Done the right way, trade can increase our access to raw material for production and create American jobs. It can open foreign markets to our goods and services and bring new and unique products into the United States. Done the right way, trade can not only contribute to the economic prosperity of America and its working families, it can also strengthen the economic and political stability of our trading partners. It is because I believe in the many positive impacts that trade can bring when done the right way that I have been fighting for a new trade model.

The NAFTA-style trade free trade agreements negotiated by the Bush administration are the wrong way to do trade. They bring nothing more than empty promises and harm to the American working class. My support for smart trade agreements that work for working people means that I cannot support the U.S.-Peru FTA. It is based on the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, which has resulted in job losses in America, pushed small farmers off the land in Mexico, and jeopardized public health and safety policies in the U.S., Mexico, and Canada.

When the administration announced its new policy on trade earlier this year, I, along with the rest of my colleagues in the House Trade Working Group were hopeful that the administration had taken bold steps to improve its trade policy. Unfortunately, it soon became clear that the Peru FTA, along with the rest of the pending trade agreements, retain the basic structure of NAFTA and CAFTA. The bold promises of new protections for workers turned out to be nice promises that had little chance of being enforced.

The American people are fed up with trade agreements that only benefits the ''haves'' while making it harder for the ''have-nots'' to get ahead. A recent Wall Street Journal survey identified the declining public confidence in the NAFTA-style trade model. According to the survey, 60 percent of conservative Americans, those who would have been most apt to support the expansion of free trade, now believe that free trade is harmful to the U.S. economy.

The promises of U.S. job creation and an increased standard of living for the working class have not been fulfilled. Instead, we continue to see the rich get richer and the rest, the middle and working class, get left behind. The administration asserts that the new additions to the Peru agreement will add long-sought labor and environmental protections; however, a careful analysis reveals that there are few changes from the basic NAFTA–CAFTA text. And even when there are changes, the new provisions offer few new protections.

If the Peru FTA is so great, where is all the union support for it? Why do so many environmental groups oppose it? NAFTA–CAFTA provisions that have caused downward pressure on wages, the export of U.S. jobs and an import of unsafe products and food have saved little. This so-called new deal is a bad deal. It is an old clunker with a new coat of paint. But even if this new deal contained the most stringent labor and environmental protections in the world, it would be dependent on the executive branch for enforcement. And enforcement of labor and environmental standards is something the current administration is unlikely to do. Let's be honest. The Bush administration has a consistent record of nonenforcement.

We need a real new deal, not another NAFTA clone. Simply put, the NAFTA model doesn't work. It has failed to bring the jobs and prosperity that we were promised. Remember when we were promised that NAFTA would create jobs in Mexico and stem the flow of immigration? Remember when we were promised that NAFTA would ensure our trading partners would uphold the same strong labor and environmental standards that we have here in the U.S.? And now, this administration is asking us to believe its promise that the labor and environmental provisions of the Peru agreement will be stringently enforced.

Well, if the experience of the last 10 years hasn't convinced you, I have some swamp land in Florida that I would like to sell you. So long as we have to rely on this administration to protect the rights and safety of working men and women, we will continue to be disappointed. This administration's track record does not reflect a real commitment to the working families of America. The truth of the matter is that the NAFTA model heavily favors the wealthiest few leaving small businesses to fend for themselves on an unequal playing field. The Peru Free Trade Agreement has been advertised as the new model for trade deals. This sounds eerily familiar to what we were told when CAFTA was being pushed. CAFTA was supposed to include bold new wage protections for workers. But those protections were disappointingly weak allowing countries to downgrade their own labor laws.

Minor adjustments in NAFTA-style deals such as the U.S. Peru FTA are not good enough. We need to reject the Peru FTA agreement, and I urge all my colleagues to oppose it.

□ 2000

ENDING THE GENOCIDE IN DARFUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES of Ohio) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, another opportunity to be here on the floor on Monday night during the Congressional Black Caucus message hour, and you are in the chair. What a privilege.

I rise tonight, Madam Speaker, during this message hour to pause to address an ongoing crisis in Darfur. For many years now we have seen the devastating atrocities taking place in the Darfur region of Sudan. With the support of the Sudanese Government, the janjaweed militia has ravaged the people of Darfur, raping, torturing, murdering and forcing hundreds of thousands of Darfuris to flee to refugee camps in neighboring Chad and the Central African Republic. We saw the same devastation in Rwanda over a decade ago; and the American people have made their voices heard on this issue, vowing never again to remain silent when humanity is threatened.

The Congressional Black Caucus has been a leader on this issue. I, along with many of my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues, were some of the first Members of Congress to speak out about this issue. We have been to the Sudanese embassy to protest. Many were arrested. We have visited the region numerous times and we have repeatedly addressed this issue with President George Bush in meetings, asking him to take immediate action. Yet, once again, we come to the House floor to challenge this administration to take a stand in Darfur.

Madam Speaker, today's Washington Post had this to say about our progress in Darfur: ''A year and a half later, the situation on the ground in Darfur is little changed. More than two million displaced Darfuris, including hundreds of thousands in camps, have been unable to return to their homes. The perpetrators of the worst atrocities remain unpunished. Despite a renewed U.N. push, the international peacekeeping troops that Bush has long been seeking have yet to materialize. Just this weekend, peace talks in Libya aimed at ending the 4-year conflict appear to be floundering because of a boycott by key rebel groups.

''Many of those who have tracked the conflict over the years, including some in his own administration, say Bush has not matched his words with action, allowing initiatives to drop because of inertia or failure to follow up, while proving unable to mobilize either this bureaucracy or the international community.''

I continue to quote from the Washington Post: ''The President, who famously promised not to allow another Rwanda-style mass murder on his watch, has never fully chosen between

those inside his government advocating more pressure on Sudan and those advocating engagement with the Islamist government. So the policy has veered from one approach to the other.''

Today, I am pleased to say that the House passed three resolutions on Darfur, which I will discuss as I come back to the microphone. I am pleased to be joined again this evening, Madam Speaker, by one of my colleagues and good friends, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California. She has been out front, particularly on this issue. We have had an opportunity to have press conferences with several leading Hollywood-types who have really been with us on the issue.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as she may consume to the great woman from the great State of California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, first let me thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding and her leadership in organizing these Special Orders. This is a particularly timely discussion we are having tonight, and I want to again thank Congresswoman STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES for ensuring that not only this issue, the ongoing genocide in Darfur, stays in the spotlight, but also so many issues that we are addressing here on behalf of the American people and as a result of the Congressional Black Caucus being the conscience of the Congress. Congresswoman TUBBS JONES, thank you very much for your voice, stepping up to the plate, and your constant leadership on the issues we are addressing, which are so timely and, quite frankly, so difficult.

