

radar data to the meteorological community and interested partners. Research at NSSL has led to greater knowledge and improved forecasts of tornadoes, flash floods, damaging winds, hail, lightning, heavy snow, ice and freezing rain.

Early on, NSSL researchers recognized the potential of Doppler radar to improve the detection and warning of severe weather. NSSL built the first real-time displays of Doppler velocity data, which led to discoveries of tornado-related radar "signatures." The successful demonstration that Doppler radar could help forecasters provide much improved severe thunderstorm and tornado warnings led to the deployment of the Next Generation Weather Radar, NEXRAD, WSR-88D, network of Doppler radars throughout the United States. This important contribution to the Nation was recognized by a Department of Commerce gold medal award, and was the only NOAA research laboratory so recognized.

NSSL continues to be a pioneer in the development of weather radar. The lab is working with the NWS to deploy dual polarization, a planned upgrade to the current NEXRAD Doppler radar hardware that provides more information about precipitation in clouds to better distinguish between rain, ice, hail and mixtures. Such information will help forecasters provide better forecasts and warnings for flash floods, the number one severe weather threat to human life.

In addition, NSSL researchers are adapting state-of-the-art radar technology currently deployed on Navy ships for use in tracking severe weather. Phased array radar reduces the scan or data collection time from 5 or 6 minutes to less than 1 minute, potentially extending the lead time for tornado warnings beyond the current average of 12 minutes. When combined with other technology being developed at NSSL, warning lead times may be extended even farther.

Recently, NSSL collaborated with the University of Oklahoma, Texas Tech, and Texas A&M University to build two new 5-cm mobile Doppler radars. These SMART-Radars—Shared Mobile Atmospheric Research and Teaching Radars—are capable of scanning and penetrating an entire tornadic storm or hurricane, providing critical data needed to understand the mysteries of how tornadoes form and for eventually improving severe storm forecasts and warnings.

During the past few years, scientists from NSSL completed several field experiments to study severe and hazardous weather. In 2003 and 2004, researchers launched weather balloons loaded with instruments into thunderstorms during the Thunderstorm Electrification and Lightning Experiment, or TELEX. The lightning observations they made will be used to improve forecasts and warnings of hazardous weather. In 2002, NSSL hosted the International H2O Project or IHOP, one of

the largest weather-related studies ever conducted in the U.S.

NSSL has a research partnership with the Cooperative Institute for Mesoscale Meteorological Studies, a cooperative institute between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the University of Oklahoma. Additionally, NSSL conducts collaborative research with other NOAA laboratories including the Forecast Systems Laboratory, the Environmental Technologies Laboratory, and the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, as well as the U.S. Navy, Air Force, Army, Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Texas A&M, Texas Tech University, Lockheed Martin, Basic Commerce and Industries, Weather Decision Technologies, WeatherNews International, Inc., WeatherData, Inc., and Salt River Project.

I congratulate the National Severe Storms Laboratory in Norman, OK, on their first 40 years. Based on their performance since 1964, I believe we can expect many more years of pioneering scientific research from this outstanding institution, their academic, government and private sector partners, and their many scientists and technicians.

LOSING GROUND

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it has been nearly a month since Republican congressional leadership and the President allowed the assault weapons ban to expire. This lack of action made it potentially easier for criminals and terrorists to acquire 19 previously banned assault weapons that could be used to harm innocent Americans. Adding insult to injury, the House of Representatives last week passed legislation that would make families in the Nation's capital even more susceptible to gun crime.

The misnamed District of Columbia Personal Protection Act, which passed the House last week, would repeal a local law in Washington, DC that bans the sale and possession of unregistered firearms, requires firearm registration, imposes commonsense safe storage requirements, and bans semiautomatic weapons in the District. Should this bill become law, tourists and especially those who live and work in our Nation's capital will face a considerably greater threat of gun violence.

According to the Brady Campaign To Prevent Gun Violence, this bill would roll back gun laws in D.C. to a point that it would be legal to possess a loaded assault rifle on city streets without a permit. Over the strong objections of local leaders, the Republican-controlled House made the unwise decision to take up and pass this legislation even as we face the increased threat of terrorism. Hopefully the Senate will not make the same mistake.

Unfortunately, instead of making progress on the issue of gun safety, we seem to be retreating. Instead of

strengthening laws that would help prevent future gun crimes and terrorist attacks, they are being weakened giving potential criminals and terrorists easier access to weapons that have no place on our streets. I will continue to work toward reversing this course and toward passing sensible gun safety legislation that will make our communities more, instead of less, safe.

