

When the Turkish troops invaded the island, they took 1,614 Cypriots and five Americans and have never been seen or heard from since. For 24 years their families have had to wonder whether they are. This spring, the remains of Andrew Kassapis were brought home to his parents in Michigan. I was touched and honored to have had the opportunity to take part in a memorial service with his family and other Hellenic leaders on the steps of the Capitol. This report is only the beginning. We must find out the fates of the 1,614 Cypriots who have also been missing since 1974. I will continue my work in Congress to bring answers to the families and friends of the Cypriots who are still missing and to bring the remains of the other four Americans, including George Anastasiou and Christaci Loizoi, home to their families. The Kassapis family was able to experience some closure and I want to see these other families afforded the same right.

Others that must not be forgotten are the people detained in the enclaved areas of Northern Cyprus. In 1974, 20,000 Greek-Cypriots did not leave their homes after the Northern portion of the island was occupied. There are strict restrictions on where they are allowed to travel. If they leave their villages, they are no longer allowed to return. Those 20,000 people have been the victims of persecution and discrimination that has caused their depletion. Now only 540 people are left. And, Greek Cypriots that want to visit their family and friends in the enclaved area are forced to pay \$30 for each visit.

Using Cyprus's European Union membership aspirations as a pretext, Turkey has recently embarked on an increasingly hostile pursuit of its long-standing objective to partition Cyprus.

Illegal military overflights of Cyprus have increased, Turkish occupation forces have brought new weaponry into the occupied area, and they have provoked incidents along the UN cease-fire line, killing four Greek Cypriots in 1996. Turkey has also made plans for the construction of two new naval bases and an air force base in the occupied area and has upgraded its bases on the southern coast of Turkey, which is only 50 miles from Cyprus.

Most ominous of all, Turkey has threatened to "integrate" the occupied area of Cyprus if Cyprus joins the EU, and the Turkish Cypriot leader has said that "there will be war if Cyprus joins the EU." Turkey has, in fact, already signed a number of "agreements" with the illegal Turkish Cypriot regime that lay the groundwork for an eventual annexation of the occupied area.

In August 1997, Cypriot President Clerides provided the Turkish Cypriot community's leader with a proposal to engage in a dialogue to resolve security concerns of all parties. On June 20 of this year, President Clerides requested U.N. Secretary General Annan to undertake a personal initiative to reduce military tensions. President Clerides reiterated to Annan his commitment to reconsider the acquisition of missiles if progress is made leading to the demilitarizations of Cyprus.

Last year, this Congress passed a resolution urging the Administration to launch an initiative to resolve the Cyprus problem, setting forth the parameters for such a solution, including demilitarization. The Turkish side, however, has refused to come to the negotiating table unless the occupied area is first recognized as an independent state and Cyprus

withdraws its application to join the EU. The U.S. has opposed these conditions as unacceptable obstacles to progress in resolving the Cyprus problem.

We must stress that Turkey must come to the negotiating table with no preconditions and open to peace;

We must stress that demilitarization of the island is necessary to obtain peace;

And, we must stress that there will be severe consequences if further military action against Cyprus is taken.

We must take a firm stand in obtaining peace on Cyprus in the upcoming year so that next year we may celebrate peace instead of remembering war.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE A NATIONAL VETERANS CEMETERY TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN METROPOLITAN ATLANTA IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1998

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce to my colleagues in the House of Representatives that I am introducing legislation authorizing a national veteran's cemetery to be constructed in the metropolitan Atlanta area in the State of Georgia.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this effort not just on behalf of the veterans in Georgia but veterans across our nation.

Our nation has a sacred obligation to fulfill the promises we made to our veterans when they agreed to risk and, in many cases, give their lives to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. One of those promises was a military burial in a national cemetery.

Speaker GINGRICH is an original cosponsor to this important piece of legislation. The Speaker has been a dedicated advocate of the veterans in the state of Georgia and of this country. In addition, I want to thank the other Members of the Georgia delegation for their support of our efforts. Congressmen COLLINS, KINGSTON, LINDER, CHAMBLISS, DEAL, LEWIS, and BISHOP realize the importance of the veterans in Georgia.

Sadly, the access of many veterans in Georgia to military burial has been blocked due to the lack of a national cemetery near their homes and the homes of their loved ones. Georgia has no National Cemetery space available. None. This situation is inexcusable, and we must take immediate steps to remedy it.