The poor track record of the Sudanese Government in previous talks really have warranted our work here to become more intense and revved up. We have got to do our part to keep the pressure up on all sides, especially the government, and come together to stop the violence and the killing.

Now, Members of the Congressional Black Caucus and Congresswoman TUBBS JONES, I am very pleased that you recounted some of this history tonight because it was Congressman DON PAYNE who for so long was the lone voice in the wilderness with regard to the genocide that was taking place. Finally, several years ago he brought together this entire body to declare that what atrocities we had witnessed is genocide.

So this declaration of genocide exists, it's a matter of record, and we, unfortunately, have not acted in a way that warrants that declaration in terms of the Darfurian people. So we have to remember Congressman DON PAYNE tonight and members of the Congressional Black Caucus who have visited Darfur. I have been there on three occasions. We have witnessed the tragedy, we have witnessed the faces, the eyes of the children who have seen right before their eyes their villages burn, their women raped and their family members killed.

It is very important that we come together once again with our young people from around the country, because it is young people who are leading the charge, and the faith community, to end this genocide. Unfortunately, as Congresswoman TUBBS JONES said earlier and, again, The Washington Post, actually the headlines today, says: ''U.S. promises on Darfur don't match actions. Bush expresses passion for issue but policies have been inconsistent.''

Let me mention a couple of the policies in addition to the bills that were passed today, which were very important, major steps in the right direction. We introduced a resolution, Congresswoman TUBBS JONES was a cosponsor, and I introduced it with many others, about a year and a half ago, which really was a bill calling for divestment and allowing States to divest. This bill is called the Darfur Accountability and Divestment Act, better known as DADA.

Two weeks ago, the Senate banking committee amended and passed DADA, which, again, is bipartisan, and it really is a major bill that I hope gets to the President's desk very soon. What it does is it would authorize divestment from certain companies doing business in or with Sudan and prohibit any new Federal contracts with such companies. No one should have to worry that they are supporting genocide, whether it is through their tax dollars or their pension funds.

Madam Speaker, thanks to the persistence of a committed group of students and grass-roots activists, divestment has become a national movement that has the potential to really hit the Government of Sudan where it hurts the most, and that is their wallets. Today, 20 States, 59 universities, 10 cities and scores of individuals and organizations around the country have chosen to divest from businesses supporting the genocidal regime in Khartoum. Their actions have already had an impact. Once we introduced DADA over here, many multinational companies began to significantly change their business operations in Sudan, and some actually ceased doing business there.

So we must follow through on this massive grass-roots mobilization and pass Federal divestment legislation now so that we can put further pressure on Khartoum to end this genocide.

As we pursue divestment, we must also ensure that we support our peacekeeping efforts in the region and protect civilians and prevent violence. Again, I witnessed what was taking place on the border of Chad several years ago in Sudan, and also this year and last year with two additional congressional delegations; and each time I was there, I saw more violence and it was getting much worse; and it still is getting much worse.

The recent attacks, really the AU forces, actually when we were there last time, I believe it was five soldiers were killed from the African Union. They are really overstretched and we need to make sure we approve the $210 million in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill, because they deserve the resources, they need the resources. We need a strong, robust force to provide for peacekeeping operations.

So I hope that the President will not veto this legislation and that he will sign the DADA bill, which would begin to end this genocide in Darfur and to assist the Darfurian people.

Our Speaker, Speaker NANCY PELOSI, has been such an unbelievable leader on this issue. She has made this a priority. I participated with her on her delegation last year. Subsequent to that, Majority Leader STENY HOYER led a delegation. And Congressman ED ROYCE led a delegation where Don Cheadle, the wonderful Academy Award nominee for Hotel Rwanda, was with us and spent time in the refugee camps.

I share that, because the world needs to know that this has been here in the House and Senate a bipartisan effort, but we still haven't quite done what we need to do. But it is a moment that we must all embrace now, because we have to do this. More people are getting killed each and every day.

Yes, some of us were arrested. We were very involved in the anti-apartheid movement, and sometimes you have to do things out of the box to make sure that the public understands that death and destruction is taking place and that we cannot allow this death and destruction to continue.

So I want to commend members of the Congressional Black Caucus for really putting their bodies on the line and getting arrested and doing some of the things that we had to do in the sixties and the seventies to ''make some noise,'' as Congressman JOHN LEWIS says, because we have to work with our outside groups and we have to do the legislative work. We have to do what it takes to end this.

We cannot have another Rwanda. Unfortunately, Congresswoman TUBBS JONES mentioned Rwanda. We stood by and we saw nearly 1 million people die. The only thing our government did was apologize after the fact, after the fact. One million people.

So not on our watch are we going to allow another Rwanda to take place. Whatever we have to do, we will do. The people of Darfur are suffering and they are dying. The world is watching. Congresswoman CAROLYN KILPATRICK, under her leadership, we met with the President of Algeria. We met with President Mubarak. We tried to bring forth the League of Arab Nations. We talked to China and their representatives. We passed resolutions here in a bipartisan manner to ask China and the League of Arab Nations to join with us in condemning this genocide and doing the things that need to be done. So we cannot stand by and do nothing. Not on our watch, not on our dime.

So I want to congratulate Congresswoman JACKSON-LEE for the passage of

your resolution today, and all of the other Members that are working so hard each and every day 24/7, to stop this slaughter that is taking place in Darfur.

Congresswoman TUBBS JONES, thank you again for your leadership and for calling us together once again to beat the drum and to let the American people know that not on our watch, not on our dime, will this genocide continue.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD from today's Washington Post, October 29, 2007, this first part of the article entitled, ''U.S. Promises on Darfur Don't Match Actions'' by Michael Abramowitz.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 29, 2007]

U.S. PROMISES ON DARFUR DON'T MATCH ACTIONS

(By Michael Abramowitz)

In April 2006, a small group of Darfur activists—including evangelical Christians, the representative of a Jewish group and a former Sudanese slave—was ushered into the Roosevelt Room at the White House for a private meeting with President Bush. It was the eve of a major rally on the National Mall, and the president spent more than an hour holding forth, displaying a kind of passion that has led some in the White House to dub him the ''Sudan desk officer.''

Bush insisted there must be consequences for rape and murder, and he called for international troops on the ground to protect innocent Darfuris, according to contemporaneous notes by one of those present. He spoke of ''bringing justice'' to the Janjaweed, the Arab militias that have participated in atrocities that the president has repeatedly described as nothing less than ''genocide.''

''He had an understanding of the issue that went beyond simply responding to a briefing that had been given,'' said David Rubenstein, a participant who was then executive director of the Save Darfur Coalition, which has been sharply critical of the administration's response to the crisis. ''He knew more facts than I expected him to know, and he had a broader political perspective than I expected him to have.''

