

House of Representatives even as I'm pleased to say that only a few weeks ago, Michael Sarbanes, another son of Paul and Christine, has announced his candidacy for the presidency of the City Council of Baltimore. Obviously, politics runs in the Sarbanes family!

I'm glad, too, to welcome some other friends from my days in Washington, including the distinguished former Ambassador of Cyprus to the United States, Andreas Jacovides, and his wife, Pamela, as well as two great champions of the Hellenic cause in my country and, indeed, the world, Andrew Athens and Andrew Manatos.

I'm pleased also that two vigorous voices of the Cypriot community in the United States are here today, Phillip Christopher and Panicos Papanicolaou.

I'm glad as well to greet a colleague from New York University, an outstanding scholar, Professor Joan Breton Connelly, leader of the excavation of Yeronisos Island and of an international team there. Professor Connelly has just published a magnificent book, *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, which has won splendid reviews in the New York Times and New York Review of Books.

And I must salute that eminent archaeologist, Professor Vassos Karageorghis, director of the Anastasios G. Leventis Foundation.

LINKS WITH CYPRUS

I have still other links with Cyprus.

I serve on the international advisory counsel of The Pharos Trust, that splendid chamber of cultural activity in Cyprus, led by Garo Keheyan. And as a graduate of Harvard University, I'm pleased also to serve on the Executive Council of the Cyprus International Initiative for the Environment and Public Health—Harvard School of Public Health. And as I'm recalling connections, I'm glad again to see a respected Cypriot businessman, George Paraskevaides, and his wife, Thelma.

Tonight I recall that it was nearly ten years ago in June of 1998, that I had the privilege of visiting the University of Cyprus and being received by its distinguished Rector, Professor Dr. Miltiades Chacholiades, and of addressing members of the Cyprus Chamber of Commerce & Industry and Cyprus American Business Association.

Of course, particularly meaningful, all the more so in light of the decoration Paul Sarbanes and I are today receiving, is the trip Paul and I made in August 1977 when we came here for the funeral of the great leader of the Cypriot people, His Eminence, Archbishop Makarios.

The connection, however, with Cyprus of which some of you may be most aware is the one of which I shall say a few words now.

In 1967, when a group of Greek colonels overthrew young King Constantine of Greece, I, the only Greek-American in Congress, sharply attacked the coup. I refused to visit Greece or go to the Greek Embassy in Washington and I publicly opposed U.S. military aid to Greece, arguing that as Greece was a member of NATO, which championed freedom, democracy and the rule of law, none of which values the Greek military junta supported, the United States should not be sending them arms.

TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

In July 1974, the junta attempted to overthrow Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus, an action that brought the downfall of the colonels but also triggered two invasions of Cyprus by Turkish armed forces, forces equipped with weapons supplied by the United States, a legal "No-No".

So I led a group of several Members of the House of Representatives, including then Representative Sarbanes, to call on the Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, and we told

him that as American law mandated an immediate halt to further shipment of arms to any country using American weapons for other than defensive purposes, he should enforce the law and impose an embargo on further U.S. arms to Turkey.

As this was the same week that Richard Nixon resigned the presidency, I reminded Secretary Kissinger that the reason Mr. Nixon was on his way in exile to California was that he had not respected the laws of the land or the Constitution of the United States.

"You should do so," I told Kissinger.

He and the new President, Gerald R. Ford, refused to enforce the law, and, therefore, we in Congress did.

I remind you that the United States has a separation-of-powers constitutional system, not a parliamentary system! So in 1974, Congress voted an embargo on sending further American weapons to Turkey. As I have from time to time heard criticisms, in respect of the role of "the Greek lobby" in Congress, I observe that when we voted the embargo on further U.S. arms to Turkey, there were only five of us of Greek origin in Congress, all in the House of Representatives: John Brademas, Paul Sarbanes, Peter Kyros, Gus Yatron—all Democrats, all of whom supported the embargo—and one Republican, Skip Bafalis, who voted against it. There were at that time no Americans of Greek descent in the Senate.

Accordingly, this so-called "Greek lobby" was effective because of the validity of our arguments and, if I may say so, of our work to generate support for our position not only among Greek-Americans across the country but among other Americans who shared our views.

"THE RULE OF LAW LOBBY"

We were "The Rule of Law Lobby"!

I shall not here take time to review with you my subsequent experience when President Jimmy Carter, to my distress, as I generally supported his Administration, called on Congress to support lifting the embargo on Turkey despite the fact that there had been no action to resolve the Cyprus question.

Here I must pay tribute to my friend of many years, Costa Carras, founder in London of "Friends of Cyprus" who has continued to call attention to the issue that concerns us all—justice for Cyprus. In my view, finding a just resolution for Cyprus is an indispensable requirement as the European Union considers the application for membership of Turkey even as I believe there are other commitments Turkey must make if it wishes to join the EU.

