

minority segment of the government that sanctions genocide and denies it is occurring. I rise in strong support of this resolution and encourage my colleagues to stand up for the people of Darfur, Sudan and to challenge and shame the government of Sudan into taking appropriate action to rectify an ever expanding tragedy.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 467, which calls the current situation in Sudan by its proper name: genocide.

Throughout years of civil war, the government in Khartoum and its militia sympathizers slaughtered tens of thousands of people in Southern Sudan and enslaved many others. Over the past two decades, it is estimated that more than two million people have died from war related causes and famine. Now violence has escalated in the Darfur region of the Western Sudan, where government-sponsored militias have been ruthlessly targeting various ethnic groups. More than 30,000 civilians have already been brutally murdered and approximately one million civilians have been forced to flee their homes and are now either internally dispatched or seeking refuge in neighboring Chad. These numbers cannot capture the horror of daily life in Sudan where violence, death and disease run rampant and young men cannot go outside the refugee camps for fear of being killed. Any woman or girl who dares to leave in search of food or water instantly becomes a target for rape or murder. With each passing day, more and more people are suffering and dying. The United States must act swiftly to end this genocide and punish those responsible for these heinous crimes against humanity.

By considering this resolution, we are taking the first step in what will be a long road to ending years of violence in Sudan. The President, the Secretary of State, the U.N. and the international community must all declare this genocide and offer all assistance possible to end the atrocities occurring in Sudan. It is my hope that the international community will come together and send a multi-national force to Sudan to provide security and to help with the delivery of humanitarian aid. If the world community is unwilling to do so or cannot do so in a timely manner then I believe the U.S. should send a force of its own to Sudan.

Although I was an ardent opponent of the war with Iraq, I do believe that in certain instances unilateral force is both necessary and justified. This is undoubtedly one of those times. Tens of thousands of people have already died and thousands more will perish if we stand by and do nothing. If the world remains silent in the face of genocide, then America alone must act. The America that I know and believe in is a moral leader in the world and taking the leading role in bringing an end to genocide in Sudan will save thousands of lives and move us closer to fulfilling our true destiny.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the sponsor of this resolution, Mr. PAYNE, as well as Chairman HYDE of the Committee on International Relations, and all of the members who have worked to bring H. Con. Res. 467 to the floor. I think it's very important that Congress act on this resolution before the August recess. Tonight the House of Representatives will go on record declaring the atrocities being committed in the Darfur region of Sudan to be "genocide." H. Con. Res. 467 is a statement

for the world, and a stark warning to the Sudanese government.

We've heard about the atrocities government-backed militias are perpetrating in Darfur. This resolution cites an estimated 30,000 innocent civilians brutally murdered, more than 130,000 people fleeing to neighboring Chad, and more than one million people internally displaced. The Africa Subcommittee that I chair has held several hearings on Sudan. We've heard about the human suffering. We have also heard about how this killing is targeted and systematic. Villages are razed, crops are burned, and wells are poisoned. I fully support this resolution's determination that genocide is occurring in Sudan, as it played out in Rwanda ten years ago.

Those doing the killing need to understand that the world is changing. We have international courts to hold human rights criminals accountable. Information is being collected. The days of impunity are ending. That is a message that this resolution sends.

H. Con. Res. 467 deplors the failure of the United Nations Human Rights Commission to take appropriate action on Darfur. Earlier this year, the Commission failed to support a United States led effort to strongly condemn gross human rights violations in Darfur. Others just don't care. The administration has taken the lead in seeking an end to the slaughter in Darfur, and addressing the humanitarian crisis there. Why do we seem to care about Darfur more than African governments? We desperately need African engagement, and outrage, on Darfur. It is Africans who are being slaughtered.

Indeed, the administration deserves much credit for achieving a north-south peace accord in Sudan. It has played a very good hand with the cards it was dealt. Congress has been supportive of these negotiations, including with the Sudan Peace Act. But now we have a genocide in the west of Sudan—in Darfur.

Peace isn't divisible in Sudan. It's a cliché, but in Darfur, Khartoum is showing its true colors. Today, that government is hearing loud and clear that there will be no U.S. aid or improved relations, no support for the peace process, as long as the killing continues in Darfur. Maybe that matters to Khartoum; to be honest, maybe it doesn't, which is a possibility we need to prepare for. That is why H. Con. Res. 467 urges the administration to seriously consider multilateral or even unilateral intervention to stop the genocide should the United Nations Security Council fail to act. I don't think it needs this urging.

The suffering in Darfur is moving the American people. There's an awakening to the horror being afflicted there. Tonight, the House of Representatives is amplifying these concerns for the world.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 467, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4840 and H.R. 4841.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S LACK OF PLAN TO COMBAT TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the 900th U.S. soldier died today in Iraq. A brave soldier whose name we do not know yet died in the line of duty. Four other soldiers died yesterday in Iraq. The fighting and dying goes on in Iraq, but the administration does not say much about it.

The President did not mark today's sober note. Instead, he hit the campaign trail and did not say anything

about the 900th American dead or of the 899th or the 898th, or the other brave men and women who have died just yesterday, not to mention since the war was launched by the President.

Iraq is not popular with the American people, so it has fallen out of favor in the President's remarks. By the Republican convention, finding any comments about Iraq by the President will be akin to finding weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Just not there.

