

The challenge today in Sudan is to accept an obligation to act on the diplomatic and humanitarian front without becoming militarily engaged. The killing and displacement must be stopped, but little could be more counter-productive than a perceived U.S. military intervention against a third Muslim nation at this time.

In this year's presidential race there is a profound debate about whether a U.N. mandate is necessary before America can act militarily. Both major party candidates have properly noted that the U.S. reserves the right to act alone. While each gives different emphasis to the wisdom of receiving international sanction, each also recognizes the preferability, although not necessity, of obtaining international support. What hasn't been discussed is the question of whether the U.S. reserves the right not to engage militarily even if there is a U.N. mandate to act. The answer is clearly yes. We reserve the right not to use force, just as we reserve the right to defend ourselves.

Sudan is a case in point. The U.S. is attempting to nudge the Security Council in a more attentive way, but our emphasis is properly on pressing for African Union rather than U.S. force deployment, with the understanding that we may have to give material and logistic support to African soldiers. Such an approach was well envisioned by the founders of the U.N. Indeed, with the principal exception of the Korean war, the Big Five of the Security Council have traditionally provided the funding for peacekeeping forces, while the troops themselves have generally been drawn from smaller or non-aligned countries, such as Canada, Nigeria and India.

In this context, an operation to bring peace to Darfur should involve many countries and, as the Special Representative to the Secretary General for Sudan Jan Pronk said, be "broad, big, and quick." U.S. focus should be on:

1. Humanitarian assistance. Some aid is already en route, purchased with money diverted from Iraq. More is required. The need is dire and urgent. People of Darfur lack adequate shelter, potable water and health care facilities. They do not expect to see a usable harvest until January 2006.

2. Regional Organizations. To carry out its mission, the African Union needs a broad mandate for at least 3,500 armed and unarmed troops and authority to use force if necessary. As it is, the AU, currently has a limited mandate for a 305-person armed force serving to protect 100 or so unarmed monitors of the April 8th cease fire between the Sudan Liberation Army, the Justice and Equity Movement and government forces.

3. Negotiations. These must be pursued on two fronts. One, to settle the 21-year-old conflict between the North (the government) and the South of Sudan; the other, to bring peace to Darfur. The two situations are interrelated and neither can be credibly brought to a close without the other. An agreement between the North and the South hopefully can provide a framework for a settlement between the rebels and the Sudanese government in Darfur, but progress on the first front should not be a condition to seek progress on the second.

4. Leverage. The U.S. and the U.N. are preparing a list of sanctions to induce the Sudanese government to comply. In the bill before us, H.R. 5061, the President is empowered to freeze Sudanese assets, restrict travel and impose other sanctions. It is a mistake, however, to put the heat solely on the Sudanese

government. Pressure must also be applied on the rebels to stop ambushing humanitarian aid convoys.

A strong international approach to Darfur has the prospect of stabilizing a dire situation and serving as a reminder to all governments that sovereignty is not a shield behind which genocidalists can hide. Combating genocide is a world responsibility. With humanitarian aid, support for the AU, a double-pronged negotiating strategy and a carrot-and-stick approach, the prospect that Sudan can move toward greater peace and security for its citizens is promising. But a timely commitment of the international community is key. It has yet to be established.

This resolution is modest but important step in the right direction. I urge its passage.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD IMPROVE AIRPORT PERIMETER SECURITY

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events of September 11, 2001, anxieties about airport security have increased. Most visible improvements and modifications—such as passenger screening—have already been done. Less visible improvements, particularly in terms of protecting airport perimeters against unauthorized entry, are lagging.

A recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report found that airport perimeter security has not appreciably improved in the past three years, despite persistent expressions of concern by Congress. The funds provided for these purposes have not been delivered to airports where they are needed.

This report's title tells the whole story: "Aviation Security: Further Steps Needed to Strengthen the Security of Commercial Airport Perimeters and Access Controls." In it, the GAO notes that "through funding of a limited number security enhancements, TSA [the Transportation Security Agency] has helped to improve perimeter and access control security at some airports. However, at the time of our review, TSA had not yet developed a plan to prioritize expenditures to ensure that funds provided have the greatest impact in improving the security of the commercial airport system."

The safety and security of our airports and air passengers are contingent on the priorities established by the TSA and other government agencies.

Congress recognizes this, and in response to the terrorist attacks on our country, it established the Federal Airport Security Capital Fund to finance improvements at U.S. airports. This fund provides \$250,000,000 a year to be parcelled out according to a legally-mandated formula by the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Borders and Transportation at the Department of Homeland Security. Despite this fund's existence, much remains to be done.