Yet a year and a half later, the situation on the ground in Darfur is little changed: More than 2 million displaced Darfuris, including hundreds of thousands in camps, have been unable to return to their homes. The perpetrators of the worst atrocities remain unpunished. Despite a renewed U.N. push, the international peacekeeping troops that Bush has long been seeking have yet to materialize.

Just this weekend, peace talks in Libya aimed at ending the four-year conflict appeared to be foundering because of a boycott by key rebel groups.

Many of those who have tracked the conflict over the years, including some in his own administration, say Bush has not matched his words with action, allowing initiatives to drop because of inertia or failure to follow up, while proving unable to mobilize either his bureaucracy or the international community.

The president who famously promised not to allow another Rwanda-style mass murder on his watch has never fully chosen between those inside his government advocating more pressure on Sudan and those advocating engagement with its Islamist government, so the policy has veered from one approach to another.

Meanwhile, a constant turnover of key administration advisers on Darfur, such as former deputy secretary of state Robert B. Zoellick and presidential aide Michael Gerson, has made it hard for the administration to maintain focus.

''Bush probably does want something done, but the lack of hands-on follow-up from this White House allowed this to drift,'' said one former State Department official involved in Darfur who did not want to be quoted by name criticizing the president. ''If he says, 'There is not going to be genocide on my watch,' and then 2½ years later we are just getting tough action, what gives? He has made statements, but his administration has not given meaning to those statements.''

Since the United States became the first and only government to call the killing in Darfur genocide, Bush and his aides have grappled with how to provide security for civilians in a large, remote area in the heart of Africa.

While almost everyone involved in Darfur policy agrees that an African Union peacekeeping force of just 7,000 troops is not up to the task, the United States has refused to send troops and, despite promises of reinforcements, has yet to secure many additional troops from other countries. At the same time, it has been unable to broker a diplomatic resolution that might ease the violence.

Even Bush has complained privately that his hands are tied on Darfur because, with the U.S. involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan, he cannot be seen as ''invading another Muslim country,'' according to people who have spoken with him about the issue.

''It's impossible to keep Iraq out of this picture,'' said Edward Mortimer, who served as a top aide to then-U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan and says resentment over Iraq caused many countries to not want to cooperate with the United States on Darfur.

Bush advisers argue that the lack of success reflects the limitations of working through institutions such as the United Nations, NATO and the African Union. They cite the billions of dollars of U.S. relief aid that has kept millions of Sudanese alive. They say U.S. pressure has kept the issue on the world's agenda.

''If there was ever a case study where the president sees the limitations and frustrations of the multilateral organizations, it is the issue of Darfur,'' said Dan Bartlett, former White House counselor. ''Everybody for the most part can come to a consensus: Whether you call it genocide or not, we have an urgent security and humanitarian crisis on our hands. Yet these institutions cannot garner the will or ability to come together to save people.''

There is no doubt that responsibility for inaction on Darfur can be spread around. The Sudanese government has resisted cooperation at every step in the saga and has been shielded at the United Nations by China, its main international protector. Few other Western nations, with the notable exception of Britain and some Nordic countries, have shown much interest in resolving the crisis. The process of raising peacekeepers from U.N. members has proved tortuously slow.

''There's an enormous stain on the world's conscience,'' said Mitchell B. Reiss, former State Department policy planning chief. ''We collectively stood by and let it happen a decade after it happened in Rwanda.''

A PRESIDENT'S PASSION

In late 2005, Bush gathered his most senior advisers to discuss what to do about Darfur. He wanted to know whether the U.S. military could send in helicopter gunships to attack the militias if they launched new attacks on the refugee camps. Could they also shoot down Sudanese military aircraft if necessary? he asked. His aides worried that the United States could get involved in another shooting war, and the president backed off.

''He wanted militant action, and people had to restrain him,'' said one senior official familiar with the episode. ''He wanted to go in and kill the Janjaweed.''

The meeting underscored both Bush's personal investment in Sudan, dating back to the beginning of his administration, and his instinct, which aides have kept in check, to take direct action.

Many close to Bush believe that this intense interest in the issue was heavily influenced by American evangelicals, who have adopted the cause of Christians in southern Sudan. Even before the crisis in Darfur, in western Sudan, one of Bush's foreign policy goals was to try to end the civil war between the Muslim government in Khartoum and rebels in the south, a conflict that had lasted more than two decades and cost more than 2 million lives.

Former Senator John C. Danforth (R-Mo.), whom Bush appointed as his special envoy for Sudan, said the president's interest in the country is rooted in a larger sense of morality. ''This isn't a country that has much strategic interest for the United States,'' he observed.

Bush's initiative to broker a north-south deal worked. Despite difficult negotiations, Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir agreed in January 2005 to a plan to share power and oil revenues with the rebels—and even gave the south the right to secede in six years if the leadership could not reconcile their differences.

But by then a separate conflict had exploded in Darfur, as long-standing conflicts between African farmers and Arab herders over land, and a failure by the Khartoum government to redress local grievances, boiled over into armed rebellion.

The government turned to a tactic it had employed in fighting the southern rebels: arming local Arab militias, the Janjaweed, to carry out a counterinsurgency on its behalf. The militias rampaged throughout Darfur starting in mid–2003, burning hundreds of villages, raping women and summarily executing African villagers, according to numerous human rights reports. More than 200,000 people have died in Darfur since the crisis erupted, according to U.N. estimates. Some estimates place the figure as high as 450,000.

Many familiar with Sudan believe that Bush and his aides initially averted their gaze to the flaring violence in Darfur because raising the issue might interfere with the difficult negotiations with Bashir. Some U.S. officials saw another reason for the reluctance to get involved: preserving a burgeoning intelligence relationship with Khartoum, which had begun sharing critical information about al-Qaeda and other Islamic extremists.

''There was a tendency not to see Darfur initially for what it was,'' said Gerard Gallucci, who served in 2003 and 2004 as the top U.S. diplomat in Khartoum. It was well known among Western governments, he said, that Sudan ''was using terror to cleanse black Muslim Africans from land that they had promised the Janjaweed.''

Such claims are vigorously contested by Danforth and other Bush advisers, who say the president repeatedly warned Bashir about the consequences of sending Arab militias after defenseless civilians.

Over time, Bush has become increasingly outspoken about the situation in Darfur, raising the issue with foreign leaders and meeting privately with dissidents and other little-known political players in Sudan to encourage a solution. In recent months, he has singled out Bashir for harsh condemnation, accusing him of subverting efforts to bring peace to Darfur.

Meeting with the Darfur activists, Bush acknowledged that Sudan had cooperated in anti-terrorism initiatives—but he insisted that Khartoum could not ''buy off'' the United States, Rubenstein said.

