

and focus on something that will really work and will give us the results that we want.

We have a great challenge over the course of the next few months. Our President has made education his top priority and that gives us a tremendous opportunity to make some long-needed changes in Federal education policy. But the devil is always in the details and the difficulty is not in talking about it, but in getting it done. So I hope that we will work hard to make sure that we get there and do what we need to do on education.

We need to make an investment, but in order to make that investment, we need to show the taxpayers that they are going to get results for their dollars. That is sort of the battle I think that has been going on in this country, and a lot of skepticism about the ability of government to get anything done. There are those who believe that government should just sort of get out of the way of everything, and we are not going to change their minds. However, I think there is a larger group of people out there who recognize that particularly in an area like education, government can have a real positive impact on improving the quality of our lives in this country.

□ 1400

These taxpayers just want their money's worth. They do not want us to simply say we are going to throw more money at the problem. They want to know that they are going to be accountable for results that comes with that money. If we can push the three Rs bill that focuses on local control, flexibility and results, I think we can get the public support we need to spend the dollars we need, but that is going to be a real challenge.

It is a challenge as new Democrats that we put down for the President to work with us, certainly to get the accountability and the results-oriented focus. But once we have done that, make the investment that is necessary to get it done, I mean, I wish we could improve the quality of education without spending any more money on it, that would make all of our lives more easy. We would not have to find the dollars and make the more choices when you look at the crushing needs out there, particularly in impoverished communities, rural communities, some urban communities, areas that do not have the dollars to get the basics of what they need, you know that they need help in the resources department.

They need some money from the Federal Government to help meet the needs of their children. And if the philosophy is leave no child behind, you better be prepared to step up to that commitment.

We will give them the accountability and the results, but let us make sure that we go out there and make the investments necessary to educate our population to the degree that they deserve.

I am joined by the person who has done more work on this than anybody, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), the gentleman and I actually introduced this bill last session of Congress. It did not go anywhere then, but it is moving now.

There is some change here and I think we have a real opportunity to move forward on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) to conclude our discussion today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for yielding to me, and I am just delighted to be here in support of our three Rs proposal.

As Democrats, we recognize that we have to make reforms in the way that the Federal Government is participating as a partner with our local school districts, and what we are doing with this proposal is understanding that it is incumbent upon us to invest more in our public schools and investing those dollars in a way which we are sure are going to benefit those students that are facing the greatest challenges.

I represent a district in the central valley of California. It is one of the lowest income districts in the State. There is a lot of farm worker families that are struggling to make ends meet.

Our school districts are struggling financially, and what this proposal will ensure is that those children of farm workers are not going to be left behind, that the Federal Government is going to be there in order to provide them with the resources that those schools need to ensure that they are going to have the opportunity to excel academically.

But basically as a covenant that we are creating here with our local school districts, by providing these additional dollars, we are going to be demanding more. We are going to be demanding that those schools be held accountable for improving the academic performance of these students. We are going to require that we see improvement on an annual basis of these children and their performance in their classes.

We also are convinced that while we are providing these additional resources, we are providing for greater accountability that we have to have confidence in our local school districts, to do what they think is best in order to provide for this quality academic environment. Thus, we are giving those school districts greater flexibility.

We have consolidated over 45 programs down into five revenue streams, giving those school districts the ability to develop those programs that are going to meet some of their unique challenges. So in return for that investment of additional dollars, in return for giving those school districts greater flexibility, we are going to demand the greater accountability, because we believe, as President Bush does, that we cannot leave any child behind.

We disagree with President Bush on a number of his proposals, but where

there is a lot of in common, there are some significant differences is that with our proposal, when we have a school that is not meeting the academic performance that we believe is appropriate, is that we provide them with additional resources, both in personnel and dollars initially to help see improvement there. But if they continue to fail, we then provide for the option of those school children to go into other public schools.

We provide for public school choice. We also allow that school district to convert that school to a charter school so they can try different and more innovative approaches to improving the academic environment there.

