

30TH ANNIVERSARY ON TURKEY'S  
INVASION OF CYPRUS**HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 22, 2004*

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week, the world marked the 30th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus. And so began three decades of Turkey's illegal military occupation of Cyprus. Even as we speak, Turkey maintains 30,000 heavily armed troops in the occupied portions of Cyprus.

For 30 years, Cyprus has been divided by a green line—a 113 mile barbed wire barrier that runs across the width of the island.

For 30 years, Greek Cypriots have experienced 30 years of ethnic cleansing, forcible evictions, and missing persons. Cyprus has endured 30 years of the flouting of its territorial integrity. This includes the occupation authority's attempt to create an independent "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus."

The international community has witnessed 30 years of the flagrant violation of U.N. General Assembly resolutions and Security Council decisions calling for immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cyprus, the return of refugees, and respect for the island's sovereignty.

Thirty years is a long time. The occupation of Cyprus has been going on too long. If left to their own wisdom and devices, with firm international support, Greek and Turkish Cypriots could find ways to live in peace and harmony.

The international community can and must play an indispensable role in settling the Cyprus dispute. But, to do this, it must draw the proper conclusions from results of the vote this past April on the reunification plan put forward by the United Nations.

Seventy six percent of the Greek Cypriot electorate opposed the "Annan Plan" because of concerns about security, property restitution, and the structure of the proposed central government, while 65 percent of Turkish Cypriot voters supported it. It is clear from this experience that a workable solution must take the interests and concerns of both the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities fully into account.

It is instructive that the split vote has not led to greater tension between the two communities or between Greece and Turkey. During most of the 433 year history of Cyprus, Greek and Turkish Cypriots have coexisted peacefully.

With the notable exception of the period that immediately followed Turkish occupation of Cyprus, Greek and Turkish Cypriot relations have largely been free of inter-communal violence. The hotly debated referendum itself took place overwhelmingly with an absence of conflict. This shows that despite the differences between them, Greek and Turkish Cypriots overwhelmingly share a desire for peace.

The leadership of the Republic of Cyprus seeks a bizonal, bicomunal federation under a plan that promotes the genuine reunification of Cypriots and Cypriot society, while enabling each community to retain its own identity and culture.

Cyprus's admission to the European Union on May 1st of this year may have created a

new opportunity for resolving the division and occupation with an inclusive democratic system in which human rights are fully respected and the fundamental freedoms on which the European Union is founded, are guaranteed.

Taking all of this into account, the U.N. needs to go back to the drawing board. The U.S. needs to remain an honest broker. It must not attempt to impose a solution that the overwhelming majority of Greek-Cypriots reject. To do so will make an ultimate solution and final reunification difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.

America must at all times remember that a united, peaceful, and prosperous Cyprus is in our national interest and the interest of world peace. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Cyprus was one of the first nations to express its solidarity with the United States. Cyprus has also been a strong ally in the war against terrorism. We must continue to support our friends, who like us, only seek to live in peace.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL  
WILLIAM P. KANE**HON. PHIL GINGREY**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 22, 2004*

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Brigadier General William P. Kane, who has faithfully served as the commander of the 94th Air Lift Wing, Dobbins Air Reserve Base in Marietta, Georgia for the last six years. The 94th Airlift wing is an Air Force Reserve C-130 unit and has a mission to train and equip combat-ready units to deploy on short notice to defend our nation, which I might add, they did on several occasions during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Additionally, Dobbins serves as the host organization to other tenant organizations, such as Naval Air Station Atlanta and Lockheed Martin, where they manufacture the F/A-22.

With this complex mission, General Kane did an outstanding job and we who reside in Marietta and Northwest Atlanta owe him a great debt of gratitude.

In addition to holding a Ph.D. in Cell and Molecular Biology, General Kane is a highly accomplished C-130 pilot, logging over 6,500 flight hours. In addition, General Kane has faithfully served the Air Reserve during his various commands of one squadron, two groups, and now three wings during his distinguished 32-year career.

While General Kane has gone on to take over command of the 302nd Airlift Wing in his hometown of Colorado Springs, Colorado, he will be sorely missed in the 11th District of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in thanking Brigadier General Kane for his outstanding and selfless service.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CORAL  
REEF CONSERVATION AND PRO-  
TECTION ACT OF 2004**HON. ED CASE**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 22, 2004*

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, every once in awhile I am deeply grateful for an action I am

able to take that is both long overdue and truly needed. That is how I feel now as I introduce the Coral Reef Conservation and Protection Act of 2004.

