

Boom. The oil shipments have since been restored, but threats continue.

Despite increasingly bellicose threats by Russia to cut off energy supplies and to target Poland and the Czech Republic with military means, these allied Governments have maintained their freedom, their independence, their sovereignty, and their courage, and have stood fast with the United States and NATO. So the very least this Senate could do would be to recognize the importance of these decisions, to express our full and strong support for what these nations have done on behalf of themselves and the Atlantic alliance and affirm that with the support of legislation that would move forward with the third site.

In closing, I would share with my colleagues the words of Mirek Topolánek, the Czech Prime Minister. The Czech Republic and Poland are such wonderful countries. They are so proud to be free and independent. They are some of our best allies in the world.

The Prime Minister placed this issue in the proper context, when he stated:

The moral challenge is clear and simple. If we are not willing to accept, in the interest of the defense of the Euro-Atlantic area, such a trifle as the elements of a missile defense system, then how shall we be able to face more difficult challenges that may come?

Isn't that a great statement? That is the right context.

I hope this part of the bill will remain intact. I am confident it will. I hope our appropriators will find the money necessary to move forward rapidly to complete the development of these systems. Indeed, our NATO allies and the United States are certain to face more difficult challenges in the days ahead, as Iran and other nations continue to develop weapons of mass destruction and the ballistic missile capability to deliver them. As the crisis in the Caucasus suggests, there may be even greater challenges ahead. By supporting the European missile defense initiative, we extend missile defense capabilities to our allies while bolstering the defense of the United States homeland. In so doing, we strengthen our partnership and our collective security. We send a strong message to potential adversaries that this alliance will take such actions as necessary to ensure its security against threats that may occur.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for whatever time I may consume.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, allow me to echo strong agreement with my colleague from Alabama. We both serve on the Armed Services Committee. It is our hope and belief that we will be able to get a bill tonight. There are a lot of amendments that we

would have liked to have had time to add. Senator SESSIONS talked about the successes we have had in the Czech Republic and in Poland. It is absolutely necessary. This is a life-threatening situation. I believe we are in pretty good shape there. I had several programs that are going to be included in this bill expanding the training and equipment. Sections 1206, 1207, and 1208 are significant. Those are things we can do in the field in these countries where we are in a position to train and equip these people, which is certainly to our advantage. Expanding what used to be called the CERP, the Commanders Emergency Response Program—they changed the name. I can never keep up with these things. But instead of having it only apply to Iraq and Afghanistan, it now applies to other areas also. It gives the commanders in the field a chance to respond immediately rather than go through all the bureaucratic redtape of correcting problems back in Washington.

With the IMET program, which is a program whereby we bring in officers and train them in our facilities in the United States, it used to be that until they signed an article, we would not allow them to be trained in the United States. The assumption was that somehow we were doing them a favor by training them. The reverse is true. They want to come to the United States to train because they know we have the best training. If we refuse to do it, countries such as China will welcome them with open arms. One of the interesting things is, once officers are trained in this country, they develop an allegiance that stays.

A lot of these things are in the bill that are good. I am delighted, because I understand we will be voting on it very soon.

AFRICA

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, the main reason I wanted to come to the floor today is another resolution we hope we will be able to get passed before we leave having to do with Darfur. I have had the habit of bringing attention to situations and conflicts in places around the world that get little attention. However, in the case of Darfur, it has had all the attention. When people ask, what are the problems with Africa, they always talk about Darfur. So while they have received all of the attention, there hasn't been any kind of action that has followed. It is distressing that the situation in Darfur has received so much press and generated so much attention, with documentaries and advocacy campaigns and waves of public support, but it has not spurred the international community to more action.

We have been saddened and horrified at the pictures we have seen and the stories we have heard about the genocide in Darfur that has unfolded since 2003. At least 300,000 people have died,

and 2½ million have been forced from their homes at the hands of violent militias called the jingawit who have been encouraged and supported by the Khartoum Government, President Bashir. One of the things that is interesting about this is, we recall the tragic genocide that took place in the middle 1990s in Rwanda. People are now aware of that and wondering why we couldn't have done something about it earlier to prevent it. They have now killed about a third the number of people of the genocide that took place in Rwanda, and President Kagame is doing such a great job there. But where were we when we could have helped President Kagame and prevented the genocide from taking place?