They have moved on as quickly as possible, but remember meanwhile, 160,000 U.S. soldiers remain in harm's way in Iraq, fighting and dying because America sent them there, but the America they left behind, not the America they have come home to.

That is worth some discussion. We have an administration that talks tough on terror, but they completely overlook Iran. Ten years later the administration's best sound bite today is we will look into it. That is not a plan to combat terror at home or anywhere else.

The administration had 10 years to look into it. Instead, they looked to someone they knew on evidence that was flimsy at the start and proven false since; the President committed American soldiers to a war in Iraq. When they could not find weapons of mass destruction, the administration changed the reason for going to war. Then they changed it again. Is that the administration's plan to combat terror? Yes. There is terrorism in the world, but we need real leaders and a real plan to meet that threat.

There is terrorism in the world, and America is capable of meeting that threat, but not with bullets and bombs alone. And if you look at the record of this administration, you have to conclude that they do not have a plan on terror. They hold news conferences to tell everyone, presuming they include terrorists, that America should be vigilant, but afraid. America should go about its business, but be afraid. That is not a plan. That is rhetorical duct tape.

America needs to be strong, not afraid. We did not win World War II by being afraid. We won by being American. We won by being American by fighting for American values, by fighting for American freedoms, but today American freedoms are under attack, and it is happening right here by this administration. In the immediate aftermath of 9/11, the administration switched language in the middle of the night and America woke up to something called the PATRIOT Act. There is nothing patriotic about depriving Americans of their civil liberties. There was nothing patriotic a few days later when the House voted to restore some of the civil liberties taken by the PATRIOT Act.

Then Republicans deliberately left open the vote until they could force enough Republicans to change their vote. Yes, I said change their vote.

The White House had preordained the outcome of the vote, so Democrats and

Republicans voted. Then the Republicans voted again. The process was rigged. Civil liberties never had a chance. That is what the administration calls its plan to combat terror. Monitor the books you checked out of the library or the movie tickets you are buying online. They can go to a secret court and gain access to your entire life.

George Orwell called it "1984," his legislative novel that we used to think could not happen in America. It is happening. We have law enforcement agencies, smart, dedicated public servants who know how to catch the bad guys. We have the financial resources to arm the agencies with the funding they need to support our people. We do not need 1984 in 2004. Every time the administration says, oh no, that is not what we are doing, another story surfaces about America under suspicion for doing something like taking pictures at a popular tourist site in Seattle, for example.

The administration does not have a plan to combat terror. It has a terror alert stuck on "be afraid, always." The American people deserve more than that. America is strong enough to fight the war on terror. It needs a leader strong enough to do it.

JOHN KERRY is a decorated combat veteran, a war hero who has seen the face and the horror of war firsthand. America can win the war on terror, but not by subverting American freedoms and civil liberties.

America can win the war on terror under the leadership of a sailor who led men in combat and who risked his own life to save others under fire. America can win the war on terror, but it needs a combat veteran to do it. JOHN KERRY is just such a man. We will have him in 104 days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HENSARLING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FREE SPEECH BY RELIGIOUS LEADERS BEING DENIED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor again to-

night, as I have been for the last 2 or 3 weeks, to talk about the fact that in America today with all of our brave men and women fighting for freedom for the Iraqis and in Afghanistan and certainly to protect the American people, that yet in this country today a minister, a priest or a rabbi or cleric cannot speak freely about the politics and the moral issues of the day in America. I think that is a sad commentary on this great Nation.

I want to briefly talk about the history of this issue. Prior to 1954, there was never any restriction of speech on our ministers in this country or our rabbis or our priests until 1954. The Lyndon Baines Johnson amendment in the Senate, never debated, no hearings were held; and yet the Senate unanimously accepted the amendment by Senator Johnson that basically said if you are a 501(c)(3), you may not have political speech, and that means endorsement or opposition to a candidate.

Well, I looked at the history of this, and I looked at the history of churches being qualified for a 501(c)(3). Never in any of the history that we looked upon was there any restriction of speech at all on the churches or synagogues or mosques in this country.

The reason I bring this to the floor again tonight is because I believe sincerely if morality in this great Nation is to survive based on the Judeo-Christian principles that this Nation was founded upon, then the ministers, the priests and the rabbis and the clerics should be able to speak freely about the moral and political issues of the today without any restriction.

The IRS is in charge of overseeing the speech of our churches, synagogues, and mosques. They testified 2 years ago they cannot even enforce the law. Yet, what we have today is a man named Barry Lynn with the Americans United that stands for the separation of church and State; and what he does is file a complaint, like he did in Colorado 4 weeks ago. Bishop Sheridan, a Catholic Bishop, the diocese of Colorado Springs, wrote a pastoral letter, three pages to the Catholics in Colorado Springs, and reminded them that the Catholic Church stands for protecting the unborn, it stands against stem cell research, it stands against euthanasia; and all they did in the pastoral letter was he did not mention Mr. KERRY or Mr. Bush. He did not mention Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative, but what he did was mention the word "pro-life."

And I want my friends to know in the House that in the early 1990s that the Internal Revenue Service expanded, through an administrative process, the definition of what the Johnson amendment said. So in this documentation I am holding up tonight, Mr. Speaker, is a section called "code words." Well, this begins to sound like what I can imagine in the late 1930s in Germany, code words.