Last spring, when the White House worked on a new plan to try to press Sudan's government to accept international peacekeepers, it was the president himself who was the driving force in the interagency process, many officials involved the debate said. According to national security adviser Stephen J. Hadley, Bush refused to accept a program developed to confront Sudan because he was concerned that it was not tough enough. He kicked it back to the bureaucracy.

''I've had it with this incrementalism,'' Hadley quoted the president as saying in the Oval Office. ''We're going to lead, and if people don't want to follow us, they're going to have to stand up and explain why they are willing to let women continue to be raped in Darfur.''

At one point, one senior official said, Bush wanted action to crimp Sudan's booming oil business, a move that would have severely aggravated relations with China—and that no one else in the government favored.

There was stunned silence in the room, the official said, when Hadley disclosed Bush's idea to other government officials. Hadley made clear he was not interested in having a discussion, but the administration never went as far as the president seemed to be demanding. Instead, Treasury officials came up with a sanctions plan aimed at tracking and squeezing key individuals and companies in the Sudanese economy, including the oil business.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California, my good friend BARBARA LEE, for her leadership on so many issues. As we come to the floor tonight, I want to thank her for her work that she has done in Darfur and thank her for joining me again in this hour.

As has been said previously, there were three pieces of legislation on Darfur that were voted on on the floor today, and one of those resolutions happened to be a resolution authored by my colleague and good friend SHEILA JACKSON-LEE from the great State of Texas.

She has had many great opportunities to take the lead on some of these issues as well. I have to say she and BARBARA LEE have been wonderful about helping me with this CBC message hour every week.

I am happy to yield to my colleague and good friend SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Houston, Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Thank you, Madam Chairman and Madam Manager. I think it is appropriate to congratulate and to thank you again for giving us the opportunity to provide a face on the work of the Congressional Black Caucus and to thank our chairwoman, the Honorable CAROLYN KILPATRICK, for working with us to continue to show the efforts being made that have such a vast array of impact. Let me thank the distinguished Speaker this evening for her leadership as well as we work together.

I am grateful that my first efforts with the Honorable Congressman BARBARA LEE was an historic trip that we took some years ago as the first Presidential trip or major statement before the Marshall Plan on HIV/AIDS. I cite that to say that it can be done. You can get your hands around a major devastating killer. HIV/AIDS is a killer. It continues to kill in Africa. But yet there is the Millennium Account, there are a number of issues that address the question of HIV/AIDS. Part of it was out of the trip that Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and myself and Congresswoman KILPATRICK went on some years ago.

□ 2015

And so as I stand here today to acknowledge the Congressional Black Caucus, I want to reinforce the fact of the number of Members who were arrested of the organized campaign to respond to the pain of what is going on, and the legislative initiatives and the work we did with Congresswoman LEE on the divestiture bill. And I, too, believe it is long overdue that this bill should move and be signed by the President of the United States.

Just this past summer, I led a delegation with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) to go into Darfur and get into the soul and the soil of Darfur and begin to realize and to emphasize the importance of moving on the peacekeepers.

We were the first American delegation to go in right after the recognition that the peacekeepers should come in and the agreement by the government in Khartoum, as represented to us by the U.N., that they had agreed to peacekeepers. We went in, and not only did we go to Darfur, Sudan, but we went to Tunisia and Algeria and Ethiopia, and we asked each governing body to provide troops to the peacekeeping effort through the African Union because it was a serious effort.

But what we found most of all was red tape. I want to put a human face on these refugee camps: 2.4 million displaced. The genocide in Darfur has destroyed well over 60 percent of the villages in Darfur, displaced over 2 million people, killed an estimated 400,000 and driven 200,000 into Chad, and that is a separate story in talking about the physical and emotional and financial burden of the refugees on Chad and the conflict that is rising up in Chad because of the refugees.

Today the House considered H. Res. 740, which condemned in the strongest terms the recent attacks on African Union peacekeepers that occurred in Haskanita, Darfur, Sudan, on September 29, 2007. I introduced this bill along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), and 55 Members joined me in this. They recognized that we are not going to make any steps of success to put a human face on the suffering. We are not going to be able to pull that suffering back, to be able to quash the janjaweed, to be able to separate the rebels, to prevent some of the tragic stories that I heard.

We sat in the refugee camps to listen to the women who spoke about their plight. This is a growing Rwanda. And I remember people saying, ''Never again, not on my watch.'' I remember the horror of recognizing the inaction of this government, the American Government as related to the crisis in Rwanda. Then it was we did not know. Now we have the backdrop of Rwanda. Thank God Rwanda is moving to a country of stability and overcoming their horrific crisis. But after a million deaths, is that what we want to see after 400,000 have died, over 2 million displaced, 2.4 million displaced, children whose birth weight is far below the average because of limited amount of access to food and water? In essence, there is a degree of malnutrition, even though I want to give great thanks to the NGOs, but it is just not enough. These people need food and health care and water and the ability to survive.

Yet we are seeing the constant dust up of the violence around the camps. We saw it firsthand, and it is important that these troops are able to come in without the violence. Let me just cite the incident that occurred on September 29. An estimated 1,000 members of a heavily armed Darfur rebel group in 30 vehicles, armed with heavy artillery and mortars overran a small base in Darfur, Sudan, which was occupied by the African Union mission peacekeepers. The ambush resulted in several hours of intense fighting that killed 10 peacekeepers and wounded many others.

According to U.N. estimates in the aftermath of this brutal attack, which was described by the African Union commander as deliberate and sustained, 15,000 civilians fled the area to neighboring towns or the wilderness fearing for their safety. And in the wilderness, there is nothing but death. There is violence by the janjaweed and rebels not in line with the peacekeeping mission. There is devastation, lack of water. There is lack of food. There is death. And the 15,000 that fled were the elderly, women with children and families.

Madam Speaker, this is what is going on in Sudan and so it is important for the Congressional Black Caucus to list a number of efforts, including the divestiture, including a number of initiatives, putting ourselves forward to protest at the Sudanese Embassy.

Let me say the recent ambassador that I discussed this matter with seemed to care, seemed to want to do something. But my words are that you can't want to do something; you must do something.

So here you can see the landscape. Although it reflects the landscape of Sudan generally, this is a compound where people are confined and these children have nowhere to go. They have no life. They have no games. They have no way of looking to the future. As you see, this group of children, there are thousands upon thousands upon thousands of children. Babies being born as well. And, therefore, these babies are being born with limited health care, malnutrition. And it

is important to note that they are struggling under these conditions.