President Bush takes a little bit different approach, and basically he would abandon those schools after 3 years and give that child a \$1,500 voucher that could be used at another public school or a private school. Many of us think that is a false promise, because a \$1,500 voucher to a farm worker child in my district that does not have a private school option, or the private school option they have is much more expensive than that, it is really a false promise.

We are hopeful as we move forward here with this debate on education that we can narrow or find the common ground that is between President Bush's proposal and what we are offering today, because we think, we are not that far apart, with the exception of the utilization and embracement of vouchers by President Bush. Our 3 R's proposal is one which I am convinced will provide the flexibility and resources that our local schools need, will ensure that our children will have a higher quality education, and will ensure that those children that are in some of the most struggling economic areas of our country will have the resources that they need to ensure that they will have the academic opportunities that are going to be so important in terms of their future success.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), I really appreciate all the work the gentleman has done there and all the cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), who is the prime sponsor actually of the 3 R's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank all of my colleagues once again for their broad support. I think we have the opportunity in the next several months to make some very positive changes in Federal education policy, and I think this bill is an excellent place to start.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working on that with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

A FIRST-HAND LOOK AT AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is

recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to report on my recent eight-day, six-country trip to Africa where I visited the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda, Sudan and Kenya. I left Washington on January 6 and returned January 14.

I have closely followed events in Africa since being elected to Congress. My first trip to the continent was in 1984 when I went to Ethiopia to witness the heartbreaking famine which resulted in the death of hundreds of thousands of women and children.

Mr. Speaker, I also have been to Algeria, Benin, Egypt, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone and Somalia.

Let me begin by saying that there is far too much suffering going on in Africa. Pain and suffering are a constant. Too many children are dying of starvation, disease, war, and AIDS.

70 percent of the world's AIDS cases are in Africa, where more than 16,000 people a day are infected by the virus. More than 2 million Africans died of AIDS in the year 2000.

The raging civil wars in both the Congo and Sudan are taking a tremendous toll on human life. More than 4 million, more than 4 million combined have died as a result of the two wars in the Congo and Sudan and millions have been displaced.

My trip started in Kinshasa, the capitol of Congo. I visited Congo to help better understand the cause of a raging Civil War that has resulted in more than 1.7 million deaths since 1988, according to the International Rescue Committee, and to explore what, if any, role the United States may be able to play in bringing an end to the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I was there less than a week before Congolese President Laurent Kabila was assassinated. We met with him on January 8 in the Presidential palace. From Kinshasa, I traveled by plane 1,000 miles to what is called the Great Lakes Region in eastern Congo and spent a day in the town of Goma and a day in the town of Bukavu.

I met with the rebel leadership, women's groups, clergy, average Congolese citizens and representatives of a number of nongovernmental organizations.

I also met with the American missionaries. And I might say. Few of the people that we spoke with support the rebel leadership in this part of the Congo.

Life is not easy for the average Congolese. There are few schools or hospitals and little potable water. Children go hungry. Women live in fear. I heard horrific stories and tales of rape and abuse by different armed forces and soldiers who come into one village, take the food, rape the women, do different things. Three days later a different group comes in. So life for the average person, particularly women and children, is very, very grim.

Soldiers are everywhere; most are young boys or men carrying automatic weapons.

I visited Rwanda to learn more about the reconciliation process the country is going through following a genocide of more than 800,000 ethnic Tutsis in 1994. My trip to Burundi followed for similar reasons.

From 1993 to the year 2000, violence between Hutu and Tutsi ethnic factions in Burundi has left more than 250,000 people dead and created hundreds of thousands refugees. In Rwanda, the first place we visited was Murambi Technical School, which is now a genocide site.

The world seems to forget, but over the course of 100 days, in the spring of 1994, more than 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus were systematically murdered in Rwanda as part of ethnic genocide. Some 50,000 people were slaughtered in the villages near the Murambi Technical School that we visited.

Contorted skeletons now rest on wooden tables in 18 of the school's classrooms. Some are missing limbs. Others have arms over their heads, as if trying to protect themselves from their killers.

One room was filled with just skulls, and they were hacked to death with machetes and most skulls are fragmented from being smashed.