First, of course, is that Turkey comply with the so-called Copenhagen criteria, which include respect for minorities, respect for human rights, respect for decent treatment of peoples.

Certainly it is not rational that a European Union member-state militarily occupy another EU member-state, and Cyprus is now a member of the European Union.

As today there are over 40,000 Turkish armed forces in Cyprus, their continued presence, if Turkey were in the European Union, would be an offense to common sense.

I add that there are an estimated 160,000 Turkish settlers in northern Cyprus while there are only 100,000 Turkish Cypriots!

A second point: It is also unreasonable for one member of the European Union to refuse to give diplomatic recognition to the existence of another member, and as we all know, Turkey has refused to recognize the Republic of Cyprus.

So these then are two of the conditions—removal of Turkish troops and diplomatic recognition of Cyprus—that it seems to me

must be met by the Government of Turkey as it seeks to join the European Union and take advantage of the benefits of such membership.

If a just settlement on Cyprus is one issue related to Turkey's desire to join the European Union, there is another of which I shall say a word.

ATTACKS ON ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

Three years ago, His Eminence, Archbishop Demetrios, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church in America, testified on Capitol Hill before the United States Helsinki Commission. His Eminence and religious leaders of other traditions voiced their concern about the systematic efforts on the part of Turkey to undermine the Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

I cite, by way of example, the expropriation by Turkish authorities of properties of Christian Orthodox communities, the refusal by the Turkish Government to accord recognition as a legal entity to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the shutdown of the Halki School of Theology and other attacks on religious minorities—Greek Orthodox, Armenian Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Jews.

For an impressive analysis of Turkish persecution of religious minorities, I refer you to the report issued only in May of this year by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

And I could add the powerful statement on religious freedom made by Congressman Tom Lantos of California, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, also last May. Chairman Lantos sent a letter to Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan urging him to take several steps to liberalize Turkey's policies toward the Ecumenical Patriarchate, once and for all.

Forty-two of Chairman Lantos' Committee colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, signed the letter urging the Turkish Government to stop trying to bully the Ecumenical Patriarchate into extinction.

You here better than I can speak of the desecration of Greek Orthodox churches in Turkish-occupied Cyprus.

Let me conclude. As one who in the year 2001, in an address at the Bosphorous University in Turkey, said that I wanted to see a democratic Turkey, Turkey part of Europe and Turkey in the European Union, provided that country comply with the Copenhagen criteria, including respect for human rights, I must tell you that in 1974, when Paul Sarbanes, our colleagues and I in Congress voted an embargo on further American arms to Turkey, we made clear that for us this decision was a matter of respecting the rule of law—a point I have made earlier.

Paul Sarbanes and I, to repeat, were leaders of "The Rule of Law Lobby"!

Paul Sarbanes and I and many of our former colleagues in Congress—and I regret that I cannot include the present President of the United States in this regard—will continue to call on respect for the laws of our own country even as we will continue to urge justice for the brave people of Cyprus.

President Papadopoulos, thank you again for the great honor that you do Senator Sarbanes and me.

LANDMINES IN COLOMBIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the people of Colombia have endured decades of civil conflict characterized by widespread killings and disappearances of civilians perpetrated by rebel groups and paramilitary death squads, sometimes with the active participation of government security forces. In recent

years, both rebels and paramilitaries have financed their illegal activities through the sale of cocaine, which has also corrupted government institutions.

Each year since the inception of Plan Colombia, the United States has provided Colombia with more than half a billion dollars in mostly military and counter-drug assistance, totaling more than \$5 billion.

The primary goal of Plan Colombia, at least as sold to the Congress, was to decrease by half the amount of coca produced, resulting in commensurate reductions in the income derived from cocaine to the rebels and paramilitaries and the amount of cocaine entering the United States.

While there is no reliable evidence that Plan Colombia has affected either the price or availability of cocaine in the United States, the Office of National Drug Control Policy reports that profits from illegal drugs to the FARC rebels declined by about one-third between 2003 and 2005. This is welcome news. But whether this trend has continued since then or has ebbed and flowed like most other statistics relating to drug cultivation and trafficking in Colombia, is unknown. Unfortunately, it is also not yet apparent that this reported reduction in profits has affected the FARC's ability to operate.

While the majority of killings of civilians during the 7 years of Plan Colombia are attributed to paramilitaries, sometimes with the active or tacit support of government forces, the FARC has engaged in many atrocities, including attacks against civilian targets and kidnapping. But perhaps the most insidious of their crimes is the widespread use of landmines.

According to a report released yesterday by Human Rights Watch, casualties from landmines used by the FARC, as well as by another rebel group known as the ELN, have risen steadily in recent years. As is so often the case with landmines which are triggered indiscriminately by the victim, most of the casualties in Colombia have been civilians.