This is a mother and child. They are trying to make mud bricks so they don't have to go out beyond the parameters of the refugee camp because that is when these women are attacked. Their livelihood is dependent on getting firewood as they did 50, maybe 100 years ago. Every time they go out to get firewood, the women are subjected to rape. The men cannot go because they may be killed, so the women go. They scavenge the land. It is completely barren because you have 2.4 million people living in one compound trying to survive. So they have come up with a creative way to try to use the mud to keep the fire going so they don't have to go out as much. This is the condition. This is where they cook. This is the communal cooking area. I can assure you, as loving as this mother is, that the food is so limited it may be one meal a day. It may be a porridge because of the limit of wildlife, access to meat and vegetables, and these are the conditions.

I will say to you that the people are resilient, but they are looking to us to do something, and the question is: What are we going to do? These are the women who I sat down with trying to make baskets to sell. I listened to their stories about the intrusions at night coming into the camps, going into their living quarters and attacking them. And only through their screams did they have men and others come to scare away the attackers. So they are not safe from rape even in these villages. This is a crime against humanity.

Those of us who believe in the sanctity of human life, the abhorrence of rape and violence, this is a disgrace of what these women are facing. I, too, join in reflecting in the words and the headlines in The Washington Post, ''U.S. Promises on Darfur Don't Match Actions.''

But what I want to say to the Commander in Chief who has just asked for some $46 billion or more for the Iraq war when our soldiers have already done their job and the American people want them home, what we want to see done is where the benevolence of the United States can help get something accomplished, where people are looking for our safety net, and our technical help with the peacekeepers can make a difference.

Listen to these words from the former director of the Darfur Coalition who I have worked with, and I thank him and thank them for their leadership. Bush insisted there must be consequences for rape and murder, and he called for international troops on the ground to protect innocent Darfuris. According to contemporaneous notes by one present, he spoke of bringing justice to the janjaweed, the Arab militia, that has participated in atrocities that the President has repeatedly described as nothing less than genocide.

Congresswoman JONES, you remember it was the Congressional Black Caucus sitting down with Secretary Colin Powell, and I thank him for what he did, but colleagues like our chairman of the Subcommitte on Africa, DONALD PAYNE, claimed this was genocide, called this genocide many months before. But it was our persistence to meet with the Secretary of State, to sit down in a meeting at which he came, and at that meeting he made the statement which he then made public that he had determined this was genocide based on the pursuit, the pressure, the information, the agitation, the advocation of members of the CBC and of course other colleagues in the Democratic Caucus and of course in the Republican Caucus, because this is a bipartisan issue.

So the Secretary of State Colin Powell announced, I believe in 2004, that this was genocide by this government. So the President recognized what was happening, and the article goes on to say that the White House, President Bush, had an understanding of the issue that went beyond simple responding to a briefing that had been given, said David Rubinstein, a participant who was then executive director of the Save Darfur Coalition, which has been sharply critical of the administration's response to the crisis.

He knew more facts than I expected him to know, and he had a broader political perspective than I expected him to know. Yet a year and a half later, having known all of this information, the situation as you reported on the ground in Darfur is little changed, and more than 2 million people remain displaced. The question is that if we know all of this, if the administration knows all of this, if we have declared genocide, it is imperative that we act.

In my visit in August, I could see there was no action. There was no action in the south to settle that down so rebels are scattered. There are now multiple rebel groups, and then there is the conflict with the janjaweed.

I think tonight what we wanted to do was to reconfirm and reaffirm the Congressional Black Caucus is not going to let this rest. We are not going to suffer the indignities that these people are experiencing and suffering. We are going to call on our colleagues in the Congress. We are going to thank Speaker PELOSI and Leader HOYER and Majority Whip CLYBURN, Chairman EMANUEL and Vice Chairman LARSON and our leadership in the Congressional Black Caucus, which I am proud to serve as whip, our leadership, that what I believe we need now is for this administration to move on getting the peacekeepers on the ground, to not take no for an answer, to help move the U.N. so they can join with the African Union peacekeepers, because it is clear we need additional help other than the African Union troops. We must have additional help.

The last thing I want to say, we have friends and allies, and they include members of the Arab League and China. We cannot continue to have our allies empower and embolden the Khartoum Government without solving this problem. If they think 2.4 million people are okay and nothing is happening, I am here to tell you they are wrong. Rape and pillage and suffering is going on. I ask on this floor for the U.N. and the new Secretary General to take a firm stand to move U.N. peacekeepers in now and to help the AMIS effort, the African Union peacekeepers now, and have these people move back to their places of residence and to solve the violence and the viciousness going on in Darfur. Enough of genocide and enough of the travesty on human rights.

I include the remainder of The Washington Post article dated September 29, 2007, for the RECORD.

WAY OF SENDING TROOPS

At an appearance in Tennessee this summer, Bush raised a question many have asked about the situation in Darfur: ''If there is a problem, why don't you just go take care of it?'' But Bush said he considered—and decided against—sending U.S. troops unilaterally. ''It just wasn't the right decision,'' he said.

With the United States tied down in Iraq and Afghanistan, skepticism about using U.S. soldiers, even in a limited way, cut across agencies and bodies that often disagree, from the State Department to the Pentagon to Vice President Cheney's office, according to many current and former officials.

Advisers say Bush came to accept, albeit grudgingly, the arguments against using U.S. military assets—especially the possibility that they might attract al-Qaeda. ''In my mind, there would never be enough troops to impose order on this place,'' former secretary of state Colin L. Powell said an interview. ''The only way to resolve this problem was for there to be a political settlement between the rebels and the government.''

Sharing this belief was Powell's bureaucratic nemesis, then-Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, who advocated sending troops to Iraq but not to the middle of Africa, according to many officials in the government.

This aversion to any use of force was frustrating to some lower-ranking government officials, who saw a modest U.S. military effort as indispensable to making the Sudanese take American diplomacy seriously. Early in the crisis, in the summer of 2004, the U.S. mission in Khartoum made clear to Washington its belief that the African Union was incapable of dealing with the security problem in Darfur on its own.

It recommended that several hundred U.S. troops help fly in African Union forces and provide other assistance, according to a former State Department official. The idea was never seriously entertained, the official said, and it was not until two years later that the United States began making efforts at the United Nations to bolster the overmatched African mission.

Roger Winter, a former State Department official who was intimately involved with Sudan policy during the Bush administration, argues that the United States has never been serious about pressuring the Sudanese government. ''They know what we will do and what we won't do,'' he said. ''And they don't respond unless there is a credible threat. And they haven't viewed everything that has happened up until now as credible.''

CARROTS VS. STICKS

Over the course of the conflict, Bush has found himself torn between different factions

in his administration over how to handle Sudan—whether, simply put, to try carrots or sticks.

In early 2006, Bush empowered Zoellick to seek a peace deal between Khartoum and the Darfur rebel groups. Zoellick, now president of the World Bank, was essentially pursuing what one senior U.S. official described as a policy of engagement with the Sudanese government, even though the Bush administration believed it was involved in perpetrating the atrocities in Darfur.