The legislation we are introducing today is an important first step in creating a new national veterans cemetery. Senators CLELAND and COVERDELL are introducing a companion measure in the United States Senate.

Establishing a national cemetery in Georgia would give veterans and their families accessibility and the recognition they deserve.

There are currently over 700,000 veterans living in Georgia. Some 450,000 of these veterans live in the Atlanta metropolitan area. Atlanta is the largest metropolitan area in the United States without a useable national cemetery.

Georgia currently has only one national cemetery located in Marietta. However, this

resting area for so many veterans has been full since 1970. The nearest national cemeteries accepting burials are in Alabama and Tennessee; neither of which are accessible to Georgia's 450,000 veterans who live in the Atlanta Metropolitan area.

Placing a national cemetery in the Atlanta area will alleviate the pressure on the cemeteries in Tennessee and Alabama.

According to a National Cemetery System report, Atlanta, Georgia was listed as one of the ten geographic areas in the United States in which a need for a burial space for veterans is the greatest. The Atlanta area has had this designation now for two decades.

This legislation is supported by Pete Wheeler, Commissioner of the Georgia Veteran's Association, and the Georgia Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and other veterans' groups. I ask all veterans groups to support this legislation because it is only appropriate for Georgia's heroes to be allowed to be laid to rest in their home state.

This has been a long awaited process for Georgia veterans. These men and women deserve a proper resting place. The legislation we are introducing today is an important first step in creating a new national cemetery.

ADDRESS OF JOHN BRADEMAs AT ROYAUMONT PROCESS CON- FERENCE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former colleague in the House of Representatives from my native State of Indiana, Dr. John Brademas, who as Members know, served as Majority Whip of the House from 1977 to 1981 and then President of New York University, has since 1994 been Chairman of the Board of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Earlier this month, on July 9, 1998, Dr. Brademas delivered the Keynote Address at a conference in Salonika (Thessaloniki), Greece, sponsored by the European Union Royaumont Process for the "Promotion of Stability and Good-Neighborly Relations in Southeastern Europe."

Because I believe Members will read with interest Dr. Brademas' remarks on this occasion, I ask unanimous consent to insert his address at this point in the RECORD:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF DR. JOHN BRADEMAs

Distinguished guests and friends, I count it a great privilege to have been invited by the distinguished European Union Coordinator of the Royaumont Process, Dr. Panayotis Roumeliotis, and Professor Panayotis Korliras of the Lambrakis Foundation, to offer some remarks at the opening here of this important conference sponsored by the Royaumont Process to Promote Stability and Good-Neighborly Relations in Southeastern Europe.

In the first place, I feel at home here. My father was born in Kalamata, Greece, and I was the first native-born American of Greek origin elected to the Congress of the United States.

Second, I am glad to be back in the great city of Thessaloniki, one of the most important centers, culturally, economically, politically and religiously, in this part of the

world. I've been in Thessaloniki several times in recent years and always rejoice at the prospect of returning.

Third, I applaud the purpose of this conference, and I salute not only the leaders of the Royaumont Process and the Lambrakis Foundation but the other sponsors as well, the University Research Institute of the University of Macedonia, the Association for Democracy in the Balkans and the Kokkalis Foundation.

And what is the purpose of our meeting in Thessaloniki?

It is to promote the objectives of a timely European Union initiative, the Royaumont Process, which are "stability and good neighborliness" in this region, and to do so by bringing together representatives of non-governmental organizations who, if from different countries and backgrounds, have a common interest in the development of civil society.

The Royaumont Process concentrates on actions needed to spur civic structures and create effective means of communication across national boundaries, at both bilateral and multilateral levels, in Southeastern Europe.

The countries taking part in the Process are: Albania, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia, Hungary and Turkey as well as European Union Members (like Greece), Russia and the United States.

The Royaumont Process lays special emphasis on both local citizen involvement and crossborder collaboration and its authors believe, rightly, that dialogue across ethnic lines and national boundaries is indispensable in developing the conditions of peace and stability.

I think it particularly significant that this conference will concentrate on the role of non-governmental organizations in building and sustaining institutions of democracy and stability in Southeastern Europe.

Certainly NGOs have played a crucial role in developing democracy in the Western world, they are, indeed, the vehicles of civil society.

