dispute. If the dispute over Cyprus is not resolved, Cyprus will accede into the European Union and Northern Cyprus will see the great economic disparity that already exists between the two regions widened.

Throughout the occupation, the United Nations has been trying to encourage a solution to the Cyprus problem. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has sponsored proximity talks between the President of Cyprus, Glafcos Clerides, and Rauf Denktash, the self-proclaimed leader of the Turkish part of Cyprus. The third round of talks started this month. For these talks to be successful, there will have to be significant movement on the part of the Turkish Cypriots.

The solution that has been endorsed by the United Nations, by the European Community and by the United States is the formation of a bizonal, bicommunal federation. Unification with Turkey is not an option and neither is the status quo.

Two weeks ago, I wrote a letter to President Clinton co-signed by 231 of my colleagues and 81 Senators encouraging him to give his utmost attention and involvement to the third round of proximity talks. I hope that the President and the administration will give these talks the close attention they deserve.

Cyprus, Mr. Speaker, belongs to all Cypriots, whether they are of Turkish or Greek descent. America has a duty to the people of Cyprus and to itself to push for a peaceful and permanent resolution to the Cyprus problem. I hope it is a duty that we will discharge to the very fullest of our ability.

□

COMMEMORATION OF THE 26TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Maloney) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again, as I have every year that I have been a Member of Congress, it is my distinct honor and privilege to commemorate the 26th anniversary of the 1974 illegal Turkish invasion of Cyprus. Over 77 members of the Hellenic Caucus join me in the spirit of remembering this important illegal date.

The continued presence of Turkish troops represents a gross violation of human rights and international law. Although the President has only a little more than 6 months remaining in office, he has a golden opportunity to once and for all help resolve the problem of reuniting Cyprus.

Since their invasion of Cyprus in July of 1974, Turkish troops have continued to occupy 37 percent of Cyprus. This is in direct defiance of numerous nations' resolutions and has been a major source of instability in the eastern Mediterranean, but recent events have created an atmosphere where there is now no valid excuse for not resolving this long-standing, thorny problem. However, this cannot happen without the committed and sustained U.S. leadership.

More than 20 years ago, in 1977 and 1979, the leaders of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities agreed to work together to establish a bicommunal, bizonal federation to replace the unitary government created under the 1960 constitution. Even though this agreement was codified in U.N. Security Council resolution 939 of July 14, 1994, there has been no action on the Turkish side to fill in the details and once and for all have a final agreement. Instead, for the last 26 years, there has been a Turkish Cypriot leader presiding over a regime recognized only by Turkey. It has also meant the financial decline of the once rich northern part of Cyprus to just one quarter of its former earnings.

As my colleagues know, this conflict reached a low point after the European Union summit of December 1997 when Cyprus was invited to participate in accession negotiations while Turkey was deemed not yet ready. But since then, we have seen several positive steps towards peace. First in December, the European Union formally invited Turkey to become a candidate. Then President Clinton made it clear, and he made a clear statement to Turkish President Ecevit that a resolution of the Cyprus problem could not involve a return to pre-1974 conditions. Most recently, we saw a thawing in Greek-Turkish relations resulting from the earthquake diplomacy in which each country gave assistance to the other during the tragic earthquakes last August and September.

With these developments, there is now no valid reason for the Turkish side to resist direct and serious negotiations on all issues during the continuation of meetings in Geneva. The U.S., the EU, Greece and Cyprus have all acted to accommodate Turkish concerns but it remains to be seen whether Turkey will put pressure on Denktash to bargain in good faith. And make no mistake about it, if Turkey wants the Cyprus problem resolved, it will not let Denktash stand in the way. We cannot let one person dictate Turkish Cypriot policy.

□

REMEMBERING THE KOREAN WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this month, without warning or provocation, hundreds of thousands of North Korean troops invaded South Korea, pouring across the 38th parallel and precipitating the Korean War. Unprepared South Korean, or ROK, forces and the handful of Americans on the ground were incapable of halting this swift and brutal assault. In a matter of days, the badly battered U.S. and ROK units had been pushed back to a tiny toe-hold on the southern tip of the Korean Peninsula.

It was only with determination and unbelievable courage that American forces, together with South Korean and allied troops, were able to push back the attacking North Korean Army. The break-out of the Pusan perimeter, the Inchon landing, battles like Pork Chop Hill and Heartbreak Ridge, the terrible fight against overwhelming odds at the frozen Chosin Reservoir, on these and countless other unnamed battlefields we beat back the invaders.