It is now up to a third that many in Darfur. So we can do something and do something now to avoid it. Last week we received news that Sudan's central government is launching land and air attacks in Darfur, with many dead and injured. Last month, in August, the Sudanese military and police opened fire on Darfur refugee camps, killing 31 people and injuring a lot of others. The United Nations/African Union hybrid peacekeeping force assessed the incident and concluded that Sudan used an excessive, disproportionate use of lethal force. For the United Nations to come up with that, it has to be bad. They also concluded that the refugees were only carrying sticks and knives and spears while the Sudanese forces were armed with guns. Khartoum insisted that they were searching the camp for drugs and weapons.

In July, The Hague, the International Criminal Court, began the process of indicting President Bashir on 10 charges, including three counts of genocide, five crimes against humanity, two of murder, and masterminding the campaign to annihilate the tribes in Darfur. A senior U.S. official said recently that he expects the ICC, the International Criminal Court, to issue an arrest warrant in the next month—long overdue, I might add. Bashir, who no doubt is beginning to feel the political ground shifting beneath him, continues to resort to more intimidation and violence. One major factor in the ongoing violence in Darfur can be traced to the continued violations of the U.N. arms embargo on Sudan. China is Khartoum's major source of weapons used in Darfur. China has embarked on a new form of colonialism in Africa, grabbing as many natural resources as it possibly can while disregarding the effect on the people. I wish more Members were familiar with Africa and the history of Africa. There are so many books written about that, one of them addressing the Belgium situation there in the early years. They came in, raped the country, took all the natural resources, and left the people there to die. We should be aware that that is exactly what China is doing right now.

Beijing has declared 2006 the year of Africa. It shows no signs of slowing

down in spreading its influence to claim resources. Currently, China's national petroleum company is pumping roughly 500,000 barrels a day from wells in southern Sudan. Keep in mind, China is our biggest competitor for oil and gas around the world. Obviously, we are dependent upon foreign countries, many of them not too friendly to us, for our ability to even fight a war. That is another issue and one we will address. But China is right in the middle of this one, making it more difficult for us. In order to assure continued access to the oil, China has provided weapons to Khartoum and taken a very passive stance toward the government's brutal treatment of the people of Darfur.

Last year Amnesty International reported that both China and Russia had broken the arms embargo by supplying Sudan with attack helicopters, bombers, and weapons. On July 12, the British Broadcasting Corporation reported they had evidence that the Chinese Government provided training and equipment to Bashir's government. In February, the report said that China was training pilots to fly Chinese Fantan aircraft jets on missions from the airfield in southern Darfur. This is a direct violation of the U.N. arms embargo which covers training, not just the supply of weapons, equipment, and military vehicles. The BBC also investigated weapons that China sold to Sudan in 2005 and found postembargoed trucks that carried anti-aircraft guns. This news, although not a surprise, comes at a time when Khartoum is using force against refugees with the very planes and weapons that China is supplying.

China is not the only problem there. Russia is actually a problem also. Russia is to blame for violating the arms embargo. During the last couple of weeks of attacks, Darfur rebels stated that the government used four helicopter gunships and two Russian-made Antonov airplanes. Russia's continued disregard for crimes perpetrated by the Khartoum Government in Darfur and the selling of arms to carry out such violence against the people of Darfur is inexcusable and needs to be stopped immediately.

I hasten to say there are many other problems I have come to the floor and talked about over the last 12 years in Africa. Darfur is one that has captivated everyone's attention. But I assure my colleagues, there are problems in other areas. Right now, as we all know, China is currently Zimbabwe's largest investor and President Mugabe has destroyed the economy in Zimbabwe. We can all remember when they were considered to be the breadbasket of all of Africa. It is amazing that Zimbabwe is able to buy military articles such as their recent purchase from China that included \$240 million in fighter jets, in light of their dying economy. When I say "dying economy," they don't even talk anymore about the value of their currency be-

cause their currency has no value. So the only ones eating in Zimbabwe, the area that used to be the breadbasket of all of Africa, are the ones who are subsistence farmers, able to grow what they and their families can eat.

