

change to accommodate many tribes on more fragile land. Widespread investment and education would be necessary.

But with Khartoum uncooperative, creating the conditions conducive to these sorts of solutions would probably require not only forceful foreign intervention but also a long-term stay. Environmental degradation means the local authorities have little or no surplus to use for tribal buy-offs, land deals, or coalition building. And fighting makes it nearly impossible to rethink land ownership or management. “The first thing you’ve got to do is stop the carnage and allow moderates to come to the fore,” says Thomas Homer-Dixon, a political scientist at the University of Toronto. Yet even once that happens, he admits, “these processes can take decades.”

Among the implications arising from the ecological origin of the Darfur crisis, the most significant may be moral. If the region’s collapse was in some part caused by the emissions from our factories, power plants, and automobiles, we bear some responsibility for the dying. “This changes us from the position of Good Samaritans—disinterested, uninvolved people who may feel a moral obligation—to a position where we, unconsciously and without malice, created the conditions that led to this crisis,” says Michael Byers, a political scientist at the University of British Columbia. “We cannot stand by and look at it as a situation of discretionary involvement. We are already involved.”

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to also ask unanimous consent that the article I referred to in the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DURBIN. Divestment is not the only answer, nor are stepped-up U.S. sanctions or even multilateral U.S. sanctions, but together these steps might work. Hundreds of thousands of people in Darfur have been killed, and millions have been driven from their homes. It is too late to repeat the empty promise of “never again,” but we can at least live up to the pledge of no more.

I am reminded of my former colleague, boss, and mentor, Paul Simon of Illinois, who in 1994 joined Senator Jim Jeffords in asking that troops be sent to Rwanda to try to stop the massacre. We were told that 5,000 soldiers could have stopped that massacre of 800,000 innocent people. No action was taken. These innocent people died. Senator Simon and Senator Jeffords did their best to try to call the attention of Congress and the Government and the world to what was happening in that nation, to no avail.

But they can at least take satisfaction—the late Paul Simon and Jim Jeffords—that they did their best as Members of the Senate. So many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle joined me in this bipartisan effort to call attention to the genocide in Darfur and to urge our Government to take decisive, meaningful action as quickly as possible to spare these suffering people.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Wall Street Journal]

THE GENOCIDE OLYMPICS

(By Ronan Farrow and Mia Farrow)

“One World, One Dream” is China’s slogan for its 2008 Olympics. But there is one nightmare that China shouldn’t be allowed to sweep under the rug. That nightmare is Darfur, where more than 400,000 people have been killed and more than two-and-a-half million driven from flaming villages by the Chinese-backed government of Sudan.

That so many corporate sponsors want the world to look away from that atrocity during the games is bad enough. But equally disappointing is the decision of artists like director Steven Spielberg—who quietly visited China this month as he prepares to help stage the Olympic ceremonies—to sanitize Beijing’s image. Is Mr. Spielberg, who in 1994 founded the Shoah Foundation to record the testimony of survivors of the holocaust, aware that China is bankrolling Darfur’s genocide?

China is pouring billions of dollars into Sudan. Beijing purchases an overwhelming majority of Sudan’s annual oil exports and state-owned China National Petroleum Corp.—an official partner of the upcoming Olympic Games—owns the largest shares in each of Sudan’s two major oil consortia. The Sudanese government uses as much as 80% of proceeds from those sales to fund its brutal Janjaweed proxy militia and purchase their instruments of destruction: bombers, assault helicopters, armored vehicles and small arms, most of them of Chinese manufacture. Airstrips constructed and operated by the Chinese have been used to launch bombing campaigns on villages. And China has used its veto power on the U.N. Security Council to repeatedly obstruct efforts by the U.S. and the U.K. to introduce peacekeepers to curtail the slaughter.

As one of the few players whose support is indispensable to Sudan, China has the power to, at the very least, insist that Khartoum accept a robust international peacekeeping force to protect defenseless civilians in Darfur. Beijing is uniquely positioned to put a stop to the slaughter, yet they have so far been unabashed in their refusal to do so.