To illustrate my point, only last month I spent several days in Cyprus where I talked with both President Glafkos Clerides of the Republic of Cyprus and with the Turkish Cypriot leader, Ralf Denktash. In my address at the University of Cyprus, I made clear my distress that Mr. Denktash had ordered a halt to contacts between the two communities and I urged a renewal.

By his action, Mr. Denktash has cut short a most promising practice whereby large numbers of both communities were meeting in regular and structured fashion.

I talked to a number of persons, not only Greek Cypriots but Turkish ones, who are anxious that such contacts be resumed not only between individuals but between NGOs on the island.

Indeed, as our meeting in Thessaloniki demonstrates, non-governmental organizations are at the forefront of efforts to create regional networks and foster citizen participation. The Association for Balkan Democracy, founded by Costa Carras, Nikos Efthimiades, Rigas Tzeleploglou and Petros Papasarakantopoulos, and the Research Institute of the University of Macedonia are good examples.

I must note here yet another NGO, born in this region and certainly worthy of emulation, the Association of Interbalkan Women's Cooperation Societies. Ably led by its dynamic founder, Ketty Tzitzikosta, the Association brings together on a regular basis women from other NGOs in the region to discuss, teach and develop ways to promote peace and stability—often with a focus on

the important areas of social development and environmental concerns.

Here let me speak to you not only as a former Member of Congress but also as Chairman of an American non-governmental entity, the National Endowment for Democracy.

NED, as we like to call it, is unusual in the United States, in that it is a non-governmental organization financed with government funds.

The purpose of NED is to make grants to private organizations in countries that do not enjoy democracy in order to encourage the institutions and practices of a free, open and democratic society—free and fair elections, independent media, the rule of the law and vigorous non-governmental organizations.

Albeit with modest funds, the National endowment has, among its programs in over 90 countries, sought to address some of the obstacles to democratization in Southeastern Europe. NED grants have encouraged the resolution of inter-ethnic conflict, greater political pluralism and economic reform as well as assisted the independent organizations necessary to form the basis of civil society in the region.

I cannot begin to list all the proposals the Board of NED Board has considered. But let me note a few of the countries for which grants have recently been approved.

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, with the continuing animosity between Muslims and Croats and where peace remains fragile, NED is helping an NGO in Livno, the Center for Civic Cooperation, in an effort to promote cross-cultural communication and better relations between these two ethnic communities.

In Bulgaria, despite the victory of non-communist forces in presidential and parliamentary elections, genuine participatory democracy is far from reality. NED is assisting an NGO, the Balkan Forum Civil Association, that teaches people how to be politically active in their own communities.

In Kosovo NED has supported *Kota Ditore*, the only independent daily newspaper and one of the few reliable sources of information on political and economic developments in the Balkan countries where Albanians live. In Serbia, too, where Milosevic uses the official media to attack his opponents and to disseminate anti-Western propaganda, NED supports *Vreme*, a weekly magazine regarded as the number one chronicler of events in Yugoslavia and a leading critic of Milosevic.

To generalize, and as all of you know better than I, the advance of democracy has proceeded at a different pace in the various states of the region. Given the different circumstances in each, this is not surprising.

The countries of Southeastern Europe and the New Independent States continue to struggle, economically, politically and, as the strife in Kosovo illustrates, sometimes violently. What the National Endowment for Democracy, with its grants program, has demonstrated, that NGOs can play a crucial role in promoting stability and democracy.

This observation leads me to tell you of a project on which I have been working for the past two years with several colleagues, including, in the United States, President Clinton's Special Envoy for dealing with the dispute between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Matthew Nimetz, and in Greece, someone known to many of you here because of his long and constructive interest in Cyprus, Costa Carras, and a prominent citizen of Thessaloniki, Nikos Efthimiades, to establish a Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe.

I am pleased to say that our efforts are bearing fruit and that only this morning we

had the first, informal, meeting of the Board of the Center.

To be located administratively in Thessaloniki, the Center, will devote attention to such fields as education, the environment and a market economy as well as to the practices of a pluralist, democratic society, that is to say, an independent judiciary, free and responsible media, healthy non-governmental organizations, efficient and accountable central administrations and local governments and effective parliamentary institutions.

Our Advisory Council includes persons from Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Greece, the Netherlands, Rumania, Serbia, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The purpose of the Center's multinational approach will be to foster greater interchange and understanding among the peoples of the area and to develop networks among individuals and groups committed to the democratic and peaceful development of Southeastern Europe.