In Kigali, the capitol of Rwanda, I met with President Paul Kagame, members of the Parliament and NGOs. Rwanda needs to pull its troops out of the Congo as do the other countries that have troops in Congo.

Having said that, I do understand the security concerns that the Rwandans have, particularly with what took place with regards to the genocide, but some now appear to have other motives.

They have fought, at least the Rwandans and the Ugandans, have fought at least three times over diamonds and other minerals near the town of Kisangani. And Kisangani is far from the border where they are threatened by EXFAR and Interahamwe.

I next visited Burundi primarily to speak at a prayer breakfast attended by Hutus and Tutsis. Like Rwanda, Burundi has experienced ethnic violence between the Hutus and Tutsis, and more than 250,000 people have been killed over the last decade.

I also met with President Pierre Buyoya and members of the Parliament and, frankly, was very impressed with the efforts of reconciliation taking place both in Rwanda and also in Burundi.

The last leg of my trip took us to Sudan, my fourth visit there in 11 years. Over the past two decades, a Civil War pitting the Khartoum government against the black Christians and others in the southern half of the country has cost more than 2 million lives in war and famine-related deaths, and millions more have been displaced.

So in the last 17 years, over 2 million people, most black Christians and animists have died as a result of the Khartoum government in the North

and with irreverence against those in the South. Regrettably, the situation in Sudan is no better today than in 1989, the first time I traveled to the war-torn region.

The Khartoum regime continues to persecute members of different religious minorities, Christians, Muslim and animist, under the auspices of what they call the Sharia law.

Since 1983, the government of Sudan has been waging a brutal war against factions in the South who are fighting for self determination and religious freedom. The Committee on Conscience of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has issued a genocide warning for Sudan. It is important for the people in the West to know if the Holocaust Museum believes it is that significant, then those of us in Congress and in the administration should also take note of the genocide warning issued with regard to Sudan.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, today in the House, during the debate on the resolution on the day of remembrance for the victims of the Holocaust, we took time to speak out to remind the people of genocide that took place less than six decades ago. We need to remember. We need to speak out. Our voices should be raised today about the genocide taking place in Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, I visited the southern town of Yei where the Khartoum government last November committed one of the most heinous acts of violence in the war, bombing a busy marketplace in the middle of the afternoon. Nineteen people were killed. Fifty-two were injured, 14 bombs were rolled out of the back of a Soviet-made Antonov bomber on November 20, the year 2000. No one was spared, women, children, young and old.

I also saw a video that was given to me by an NGO when we were there taken of the bombing. The marketplace was packed. People had nowhere to hide. Some of those killed had their limbs blown off. Women and children were screaming as they witnessed the carnage. The photograph here shows one of the victims, one of the 19 victims of the bombing.

Now, this is a civilian village. It is not a military target, and yet the Khartoum government of Sudan sends bombers over to bomb innocent women and children in the villages.

□ 1415

Now, if you look at the definition of genocide that is recognized, clearly what is taking place in the Holocaust Museum is accurate: genocide in Southern Sudan, and here is an example. Yei is hundreds of miles from the front lines. It is not a military target, but on a daily basis a high-altitude Antonov bomber passes over the town. People are terrified by the bombing runs. You can see it in their eyes. You can hear it in their voices. Ask anyone what concerns them most and the refrain is "the Antonov bomber."

No one knows where the bombs are being dropped because the plane is

sometimes beyond eyesight. Sometimes the planes fly overhead to play mind games with the residents of the town. Sometimes bombs randomly fall from the sky. They have hit churches, homes, hospitals, and sometimes the bombs are 55-gallon oil drums packed with dynamite and nails. The planes fly morning, noon, and night. An Antonov bomber flew over the town on January 13, the last morning I was in Yei. Panic set in. Psychological warfare is taking its toll. People are afraid to build houses or raise crops when they could be destroyed. Peddlers have dug foxholes in the marketplace so they can climb into the hole if a plane flies over, and they pray that the bombs fall somewhere else. We also saw a bomb shelter outside the hospital; people from the hospital went into the bomb shelter and then it was hit and people died. The bombing runs have become a major obstacle to daily life in Yei and throughout Southern Sudan.

