

claimed that they were merely raising and possessing birds to sell to legal cockfighting states and countries, when in reality they were often engaging in illegal fights in their own states. It makes enforcement of state laws against cockfighting very difficult.

During consideration earlier in this Congress of the Farm bills, the House and Senate passed identical versions of legislation to close the loopholes in the law. Unfortunately, the conferees removed a provision, identical in both bills, to increase jail time for individuals who violate any provision of Section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act. The House and Senate increased the maximum jail time from one year to two years, seeking to make this illegal animal fighting a federal felony.

U.S. Attorneys have told humane organizations and others that they are reluctant to pursue animal fighting cases with such a modest penalty. They will be far more likely to pursue cases if it is a felony offense.

My legislation today seeks to restore what the House and Senate originally passed in terms of penalties. The adoption of this provision will bring federal law in better alignment with state laws. As I mentioned previously, 46 states have either dogfighting or cockfighting felony provisions. It is fitting and appropriate that the federal government treat dogfighting and cockfighting as felony offenses. It is well known that these forms of animal cruelty are often associated with drug traffic, illegal firearms possession, violence to people, and illegal gambling. In short, other criminal conduct goes hand in hand with animal fighting.

My legislation also bans the interstate shipment of deadly knives and gaffs, which are the implements attached to the birds' legs to heighten the bloodletting and expedite the conclusion of fights. These knives and gaffs are sold through cockfighting magazines and through the Internet, and it is time that this traffic in these deadly implements is halted. A number of states have prohibitions on the sale of these implements, but it is time to adopt a national standard.

Finally, this legislation improves and updates other enforcement language in the Animal Welfare Act, provisions that were adopted more than a quarter century ago, on forfeiture and disposition of animals seized by law enforcement once they make arrests of individuals participating in illegal animal fights.

I thank several colleagues for adding their names as original cosponsors, and hope that the committees of jurisdiction give this legislation proper and prompt attention and action. I hope it can be passed before the 107th Congress completes its work.

EGMONT KEY LAND TRANSFER

HON. DAN MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to convey Egmont Key, which is currently under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to the Florida State Park Service.

Egmont Key is located at the mouth of Tampa Bay within the Congressional Districts of Mr. BILL YOUNG, Mr. JIM DAVIS, and myself, both of which are greatly supportive of my ef-

forts and are also original cosponsors of the bill. Egmont Key's cultural history dates back to 1830's, as a matter of fact the construction of Fort Dade in 1882 was to protect the city of Tampa during the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. Egmont Key even served as a site for the Union navy to operate their Gulf Coast blockade in the Civil War. Area residents, including my family and I, have enjoyed Egmont Key's historical and recreational benefits for years, and the local support for conveying the ownership of this island to the Florida State Park Service is strong.

The bill will convey the title of Egmont Key, a small island, which is approximately 350 acres, to the Florida State Park Service. This bill will not only improve the management of the public facilities, historical remains and wildlife habitat on the island, but also save the federal government money in the long term by removing it from federal responsibility.

Transfer of this property to the State of Florida will prove to be highly beneficial to its visitors. Providing more efficient facilities and an all around atmosphere of family interaction. Egmont Key serves as a habitat for numerous species of birds, and its white sandy beaches are valuable to the lives of many turtles, animals, and plants. The State of Florida's ownership of this picturesque island would improve the quality of life for its inhabitants and the quality of enjoyment for its enthusiasts.

Mr. Speaker, due to the limited amount of time left in the 107th Congress and my pending retirement this year, it is my hope that this bill will move quickly through the legislative process. I strongly believe that Egmont Key is best operated through the ownership of the Florida State Park Service, therefore I am requesting my colleagues join me today in cosponsoring this legislation. Egmont Key is a valuable resource to our area, and ownership by the State of Florida would simply provide the desired access to the community while also maintaining the ecosystem.

REMARKS ON SUSAN HIRSCHMAN

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, not to bid farewell, but to extend my heartfelt wishes for a future of success and happiness, to Susan Hirschmann.

Susan has served as the Chief of Staff to our Majority Whip, TOM DELAY, since 1997, managing the personal, district and Whip offices for our good friend from Texas.

Many of us have turned to her throughout the years for her political acumen and superb strategic skills.

Since moving to Washington, D.C. in 1987, she has been in the trenches promoting the Republican agenda—America's agenda.

She is more than a colleague. She is a friend.

While she is leaving the Hill, her passion and commitment to priority issues will keep her nearby.

I will surely miss the dinners we shared, as well as the late-night discussions over Chinese food and fried chicken in the Whip's office.

