

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

found no evidence of wrongdoing and urged immediate and unconditional release of these funds.

Study after study has shown that development is fundamentally about women: dollars go further and programs mean more when they reach women. Increasing women's access to education, health care, and human rights brings enhanced child health, improved food production, lower population growth rates, and higher incomes—in short, better quality of life for women and their families.

Reproductive health is an important component of this agenda, especially when we look at maternal and child mortality rates. That is why it is so important that we support the UNFPA and in the process advance our other foreign assistance goals.

NUCLEAR ENERGY FOR A BALANCED ENERGY PORTFOLIO

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to endorse S. Con. Res. 141 offered by Senator DOMENICI recognizing the essential role that nuclear power plays in our society.

The U.S. Senate must recognize the important role that nuclear energy plays in our Nation's economy, our Nation's energy independence and security, and our Nation's environmental goals. And, we need to acknowledge that like nearly every other source of energy, nuclear power needs our help to continue playing its important role in our Nation's energy policy.

Nuclear energy currently generates electricity for one in every five homes and businesses today. It is important not only in Louisiana, where two nuclear plants produce nearly 17 percent of my State's electricity, but also in States such as Connecticut, Illinois, New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Carolina and Vermont where nuclear generates more electricity than any other source. Nationwide, 103 reactors provide 20 percent of our electricity—the largest source of U.S. emission-free power provided 24-7.

Nuclear energy is also vitally important for our environment and our Nation's clean air goals. Nuclear power is the Nation's largest clean air source of electricity, generating three-fourths of all emission-free electricity. For future generations of Americans, whose reliance on electricity will increase and who rightfully want a cleaner environment and the health benefits that cleaner air will provide nuclear energy will be an essential partner.

Just this past Sunday, the Washington Post highlighted the problems that the Shenandoah National Forest now faces with pollution. Think how much worse our Nation's air pollution would be if nuclear energy did not generate one fifth of our electricity.

According to the Department of Energy the demand for electricity is expected to grow by 40 percent by 2020. In order to continue producing at least one-third of our total electricity gen-

eration from emission-free sources, we must build 50,000 megawatts of new nuclear energy production. If we do that, we are just preserving our current levels of emission-free generation, not improving them.

And, we need to recognize that nuclear power, by providing a stable, dependable source of electricity, is vital to our Nation's energy security and independence. Nuclear power is essentially an American invention. We generate nearly a fourth of the world's total nuclear power and we can do so with domestic energy sources. Hydrogen holds the promise of helping us lessen our dependence on imported oil and nuclear power is one of the most promising ways that we can produce hydrogen economically and efficiently.

There is a nuclear power renaissance in the making. Three of the Nation's leading nuclear power operators have already applied for an early site permit to build a new nuclear plant next door to an existing nuclear plant they operate, testing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's new licensing process for the first time. Also, just a few months ago, nine nuclear operating companies and the two major U.S. power reactor manufacturers formed the NuStart Energy consortium to apply for a construction and operating license, COL, to test the regulatory process for actually building and operating the next generation of nuclear power plants.

These are positive signs that the U.S. nuclear power industry is alive and ready to build and operate the next generation of nuclear power—still without emitting any air pollutants, increasing our energy independence, and using the safest designs ever.

Today 29 new plants are being built around the world in 16 countries—most using a design that originated here in America—but not one of them is in the U.S. That must change.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical resolution which will further promote a vital source of energy while helping to pave the way towards improving our Nation's energy security.

ART THERAPISTS VITAL TO THE CARE OF VETERANS

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, today I bring attention to the impressive work that art therapists do with our Nation's veterans and the significant accomplishments they have made in this field. Art therapists provide effective treatment and health maintenance intervention for veterans, focusing on all of their life challenges, such as mental, physical, and cognitive impairments. Intense emotion and memory, often difficult to convey in words, often are more easily expressed in images with the guidance of a trained clinician.

Art therapists are master's level mental health practitioners trained in psychology, psychotherapy, and the interface with the arts modality. The American Art Therapy Association es-

tablishes national academic standards of education and clinical practice. After September 11, art therapists assisted both survivors and the bereaved, drawing out their traumatic experiences and dealing pictorially with the horror as they moved through the various stages of grief. Similarly, art therapy is used with veterans who struggle with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Research has demonstrated that traumatic memory is not stored in a fashion that can be expressed only through words. Instead, it is retained as visual, auditory, olfactory, and other sense mechanisms. Images may return as flashbacks or nightmares that the veteran is unable to integrate as memory. As a result, these impressions remain a toxic force, causing intense fear and leading the veteran to try to shut off all memory and emotion and possibly leading to depression, the inability to properly function day to day, and estrangement from family. The traumatic experiences that a veteran is unable to discuss or confront, however, can instead surface through artwork. The process of creating the artwork and externalizing intense issues help the veteran to regain control, integrate horrors into manageable memory, and allow feelings to be experienced again.

For example, a former Marine who served in Vietnam and struggled for years with feelings of inadequacy and fear in crowds benefitted considerably from art therapy. He has said that it enabled him to address problems he otherwise did not have access to, thereby helping him to "mourn the pain . . . overcome . . . and feel comfortable within" himself. Another serviceman drew out his dreams as a way of placing combat experiences into the past and therefore to function more effectively in the present. Such life-enhancing and cost-efficient intervention is not only viable as a treatment option, but may be preventive by forestalling full-blown PTSD. Given the number of veterans gradually returning from the current war in Iraq, art therapy has the potential to assist them as a form of rehabilitation. The American Art Therapy Association is currently investigating possible sites and funding sources for conducting outcome studies on the efficacy of art therapy with veterans.

I would also like to mention with pride that more than 100 registered art therapists live and work in my home State of Florida. These therapists practice all across the State, from my hometown of Miami all the way up to the Panhandle. I am so pleased that almost every veteran—or anyone else—residing in Florida has access to the benefits art therapy can offer.

As ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I support the use of art therapy programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs health care facilities, and I recognize the contribution of art therapists to the effective reintegration, enhanced coping,