ANABOLIC STEROID CONTROL ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has passed S. 2195, the Anabolic Steroid Control Act, and I commend my colleagues Senators HATCH and BIDEN for their commitment to this important legislation.

While S. 2195 is a positive first step toward protecting the public health, our work is not complete. We must continue to explore ways to improve the Dietary Supplements Health and Education Act, DSHEA, which has provided safe harbor for substances like those made illegal by S. 2195. We must make it more difficult for dietary supplement manufacturers to place harmful substances into the stream of commerce, and require that such manufacturers report to the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, adverse health events suffered by consumers when using their products. We must also demand that best practices for the manufacture of dietary supplements be developed by the FDA and followed by the supplement industry to ensure the efficacy and safety of these products.

RWANDA AND SUDAN: SIMPLY RECOGNIZING GENOCIDE IS NOT ENOUGH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this summer and fall, a lot of us have been drawing comparisons between Sudan today and Rwanda a decade ago. The October 4, 2004 edition of the New York Times contains a piece furthering this argument by one who is uniquely qualified to do so: retired General Roméo Dallaire, who was the commander of the United Nations forces in Rwanda during the genocide.

Ten years ago, General Dallaire pleaded for more troops to stem the rising tide of murders that were sweeping across Rwanda. Instead of sending reinforcements, the United Nations cut his peacekeeping force from 3,000 to 500, leaving Dallaire and his troops to witness the mass killings that they did not have a prayer of stopping. In the aftermath of this decision, 800,000 people died in 100 days.

Ten years ago, the African Union promised battalions to stop the killing but lacked the equipment and logistical support to come to the assistance of Dallaire and the people of Rwanda. Those forces never arrived in any numbers.

Today, genocide is again taking place, this time in Sudan. Secretary General Kofi Annan has recognized it. President Bush has recognized it. But

again the world is essentially standing by.

Last month, the Senate passed an amendment to the Foreign Operations appropriations bill which provided \$75 million to support an expanded African Union mission in Darfur, Sudan. This bill is now in conference. It is vitally important that it pass with this measure and additional assistance for Sudan relief efforts intact.

President Clinton has said that failure to act in Rwanda constitutes his greatest regret as president. That is not a failure that we can bear to repeat. It is not enough for the international community to recognize genocide. This time, we actually have to stop it.

I ask unanimous consent that General Dallaire's op-ed from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 2004]

LOOKING AT DARFUR, SEEING RWANDA
(By Romeo Dallaire)

MONTREAL.—Each day the world is confronted by new reports of atrocities in the Darfur region of Sudan. President Bush, in his address to the United Nations General Assembly last month, referred to the situation as "genocide," and he and Secretary General Kofi Annan pledged support for sanctions against the Sudanese government and a Security Council resolution to expand the African Union force on the ground there. But I am afraid that moral condemnation, trade penalties and military efforts by African countries are simply not going to be enough to stop the killing—not nearly enough.

I know, because I've seen it all happen before. A decade ago, I was the Canadian general in command of the United Nations forces in Rwanda when that civil war began and quickly turned into genocide. The conflict was often portrayed as nothing more than an age-old feud between African tribes, a situation that the Western world could do little to stop. All that was left to do was wait to pick up the pieces when the killing stopped and to provide support to rebuild the country.

Although the early stages of the Darfur situation received more news coverage than the Rwanda genocide did, at some level the Western governments are still approaching it with the same lack of priority. In the end, it receives the same intuitive reaction: "What's in it for us? Is it in our 'national' interest?"

Sudan, an underdeveloped, orphan nation, with no links to colonial masters of its past, is essentially being left to its own devices. The Islamic Janjaweed militias of Darfur, with the complicit approval of the government, are bent on ridding the region of its residents, primarily black Africans—killing, raping and driving refugees into camps along the border with Chad.

The United Nations, emasculated by the self-interested maneuverings of the five permanent members of the Security Council, fails to intervene. Its only concrete step, the Security Council resolution passed in July, all but plagiarized the resolutions on Rwanda 10 years earlier. When I read phrases like "reaffirming its commitment to the sovereignty, unity, territorial integrity and independence of Sudan" and "expressing its determination to do everything possible to halt a humanitarian catastrophe, including

by taking further action if required," I can't help but think of the stifling directives that were imposed on the United Nations' department of peacekeeping operations in 1994 and then passed down to me in the field.

