

military invasion and continued occupation of part of the territory of a sovereign state. This fact should not be conveniently overlooked in people's perception, by concentrating on peripheral parameters. Any initiative to solve the problem must have at its core, this most basic and fundamental fact and be based on the premise that international legality must be served and the occupation lifted.

Unfortunately, the fundamentals of the situation on the ground remain unchanged for the past 30 years since the Turkish invasion in Cyprus. This situation is one comprising of severe violations of the most fundamental human rights. The yet unresolved issues of the missing persons, an issue of a purely humanitarian nature, as well as that of the enclave of the Karpass peninsula, are in themselves an indication of Cyprus' enduring suffering. This should not only point towards the specifics of the solution to be pursued but must also guide our actions with regard to managing the current status quo. For instance, the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), assigned with the task to manage the status quo inflicted 30 years ago, should remain specific to the situation on the ground.

The accession of Cyprus to the European Union, in conjunction with the lack of an agreement on the settlement of the Cyprus problem, in spite of our efforts and our preference for a settlement prior to accession, signifies the end of an era and the beginning of a new one. I firmly believe that the new context defined by the accession of my country to the EU and by the expressed will of Turkey to advance on the European path offers a unique opportunity and could have a catalytic effect in reaching a settlement in Cyprus. Our vocation is to be partners and not enemies.

Hence, in this new era, we plea to Turkey, to join us in turning the page and seeking ways to mutually discover, mutually beneficial solutions to the various aspects that compose the Cyprus problem. The mere realization that peace and stability in our region serve the interests of both our countries is ample evidence to prove that what unites us is stronger than what divides us.

THE RECOGNITION OF COMMISSIONER BRADLEY M. CAMPBELL

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 2004

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the work and tireless efforts of Commissioner Bradley M. Campbell. In the time that I have known Commissioner Campbell, I have found him to be a man of great integrity, courage, and dedication towards everything he does. This weekend, Mr. Campbell will be the recipient of the "Big Kahuna" award from the Surfers' Environmental Alliance. As New Jersey's Environmental Commissioner, I can say with great certainty, that through his work, Bradley Campbell is a truly deserving recipient of such an award.

In surfing circles a Kahuna is recognized as a respected elder of the sport, and a mentor to young surfers. Past recipients of the award have included surf shop owners, surf team managers, athletes or leaders in various environmental initiatives that have championed the sport. All these individuals have two things in common—they have had a great love and respect for the sport of surfing, and they have—

in their own ways—encouraged and preserved the sport for everyone to enjoy.

Commissioner Campbell is truly an advocate for the sport of surfing as well as various environmental causes that are significant to surfers, as well as all individuals who care about the preservation of our beaches and the well being of our environment. Through his position as Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection, he has strengthened New Jersey's environmental laws and greatly improved the quality of our state's natural resources. Prior to assuming his position as Commissioner, Brad had a distinguished record of service, which included serving as the Associate Director of the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), and later, being appointed by President Clinton as the Regional Administrator (Mid-Atlantic Region) of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Speaker, once again I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Commissioner Campbell on his award, and I would like to extend my gratitude for all his years of hard work and genuine commitment.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 2004

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to express my strong opposition to what is an assault on our Constitution, H. J. Res. 106, the Marriage Protection Amendment.

Constitutional amendments can never be taken lightly. Our Constitution has been amended only twenty-seven times in the two centuries since our country was founded, but it's never been amended to limit the civil rights of a specific group of people as we are doing here today.

Few policy issues are more grounded in the jurisdiction of the fifty states than the laws of marriage. As Vice President CHENEY said in a recent interview, "Historically, that's been a relationship that's been handled by the states," and "States have made the basic fundamental decision [as to] what constitutes a marriage." I agree with the Vice President. Should this legislation pass, not only would state courts be prohibited from recognizing same-sex marriages, but states would also be prohibited from enacting legislation to grant same-sex marriages through referendum, ballot initiative, or even through their own state constitutional amendment process, even in states where the majority supports it.

As I strongly oppose the content of this legislation, the Majority's motivation to consider it today is raw politics. Bringing this legislation up weeks before our national elections, divides this nation even further at a time when critical issues and needs must be addressed. We should be using this time to focus on the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission; on the restructuring of our intelligence community; on protecting our ports, nuclear facilities and other potential targets from terrorists; on the rising health care costs in this country; on the loss of jobs throughout this country; on reducing our spiraling budget deficit; or on the rap-

idly deteriorating situation in Iraq. Instead, one month before the election, we're debating an amendment to our Constitution that has no hope of enactment, but merely because the Republican Majority believes they will be able to score points with this ill-begotten bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and get back to work on the critical needs facing America.

TRIBUTE TO CARL OSTROM

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 2004

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House to join with me to recognize and honor 86-year-old Carl Ostrom, from Seattle. The nationally acclaimed non-profit "Experience Works," which recognizes outstanding contributions by seniors in its annual Prime Time Awards Program, selected Mr. Ostrom as their 2004 Outstanding Older Worker from the State of Washington. It is an honor well deserved.

Mr. Ostrom helps to make the world a better place through his leadership at the University District Food Bank in Seattle, which assists 800 families every week.

Mr. Ostrom serves as the part-time operations manager, overseeing the critical work of delivery and distribution of food. Remarkably, Carl Ostrom has been involved with the University District Food Bank for 17 years.

Carl's unselfish deeds and extraordinary commitment to give back to his community are an inspiration. Carl Ostrom proves, again, that senior citizens can make lifelong contributions to their community and their country. I congratulate Carl Ostrom for being selected the 2004 Outstanding Older Worker in the State of Washington, and I look forward to his continued role in making the world a better place.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 2004

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 106, which would deny basic rights under the Constitution to gays and lesbians. This resolution is a cynical ploy to foster division and diversion for the election campaign. Even its strongest proponents know it has no chance of passing.

Two short months ago, the House passed unprecedented legislation that would strip the federal courts of the ability to decide the constitutionality of The Defense of Marriage Act. And today the House will vote on whether to use the very document that guarantees our liberties and protections to restrict the rights of one group of Americans.

Throughout U.S. history, the states have been responsible for marriage and family law. Thirty-eight states have already acted to define marriage as the union of a man and woman and no state has adopted legislation