In a "report card" published by the Airline Pilots Association, airport perimeter security in the United States was given an overall grade of "D." Based on the judgment of those who

have reason to know the situation best, a grade like this is shameful and unacceptable.

Several key airports have been identified as having particular needs for expeditious improvements. These include the four airports administered by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Islip, JFK, LaGuardia, Newark); Chicago O'Hare; BWI; the airports in Allentown, Harrisburg, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Birmingham International Airport in Alabama.

In recent months, it has been my privilege to consult with several private-sector experts on airport perimeter security. Dr. Walter Estulin, Philip Allen, and David Brownstein of the New York-based high-technology company, L-3 Communications, have taken time to explain to me how off-the-shelf technology can be used to protect our airports from intruders and infiltrators who can undermine the integrity of our air transportation system. Scientists and engineers from L-3 Communications have examined the problems faced by airports (and, by extension, seaports and inland harbors) and have developed technology that can go a long way toward meeting the security needs of transportation infrastructure. One issue of particular concern is the proliferation of MANPADS—"Man-Portable Air Defense Systems"—or, in a nutshell, shoulder-launched anti-aircraft missiles. In a GAO report published in May 2004, we learn that "MANPADS pose a threat to commercial aircraft for several reasons. First, MANPADS are widely available. . . . The U.S. government estimates that a few thousand MANPADS are outside government controls. . . . Second, the characteristics of MANPADS—their lethality, portability, ease of use and concealment, and relatively low cost (from less than \$1,000 to \$100,000 each)—make them attractive to terrorists for acquisition and use against commercial aircraft. Third, MANPADS have been successfully used to attack and bring down aircraft." So far, luckily, none of these weapons have been used successfully within the United States. Still, in the "report card" from the Airline Pilots Association, defense against anti-aircraft missiles was given a grade of "F." This is certainly a cause for concern.

There are two actions we can take to address these matters. First, Congress should direct the Secretary of Transportation to better prioritize grants made under his authority under the Federal Airport Security Capital Fund.

Second, we should pass legislation now under consideration, introduced by Senators JAY ROCKEFELLER (D-West Virginia), JOHN MCCAIN (R-Arizona), and ERNEST HOLLINGS (D-South Carolina), called the "Aviation Security Advancement Act" (S. 2393). If passed, this bill would authorize \$100,000,000 for the Department of Homeland Security "for airport perimeter security technology, fencing, security contracts, vehicle tagging, and other perimeter security related operations, facilities, and equipment." This sum should be doubled. Surely \$200,000,000 is a small price to pay to assure the safety and security of the millions of Americans who travel by air each year.

EMBRACE DRUG REIMPORTATION

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I ask a very serious question. Why is it, the Cheney-Bush bunch allow us to import foreign made flu vaccines, but won't allow Americans to shop for American made cheaper drugs across our borders?

We all know the importance of getting our flu vaccines every year. The Washington Post reports that last year's flu season was the worst flu season we've had in 4 years, and the flu killed 142 people. As all Americans are aware, there is another flu vaccine crisis in our country.

America's supply of the flu vaccine has practically been cut in half, because the world's second-leading supplier, The Chiron Corp. based in Britain, was shut down because of contamination reported in its batches of the vaccine.

48 million vaccines were due to be shipped before this shutdown. I repeat, 48 million doses of this vaccine were to be imported into this country, to help combat a life-threatening illness.

Mr. Speaker, I speak to address a glaring policy inconsistency on the part of the Cheney-Bush administration.

Why is it, that a long-standing health policy, that is wildly effective and successful, be permitted with respect to one killer, but denied to every other disease?

142 people died from the flu last year, and it causes outrage and action. 250,000 people die from heart attacks before they even get to the hospital each year, and it's accepted as just another statistic.

How many of these 250,000 could have been saved, if only they'd had medicine to lower their cholesterol?

How many of these 250,000 could have been saved, if only they'd been able to afford their medicine?

According to a recent press release from the University of Michigan Health System, nearly half of patients who have a prescription for any of the cholesterol-fighting drugs called statins fail to fill their prescription every time—or stop filling it altogether! The University goes on to say that the higher the prescription cost, the lower the number of prescriptions filled.

Let's ignore, for a moment, that Europe has been importing drugs safely and effectively for over 20 years.

Let us also ignore that countries like Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, and France also have higher life expectancies and lower child mortality rates than the United States does.

But let us not ignore a new FDA proposal. A proposal that would require customs agents to return all drugs sent from foreign addresses back to their senders.