Zoellick worked closely with senior Sudanese officials and dangled the possibility of improved relations and other incentives should Khartoum cooperate in bringing peace to Darfur. And he came close to pulling it off: An agreement to end the violence was negotiated in the spring of 2006, but it fell apart after key rebel leaders refused to sign on.

Some U.S. officials say Bush never completely bought into Zoellick's approach. He seems to have been influenced in that regard by Gerson, the then-speech writer who was given a wide-ranging policy berth in the early part of Bush's second term.

Gerson, now a Washington Post columnist, is a devout Christian who was especially animated by the part of the Bush agenda that focused on alleviating suffering in Africa. He traveled to Sudan with Zoellick in late 2005, a trip that included a meeting with Bashir, and came back convinced that Khartoum was not seriously interested in efforts to improve conditions in Darfur.

''There was always a series of incremental steps, and nothing changed on the ground,'' Gerson said later.

Returning to Washington, Gerson told Bush that Bashir was feeling no pressure to cooperate and that the African Union peacekeepers were not up to the task of protecting civilians. He also suggested that it might be useful to establish a no-fly zone to prevent the Sudanese government from flying bombing missions in support of Janjaweed attacks.

Several months later, Gerson sent Bush some articles criticizing the U.S. approach as anemic, and Bush summoned his aide to the Oval Office, a little hot under the collar because he did not agree with the criticism. But he assured Gerson, as the former aide remembers, ''I want you to know we are acting on this.''

In February 2006, Bush proposed using NATO forces to help quickly bolster the beleaguered African Union mission. The president seemed so excited about the idea that he mentioned it, almost casually, in response to a question about Uganda during a public appearance in Florida. The statement stunned some in the U.S. bureaucracy.

But even Bush's efforts to promote the idea did little to move the process along. The French were leery of a new NATO mission outside its normal sphere of operations, and there was no interest from Sudan or the African Union in a major role for this quintessentially Western military alliance, according to U.S. officials. The plan went nowhere.

Now, 20 months later, with Zoellick and Gerson gone, new administration figures are working with other countries on new plans for peace and peacekeepers in Darfur. Given the track record, those who have handled Darfur over the years are cautious.

''Overall,'' concluded John R. Bolton, the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, ''Sudan is a case where there's a lot of international rhetoric and no stomach for real action.''

Madam Speaker, the genocide in Darfur has taken a horrific toll on that region of Sudan. It has destroyed well over 60 percent of the villages in Darfur, displaced over 2 million people, killed an estimated 400,000, and driven 200,000 into refugee camps in neighboring Chad.

Today the House considered H. Res. 740, condemning in the strongest terms the attacks on African Union peacekeepers that occurred in Haskanita, Darfur, Sudan, on September 29, 2007, which I introduced, together with my good friend and distinguished colleague, Mr. CHABOT. This measure was cosponsored by 55 of my colleagues, and it passed the House by voice vote.

Since 2003, we have witnessed a systematic campaign of displacement, starvation, rape, mass murder, and terror in the western Sudanese region of Darfur. In the worst humanitarian crisis of our time, an estimated 400,000 people have been killed in Darfur by the Government of Sudan and its Janjaweed allies. An additional 2,000,000 people have been displaced from their homes and livelihoods. Both the House of Representatives and the Senate declared that the atrocities in Darfur constitute genocide in July 2004, and the Bush administration reached the same conclusion in September 2004.

However, three years later, the situation in Darfur continues to deteriorate. The United Nations reported a substantial decline in the humanitarian situation during the first three months of 2007, during which time 21 humanitarian vehicles were hijacked, 15 additional vehicles were looted, and gunmen raided 6 humanitarian compounds. The security situation makes it extremely difficult for aid organizations to reach vulnerable populations, and, in the 12 months preceding April 2007, the number of humanitarian relief workers in Darfur decreased by 16 percent, largely due to security concerns, restrictions on access, and funding limitations. The flow of humanitarian aid has been severely threatened by the escalating violence in the region.

Since 2004, a small contingent of African Union peacekeepers have been deployed to Darfur, responsible for maintaining security in a region roughly the size of France. The 7,000 peacekeepers under the banner of the African Union Mission in Sudan, or AMIS, have displayed exemplary courage and resilience, but they are woefully outmanned and outgunned, as well as chronically short of funding. Recognizing the near-collapse of the AU Mission, the United Nations, in July 2007, approved a UN–AU hybrid peacekeeping mission, to be known as UNAMID, which is meant to take over from AMIS shortly.

The AMIS peacekeeping mission recently encountered yet another significant setback. On September 29, 2007, an estimated 1,000 members of a heavily armed Darfur rebel group, in 30 vehicles armed with heavy artillery and mortars, overran a small base in Haskanita, Darfur, Sudan, which was occupied by AMIS peacekeepers. The ambush resulted in several hours of intense fighting that killed ten peacekeepers- seven Nigerian peacekeepers and three other soldiers from Mali, Senegal, and Botswana- and wounded many others.

According to UN estimates, in the aftermath of this brutal attack, which was described by the African Union commander as ''deliberate and sustained,'' 15,000 civilians fled the area to neighboring towns or the wilderness, fearing for their safety. This attack is considered to be the worst on AMIS peacekeepers since their deployment in July 2004. The United Nations Security Council condemned this ''murderous attack'' on AMIS peacekeepers, and demanded that ''no effort be spared'' to identify and bring to justice the perpetrators of this assault.

Only recently, during the August recess, I had the opportunity to lead a Congressional Delegation (CODEL) to Darfur. This was the first CODEL to the region since the announcement of the joint UN/AU peacekeeping force. Along with my colleagues Mr. CHABOT, who joins me as the lead Republican cosponsor of this legislation, and Mr. SMITH, I had the I opportunity to meet with government officials, civil society leaders, international aid workers, and affected civilians, as well as with the African Union peacekeepers responsible for protecting Darfur. I saw first hand the immense suffering of the people of Darfur, as well as the enormous strain on the courageous but outnumbered AU peacekeepers.

I strongly condemn recent attacks on African Union peacekeepers. This legislation also expresses the condolences of this House to the people and Governments of Nigeria, Mali, Senegal, and Botswana, the families and friends of those individuals who were killed or missing in the attacks, and expresses its sympathies to those individuals who have been injured. It expresses the solidarity of the people and Government of the United States with the African Union and the African Union peacekeepers as they recover from these attacks, and the readiness of Congress to support efforts to bring to justice those individuals responsible for the attacks and efforts to detect, pursue, disrupt, and dismantle the networks that plan and carry out such attacks.