Godspeed Susan!

EQUITY IN EDUCATION ACT

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2041, "The Equity in Education Act of 2001."

The rising cost of higher education is one of the major concerns facing American families today. In recent years the cost of college has gone through the roof. Making college affordable is vital to our children, our country's future, and our ability to remain competitive in a global economy.

I introduced the Equity in Education Act to help families save to send their children to college. It would allow individuals to use investments in securities to pay for higher education expenses without being penalized by the tax code.

The Equity in Education Act would provide families with a viable way to secure a good education for their children. By supporting this bill, Congress has the opportunity to ensure that the cost of receiving a higher education does not go beyond the reach of many Americans.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2041.

AN ACCURATE HISTORY OF CYPRUS

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, recently several Members of Congress came to the House floor to attack Turkey and enumerate all the bad things that have happened to Cyprus as a result of the 1974 Turkish intervention on Cyprus. As has happened in the past, only one-sided, inaccurate, and incomplete information was provided, which not only ignored the historical reasons for the division of Cyprus, but also ignored the international laws that legitimized the Turkish intervention. For the sake of historical accuracy, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article authored by the Honorable Osman Ertug, the Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus here in Washington, DC. I commend it to anyone who has a sincere desire to understand why Cyprus stands divided today.

IS IT ALL HISTORY?

The month of July is marked by mourning and protestations in Cyprus on the one side, while by jubiliations and celebrations on the other. Even this sharp contrast in public mood shows the depth of the division between the two peoples of this eastern Mediterranean island—the Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. We believe the 28th Anniversary of the events of 1974 in Cyprus is an appropriate time to reflect on the background of the conflict and the prospects for its peaceful resolution.

Contrary to common belief, the origin of the Cyprus conflict dates back not to 1974, but to December 1963, when the Greek Cypriots, aided and abetted by Greece, launched an all-out attack on the Turkish Cypriot

people aimed at annexing the island to Greece (Enosis).

Turkish Cypriots resisted Greek attempts to "hellenize" Cyprus and, with the help of Turkey, which is a Guarantor Power under the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960, succeeded in defending and maintaining their existence in Cyprus as one of the two equal peoples of the island. Yet, this defense came at a heavy cost to the Turkish Cypriots, with thousands of them being killed, wounded or missing; a quarter of the Turkish Cypriot population evicted from their homes and properties in 103 villages; and the entire Turkish Cypriot population condemned to live in enclaves on 3% of the territory of Cyprus deprived of all human rights. The suffering of the Turkish Cypriots prompted a prominent US official, Mr. George W. Ball, former US Undersecretary of State, to write the following in his memoirs entitled "The Past Has Another Pattern":

"Makarios' central interest was to block off Turkish intervention so that he and his Greek Cypriots could go on happily massacring Turkish Cypriots. The Greek Cypriots just want to be left alone to kill the Turkish Cypriots."

The severity of Greek Cypriot attacks was such that The Washington Post of 17 February 1964 reported in a relevant article that "Greek Cypriot fanatics appear (ed) bent on a policy of genocide. . ."

The years-long campaign of the Greek Cypriots to annex the island to Greece culminated in the coup d'etat of 15 July 1974, which was described as "an invasion of Cyprus by Greece" even by the then Greek Cypriot leader Makarios in his dramatic admission before the UN Security Council on 19 July 1974.

Turkey exercised its right of intervention under these circumstances, in order to prevent the wholesale massacre of the Turkish Cypriots; stop the bloodshed on the island and prevent the colonization of Cyprus by Greece. Turkey's legitimate and justified intervention did not only achieve all these aims, but also led to the downfall of the military junta in Greece. The legitimacy of the Turkish intervention was confirmed by prominent outside sources, including the Standing Committee of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, which, in its decision dated 29 July 1974, stated the following:

"Turkey exercised its right of intervention in accordance with Article IV of the Guarantee Treaty."

Even the Athens Court of Appeal, in its decision of March 21, 1979, also held that the intervention of Turkey in Cyprus was legal:

"... The Turkish military intervention in Cyprus which was carried out in accordance with the Zurich and London Agreements was legal. Turkey, as one of the Guarantor powers, had the right to fulfill her obligations. The real culprits . . . are the Greek Officers who engineered and staged a coup and prepared the conditions of this intervention."

Decision No. 2658/79 dated 21 March 1979.

The events of 1974 were followed by a population exchange between the North and the South, formally agreed between the two sides in August and implemented in September 1975, enabling the Turkish Cypriots to regroup and reorganize themselves in the North, and the Greek Cypriots in the South. This created the geographical basis for a permanent settlement of the Cyprus issue on a "bi-zonal" basis—a term that has since become a permanent feature of the UN's Cyprus vocabulary.

