

Mario Musso
 Nicholas Nardella
 John Page
 Guiseppe Paternostro
 Antonio Perrugini
 John Puskar Jr.
 Anthony Rinaldi
 Albert Ritz
 Michael Russillo
 Reginald Siewert
 William Varga
 Frank Visconti
 Scott Ward

DARFUR

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I wish to talk about the ongoing genocide in Darfur, and this administration's inexcusable failure to do all it can to stop the violence there. We all understand the monumental challenge we face in ending the violence in Darfur, but this administration's behavior and recent statements on this issue suggest that it simply does not know when to stop talking and when to start acting. And all the while innocent people continue to needlessly die under our watch.

Last fall, the President's Special Envoy for Darfur, Andrew Natsios, announced that if the Sudanese Government did not accept a U.N.-African Union peacekeeping force by January 1, the administration would implement punitive measures as part of its Plan B.

Well here we are today. Over 100 days have passed since January 1. And what do we have to show for it? No U.N.-African Union peacekeeping force on the ground in Sudan. And no Plan B.

Meanwhile the death toll has risen. Over the course of the conflict, 200,000 people have been killed; 2.5 million displaced. Families and villages have been decimated; women and girls have been raped.

Fighting has infected Sudan's neighbors, leaving scores dead along the Sudan-Chad border. One U.N. official recently described the scene of dead bodies in the area as "shocking and apocalyptic."

So much death and destruction, 2½ years after this administration stated that genocide was indeed occurring in Darfur. More than 100 days after Mr. Natsios's deadline, the killings continue.

Earlier this month, Mr. Natsios testified before the Foreign Relations Committee on Darfur and Plan B. His testimony only deepened my concerns about the administration's Darfur paralysis.

When asked repeatedly by Senator MENENDEZ to answer yes or no as to whether genocide was occurring in Darfur, he did not answer yes. Instead his response was that the violence has abated in Darfur and that the rebel groups were also engaging in killings. His answer was incredibly disturbing to me and to other members of the committee.

Now I understand Mr. Natsios's desire to convey the complexity of the situation and the complicity of various

parties on the ground, but the fact is that the primary party responsible for the killings is the Sudanese Government and its Janjaweed proxies. For Mr. Natsios to be unable to state that genocide is occurring in clear terms seems to me a classic example of missing the forest for the trees. It also raises a question of credibility. After all, how can this administration stop a genocide when its special envoy won't even fully acknowledge it?

Mr. Natsios also stated that although the President is supposedly angry about the situation in Darfur and has recently proposed certain sanctions, he has acceded to a request by U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon to delay any implementation of Plan B for another two to four weeks to give the Secretary-General time to convince the Sudanese Government to accept a peacekeeping force.

Now 2 to 4 weeks may seem like nothing in the context of protracted and complex diplomatic negotiations, but this is no treaty that is being negotiated. There are lives at stake every day here and we just cannot afford to take a "wait and see" approach.

Recent reports suggest that the Sudanese Government has agreed to a hybrid force but based on its previous track record, I will believe it when I see some additional boots on the ground. In the meantime, a pause on the administration's part is simply unacceptable.

And so I believe that even as the modalities of a peacekeeping force, that may or may not materialize, are worked out, the administration must begin implementing certain elements of Plan B immediately. Not 4 weeks from now. Not 2 weeks from now. Immediately.

Select punitive measures as described by Mr. Natsios at the hearing include imposing personal sanctions on certain members of the rebel groups and the Sudanese Government; curbing the Sudanese Government's access to oil revenues; and increasing penalties on companies operating in Sudan.

There is nothing revolutionary about these measures. They were leaked to the public and have been under discussion for some weeks. The question in my mind is not so much about whether we should implement them but why haven't we already implemented them.

As chairman of the Banking Committee and a senior member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am absolutely willing to work with the administration to put these measures into force and look forward to some clear answers from the administration on this.

Now let me be clear about what I mean in saying we should go ahead and implement elements of Plan B. I fully appreciate the sensitivities of our diplomatic efforts related to Darfur. I fully agree with the importance of working this issue through the U.N. in a multilateral manner. But if there are certain steps that the United States

can take on its own account and indeed was supposed to take over 100 days ago to pressure the Sudanese Government, then what are we waiting for?

