

(B) After such 1-year period, and if the President has not made the certification described in subparagraph (A), the report described in paragraph (1) shall be included in the report required under section 8(b) of the Sudan Peace Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by section 5(b) of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-497; 118 Stat. 4018).

(d) In this section:

(1) The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ‘Government of Sudan’ means the National Congress Party-led government in Khartoum, Sudan, or any successor government formed on or after the date of the enactment of this title.

(3) The term ‘member states’ means the member states of the United Nations.

(4) The term ‘Sudan North-South Peace Agreement’ means the comprehensive peace agreement signed by the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People’s Liberation Army/Movement on January 9, 2005.

(5) The term ‘those named by the UN Commission of Inquiry’ means those individuals whose names appear in the sealed file delivered to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to the United Nations Security Council.

(6) The term ‘UN Committee’ means the Committee of the Security Council established in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1591 (29 March 2005); paragraph 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on this amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 517), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following list of cosponsors to the Corzine amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

CO-SPONSORS OF THE CORZINE DARFUR
ACCOUNTABILITY AMENDMENT

Brownback, DeWine, Bill Nelson, Mikulski, Kerry, Johnson, Bingaman, Schumer, Coleman, Leahy, Wyden, Feinstein, Lautenberg, Murray, Jeffords, Obama, Ben Nelson, Boxer, Specter, Kohl, Landrieu, Feingold, Bayh, Levin, Durbin, Lieberman, Clinton, Salazar, and Talent.

AMENDMENT NO. 488

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MCCONNELL, I call up amendment No. 488.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], for Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 488.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 183, line 23 after the period insert the following:

CANDIDATE COUNTRIES

SEC. . Section 616(b)(1) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (Public 108-199) is amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 606(a)(1)’’; and,

(2) inserting in lieu thereof ‘‘subsection (a) or (b) of section 606’’.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 488) was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased, on behalf of the leader, to present the following agreement that has been cleared.

I ask unanimous consent that the only remaining amendments to the bill be the Ensign amendment No. 487 and the Bayh amendment No. 520; provided further, that all time be considered expired under rule XXII, with the exception of 15 minutes prior to the votes; provided further, that on Thursday, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate resume consideration of the bill and that there be 15 minutes for debate equally divided between the chairman and Senator BAYH or his designee prior to votes in relation to the remaining amendments, and that following the disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage, with no intervening action or debate; finally, I ask unanimous consent that following passage of the bill, the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint the Appropriations Committee as conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak up to 25 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA’S INCREASING GLOBAL
INFLUENCE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I will deliver my third speech in 2 weeks on the issue of China’s increasing global influence. In these past speeches I addressed alarming trends such as China’s proliferation problem, the distressing potential that the EU may drop their Arms embargo, and other events that have obvious impact on our national security.

In 2000, Congress established the bipartisan U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission to collect and provide Congress with authoritative information on how our relationship with China affects our economy and industrial base, the impact of China’s military and weapons proliferation on our security, and the status of our national interests in Asia. I fear that the Commission’s findings have largely been ignored. I will continue to draw America’s attention to the issue until we address it.

As China becomes increasingly interdependent with its Asian neighbors, it is presenting its economic rise as a win-win situation for its trade and investment partners. According to political economist Francis Fukuyama:

Over the long run, [China] wants to organize East Asia in a way that puts them in the center of regional politics.

The implications of this are disturbing. As the 2004 Commission report points out:

... the United States’ influence and vital long-term interests in Asia are being challenged by China’s robust regional economic engagement and diplomacy, and that greater attention must be paid to U.S. relations in the region.

The Commission recommends that the U.S. increase visibility in Asia through initiatives that demonstrate our commitment to regional security. One avenue for this is the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum—APEC.

A careful look will show that China’s regional outreach is at best inconsistent. It certainly has not offered win-win benefits to Taiwan or Hong Kong. As the tense situation in Taiwan continues to simmer, China’s ongoing intimidation of this country seems to undermine the rosy picture they are trying to paint. A few weeks ago the Chinese Communist Party formalized a new stance on Taiwan. This is a total diversion from their old policy. The

following was approved by the National Peoples Congress:

If possibilities for a peaceful reunification should be completely exhausted, the state shall employ nonpeaceful means and other necessary measure to protect China's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

This represents a change from earlier ambiguous language that would have allowed China flexibility to consider other options should conflict arise. As it is, China has taken away its own alternatives.

China has also backed itself into a troubling situation with its skyrocketing demand for oil; since my floor speeches in 1999 its oil imports have doubled, and last year alone surged upwards of 57 percent. Some analysts project China's oil needs will double again by 2010 and it will use up its reserves within 14 years. China's alarming need for oil has caused it to look around the world for new sources, sources that are often problematic states with security concerns for the United States.

In Venezuela, anti-American President Hugo Chavez announced a \$3 billion trade strategy with China, including provisions for oil and gas. This came on the heels of his statement, "We have invaded the United States, [not with guns] but with our oil."

Beijing recently signed a \$70 billion oil/gas deal with Iran, from whom it receives 11 percent of its oil imports. Naturally, China has come out firmly against the U.N. Security Council holding Iran economically accountable for its nuclear program.