I recall all too well the West's indifference to the horrors that unfolded in Rwanda beginning in April 1994. Early warnings had gone unheeded, intervention was ruled out and even as the bodies piled up on the streets of Kigali and across the countryside, world leaders quibbled over the definition of what was really happening. The only international forces they sent during those first days and weeks of the massacres were paratroopers to evacuate the foreigners. Before long, we were burning the bodies with diesel fuel to ward off disease, and the smell that would cling to your skin like an oil.

Several African countries promised me battalions of troops and hundreds of observers to help come to grips with the relentless carnage. But they had neither the equipment nor the logistical support to sustain themselves, and no way to fly in the vehicles and ammunition needed to conduct sustained operations.

Today, to be sure, the international community is caught in the vicissitudes of complex political problems—particularly the fragile cease-fire between the Islamic government and the largely Christian population in southern Sudan. Powerful nations like the United States and Britain have lost much of their credibility because of the quagmire of Iraq. And infighting at the United Nations has bogged down an American proposed second resolution that probably wouldn't do much more than the one passed in July.

So in the end we get nothing more than pledges to support the international monitoring team of a few hundred observers from the African Union (on Friday, Sudan agreed that this force could expand to 3,500 soldiers). Nigeria and other countries are willing to send a larger intervention force, but they can't do so effectively without the kind of logistical and transportation support Western countries could provide.

Sudan is a huge country with a harsh terrain and a population unlikely to welcome outside intervention. Still, I believe that a mixture of mobile African Union troops supported by NATO soldiers equipped with helicopters, remotely piloted vehicles, night-vision devices and long-range special forces could protect Darfur's displaced people in their camps and remaining villages, and eliminate or incarcerate the Janjaweed.

If NATO is unable to act adequately, manpower could perhaps come individually from the so-called middle nations—countries like Germany and Canada that have more political leeway and often more credibility in the developing world than the Security Council members.

In April, on the 10th anniversary of the start of his country's genocide, President Paul Kagame told his people and the world that if any country ever suffered genocide, Rwanda would willingly come to its aid. He chastised the international community for its callous response to the killing spree of 1994, during which 800,000 people were slaughtered and three million lost their homes and villages. And sure enough, Rwanda sent a small contingent to Darfur. President Kagame kept his word. Having called what is happening in Darfur genocide and having vowed to stop it, it is time for the West to keep its word as well.

MAKING THE MOST OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: FAMILY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I would like to talk about a critical sub-

ject, the need to support family planning as part of our international development agenda.

Family planning saves lives. It is a basic health service, especially in parts of the world such as Malawi where 1 in 7 mothers die in childbirth or Mozambique where 137 infants die per 1,000 live births and where life expectancy is just 37 years.

This is a health issue and it is a development issue because the two are virtually always related.

Ten years ago, members of the United Nations met in Cairo to draft a 20-year action plan to alleviate poverty through women's empowerment and universal access to reproductive healthcare.

Recently, a new report by UNFPA has come out, "The Cairo Consensus at Ten: Population, Reproductive Health, and the Global Effort to End Poverty." This report assesses how far we have come and how far we have to go and argues that we have to mobilize political will and international assistance if we are going to build on previous gains.

This report revealed that, a decade after the Cairo meeting, more than 350 million couples still lack access to a full range of family planning services. It found that almost 530,000 women die each year from complications of pregnancy and childbirth, mostly from preventable causes. It also found that 2 out of every 5 people on the planet still struggle to survive on less than \$2 a day, and many of them earn less than half that tiny amount.

The report concluded:

Policy makers have been slow to address the inequitable distribution of health information and services that helps keep people poor . . . Developing countries that have reduced fertility and mortality by investing in health and education have higher productivity, more savings and more productive investment, resulting in faster economic growth. Enabling people to have fewer children, if they want to, helps to stimulate development and reduce poverty, both in individual households and in societies. Smaller families have more to invest in children's education and health. Rapid population growth contributes to environmental stress, uncontrolled urbanization and rural and urban poverty.

However, United States funding for UNFPA, which Congress has repeatedly passed, has not been distributed because the administration has refused to do so. Releasing the funds for UNFPA, which the administration has cancelled for the last 3 years, is a great way to help countries alter this template of maternal and child mortality, poverty, and under development.

This issue isn't about coercive abortion in China. UNFPA has a program to end coercive abortion in China. It is not about abortion at all. The UNFPA does not provide any support for abortion.

This is about providing health services for desperately poor women and their families.

The administration's own investigative team looked into UNFPA and