Last year nearly 100 innocent Sudanese were killed in bombings according to figures compiled by several NGOs in Southern Sudan. Bombs hit relief agency compounds and convoys, and getting food and supplies through Southern Sudan is difficult enough because of the deplorable conditions of the roads. It took us nearly 4 hours to travel from the border of Uganda to Yei. The actions of the Khartoum Government cannot and should not be tolerated any longer. It is a brutal, repressive regime. Government-sponsored militias torch houses and food supplies, and rape and murder with impunity. Civilian food production and supply lines are attacked, livestock is destroyed, and international relief is obstructed. In 1998 this strategy caused a famine in Southern Sudan that endangered millions and killed tens of thousands.

Then there is the slavery issue. There is slavery in Sudan that we now know for a fact. Slave traders from the north sweep down in the villages and kidnap women and children and sell them for domestic servants or concubines. This is real-life chattel slavery in the 21st century in January and February of this year.

There is also the issue of oil. In 1999 the Khartoum Government began earning hundreds of millions of dollars from oil exports. The hard currency that they are earning from these oil exports are now enabling them to buy new weapons. They are buying Soviet Hind helicopters, and they are killing people. So as they take the money, the oil from the revenue, which has now been listed on the stock exchange, the more money they get, the more helicopters they buy, the more weapons they buy, the more tanks they buy, the more people they kill. So the death rate will be increasing in Khartoum as the oil revenues increase for the Khartoum Government because they are using the hard currency to finance the weapons in the war to kill women and children.

The Khartoum Government has doubled its spending on arms since it

began exporting oil; and as I said, more people are going to die with the additional weapons that are being purchased.

From my observations on this trip, we have several recommendations for the new administration. On the general issue of Africa, I would recommend that the new Bush administration move quickly to show an interest in Africa. A Presidential task force could be created to study Africa which could be made up of experts both in and out of government who have an expertise and interest and a sense of caring with regard to what is taking place in Africa, particularly with regard to women and children.

The panel should make a top-to-bottom review of what policy the United States should take toward Africa, particularly sub-Saharan Africa. It should be charged with offering practical and strategic insight into the promotion of democracy, the prevention and spread of AIDS. Everywhere we went, the issue of AIDS came up over and over; in dealing with other diseases and economic development and trade and education and human rights and religious freedom and other aspects of improving life such as eliminating hunger for the average person in Africa. The panel should submit a country-by-country analysis as well as a regional analysis about the problems and challenges on what the United States should be doing with regard to Africa. There are many people in our government in the State Department and other agencies who have deep personal knowledge of Africa, and if they could be joined by some in academia and others to do this on a fast-track basis so we now know what the policy should be, how we deal country by country and region by region and problem by problem.

Debt relief also must be addressed. Today I introduced the Responsible Debt Relief and Democracy Reform Act, legislation that will provide incentives to countries to institute democratic reforms and basic structures of civil society in order to receive debt relief. The problem is that it is the poorest people in the world and the poorest countries who suffer as a result of the government debt.

Now, this has to be done in a way that as we forgive debt, they, an individual country, does things like bring about democracy, transparency, freedom of the press, freedom of movement; and this has to be done in a way that does not line the pockets of the dictators and the corrupt.

Regarding the area of central Africa with the assassination of Congolese President Kabila on January 16, the situation in Central Africa is more complicated than ever. Kabila's son, Joseph, has been tapped the successor; but it is unclear how all of the Congo's rivals will react. Nevertheless, the United States needs to send a clear and early signal that it cares about the fate of Congo because I think we may have ignored it too long. And when you lis-

ten to what the new president, Joseph Kabila, says, he appears to be open and here is the opportunity. I said earlier that 1.7 million people in the Congo have died. There are millions more who are in the bush in a third of the Congo that cannot even be reached who may be dying on a daily basis and no food, and so there are many more that we cannot even get into the region to find out how bad life is for them.