My legislation also looks forward, to the process of bringing about a peace settlement for Darfur. Crucial though effective peacekeeping forces are, they are no substitute for a serious and sustained peace process. Consequently, this bill also expresses its support for the people of Darfur, Sudan, in their continued struggle against extremism and violence and support for their efforts to secure a permanent peace, justice, and return to their restored villages and homes, and it encourages all parties involved in the conflict to commit to negotiate a final and binding peace agreement at the peace talks, which began on October 27, 2007, in Tripoli, Libya.

Early reports from these negotiations have not been promising. With key rebel groups boycotting the peace talks, media reports indicate that mediators will now have to travel to Darfur to meet with rebel leaders before actual peace agreements can be reached. Despite these setbacks, UN Special Envoy Jan Eliasson has maintained optimism, saying yesterday ''I refuse to state that the peace process is interrupted.''

In Darfur, rape has been an important aspect of the genocide. Women and girls have been targeted specifically as spoils or war. Though it is impossible to know or even estimate exact numbers of rape victims, particularly in light of the Government of Sudan's practice of harassing or even detaining representatives of organizations attempting to report such statistics, they would certainly be extremely high.

In Darfur, rape is linked to racial slurs. When rape victims were interviewed by human rights workers, they reported hearing Janjaweed militia and Sudanese soldiers shouting their intent—to rape the women and girls, forcing them to have Arab children. According to a Refugees International report, one woman interviewed in a refugee camp in Chad said that a Janjaweed militiaman who raped her told her: ''I will give you a light-skinned baby to take this land from you.''

One Sudanese human rights activist has noted, ''The war in Darfur is centered on identity, and rape is being used as a weapon of war in the struggle for the identity of the region. Women have a very important role in Darfur's culture, and rape destroys not only a woman but her tribe.''

Though many survivors of these attacks are able to find their way to displaced persons camps, they remain at risk. Many women and girls are attacked when they leave the relative security of the camps to collect firewood and other necessities. When women living in refugee camps were asked why they went to fetch water and risk rape rather than the men, they answered, ''If we let the men go, they will be killed. It is better for us to be raped than for our husbands to be killed.''

Today, the House also considered H. Res. 726, introduced by my colleague, Congresswoman DELAURO, which I was proud to cosponsor. This resolution draws attention to this savage practice, and it calls on the President, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the United Nations Security Council to take measures to provide assistance to these victims, to fully fund the UN Mission in Darfur, and to find the government of Sudan in noncompliance with Security Council Resolution 1325. It also calls upon the government of Sudan, responsible for unleashing this madness on the women and girls of Darfur, to provide full legal protection to the victims of rape and to bring the perpetrators to justice.

The international community must do much, much more to protect the women and girls of Darfur, to meet the needs of those who have already been sexually abused or raped, and to finally bring this horrific conflict to an end. The deployment of the hybrid UN/AU peacekeeping force is a necessary and important step, but it is no substitute for a serious and sustained peace process.

□ 2030

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I want to thank both of my colleagues for their leadership. Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, all that you've done around this issue and so many other issues, thank you so much and again for joining me as we do this Congressional Black Caucus message hour.

I'm so pleased today that the House passed the three resolutions on Darfur. One of them, H. Res. 573, recognizing and commending the efforts of the United States public and advocacy groups to raise awareness about and help end the worsening humanitarian crisis and genocide in Darfur, Sudan, and for other purposes.

H. Res. 726, calling on the President of the United States and the international community to take immediate steps to respond to and prevent acts of rape and sexual violence against women and girls in Darfur, Sudan, eastern Chad and the Central African Republic.

And, finally, H. Res. 740, condemning in the strongest terms the attacks on African Union peacekeepers that occurred in Haskanita, Darfur, Sudan, on September 29, 2007.

I want to reference back for a moment to the person that Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE mentioned and that was my friend from ECOWAS, and ECOWAS is an acronym for the Economic Commission of West African States, and my friend who went to Case Western Reserve Law School as I did is Dr. Muhammad Chambas. Was there something else you wanted to say about Dr. Chambas?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentlelady would yield, first of all, to thank him for sharing his insight and his leadership and thank you for allowing us to have that opportunity, and just to be able to emphasize, he was firm that he wanted and needed and thought that they needed more help. And that help was, of course, the United States, the U.N., and a number of other countries.

And I'd just like to finish by saying, as there may be those listening, I would encourage as you mentioned that resolution about thanking the various advocacy groups to continue their work and to reach out to the college campuses, because I remember speaking at the University of Nevada. They are there; they want to work. College campuses can be the agitation to get this government to move, to continue the light on the genocide in Darfur.

And I thank you for yielding to me just to be able to say, college students, get about the business because you can make a difference. Organize Save Darfur Coalitions on your campus, and call and write and e-mail about the crisis in Darfur.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. The Congresswoman is referencing H. Res. 573, and I want to add my comments to encourage the young people on the college campuses across this country. Many of us recognize in the history of the United States many of the great movements were begun by young people, by students sitting at lunch counters and just the involvement of so many young people.

One of the things that people often have said about young people these days is that they're self-centered and only concerned about what's going on in their own lives. I found that not to be true, and I had the opportunity even as recently as this weekend, I happened to be in Iowa campaigning for my candidate for President.

And while I was campaigning there, campaigning for Senator CLINTON, I met with a group of young University of Iowa students who were complaining about the fact that nothing has happened in Darfur and that they are expecting this government to step up on their behalf.

So I want to join my colleague in commending college students, as well as all of the nonprofit organizations across the world who are trying to focus a light or shine a light on what's happening in Darfur.

I want to talk for a moment about the whole issue of sex crimes against women and girls in Darfur. One of the worst things to happen to a woman, and particularly a young woman, is for her to be sexually abused or raped.

We recognize in this country the impact that this has had. In fact, we recognize it such that we passed the VAWA Act which is the Violence Against Women Act, to help address the issue of violence against women.

When you begin to think about the fact that there are thousands of women and girls in these various refugee camps and the things that happen, all we need do is to focus on what happened with Katrina. We had people of the United States of America in a football stadium, and the stories about what happened to young women that were raped right there in Louisiana, in New Orleans, being raped. So you can imagine, if you exponentially take a look at that and see how many thousands of women and children are there, and these women venture out just to get things to help themselves and to continue to live and the fact that they would be subjected to rape and others does not make sense.

I can only think about that movie, ''Time to Kill,'' where that young girl in the South who was like 7 or 8 years old got raped by three men and raped her such that she was never able to have any children. It just makes no sense that we would not focus, and let me give you a few statistics.

During war, rape and sexual violence are often used systematically as a weapon of intimidation, humiliation, terror and ethnic cleansing. We know right here in America that generally rape is not about sex. It really is about being in control, being in charge. It has nothing to do with the sexual act itself. I won't say ''nothing.'' In many instances, when you're involving children, it does in fact have to do with the sexual act, but it means being in charge.