Likewise, in Sudan, China seeks to defuse or delay any U.N. sanctions against Khartoum. It hardly seems coincidence that 4 percent of its oil imports come from that conflict stricken country, a supply that China seems ready to protect at all costs.

Keep in mind we are talking about the same area in northern Uganda and southern Sudan where they have the terrorist attacks that have consistently gone out, where they abduct these young children, train them to be soldiers, instruct them to kill their parents, and if they do not do it, they cut their arms off, their lips off, and their ears off. That makes no difference to China. If it means 4 percent of its oil imports potential in the future, they are willing to do it.

The United States and the European Union have sanctioned Zimbabwe, hoping to pressure its corrupt regime into reforms. China, on the other hand, has boosted aid and investment, working to blunt the sanctions.

The sources China has used to meet its oil needs and increase its world standing are clearly questionable. The Commission makes an unpopular but straightforward observation:

... [China's] pursuit of oil diplomacy may support objectives beyond just energy supply. Beijing's bilateral arrangements with oil-rich Middle Eastern states also helped create diplomatic and strategic alliances with countries that were hostile to the United States. For example, with U.S. inter-

ests precluded from entering Iran, China may hope to achieve a long-term competitive advantage relative to the United States. Over time, Beijing's relationship-building may counter U.S. power and enhance Beijing's ability to influence political and military outcomes. One of Beijing's stated goals is to reduce what it considers U.S. superpower dominance in favor of a multipolar global power structure in which China attains superpower status on par with the United States.

And while the search for energy is not yet a zero-sum game, the way the U.S. and China acquire oil is strikingly different. James Caverly, of the U.S. Department of Energy states, "The U.S. strategic framework makes certain that plenty of oil is available in the world market so that the price will remain low and the economy will benefit." China, in contrast, seeks to "gain control of the oil at the source. Geopolitically, this could soon bring the United States and Chinese energy interests into conflict." I have a chart that shows the countries that China has been buying oil from. This is the most up-to date information available. What I would like to point out is how China is using whatever leverage it can to find new energy sources, particularly in Africa. If you add up these amounts, China is acquiring about one third of its oil from African countries like Angola, Sudan, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Nigeria and Libya. Other countries China has begun seeking oil from are Algeria, Cameroon, Chad, Gabon, and Guinea.

I have had occasion to go there. And any of these countries that you go to, you see that China is giving them everything they want.

I have been traveling to Africa for many years. I just got back from a trip through Tanzania, Ethiopia and Uganda. Chinese influence is everywhere. I see conference centers and sports stadiums being constructed, donated by the Chinese. China has been expanding its influence throughout Africa with projects like this. The one thing I keep hearing is, "The U.S. tells you what you need, but China gives you what you want." Has China suddenly become compassionate and generous? No. One thing consistent with all of these countries where they are building these stadiums, sports complexes, and arenas, if you go to them, is they are places that the Chinese are depending on for their oil in the future. I think the fact these countries have large oil and mineral deposits is the reason for their generosity.

Last year, China spent nearly \$10 billion on African oil. As I said, this is nearly one third of its total crude oil imports. To gain access to these resources, China shows no qualms about catering to some of the worst governments. The fact is that China is ignoring western sanctions and redrawing the usual geopolitical map to help it level whatever advantages the U.S. may have.

The U.S.-China Commission—again, talking about the Commission that

spent 4 years looking at this—has been doing an outstanding job in translating how recent these events affect our national security. Their observations in the 2004 U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission report demand our attention.

The Commission outlines how China's energy search has both economic and security concerns for the United States:

China's rising energy demand has put added pressure on global petroleum supplies and prices. Indeed, the recent escalation in gasoline prices in the United States has been attributed, in part, to the impact of China's growing pressure on world oil supplies and the absence of any mechanism in place to counter this pressure and maintain stable prices for consumers. . . . China's growing energy needs, linked to its rapidly expanding economy, are creating economic and security concerns for the United States. China's energy security policies are driving it into bilateral arrangements that undermine multilateral efforts to stabilize oil supplies and prices, and in some cases may involve dangerous weapons transfers.

I plan on giving another speech highlighting the significance of these illegal weapons transfers, followed by a resolution to effect the Commission's recommendations. This is a critical issue and will become a greater threat as we continue to ignore it; I hope America is listening.

I would like to say it goes far beyond that. When you have people like Chavez making statements that they would defeat America not with guns but with the economy, or with oil, we have a very serious problem.

I was disturbed over the last few years with not just the nuclear capabilities that China has and is trading with other countries, such as North Korea and Iran, but also with their conventional weapons. It took a lot of courage back in 1998 for General John Jumper to stand up and say publicly that now the Russians have a better strike vehicle than we have in the United States—better than our F-15s and F-16s, speaking of the SU-30 and SU-31 series. Yet China purchased about 240 of these vehicles. It is not just their nuclear and economic capability in trading with countries that are potentially dangerous to the United States but also their nuclear and conventional base.

I will look forward to delivering a floor speech on China.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Energy Plan

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I rise to talk about the overdue need for a long-term domestic energy plan, one