will be Space Station-killing amendments, so I am here to ask my colleagues to give very serious consideration to anything that would stop this huge investment that we have made and the opportunity

for us to get a significant return on that investment over the next many years, an investment in knowledge of what is out beyond Earth's surface; what we might be able to gain in knowledge as we explore space that could change our health, our lives, knowledge-wise as far as why human beings are here; or perhaps something as simple as a solution to or a cure for a particular illness.

Those are the things we have gotten out of our space exploration for decades, and it is interesting to note some statistics: that in the 1960s, during the Apollo period, in the 1960s and 1970s, 4 percent of our Nation's budget went to NASA, 4 percent. Today, that amount is less than six-tenths of 1 percent.

It is also interesting that some of these amendments that may be considered tomorrow that will replace money from NASA, take money away from NASA and put it either into the VA or HUD parts of that bill, let us consider what has happened to Housing and Urban Development, as an example. They have had an increase from \$16 billion to \$31 billion in the last several years. The Veterans Administration has had increases from \$40 billion to \$50 billion, a 25 percent increase only in the last 4 or 5 years.

We want to support both of those. I will be supporting them. Both have had significant increases in this year's appropriation. The NASA budget has stayed flat, at \$14 billion, for the last many years. It is time for our commitment to space to be reiterated, to be spoken of again in a way that we spoke of it in the 1960s.

I remember when President Kennedy challenged our country to send a man to the moon and return him safely within a decade, and we did it. It changed the way we educated our children, it changed the way we did business. It brought huge returns to us.

So, in wrapping this up, I ask my colleagues to pay very much attention to the VA-HUD appropriation tomorrow and to support NASA in every way they can.

□ 2115

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

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPACT DIVISIVENESS COULD DAMAGE DAIRY INDUSTRY

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin-based national dairy farm magazine, *Hoard's Dairyman*, on its editorial page, expressed its support for the con-

tinuation of the Northeast Dairy Compact and allowing other regions of the country to form their own compacts. As a representative of a Congressional District with a large dairy producing population, and as a strong advocate of States' rights, I implore my fellow Members to keep an open mind on the complex interstate dairy compact issues.

I would like to read this thought-provoking editorial from the prestigious dairy magazine from the heart of dairy country, Wisconsin.

"Editorial comment: Compact Divisiveness Could Damage Our Industry. *Hoard's Dairyman*. Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin. July 2001.

"Dairy compacts, in the eyes of their proponents, help stabilize and boost dairy farmer incomes by flooring Class I prices. Opponents see compacts as an unconstitutional restraint of commerce, a rip-off of consumers and processors, and distortion of supply and demand. We see the compact 'cup' as being half full rather than half empty. That is why we support continuation and extension of the compact concept. We do so for the same reasons we work together to improve and stabilize their incomes.

"To us, compact pricing is of little difference to the overorder Class I premiums negotiated across the country by the dozen or more groups of dairy co-ops working together. Compacts are different in that they are not voluntary. Rebel processors and producers cannot circumvent the system by undercutting established prices. And unlike marketing federation boards, compact commissions represent consumers, processors, as well as producers.

"The Northeast Dairy Compact has improved incomes for dairy farm families, without hurting milk consumption or adding to price support costs. There is even a provision for leaving food programs, such as Women, Infants, and Children programs, unaffected by higher milk prices. Nor has the Northeast Compact contributed to lower Class III prices, as many in the upper Midwest contend. We see no reason to prevent dairy farmers in the South or other regions from working together the same way.

"Our biggest fear about compacts is that the issue will further divide the industry that needs cohesion more than ever. Unless cooler heads prevail, we will shoot ourselves in the foot over compacts just as we have on many other issues."

Mr. Speaker, it is a myth that upper Midwest farmers oppose dairy compacts. I urge my colleagues to pay attention to the growing support from across the country for dairy compacts. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle from all States to advance this important legislation.