The work of the Center will obviously reinforce the program of the Royaumont Process, and my colleagues and I hope that our two ventures will find ways of cooperating with each other.

We believe that the Center has now raised enough funds from individual benefactors to be able to employ an outstanding person to direct, in concert with the Board, the programs of the Center which, to reiterate, we want to see carried out throughout this region.

Of course, if we are to be able to mount a constructive program, we must raise additional funds—from individuals, business firms, foundations and, where appropriate, governmental and inter-governmental institutions such as the European Union.

Allow me to tell you about the first activity we intend the Center to undertake. To be called the Southeastern European Joint History Project, we want to approach professors at universities and research institutions in the region, secondary school teachers, representatives of the media and leaders from the different religious traditions.

For example, we should like to bring together professors of Balkan history for seminars, roundtables and other meetings not with the objective of producing a common history but rather better to understand each other's and thereby, as President Clinton said in Sarajevo, "to make history our friend and not our enemy."

I am very glad to say that a brilliant historian, of Bulgarian origin, now a professor of Balkan history at the University of Florida, Maria Todorova, has agreed to help organize the Joint History Project.

For those of you who have not read it, I commend to you Professor Todorova's splendid volume, published last year by Oxford University Press, USA, entitled *Imagining the Balkans*.

Here I observe that I was very pleased to learn from Ketty Tzitzikosta that the Association of the Interbalkan Women's Cooperation Societies will hold a conference in Thessaloniki next October on the theme, "The image of the 'other/the neighbor' in the school textbooks of the Balkan countries", and I trust that Professor Todorova and Ketty will this week compare notes on how their two efforts can reinforce each other.

In like fashion, I note that Association for Balkan Democracy is now publishing an impressive bimonthly newsletter, *Balkan Horizons*, under the editorship of Petros Papasarakantopoulos, aimed at promoting political democracy, civil society and non-governmental organizations in the region.

A third example of the kind of leadership through NGOs that I believe characterizes

the mission of the Royaumont Process is the statement adopted earlier this month in Oslo by business representatives from the Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot communities.

The fundamental thrust of the declaration is to encourage "increased contact and cooperation between two communities", including the relaxation and eventual removal of all restrictions on the free movement of people, goods and service and the expansion of contacts in business, culture and sports.

I am sure that everyone attending this conference could offer other illustrations of how nongovernmental organizations are, in a variety of ways engaged in efforts that involve men and women of different ethnic, religious and national backgrounds and are thereby laying the building blocks of the peaceful, stable region we all want to see.

As I have said, the Board of the Center will certainly want to cooperate with the Royaumont Process, and I salute Dr. Roumeliotis, Dr. Korliras and the other organizers of this conference for bringing together so many representatives of NGOs from so many different countries and cultures but all with an interest in the development of a vigorous and vital civil society.

Allow me then to indicate what I believe should be three goals of non-governmental organizations in this region, three crucial elements in developing the institutions and practices of self government: civil society, security and economic development.

First, a healthy, vibrant civil society—that is to say, institutions, associations and organizations wholly independent of government, groups through which the bonds of social trust and collaboration are created—is imperative if people are peacefully to express their differences and resolve their disputes.

A second essential criterion for democracy to take hold is a regional security regime—meaning a cluster of agreements among states to consult with, and provide their neighbors information about, their defense practices, and to agree on principles on which their security policies should be based. Such agreements and assurances are imperative not only for the immediate task of crisis prevention but also for the longer-term goal of helping generate such effective dialogue and understanding among peoples as to diminish persistent stereotypes of one another. If extremely difficult to establish, this factor is nonetheless crucial because no enduring solution to the security problems of the area can rely solely on the continued presence of the United States or Western Europe.

Third, the growth across borders of economic ties and the integration of markets can be a powerful incentive to the construction of open, pluralistic relations both within countries and throughout Southeastern Europe.

Business and trade associations, for example, can promote legal reforms that are conducive to freer internal markets as well as stronger commercial ties across frontiers. For indispensable to the long-term growth of domestic economies and trade among nations is the rule of law. Business executives and investors must be able to depend on agreed rules and their effective enforcement.

I must in this connection, say a special word about corruption, which could be the subject of an entire speech! In the last few years, corruption, long tolerated with apathy, cynicism and denial, has become a target of serious action both national and international levels.

