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.