My childhood was spent among the rich diversity of the coral reef ecosystems of my native Island of Hawaii. It was a time of budding wonder at what nature had wrought, the living corals and other reef life existing in mutual dependency and sustainability. But just weeks ago, when I returned, as I often do, now with my children, to those same reefs, they're not what they were. Still beautiful, yes; still wondrous. But there is not the same diversity of coral nor the same luster; the fish and other marine life not as plentiful nor diverse; the presence of new, alien species is apparent.

Of course, there are simply more of us in those marine environments than there were, and so our cumulative impact over my 50 years in those waters has become apparent, even at the level of recreational and subsistence use. But it's more, for these reefs have become a significant business, their coral exoskeletons, their living creators, and the shells and fish that live in and among them valuable collectors' items for the aquariums and curio shops of the world. And the purposeful and accidental introduction of marine invasives in isolated instances over the last decades have magnified into a critical mass of statewide presence and threat.

In relevant terms, though, we in Hawaii are among the lucky ones, for at least we still have living, albeit threatened, coral reefs, with declining but at least remaining marine life. At least we have marginally protective state laws, and a culture of arguable sustainability.

But in much of the rest of the marine world, especially throughout the temperate zones of the Pacific and beyond, the world of the coral reef is past endangered and into destroyed, wiped out by a wave of commercial overfishing, overcollecting, dynamiting, cyanide poisoning, and other forms of ecological pillage. In these worlds, laws do not exist to provide even minimum protections or, if they do, they are spurned.

Some say that that's their business; what do we care if they wreck their marine ecosystems? First, of course, in today's interdependent world, our global environment is everyone's business. But beyond that, we can't turn our backs because we are the chief facilitator; ours is the largest market for the products of this stripping of the world's coral reefs.

None of this is new: we have known all of this for decades. We have even set out to do something about it. In 1973, we became a party to the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), which sought to clamp down on endangered species trafficking. But although some of our world's coral reef life has been designated as covered under it, the enforcement mechanisms are frankly ineffective.

More recently, in 1998 President Clinton issued the Coral Reef Protection Executive Order (#13098) establishing the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force. That entity was directed to strengthen our stewardship and conservation of our country's reef ecosystems, and to assess our role in the international coral reef products trade with the goal of taking actions to promote conservation and sustainable use of coral reefs worldwide.

The Task Force conducted its evaluations, made its reports, and outlined what was needed. That was in large part comprehensive legislation to institute common protective standards for our nation's coral reefs, but, equally important, rules to discourage international coral reef abuse and encourage sustainable practices by allowing imports only of non-endangered products collected by sustainable practices and pursuant to integrated management plans.

The Coral Reef Conservation and Protection Act of 2004 I gratefully introduce today embodies the principal directions of the Task Force and more. It establishes a comprehensive scheme for the domestic and international protection of our world's coral reef ecosystems. The regime's key ingredients are the disallowal of any domestic taking, transport in interstate commerce, or import of the endangered marine life of our coral reefs, unless that life is collected in non-destructive ways or subject to sustainable management plans or otherwise exempted from coverage by administrative actions.

Mr. Speaker, we have to start somewhere; our world's coral reefs are crying out for our help. This bill is that start, and I urge its prompt deliberation and passage.

Mahalo, and aloha!

A POINT OF LIGHT FOR ALL AMERICANS—ESTER SILVER-PARKER VICE PRESIDENT OF DIVERSITY FOR WAL-MART STORES, INC.

### HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 22, 2004*

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished business executive well known to members of the Congressional Black Caucus, Ester Silver-Parker.

She serves on the boards of International Women's Forum, Brenau University, North Carolina Central University, National Public Radio Foundation, The Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, the Wyndham Hotel Women and Diversity Roundtable.

Ester Silver-Parker was named Vice President of Diversity Relations for Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. in December 2003. She is charged with the strategic planning and execution of Wal-Mart's diverse efforts as it relates to its supplier development program, philanthropic and community relations programs. Additionally, she is responsible for strengthening Wal-Mart's relationships with diversity leaders and leadership organizations in the communities it serves.

Prior to joining Wal-Mart, Ms. Silver-Parker served as Vice President of Corporate Affairs and President of the AT&T Foundation for AT&T. She also directed AT&T's National Constituency Relations, Issues Management and Corporate Social Responsibility Programs.