While the number of casualties did not exceed 148 a year in the 1990s, Human Rights Watch reports that last year the number was 1,107. This increase contrasts sharply with the worldwide decline in the use of these insidious weapons. In fact, Colombia is among the more than 150 nations that have signed or ratified the international treaty banning antipersonnel mines.

According to press reports, the FARC defends its use of mines by claiming that they are used only against government security forces, not civilians. That, however, is a specious claim, since mines are inherently indiscriminate. They will kill or maim whoever comes into contact with them, often months or years after they are laid. I have seen photographs of the horrific injuries suffered by both government

soldiers and innocent civilians from rebel mines.

While the FARC, like others who continue to use landmines, would undoubtedly claim that their military utility justifies their continued use, I reject that argument. The harm to civilians and the contamination of the countryside caused by mines cannot be justified.

While there are programs to assist Colombia's mine victims with rehabilitation and vocational training, they are far from adequate. I have supported efforts to increase U.S. assistance. We are looking at ways to use the Leahy War Victims Fund to assist Colombian civilians who have been injured by mines, and we are supporting United for Colombia's efforts to obtain surgery in the U.S. for Colombian soldiers who have suffered grievous mine injuries.

I have been a consistent critic of human rights violations in Colombia where impunity remains a persistent problem. There have been thousands of killings of civilians, including of human rights defenders, union members, journalists, and others who have been targeted by one armed group or another. Hardly any of these crimes have resulted in convictions and punishment. But none of that excuses the continued use of landmines by the FARC and ELN. As I have said many times before, the use of landmines should be a war crime. It is barbaric; it is inhumane; it is indefensible.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION AGAINST IMPUNITY IN GUATEMALA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week, I spoke in this Chamber about the current debate underway in Guatemala concerning the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala, CICIG. In my brief remarks I recalled the 30 years of civil war that caused widespread atrocities against civilians, particularly Guatemala's Mayan population. A substantial majority of those killings and disappearances were perpetrated by Guatemalan security forces.

Since the signing of the Peace Accords in 1996, most Guatemalans have tried to put the past behind them and rebuild their country. The United States and other donors have supported that effort.

But key aspects of the Peace Accords remain unfulfilled, and there has been no justice for the families of the war's many victims. Meanwhile, gang violence, drug trafficking, brutal killings of women, and attacks against human rights defenders and others who speak out against corruption and impunity have increased exponentially and threaten the very foundations of Guatemala's fragile democracy.

In recent years, the Guatemalan Government has worked with officials of the United Nations to draft the CICIG agreement, the latest version of which has been upheld by Guatemala's constitutional court.

The CICIG is necessary to expose the truth about clandestine groups and to bring accountability for the violence. Far from weakening national sovereignty, CICIG will support Guatemala by helping to strengthen the capacity of the country's dysfunctional judicial system.

On July 18, a majority of members of the International Relations Committee of the Guatemalan Congress, for reasons that only they can explain, voted against the CICIG agreement. Since then, several have changed their votes and I understand that on August 1 the full Congress will approve or reject the CICIG agreement or refer it to another committee.

The question of whether to approve CICIG is, of course, a decision solely for Guatemala's Congress to make. But the importance of this historic decision cannot be overstated for U.S.-Guatemalan relations and for Guatemala's future.

Guatemala, like many impoverished countries emerging from years of civil conflict, faces immense social, economic and political challenges. Without the support of countries like the United States in building its economy, promoting foreign investment and trade, and strengthening the institutions of democracy, Guatemala will lag behind its neighbors.

Today, that support hangs in the balance.

The Bush administration has voiced strong support for CICIG. The U.S. Congress has linked a resumption of U.S. assistance for the Guatemalan Armed Forces, in part, on approval of CICIG. In addition, I would be reluctant to support assistance for Guatemala to take part in any regional security initiative with the United States, unless CICIG is approved and supported. There is little point in trying to work with a government that fails to demonstrate a strong commitment to ending impunity and to combating gang violence and corruption, which have infiltrated the very institutions that would participate in such a strategy.

CICIG is nothing less than a choice between the past and the future. Rejecting this historic initiative an outcome most Americans would find inexplicable would signal that the Guatemalan Congress is more interested in protecting the forces of evil, and in covering up the truth, than in ending the lawlessness that is taking Guatemala backwards.

INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS IN COLOMBIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, at a time when we are focused on the chaos in Iraq and the flood of Iraqis who have fled their homes and are living either as displaced persons in Iraq or as refugees in Jordan, Syria and elsewhere, I want to call attention to a humanitarian crisis in our own hemisphere.

In Colombia, a country of roughly 44 million people, over 3 million have