In 2005, I gave a series of speeches detailing why I believe China to be a threat to our national security. From what we have talked about today, we know China is also a threat to other countries' national security. I challenge my African friends to be wary of current and future Chinese involvement in their countries. It seems that much of the power-sharing agreement in Zimbabwe has been reached with Mugabe remaining as President and opposition leader Tsvangirai taking over the day-to-day running of the Government as Prime Minister. I hope it works out, but I am not optimistic that it will.

We have a problem there. We have a country that had been the breadbasket of sub-Saharan Africa and is now unable to provide anything.

As to other threats in Africa, I have been quite distressed for some time that as we get the squeeze in the Middle East and al-Qaida and the various terrorist elements down through the Horn of Africa, but we have finally made a good decision in this country to assist Africa in building five African brigades, located north, south, east, west, and central. This is going to be necessary for them to take care of the problems. As to other problems in Africa, it has been 30 years now since western Sahara was kicked out of their homeland, and they have been out in the desolate areas now for more than 30 years. It is shocking to me that we don't do anything to help them get repatriated and sent back to their proper areas.

In northern Uganda, on several of my trips there, I have become familiar with what President Museveni has been trying to do for a long period. Frankly, President Museveni has been doing a great job. He was a warrior before he became President of Uganda. But the problem in Uganda is every bit as bad as it is in Darfur, and it is a problem everybody knows about, though it is totally different. We have a guy up there named Joseph Kony, who heads the Lord's Resistance Army. You have heard about the Children's Army and how he goes and trains these little kids, these little boys who are 12 to 13 and 14 years old, how to use automatic weapons. They have to go back to their villages and murder both their parents and all of their family. If they do not do it, they mutilate them. They cut their ears off.

I have been up in the northern part of Uganda and have been able to see it. What have we been able to do about that? Very little. He is still loose. Just recently they put him on the list of global terrorists for the United States, but that did not really resolve anything major. So we have that problem. And we have Joseph Kony, who is still

to this day killing and mutilating little kids.

I guess I am a little sensitive to that. We had a great experience in my family. We found a little girl in Ethiopia when she was 3 days old, and her health was not very good. As we might expect in Addis Ababa, in Ethiopia, there is a great need for nurseries and health care for kids, but the health care just isn't there.

I remember looking at this little girl. As the weeks went by and she started developing—escaping death time and time again—she finally grew up and she became a very attractive little girl. I have said on this Senate floor several times that my wife and I have been married 49 years, and we have 20 kids and grandkids. Well, this little girl shown in this picture is one of them now because my daughter Molly, who had nothing but boys, wanted to have a girl, so she adopted this little girl, Zegita Marie, and she has turned out to be an outstanding little girl.

So there are these problems. One of the problems with adopting in Africa is that culturally some countries do not approve of adopting. They think the village should be able to take care of the children who become orphans. The problem with that is, with such things that are taking place right now in Darfur, with such things that have taken place in Rwanda, the villages cannot absorb the killing and mutilating of a million people in a short period of time. That is what has happened in Rwanda.

So I am glad several Members of this body, including MARY LANDRIEU from Louisiana, have been interested in helping with the adoption of some of these kids so that other children like my little granddaughter are not left there to die in a country in sub-Saharan Africa but can find a loving family.

Anyway, right now, the subject is Darfur. The subject is Darfur because what is going on there right now is kind of in the early stages of what we witnessed taking place in Rwanda. That genocide can be stopped, and it can only be stopped by us along with anyone else in the international community who cares enough to save lives in sub-Saharan Africa. Certainly, the southern part of Darfur is a crisis right now that needs to be dealt with.