The Korean conflict reflected the absolute determination of the United States to halt the spread of tyranny and totalitarianism, but the cost was high. The war that North Korea started resulted in 39,000 U.S. deaths and over 100,000 wounded and severely undermined U.S. relations with Russia and China. It took decades for our South Korean ally to recover.

In the so-called Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the DPRK, there is certainly a very different and distorted interpretation of the events that occurred 50 years ago. Incredibly, according to the North Korean news agency, quote, ''the U.S. instigated the ROK Army to start a surprise armed invasion of North Korea on June 25, 1950. It was commanded by the U.S. military advisory group,'' end of quote.

The newscast goes on to explain that in precipitating this unprovoked attack, the U.S. supposedly indiscriminately carpet bombed throughout North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, these lies from North Korea newscasts are not from some ancient historical record. No, this was the broadcast in the last several weeks. It is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that this slanderous pack of lies was broadcast right after the recent historic meeting between South Korean President Kim Dae Jung and North Korean leader Kim Jong Il. It was broadcast the day after the United States had announced the delivery to North Korea of an additional 50,000 tons of grain. And about the same time that North Korea was reinventing history, Secretary of State Albright was announcing that North Korea is not a terrorist state or even a rogue state, but merely a state of concern.

This member points this out because of the recent changes in perception regarding North Korea. On the verge of collapse, the hermit kingdom is at least attempting to give the impression that it is reaching out to South Korea and to the West. If North Korea is in fact sincere in its peaceful overtures, that certainly would be a dramatic, positive development. However, it would be premature to assume that the DPRK has irrevocably reformed its behavior. It would be naive in the extreme to believe that a few gestures

constitute a reversion of 50 years of violently confrontational behavior and terrorism, and it would be foolish to pretend that North Korea no longer deserves to be labeled as a terrorist state.

In recent days, a historic meeting has occurred between the North and South Korean leaders. Kim Dae Jung went to Pyongyang and promised to open the spigots of foreign assistance, although at the North's insistence, it is called economic cooperation. That is, the South gives and the North cooperates by accepting. In return, the North has promised to permit some long-awaited family reunions of those who have been torn from their families 50 years ago.

From a public relations standpoint, North Korea scored a remarkable victory. Kim Jong Il was described as cherubic in the New York Times and, amazingly, senior administration officials called him courageous and visionary. But the question remains, has Kim Jong Il and the totalitarian elite that rules North Korea made a commitment to peace? When one examines North Korea's record on weapons of mass destruction, missiles and support for terrorism, it is not at all clear that it has made a permanent commitment to peace.

Despite the 1994 Agreed Framework that was touted as capping the North Korean nuclear threat, there is ample evidence that Pyongyang continues to pursue an undeclared nuclear program. An unclassified 1998 CIA report concludes that North Korea possesses between 6 and 12 kilograms of plutonium which it acquired before the Yongbyon nuclear reactor was shut down in 1995. This weapons-grade material has not been accounted for. In addition, press reports from publications such as Jane's Intelligence Review suggest the DPRK has continued its efforts to acquire uranium enrichment technologies. In 1998, a secret underground facility was discovered that certainly seemed like it was related to nuclear activities.

I hope that North Korea has made a change, Mr. Speaker, but we need to see exactly what it has done before we reach any new conclusions about its intentions.

According to the Congressional Research Service, Russian and former East German nuclear scientists are operating in North Korea.

In contrast to the time when the 1994 Agreed Framework was signed, North Korea seems on the threshold of being able to attack the United States with a missile that could deliver chemical, biological, or possibly nuclear weapons. It has produced, deployed and exported missiles to several countries of great concern to the United States. The DPRK has launched a three-stage (Taepo-dong 1) missile and continues to develop a larger, longer-range missile (the Taepo-dong 2). Not only does North Korea now possess a missile capable of reaching U.S. soil, but it is clear that it intends to sell such fully developed weapons systems to the highest bidder. According to a 1999 National Intelligence Estimate, ''the proliferation of medium-range ballistic missiles—driven primarily by North Korean No Dong sales—has created an immediate, serious and growing threat to U.S. forces, interests, and allies, and has significantly altered the strategic balances in the Middle East and Africa.''