But there is now one thing that China may hold more dear than their unfettered access to Sudanese oil: their successful staging of the 2008 Summer Olympics. That desire may provide a lone point of leverage with a country that has otherwise been impervious to all criticism.

Whether that opportunity goes unexploited lies in the hands of the high-profile supporters of these Olympic Games. Corporate sponsors like Johnson & Johnson, Coca-Cola, General Electric and McDonalds, and key collaborators like Mr. Spielberg, should be put on notice. For there is another slogan afoot, one that is fast becoming viral amongst advocacy groups; rather than “One World, One Dream,” people are beginning to speak of the coming “Genocide Olympics.”

Does Mr. Spielberg really want to go down in history as the Leni Riefenstahl of the Beijing Games? Do the various television sponsors around the world want to share in that shame? Because they will. Unless, of course, all of them add their singularly well-positioned voices to the growing calls for Chinese action to end the slaughter in Darfur.

Imagine if such calls were to succeed in pushing the Chinese government to use its leverage over Sudan to protect civilians in Darfur. The 2008 Beijing Olympics really could become an occasion for pride and celebration, a truly international honoring of the authentic spirit of “one world” and “one dream.”

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to S. 372 be agreed to.

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

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 372) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 20, S. 372, the Intelligence Authorization bill of 2007.

Harry Reid, Chuck Schumer, Russell D. Feingold, Jay Rockefeller, Evan Bayh, Patty Murray, Dick Durbin, Jeff Bingaman, Robert Menendez, B.A. Mikulski, Dianne Feinstein, Bill Nelson, E. Benjamin Nelson, S. Whitehouse, Byron L. Dorgan, Blanche L. Lincoln, Ron Wyden.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory live quorum be waived and the cloture vote occur on Monday, April 16, at 5:30 p.m.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the bill on Monday at 3 p.m. and that Senator ROCKEFELLER be recognized at that time to offer a managers’ amendment on behalf of himself and Senator BOND.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate invoked cloture on the motion to proceed to the fiscal year 2007 Intelligence authorization bill.

However, as a result of objections from the other side, the Senate now finds itself in the unfortunate position of having to run out the clock for the next several days rather than promptly considering and completing action on this important legislation.

Let me remind my colleagues of the long road we have been down with this bill already.

The previous Republican-controlled Congress failed to pass an intelligence authorization bill in fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2007—2 years in a row.

That is an unprecedented and unacceptable record for this body: prior to that, Congress had passed this bill every single year for 27 years, often with the bipartisan support of every Senator.

As my colleagues know, the Intelligence authorization bill funds the operations of the 16 agencies of the U.S. intelligence community—including the CIA, the FBI, the NSA, the Defense Department—and all the critical work they do to keep Americans safe and fight the war on terror.

It includes essential initiatives that would improve our efforts to fight terrorism and control weapons of mass destruction, enhance our intelligence collection capabilities, and strengthen intelligence oversight.

Blocking the passage of this bill, as a handful of Senators on the other side of the aisle have done over the last couple of years, has left Congress silent on these important matters and made America less secure.

Most of us in the Senate recognize how important it is to pass this bill. We know it is not a partisan issue, that there are no political points to be scored on either side. But I am increasingly disappointed at the continued obstructionism by several Republicans on a matter of national security.

Earlier this year, Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Vice Chairman BOND attempted to bring this bill up for consideration. We were told the objections of a single Senator on the other side of the aisle blocked their efforts.

I have heard that some Senators on the other side of the aisle are interested in offering amendments, yet at this time none of these amendments have surfaced or seen the light of day.

I would certainly like to be reasonable and accommodate every Senator's interest in debating amendments offered in good faith, but I am increasingly concerned that we are seeing obstructionism and delay tactics, rather than productive debate.

Some may wonder what is behind the delay. At a time of war, why would a handful of Senators be willing to hold up a bill that is crucial to our national security?

Why would a group of Senators hold up a bill that has always passed quickly, with little debate or amendment?

Why would they hold up a bill that enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support?