Is this all history? Perhaps; but it is a history from which we must learn so as not to repeat it. A forward-looking strategy in Cyprus must necessarily take into account the above background of events, the existing

mistrust between the two peoples of the island and the realities of today, that is the two-state situation on the island evolved in the course of time. The possibility of a just, realistic and viable settlement depends on the acknowledgement of these facts, not a rejection of them. The Turkish Cypriots deserve to have their own State and, what is more, they already have it, albeit without international recognition.

The current face-to-face negotiations, started at the initiative of the Turkish Cypriot side, could produce the desired result if the Greek Cypriots were to accept the Turkish Cypriots as their true partners and equals. However, pampered by the European Union and a world that has come to view the question largely from a Greek Cypriot perspective, treating them as the "Government of Cyprus", the Greek Cypriots have little or no reason to settle their scores with their Turkish Cypriot neighbors for a shared future. In view of these realities, it is evident that for the current negotiations to have a real chance of success, third parties need to encourage the Greek Cypriot side to accept that there is no going back to the old days in Cyprus, and that the aim of the talks is the establishment of a NEW PARTNERSHIP on the basis of the sovereign equality of the two parties.

Perhaps we could then reach an outcome in Cyprus that all can celebrate.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOURNALIST JESSICA LEE

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Jessica Lee for her efforts and success in the field of journalism. Jessica Lee has had a long and illustrious career as a journalist. She was one of the first African American women to cover the White House for a major daily newspaper, and she was one of the first journalists to give a voice in print to those not normally covered in many daily newspapers.

She has traveled all over the world as a White House correspondent for USA Today; from China to Russia, Europe and to South Africa where she covered the election of Nelson Mandela. She has witnessed many major current events and written about them in what has often been called the "first draft" of history.

Jessica joined USA Today in 1985 as a congressional correspondent. She was assigned to the White House in 1986 at the height of the Iran-contra scandal, reporting on President Reagan's final two years and President Bush's full term in office.

Jessica, a fluent Spanish speaker, has worked for Gannett Co., Inc., since 1978, when she was hired at the El Paso Times in Texas. She worked five years as a regional and congressional correspondent with Gannett News Service.

Jessica got her first taste of journalism at high school in Washington, D.C., where she grew up. She began her career with the Daily Journal, an English-language daily published in Caracas, Venezuela. She is a graduate of Western College for Women.

Due to her courage and tenacity as a trailblazer, she will remain a role model for many women now joining the ranks of journalists.

INTRODUCING THE SMALL BUSINESS DROUGHT RELIEF ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Small Business Drought Relief Act. This legislation provides small businesses who depend upon water supply as a means of income with the opportunity to qualify and apply for disaster assistance from the Small Business Administration when drought affects their ability to earn income. It serves as a companion bill to a similar bill introduced in the Senate.

Under current law, small businesses whose income depreciates as a result of diminishing water supply are unable to even apply for SBA loans. Often these businesses are family-owned and family-run recreational or commercial fishing firms. The majority of them are dependent upon water resources, whether lakes, streams, or rivers, for the ability to operate their businesses. When water levels drop to unbearable points, aside from the obvious water supply issues, boats are unable to make it into lakes and rivers, commercial fishing ceases to exist, and businesses often lay off workers and close their doors for good.

I became interested in drought relief last summer when Florida found itself in the most prolonged drought it had seen in nearly 20 years. The water level in Lake Okeechobee, our country's 2nd largest fresh water lake, and located in my District, had decreased by nearly 25 percent.

Not only did the water shortage in the lake cause problems for agriculture and water management, but it also destroyed the economic well being of small businesses around the Lake who depend on it for income. Realize this too, the clear majority of these businesses are owned by minorities or families who struggle every day just to get by.

As I began to try and help the towns and businesses surrounding the Lake in locating temporary assistance, even if it was only low interest loans, I found that unless a firm was involved in agriculture, assistance is virtually impossible. When it is possible, the bureaucratic red tape applicants must cut through are so discouraging that they don't even try.

The issue at hand, Mr. Speaker, is that droughts are major natural disasters. The Stafford Act says it is, as well as the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense also say it is. Congress said it as recently as 1998. But for some reason, the Small Business Act does not include drought in its definition of disaster. Frankly, this oversight is a disaster of its own.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which will reconcile the oversight made by our body's predecessors and ensure that businesses who suffer from drought will live to see another day. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I urge the leadership to bring it swiftly to the floor for a vote.