It's estimated that between 250,000 and 500,000 women and girls were raped during the genocide in Rwanda. On September 2, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda found Jean-Paul Akayesu guilty of rape and held that rape and sexual assault constitute crimes against humanity.

On October 31, the United Nations Security Council adopted Security Council Resolution 1325, calling on all parties to an armed conflict to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other forms of sexual abuse.

The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which entered into force July 1, 2002, states that rape and any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity may constitute both crimes against humanity and war crimes.

Since 2003, mass rape committed by members of the Sudanese armed forces and affiliated militia with the support of the Government of Sudan has been a central component of the Government of Sudan's violence and ethnic cleansing in Darfur.

Can you imagine this is the army, the militia of a country just having their way, going into camps and violating women and girls, thousands of women and girls who have been violated as a result.

Women and girls leaving internally displaced persons camp in Darfur and refugee camps in Eastern Chad to seek firewood, water or outside sources of income are often attacked and subjected to rape. My colleague already spoke to that issue. It is just outrageous that this could continue to happen.

On March 9, 2007, members of the United States-United Nations High Level Mission on the Situation of Human Rights in Darfur reported that rape and sexual assault have been widespread and systematic, terrorizing women and breaking down families and communities and that women are also attacked in and around refugee camps in eastern Chad.

Think about this: systemic, widespread, terrorizing of women and girls. Systemic. That is just something that I can't even imagine that we would continue to allow happen in another country. We know how great the impact of rape and sexual assault on women and girls in our country over time, and imagine what it would be in a country where they don't have available to them what our women and girls have available to us. Be it counseling, medical care, long-term mental health counseling, it just doesn't happen.

So I'm just so happy that the House passed by way of suspension bills today three resolutions around Sudan.

Finally, I think that what I would say at this point is that the people of America and all of these nonprofit organizations and the children across this country, women and children and students, must stand up. They must speak up about what's going on in Darfur, and you all know that old statement, that piece of speech that someone gave, and I can't think of the author, and it said, if you're quiet when they come for other people, who's going to speak up when they come for you? And that is what we should all be thinking about, that we need to speak up on behalf of the people of Darfur and say enough is enough; we're not going to have this happen anymore.

The United States, under the leadership of George Bush, who's been talking loud and saying nothing on this issue and not moving forward, should move forward to make sure that there are people and peacekeepers going into this area and making sure that these people are taken care of.

With that, I would again commend the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman CAROLYN CHEEKS KILPATRICK, for her leadership and thank her for giving me the opportunity to lead the Congressional Black Caucus message hour every Monday evening and to give us the opportunity to step up, speak out, and really shine a light on issues that the Congressional Black Caucus is concerned about and that the people of America, regardless of their color, are concerned about.

Again, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's always good to be leading a Special Order when you're in the chair. I thank you for your leadership as well.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today we recognize the ongoing loss of life occurring in Darfur. I would like to restate my unconditional support and commitment to advancing peace and security for the people of Darfur. I implore my colleagues in Congress to join me in urging the Sudanese government to take decisive action to address this tragedy. This quite simply is a matter of Life and Death and as the destruction of hope and possibilities continues to erode away at a people who are calling out for help. These atrocities continue to mount in the Sudan as our Administration continues to pump billions of dollars into Iraq and redirects greatly needed resources away from this unnecessary tragedy. The conflict in Sudan began as a genocide against tribes of small farmers in its Darfur region over five years ago. Militia groups have slaughtered an estimated 400,000 people and driven 2.5 million people from their homes. There has been an increase in civilian killings and large scale attacks in Darfur. The rape and torture of women and children remains a constant concern on a daily basis. Thousands have moved to displacement camps which contain their own level of violence with guns being readily available and tensions in Darfur continuing to grow every day. The African Union peace keeping troops who have put up a courageous fight have lacked the proper resources and manpower needed to contain the growing threat. Equipped only with light weapons, they are no match for the heavily armed rebels. They are undermanned and outgunned and in desperate need of advanced weapons and helicopters to properly engage with the Militia.

In May, Nobel Peace Prize winner and Holocaust survivor Elie Weisel called Darfur "the capital of suffering." He called on all of us to "tell the victims they are not alone." Violence continues in Darfur, as the Sudanese government attacked two internally displaced camps in the past week. On October 19, the Militia attacked the Kalma refugee camp, the largest in Darfur. Additionally, on Oct. 22, the Hamidiya camp near the town of Zalengei was attacked in a series of clashes between government troops and rebel groups. The killings of African Union peacekeepers and World Food Programme contract drivers combined with detentions of humanitarian workers in the conflict-ridden Darfur region of western Sudan are just a few examples of a deteriorating situation, which is prompting increased anxiety by those affected by the ongoing crisis, as well as by those responding to the emergency. From June until late August, the United Nations reported, an estimated 55,000 new persons had been displaced in the region—bringing the total number of those uprooted this year to some 250,000. In all, the UN estimates, 2.2 million of Darfur's 6.4 million people have been displaced, and four million are now dependent on some form of humanitarian assistance.

While almost everyone involved in Darfur policy agrees that an African Union peacekeeping force of just 7,000 troops is not up to the task, the United States has refused to send troops and, despite promises of reinforcements, has yet to secure many additional troops from other countries. At the same time, it has been unable to broker a diplomatic resolution that might ease the violence. There is no doubt that what is taking place in Darfur is genocide, and the government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility. Congress and the Administration must support legislation to address this most pressing human rights issue. We must move beyond the rhetoric and take action to save the lives of the people who are struggling each day with this horrific conflict. We must leave politics aside and support legislation such as H. Res. 573, which recognizes and commends the efforts of U.S. advocacy groups to raise awareness about and help end the worsening crisis in Darfur; We must also support H. Res. 740, which condemns the brutal attack on African Union peacekeepers that occurred in Haskanita, Darfur one month ago today. This violent act, carried out by rebels, took the lives of 10 peacekeepers—seven Nigerians and three other soldiers from Mali, Senegal, and Botswana; and finally H. Res. 726, a resolution calling on the President and the international community to take immediate steps to respond to and prevent acts of rape and sexual violence against the most innocent of Darfur's victims—young girls and women.

We must continue to provide security and support for the courageous humanitarian workers, who risk their lives daily. Their commitment to this struggle has been exemplarily in the face of danger. We must also take this opportunity to unite and stop these crimes against humanity. We can not allow our past failures to identify genocide in places such as in Rwanda, Bosnia, and elsewhere to exist ever again.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the House tonight as I frequently do to talk a little bit about health care.

Tonight, I will be filling the leadership hour of the minority side, and I