The time has come to delink certain elements of Plan B from our broader multilateral strategy to pressure Khartoum. The time has come to act where and when we can. This administration has shown no compulsion in acting unilaterally in the past. It did so by invading Iraq with disastrous consequence. Why does it continue to keep one foot on the side lines 4 years into this genocide when it not only has the ability but also the moral responsibility to act?

Moreover, we must not stop at implementing long overdue sanctions whose credibility has been called into question because they have yet to be implemented. We must also consider a more robust role for NATO forces, including their deployment to Sudan if the Sudanese Government continues to obstruct a hybrid peacekeeping force.

Even if the Sudanese Government consents to the U.N.-AU force, the United Nations may fail to muster the requisite troops within an acceptable period of time. In such a scenario, we should consider the deployment of an interim NATO force with U.S. participation. At a minimum, NATO forces, which already provide logistical support to the African Union mission, should enforce a no-fly zone in Darfur pursuant to U.N. Resolution 1591 to prevent military flights over Darfur.

Naturally, special attention will have to be paid in any operation to the security of refugee camps and aid workers but to those who say that military action will make things worse, I have only one thing to say: we are already at rock bottom.

The authorization of force is one of the most critical decisions a member of Congress has to make, especially if it entails sending our brave men and women into harm's way on the ground. U.S. participation however in any such action, even in a limited capacity, is critical to showing the world that America is not just about fighting the war against terrorism but also is willing to fight against injustice and mass murder. That we are prepared to fight for the principles of respect for human dignity and life, and not just talk about them.

In advocating certain measures outside the framework of the United Nations, I do not intend to dismiss the critical role that the U.N. and other countries can play. The fact is that the U.S. has limited leverage over Sudan and we need all the help we can get. We must work within the U.N. system, and also press other key countries that deal with Sudan such as India and China to do their part. China in particular has a crucial role to play in changing Khartoum's behavior.

But even as we assess the role and responsibilities of others, we must never forget our own. We must lead by example. Over the past few years, I have

voted for legislation sanctioning the Government of Sudan. I have delivered floor statements and attended hearings on Darfur, where witness after witness has testified to the ongoing atrocities. I have sent letters to the Chinese, the Russians, the Arabs and others urging them to use their clout with Sudan.

Yet after all such actions and deliberations by members of this body and after all the punitive authorities granted to this administration, to see it temporizing and regressing to a point where we are debating whether genocide is even occurring is utterly unacceptable.

The time for action is now, not in a few weeks. We are at rock bottom and the administration needs to deliver on its threats and translate its rhetoric into action. We must do everything in our power to end the genocide in Darfur immediately.

DISCUSSING PRESSING ISSUES FACING THE NATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on April 27–29, more than 800 of the foremost scientists, humanists and leaders in business and public affairs will gather here in Washington when the Nation's two oldest learned societies—the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Philosophical Society—meet jointly for the first time.

Both organizations predate the birth of the Nation, and among their founders were Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, James Bowdoin, and John Hancock.

The two organizations were established to help advance “useful knowledge” in the colonies by promoting enlightened leaders and an engaged citizenry, and they have remained faithful to their original missions to the present day. Their current membership includes more than 170 Nobel laureates and more than 50 Pulitzer Prize winners.

This joint meeting, entitled “The Public Good: Knowledge as the Foundation for a Democratic Society” will bring together academics and practitioners for a series of panel discussions, conversations and dinner programs on many of the most pressing issues facing the Nation.

Joining them for the unprecedented 2½-day meeting will be members of these congressionally chartered National Academies—the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine.

At the opening of their meeting next week, the presidents of all five organizations will issue a joint statement affirming the importance of knowledge as the foundation for sound policymaking for the public good, and I ask unanimous consent that their unprecedented joint statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

KNOWLEDGE IN SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC GOOD

As America's oldest national learned societies, we trace our origins to the tumultuous periods in the Nation's history. The American Philosophical Society was founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1743, during a period of rapid growth and intellectual development in the American colonies. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences was founded by John Adams in 1780, in the midst of the Revolutionary War. The National Academy of Sciences (1863), the National Academy of Engineering (1964), and the Institute of Medicine (1970) were all established under legislation signed by President Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War.