While individuals in the Executive Branch argue that North Korea has agreed to halt its missile program, it is important to note that the North only has agreed to a moratorium on flight tests. Design, rocket motor tests, production, and sales to other so-called ''states of concern'' can continue.

It was just last week, at negotiations that took place between U.S. and North Korean officials, that the DPRK flatly refused to halt development of missiles. Instead, they made it clear that development of new and more capable missiles will continue. In addition, North Korea demanded $1 billion to impose a ''moratorium'' on new missile exports. Unfortunately, this is all too typical of the North's pattern of threats and extortion.

North Korea insists that it is not a terrorist state, but its past and even recent actions certainly suggest otherwise. The DPRK has remained a haven for the terrorists of the Japanese Red Army faction. Pyongyang regularly has infiltrated training and resupply teams into South Korea and Japan. Other actions include border violations, infiltration of armed saboteurs and spies, hijacking, kidnapping, assassination, and threats against media personnel and institutions.

To finance these terrorist activities, North Korea uses counterfeit U.S. currency. Recently a Japanese Red Army terrorist was caught while traveling in Southeast Asia with a North Korean diplomatic passport. This terrorist was carrying over $100,000 in counterfeit currency. In short, Mr. Speaker, North Korea has not to date behaved like a country wishing to join the international family of nations.

Former Secretary of Defense William Perry, a truly outstanding public servant, was tasked with reviewing U.S. policy toward North Korea. He concluded that North Korea had two options. The first option would be the path of engagement. If the DPRK really sheds its rogue behavior, the United States should respond with a reduction of sanctions, and gradual extension of normal political and commercial activity. If, however, the DPRK chooses the path of confrontation, the Perry-recommended policy is that the United States and our allies must meet the North's aggressiveness with firmness, resolve, and military might. It must be clear that America would respond in that fashion.

Mr. Speaker, it is far too early to tell which path the DPRK will choose. It is possible that they will opt for peaceful engagement. America and South Korea obviously hope that it is the path the DPRK will choose, but we must end the cycle of extortion which the North has successfully pursued with the United States. One insubstantive summit meeting does not guarantee such a sea change in behavior. This nation must maintain its resolve to preposition 100,000 troops in the Asia-Pacific area, with 37,000 on the Korean Peninsula. We must resist the temptation to throw even more money at the North without demonstrable progress in reducing the threat. And, we must continue to aggressively pursue the development of ballistic missile defenses capable of defending this nation against the emerging ballistic missile threat—a threat made ever-more immediate by the North Korean missile development program and its missile exports.

Mr. Speaker, this Member genuinely hopes that North Korea will one day become merely a ''state of concern.'' But until this Member sees ample evidence to the contrary, he must continue to view North Korea as a ''terrorist state'' and to regard the Korean Peninsula as the place on the globe where American forces might again be attacked and a tragically costly war begun again.

□

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to sound the alarm about a silent war that is going on all over the world, the war between people and infectious diseases.

It is not a new war. Since humans first walked the earth, microbes have preyed on us and we have fought back. As recently as the 19th century, the average life span in Europe and North America was 50 years, and the likelihood of dying prematurely from infectious diseases was in most places as high as 40 percent.

With the widespread introduction in the 1940s of penicillin and other antibiotics, we thought we had won the war. Finally, we could cure a whole raft of infectious diseases that routinely took human lives across the whole span of a human lifetime, from infancy through the prime of life to old age.

A month ago, the World Health Organization issued a report that paints a comprehensive picture of the renewed danger we face from infectious diseases. Microbes are mutating at an alarming rate into strains that too often fail to respond to drugs.

Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland, director general of the WHO, recently stated, we currently have effective medicines to cure almost every major infectious disease, but we risk losing these valuable drugs, and our opportunity to eventually control many infectious diseases, because of increasing antimicrobial resistance.

The report describes how around the world almost all infectious diseases are becoming resistant to existing medicines. In Estonia, Latvia, and parts of Russia and China, over 10 percent of tuberculosis patients have strains resistant to the two most powerful TB medicines. Because of resistance, Thailand has completely lost the means of using three of the most common anti-malaria drugs. In New Delhi, typhoid 10 years ago could be cured with three inexpensive drugs, but now these drugs are largely ineffective. A small but growing number of patients are already showing primary resistance to AZT and other new therapies for HIV-infected people.

Patients admitted to hospital wards are especially vulnerable. In the U.S.,