Ms. Silver-Parker directed AT&T's public relations field offices in the Northeast States, the Mid-Atlantic States and the Southeast. She established the first AT&T public relations operations in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, designed and implemented the plan to increase AT&T's presence in the U.S. domestic field operations, and developed the organiza-

tional design for AT&T's field public relations organization. She also established AT&T's first constituent relations organization. She was the recipient of the Catherine Cleary Award, the highest leadership honor AT&T gives to a female employee.

Prior to joining AT&T, Ms. Silver-Parker worked in public relations for New York Telephone, the National Urban League and as a journalist for Essence Magazine, the Review of Political Economy and New World Outlook.

Ester Silver-Parker has traveled on behalf of the Board of Global Ministries in the Congo, Burundi and Kenya to study and write about the health conditions and quality of life of women and children. She is a frequent speaker on issues pertaining to women, diversity, corporate social responsibility, and strategic philanthropy.

She received a Masters in journalism from Columbia University School of Journalism and a Bachelors of Arts in political science from North Carolina Central University. She is a graduate of Pennsylvania State University's Executive Management Program and holds an Honorary Doctor's Degree in Humane Letters from Benedict College.

Ms. Silver-Parker has received numerous awards, including the Ebony Magazine Outstanding Women in Corporate Marketing, the Congressional Black Caucus Unsung Hero Award, the DECA Award for outstanding businesswoman, the Harlem YMCA Black Achievers in Industry Award, New York City Gus D'Amato Community Service Award, the Atlanta Business League's Outstanding Corporate Person Award, the 100 Black Men of America's Corporate Excellence Award, the National AIDS Fund's Leadership Award, the Asian Pacific Islanders Women's Leadership Starfish Award.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Silver-Parker is a genuine professional who cares deeply about her community. I am honored to recognize her as a "Point of Light for All Americans."

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 22, 2004*

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 21, I was meeting with constituents and unavoidably missed rollcall votes 402 and 403. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 402, and "yes" on rollcall vote No. 403.

### DECLARING GENOCIDE IN DARFUR, SUDAN

SPEECH OF

#### HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 21, 2004*

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, ten years ago, as bloated corpses floated down Rwanda's rivers, the international community debated whether the atrocities being committed in Rwanda fit the definition of "genocide." By the time the world stopped debating, it was too late. Millions of men, women and

children had been killed. The failure of the world to act in Rwanda remains a stain on our collective conscience.

We must learn from the tragic mistakes of the past. Today, one thousand miles north of Rwanda, in the Darfur region of Sudan, more than 30,000 people have already been killed by the Sudanese military's aerial bombardments and the atrocities being committed by their ruthless proxies, the Jangaweed militia. Gang rapes, the branding of raped women, amputations, and summary killings are widespread. More than a million people have been driven from their homes as villages have been burned and crops destroyed. The Sudanese government has deliberately blocked the delivery of food, medicine and other humanitarian assistance. More than 160,000 Darfurians have become refugees in neighboring Chad. Conditions are ripe for the spread of fatal diseases such as measles, cholera, dysentery, meningitis and malaria. The U.S. Agency for International Development estimates that 350,000 people are likely to die in the coming months and that the death toll could reach more than a million unless the violence stops and the Sudanese government immediately grants international aid groups better access to Darfur.

Here in Washington and at the United Nations headquarters in New York, many officials are again debating whether this unfolding tragedy constitutes genocide, ethnic cleansing or something else. This time let us not debate until it is too late to stop this human catastrophe. Let us not wait until thousands more children are killed before we summon the will to stop this horror. America and the international community have a moral duty to act. The United States and the 130 other signatories to the Genocide Convention also have a legal obligation to "undertake to prevent and punish" the crime of genocide.

The Convention defines genocide as actions undertaken "with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such." The actions include "deliberately inflicting on members of the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part." By all accounts, including the reports of U.N. fact finders, it is the African peoples in the Darfur region who have been targeted for destruction by the Khartoum-backed Arab death squads.

In the middle of an unfolding crisis like that in Darfur, there will always be debate over whether what is happening constitutes genocide. But it is important to remember that the Genocide Convention does not require absolute proof of genocidal intentions before the international community is empowered to intervene. The Convention would offer no protection to innocent victims if we had to wait until there were tens of thousands more corpses before we act. A key part of the Genocide Convention is prevention, not just punishment after the fact.

The United States has already done more than any other nation to call attention to and respond to this tragedy. But our efforts to date have not brought an end to the growing crisis. We must take additional measures now.

The United States should immediately call for an emergency meeting of the U.N. Security Council and introduce and call for a vote on a resolution that demands that the Government of Sudan take the following steps: First, allow international relief groups and human rights