Our founders shared a conviction that knowledge in service to the public good is an indispensable pillar of our Nation. We have remained committed to that vision over the centuries, because democracy requires freedom of inquiry, engaged and educated citizens, and a wise and responsive government.

Our societies, individually and collectively, represent leading thinkers and practitioners of the Nation. We honor excellence and use our unique convening powers to engage the expertise of our members in collaborative action. We actively create, preserve, support, and disseminate knowledge critical to the growth and well-being of our Nation.

Each generation must reaffirm and reinforce the founders' reverence for scholarship and knowledge as the cornerstones of progress and the building blocks of enduring institutions. We live in an age of instantaneous access to unimaginably rich sources of information, but truly useful information continues to depend on underlying research and basic knowledge.

The Academies assemble today not just to assert the importance of research and free inquiry in every field, but to give practical demonstration of their worth through reflection on topics that affect the workings of our society and that define the public good. A nation attentive to these values will long endure.

Signed by: Emilio Bizzi, President, American Academy of Arts and Sciences; Baruch S. Blumberg, President, American Philosophical Society; Ralph J. Cicerone, President, National Academy of Sciences; Harvey V. Fineberg, President, Institute of Medicine; Wm. A. Wulf, President, National Academy of Engineering.

NOTICE OF CHANGE IN TRANSIT SUBSIDY REGULATIONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that in accordance with Title V of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee has amended the “Public Transportation Subsidy Regulations.” Based on the Committee's review of the regulations adopted on August 1, 1992, as amended, the following changes are effective April 24, 2007.

The regulations are amended by deleting and substituting as follows:

Sec. 2, substitute entire section for the following:

Sec. 2. Authority

The Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act (Pub.L. 103–172) allows Federal agencies to participate in state or local government transit programs that encourage employees to use public transportation. The Tax Reform Act of

1986, as amended by the Transportation Equity Act for 21st Century (Pub.L. 105–178) allows employers to give employees as a tax free “de minimis fringe benefit” transit fare media up to the maximum monthly amount authorized under section 132(f)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as modified by the Internal Revenue System's published Revenue Procedures, and upon written authority of the Rules Committee.

Sec. 3, (e)

Delete “Pub. L. 101–509” and insert “Pub. L. 103–172”.

Sec. 3, insert definition at end of Section

Insert the following definition at the end of the definition: “(f) Unique Identifier—A number or token, as approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, designed to be used across all systems in the United States Senate to uniquely identify an individual's set of records within each of those systems.”

Sec. 4, (a)

Delete “currently not to exceed \$105 per month.”

Sec. 4, (e)

Replace entire section with the following language: “(e) Any fare media purchased under this program may not be sold or exchanged, although exchanges of metro card media are permissible for transportation provided by Virginia Railway Express (VRE), the Maryland Transit Administration's (MARC's) train, or vanpools certified by Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA).”

Sec. 7

Delete “social security number” and insert in its place “unique identifier.” Delete “(currently \$105).”

Sec. 8, (A)

Delete “Pub. L. 101–509” and insert “Pub. L. 103–172”.

Set forth below are the amended regulations which are effective April 24, 2007:

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY REGULATIONS

Sec. 1. Policy

It is the policy of the Senate to encourage employees to use public mass transportation in commuting to and from Senate offices.

Sec. 2. Authority

The Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act (Pub. L. 103–172) allows Federal agencies to participate in state or local government transit programs that encourage employees to use public transportation. The Tax Reform Act of 1986, as amended by the Transportation Equity Act for 21st Century (Pub. L. 105–178) allows employers to give employees as a tax free “de minimis fringe benefit” transit fare media up to the maximum monthly amount authorized under section 132(f)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as modified by the Internal Revenue System's published Revenue Procedures, and upon written authority of the Rules Committee.

Sec. 3. Definitions

(a) Public Mass Transportation—A transportation system operated by a State or local government, e.g. bus or rail transit system.

(b) Fare Media—A ticket, pass, or other device, other than cash, used to pay for transportation on a public mass transit system.