William Hubbard, a senior associate commissioner at the FDA, told Congress on June 7th, "We need to make a blanket assessment that these drugs are not safe for American consumers and they should be turned back."

Unless, of course, it's the flu vaccine.

And then it's OK if they come from the United Kingdom, as in the case of the Chiron Corp. Or if it comes from the world's largest

supplier of the flu vaccine, the French company, Aventis Pasteur.

Yes, there are criticisms about the safety of imported drugs. One might be able to look to this most recent flu vaccine scare and say that this is a perfect example of why we don't import drugs. The safety of the supply could be compromised.

I would say that this is a perfect example of why we should import from countries like Canada or the United Kingdom. They have safeguards in place, just as we do, that protect the integrity of the prescription drug supply.

On August 12th, the acting FDA commissioner Lester Crawford expressed his concern that al-Qaida may attack the supply of drugs coming into this country.

I will tell you that I am JUST AS CONCERNED about the 28 percent of older adults with diabetes who, as reported in the February 2004 issue of Diabetes Care, are going without food or other essentials to pay for their insulin.

Why, in the richest nation on Earth, with this so-called comprehensive new Medicare program, are people going without food to afford their drugs?

Why is the Administration so opposed to a program that would help so many?

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge not only the duly elected Representatives of the citizens in these United States, but also the President to do what is in the best interests of these citizens.

I urge both Congress and the President to embrace prescription drug re-importation and reject the influence of the pharmaceutical companies.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PERSONAL PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 2004

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all Americans know that gun control continues to be a serious subject of debate, right here in the District of Columbia, in the State of Georgia, which I represent, and across this nation. It's an issue of personal safety and of constitutional rights embedded in the fabric of our Nation.

I agree with those who want to restrict criminal access to guns. However, this must be done without compromising the constitutional rights of our law-abiding citizens.

I strongly support the right of law-abiding adults to purchase and own firearms for the protection of their homes and families, collecting, target shooting, and hunting. That's why I have and will continue to oppose any proposal that threatens this basic Second Amendment right.

I realize the concerns of some Americans who, in the wake of school shootings and other heinous illegal acts, call for stricter gun control measures. I understand those concerns. That's why I fully support measures that call for tougher sentences for the illegal use of firearms, to get offenders off the streets and out of our communities. I support stiff sentences of juveniles who use firearms illegally, and I support increasing the maximum penalty

for adults who illegally provide those juveniles with firearms. That's how we must keep our schools and communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, tougher gun laws should not infringe on the rights of law-abiding citizens, and Congress has both the authority and the responsibility to ensure that they do not. So, the question before us today is not whether Congress can repeal the District of Columbia's handgun and self-defense bans, it is whether Congress should do so. The U.S. Constitution, the constitutions of 44 States, Federal law, the laws of all 50 States, the vast majority of Georgians and of Americans recognize the right for law abiding citizens to use firearms for protection, and for other legal purposes. Only the District of Columbia prohibits a person from having a firearm assembled and loaded at home, for the purpose of self-defense. I believe that that's wrong. We should pass this bill and allow D.C. residents to protect themselves from crime.

UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE
ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 2004

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very important subject for the young people of my district and America, the draft. This week, the Congress considered H.R. 163, Universal National Service Act of 2003, which would require every U.S. citizen, and every other person residing in the United States, between the ages of 18 and 26 to perform a two-year period of national service, unless exempted.

Let me make clear, I do not support reinstatement of an active military draft system. Also it is very unlikely there will be a draft in the foreseeable future.

The legal authority for drafting men into the U.S. armed forces expired in 1973. However, the U.S. Selective Service System has been registering 18–25 year-olds on a stand-by basis. These young men could be called for service should an active draft ever be reinstated. Currently, women are not required to register with the U.S. Selective Service.

Young people, as well as their parents, across my district have heard about a draft bill, and these constituents are asking questions about the draft bill and want to find out its status. Congressman RANGEL and U.S. Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS from South Carolina introduced this legislation to reinstate an active draft and extend service requirements to women. I cannot speak for them about their motives behind this legislation, but they certainly do make a fundamental point: if we go to war, all Americans should share in the cost and sacrifice of that war. The authors point out that without a universal draft, this burden falls disproportionately on the shoulders of the poor, the disadvantaged, and minorities, as was the case during the Vietnam War.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 163 raises important questions about the current composition of U.S. armed forces. For example, Representative RANGEL argues that among 535 Members of Congress, only four have sons or daughters who presently serve in the military.