I also recommend that all foreign armies be publicly pressured to leave the Congo. In addition, something must be done to disarm and demobilize and resettle the former Rwandan Army and militia forces and the rebel factions warring in the Congo. When we ask the Rwandan Government to pull its soldiers out, we also have to have some mechanism whereby the Rwandans are comfortable that their border will be protected and those who did the mass genocide cannot come back in and do those things again. There are ways of doing it with balance.

The United Nations should put together an assessment team to develop a strategy for withdrawal. The United States must forcefully speak out and act creatively on this issue. Our failure to speak out during the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 was wrong. The failure of the United States and the failure of the West not to speak out on the issue of genocide in 1994 was wrong and will go down as a dark day as historians look back on that period. We should not now remain silent on the issue of foreign troops because nearly 2 million people have already died in the Congo over the last few years and that number should not be allowed to continue to multiply.

Regarding Sudan, I believe there should be a major effort on the part of the United States, the United Nations and the European Union to bring an end to the war in Sudan and peace with justice. Peace with justice has to be a priority of the Bush administration. Sudan is a litmus test; and as history looks back for those who care about human rights, about civil rights, and about religious persecution and about hunger, it should be viewed in terms of this decade's South Africa. The same amount of time and energy and resources should be put into ending the war in Sudan that was put into bringing democracy and freedom to South Africa.

I recommend that a full-time high-profile envoy be appointed by President Bush to help bring peace to Sudan. This must be a person of national stature such as former Secretary of State Jim Baker or former U.N. Ambassador Richard Holbrooke.

When President Clinton appointed former Senator Mitchell of Maine to be the special envoy for Ireland, everyone knew that Mitchell had President Clinton's ear. Any time Mitchell wanted Clinton to make a telephone call, he was able to get it done; and former Senator Mitchell should be commended for the outstanding job he did in bringing peace to Northern Ireland.

When Tony Lake was working on the Ethiopian-Eritrean war, he was the special envoy, and when he needed something done, he was able to get President Clinton to do it. The envoy must be someone that the President and the Secretary of State have confidence in and has a real interest in seeing the conflict in Sudan resolved. The envoy also must have the President's ear. Clearly the envoy concept with somebody like Senator Mitchell worked in Ireland and I believe can work and will work in Sudan.

Not to try it would be in essence sentencing the women and children in the south and the villages to continual death. One young man I spoke to said, I was born in this war and I am afraid I will die in this war. This is an opportunity for the new administration to really bring about peace and demonstrate that we can make a big, big difference. I also recommend that our allies in the region be pressured, be urged to be encouraged to become more engaged.

Egypt, for example, has tremendous influence over the Khartoum regime. The United States Government, the American taxpayer, everyone out there, should know that we have given over \$45 billion in foreign aid to Egypt since the Camp David Accords were signed in 1978. Over \$45 billion. We should use this leverage. Egypt should not be sitting by on the sidelines when this war is raging in Sudan where there are over 2.2 million people killed, where there is slavery, where there is terrorism problems. Many terrorist groups who operate in the Middle East have training camps and operate around Khartoum.

Where the problem of hunger is growing, Egypt and other friendly countries like that who are friends of the United States should be urged to be engaged and be involved to help bring about the peace, as should our allies in Europe.

□ 1430

I also believe it is important for the United States to support systems of local governance and sustenance in southern Sudan. Operation Lifeline of Sudan, which has cost billions, is subject to the control of the government of Sudan and it is manipulated by the Khartoum government to suit its objectives. The government claims that its territorial integrity is violated by foreign NGOs in the south trying to help the people it claims as citizens. And until the fighting actually ends and there is peace, the United States should strongly support the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement.

In conclusion, from what I saw on the trip, I believe the Bush administration and the Congress, working together, have a unique opportunity to make a real difference in Africa and in Sudan, and now is the time to seize it.

I was pleased to learn that the African bureau was the first section area our new Secretary of State Colin Powell visited at the State Department.

That is a small step, but it was an extremely positive one. I am also pleased that Secretary Powell addressed Africa during his confirmation hearings.