Theft, bribery and money-laundering are now more and more understood to be major obstacles to economic growth and genuine democracy. Even as 34 nations last year signed the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials, I believe attention must be paid to the challenge of

corruption in the new democracies of Southeastern Europe. Another item for the agenda of our Center!

If I have not yet exhausted you, I shall conclude these remarks by proposing some questions for our discussion in the next two days:

What kinds of voluntary, non-governmental associations are most needed in your respective states in Southeastern Europe?

What is the role of the region's major religions with respect to crafting democracy here?

What about the obligation of the media—press, television, radio—in stimulating a sense of civic responsibility and genuine accountability by government to the citizenry? How can we assure media free of government control?

How can schools, colleges and universities encourage respect for people of different ethnic origins, nationalities and religions? How can educational institutions promote understanding of the nature of democracy?

How can new cultural, economic, educational and social linkages be created to replace old ethnic and religious divisions?

Ladies and gentlemen, I have spoken of some of the factors that seem to me essential to overcoming, or at least diminishing, the many conflicts in this region and to building societies at once peaceful, democratic and stable.

And allow me to say once more how deeply impressed I am by the initiative of the Royaumont Process and its collaborators in sponsoring this conference.

I hope that the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation of which I have told you will have a long and productive relationship not only with Royaumont, but also with the many non-governmental organizations represented here this week.

How splendid it would be, as we look to a new century and the next millennium, for all the peoples of Southeastern Europe to enjoy the fruits of freedom, democracy and the rule of law!

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO MARTHA L. BUTLER FOR HER EXEMPLARY SERVICE TO THE OHIO SENATE

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1998

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay very special tribute to an outstanding individual from the Great State of Ohio, Martha L. Butler. Later this month, after thirteen years of service, Martha Butler will retire from her prestigious position of Clerk of the Ohio Senate.

Martha's initial service to the Ohio Senate began more than twenty-five years ago when she began working as an aide to the Honorable Max H. Dennis. During her early years in the Senate, her commitment to the institution of the Senate and professionalism she brought to her job were evident to all of those who had the opportunity to work with her. In 1977, she switched Senate offices and began working for the Honorable Paul E. Pfeifer as his Legislative Aide.

A short time later, Martha moved to the Senate Clerk's office where she became the Assistant Clerk of the Ohio Senate. Then, in 1985, Martha broke new ground and made history by becoming the first woman to hold the position of Clerk in the Ohio Senate. In

fact, Martha is the only woman to hold this position in either chamber of the Ohio Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, during the time when I served as the President of the Ohio Senate and in most of my twenty-two years as a State Senator, I was very fortunate to have the opportunity to work closely with Martha. She approached her work in the Ohio Senate with the highest sense of honor, responsibility, and dedication. In the future, the unwavering commitment and professionalism that Martha brought to the Office of the Clerk will be the standard by which all others who hold that position will be judged.

Mr. Speaker, having had the pleasure of working with Martha Butler and seeing, firsthand, her commitment to the people of the state of Ohio, I know she will be sorely missed. Martha truly is a credit to the Ohio Senate, and to all of Ohio. I would urge my colleagues to stand and join me in paying special tribute to Martha Butler, and in wishing her well in all of her future endeavors.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, on July 20, 1998, Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia offered an amendment to the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform substitute that proposed repealing important provisions of the 1993 National Voter Registration Act. Fortunately, this ill-considered amendment to gut what has become known as the "Motor Voter law" was defeated. In his remarks supporting Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment, Mr. DELAY of Texas cited Dr. Walter Dean Burnham, a professor of Government at the University of Texas at Austin and a nationally recognized expert on the history of American campaigns and elections. On page H5941, Mr. DELAY states: "Because of the lack of fraud provisions in the Motor Voter law, 'We have the modern world's sloppiest electoral systems,' according to political scientist Walter Dean Burnham."

In a letter to the Committee on House Oversight, Dr. Burnham writes that Mr. DELAY misquoted him and misrepresented the substance of his research on voting. His letter follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT,

Austin, TX, July 27, 1998.

Dr. KEITH ABOUCHAR

Committee on Oversight, Democratic Staff, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR KEITH: Thanks very much for the fax of July 21 and the enclosed CR remarks on the Goodlatte Amendment.

It will probably not surprise you to learn that I was grossly misquoted by Rep. DeLay. Some years ago, I was indiscreet enough to respond to a phone inquiry from some writer