It appears the answer lies not in the legislation before us now but the legislation the Senate will turn to next:

A Medicare bill that will lower drug costs for seniors and people with disabilities by giving the Federal Government the power to negotiate drug prices with some of this Nation's most powerful and profitable companies.

This is not good faith debate—it is a cynical effort by the drug companies—their lobbyists in Gucci shoes and chauffeured limousines—and their supporters—to hold this national security bill hostage and delay the Senate from acting on legislation to help society's most vulnerable.

So I ask my colleagues to consider this fair notice: unless I see some signs of good faith from the other side of the aisle toward a reasonable timeframe for considering a reasonable number of amendments, I will file cloture on this bill tomorrow.

The Senate has a lot of work ahead of it and it should begin with the swift consideration and passage of this bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, early next week, Members of the House and Senate will meet to work on the final version of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The Senate's version of this legislation provides \$123 billion primarily for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, for improving the health care for returning soldiers and veterans, for continued Hurricane Katrina recovery for the gulf coast, to fill major gaps in homeland security, and to provide emergency drought relief for farmers. The President has asserted that Congress is holding funding for the troops hostage for what he calls "porkbarrel" spending. What nonsense. Facts matter. Once again, the President does not seem to know the facts. This is legislation that meets some of the most critical needs of our troops and our Nation.

In the days since the Senate approved this legislation, the White House has taken on the regular practice of demonizing the Congress and attacking the bipartisan bill. On Tuesday, for instance, President Bush repeated his hollow claims that the Army will run out of money if Congress doesn't finish this legislation by the weekend. What nonsense.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has reported that the Army can use the dollars that Congress has already appropriated—some \$52 billion—to help the Pentagon reach the end of May. Fifty-two billion dollars. Unless the administration has a new military adventure up its sleeve that the country doesn't know about, that \$52 billion will easily pay for continued operations in Iraq.

The White House is spinning an imaginary tale of doom and gloom to

try to scare the Congress and the country. But the facts just don't support the administration claims.

To underscore this factfinding effort, the Army provided financial updates to the House of Representatives this week and told House officials that its current Army funding could last until the summer. Yet, to listen to the White House, one would think that our soldiers will be out of bullets by Sunday.

Another example of facts mattering. In remarks this week, before announcing that the troops would see their tours of duty extended for at least 3 months and that his escalation would take many months longer than he first planned, President Bush spoke of a reprogramming request for \$1.6 billion from personnel accounts. That is Washington-speak for shifting funds around to pay the bills. Basically, the Pentagon is considering a shift of dollars from September's payroll budget to fund the President's surge plan. Yet, to hear the dire claims coming from the White House, this shift would wreak havoc on the Pentagon. The truth is that no havoc will ensue. This shift is one that the Pentagon has adopted on many occasions in years past, during times of war and peace. This is a simply accounting move, not a major blow to the Pentagon's war machine.

It is time for the White House to drop this trumped-up crisis talk and get down to the truth.

Let's take a look at what the House and Senate have actually approved. The House and the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, have each approved nearly \$100 billion for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. The House and the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, approved funding to improve the health care of our troops and our veterans. The House and Senate, on a bipartisan basis, approved funding to speed long-delayed Hurricane Katrina reconstruction. The House and Senate, on a bipartisan basis, approved funding to close the major gaps in our homeland security that could be exploited at any moment.

These priorities, the White House claims, are extraneous and wasteful. On top of the \$38 billion already approved by Congress for the reconstruction of Iraq, now the White House has requested \$3.7 billion more to rebuild Iraq. I cannot understand how the White House can champion another \$3.7 billion to rebuild Baghdad but object to \$3.3 billion to rebuild the hurricane-ravaged gulf coast of America. I cannot understand how the White House can press Congress to build new hospitals in Iraq but object to \$1.7 billion to provide first-class health care for our veterans and another \$1.3 billion for our troops returning home from war.

When this legislation is finished, we will have a responsible plan that provides key resources for our troops, takes care of our veterans returning home from war, and rebuilds the communities laid to waste by Hurricane Katrina. And Congress will listen to the American people and craft a responsible framework for the Iraqis to