Africa and the world is watching. We can provide hope and opportunity to these people who have suffered so much, particularly in southern Sudan and in central Africa. The figures are hard to comprehend, but more than 4 million people, more than 4 million, a population larger than some of our largest cities, have died in Sudan and in the Congo. Four million. The number is staggering and the number is increasing. With more weapons being purchased, it is increasing more. With more child soldiers running rampant through the Congo and Sudan it is increasing more.

We cannot, we in the Congress and those in the Bush administration, cannot allow the suffering to continue without trying, without making an effort. The Bush administration has a unique opportunity to make a difference in Africa.

Throughout my trip, the constant refrain I heard was that the United States just needed to show that it cared. No one, no one asked for American troops to be deployed. No one needs, supports, believes that American soldiers have to be involved in any way. They just want America to use its efforts, and they want America to send a signal that it will begin to focus on the plight of Africa before another generation of young people is lost to civil war, famine, disease, and AIDS.

America has a rich history of reaching out to bring peace and stability and reconciliation to communities around the world. We have made a difference in northern Ireland, we have made a difference in Eastern Europe, we have made a difference in so many places. We are attempting to bring peace to the Middle East. It is now time to focus on Africa, to focus on the Congo and to focus on the Sudan to end the killing.

IN OPPOSITION TO CONFIRMATION OF SENATOR ASHCROFT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it gives me, I want to say great pleasure; but I do not know if it is great pleasure that I have as I stand here this afternoon. I stand here and hope to be joined by a number of my colleagues in opposition to the confirmation of Senator John Ashcroft for Attorney General. This special order today will be dedicated to opposing that confirmation.

In the wake of the election calamity in Florida, we find ourselves forced into yet another battle to defend the tenets of our Constitution, equal protection and fairness for all. This unfortunate situation arises only a few

weeks after the President-elect promised to be a uniter, not a divider; to be the President of all Americans, not just the minority who voted for him. Sadly, the nomination of John Ashcroft to be this Nation's Attorney General makes those words ring hollow.

If President Bush truly wishes to unite this country, his selection of John Ashcroft is a puzzling one. If, on the other hand, his goal is to appease a small minority of Americans who view the principles of equal protection and fairness for all Americans with disdain, he could find no better candidate for Attorney General than John Ashcroft.

The Ashcroft nomination does nothing to move this country towards much-needed healing. In fact, Senator Ashcroft has openly rejected those members of his own party who speak of conciliation and compromise and has fanatically urged the encroachment of conservatism. Senator Ashcroft's public record exhibits an open hostility to the very laws and policies that protect the civil rights of all individuals in our society. More importantly, Senator Ashcroft has revealed a troubling lack of integrity in his attempts to use the power entrusted to him by Missouri voters to force his personal agenda into public policy and law by whatever means necessary, including personal attacks and distortions of truth.

Sadly, he has extended his proclivity for mischaracterization into his Senate confirmation hearings, where he blatantly distorted his own record and history in hopes of convincing this Senate that the partisan zealot we have come to know has become a rational, fair, public servant. We should not be fooled.

There are a number of reasons to oppose Senator Ashcroft, but his appalling record on civil rights alone makes him unqualified for this job. No one would entrust their home to a caretaker who has made repeated attempts to burn it to the ground. Similarly, it makes no sense to place our civil rights laws in the hands of a man who has shown an outright hostility to the very notion of civil rights for all.

For example, Senator Ashcroft voted against the Hate Crimes Prevention Act and opposes any form of affirmative action. He eagerly accepted an honorary degree from Bob Jones University, vigorously opposed the gathering of racial profiling statistics, and aggressively fought school desegregation ordered by the Federal courts in Missouri. Senator Ashcroft also praised Southern Partisan Magazine, which has been called neosegregationist, and called Confederate soldiers patriots.

Many of Senator Ashcroft's supporters, in an attempt to sweep this abysmal record under the rug, insist that he should be judged not on his veracity and record but solely on his character. However, even if we were to disregard this other extensive evidence of his unfitness and limit our decision to his character, he badly fails the test