So I would ask my colleagues to join Senator BILL NELSON of Florida and me in asking for the adoption of a resolution that should take place today. It is one that is going to establish a specific position for the United States of America. The resolution is S. Res. 660, which we have submitted this week. It condemns the ongoing sales of arms to belligerents in Sudan and calls for both an end to such sales and an expansion of the U.N. embargo on arms sales to Sudan.

As Russia and China provide Khartoum with more weapons and materials, they continue to fuel the conflict and violence and drive a peaceful solution further away from reality.

Countries that want to do business in Africa, or anywhere for that matter, must be held accountable for their behavior. One of the things I have observed in Africa, no matter what country you go into—if it is an oil-rich country—anything that is new and shiny, whether it is a bridge, whether it is a colosseum, a sports arena, it is always built by China. So they have the inside track, and it is going to be up to us to join together to stop that type of mutilation of the population in countries such as northern Uganda and the Sudan.

So I urge the adoption of this resolution today and hope it will become a reality so we have a new position for the United States of America to save little girls like this one in countries that are involved in genocide.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today the stock market is down over 400 points. Yesterday it was pretty mixed. The day before it was down over 500 points. It is pretty clear that, judging by what is happening on Wall Street and judging what is happening to the economy—the news this morning on the front page of the paper: Loan guarantee offered to one of the largest insurance companies of America; the bankruptcy of an institution, Lehman Brothers, which has been around since the late 1800s; it survived the Civil War and the Great Depression—all these together demonstrate a very serious problem for this country's economy. This economy is in some peril, and I think we should not underestimate the difficulties that face it.

Our Treasury Secretary and the head of the Federal Reserve Board are taking midnight action, working 24 hours a day, apparently, convening meetings here and there, but they share something in common with us. None of us have ever been here before. No one quite understands where we are and what we do to deal with this very serious economic challenge to our country.

This is a great country. It is the only country like it on this planet. It has a very strong economy and has had for a long while. It has lifted a lot of people out of poverty and dramatically expanded the middle class. It has pro-

vided opportunity over the last century that has been almost unparalleled. Yet we now face some very difficult times, and it requires all of us to think together and work together to put together some plans to deal with this issue and this challenge. However, you cannot fix a problem you have not diagnosed.

I wish to talk a little about what got us here and a bit about what I think we ought to do about it. Two things: a subprime mortgage scandal decimated part of the foundation of this country's economy. I wish to talk about what it means. It sounds like a foreign language: Subprime loan scandal. Then, at the same time this economy was weakening because of an unbelievable subprime loan scandal, the price of oil was going up like a Roman candle, up to \$147 a barrel. It has come down some now; back up I think \$4 or \$5 a barrel today. But that had a huge impact on this economy as well. In some ways, these problems have the same roots: Unbridled speculation, regulators who didn't regulate, those who were supposed to regulate were willing to be willfully blind.

Let me talk about these things for a moment. Let me talk first about the situation with the price of oil. I held a hearing yesterday for almost 3 hours on the subject of speculation that I believe drove the price of oil to \$147 a barrel. At a time when our economy was reeling from the subprime scandal, running oil up to \$147 a barrel was a huge burden and had a huge impact in weakening this economy. I am somebody who believes it was speculation that drove this up, right under the nose of regulators who didn't care about regulating.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened yesterday. We have had all kinds of testimony about this. One of the witnesses who was at the Energy Committee yesterday was from J.P. Morgan, a venerable investment bank in this country, and Lawrence Eagles delivered testimony yesterday from J.P. Morgan. He is the head of commodity research, and here is what Mr. Eagles said:

We believe that high energy prices are fundamentally the result of supply and demand. We fundamentally believe that high energy prices are a result of supply and demand, not excessive speculation.

This from a man from the J.P. Morgan company, the global head of commodity research. But an e-mail we obtained today that was sent late last evening to the clients of J.P. Morgan by a Michael Zimbalist, who is the global chief investment officer for J.P. Morgan—the same company—said this—what we have been saying:

There was an enormous amount of speculation pent up in energy markets; example, an eight-fold increase in bank OTC oil derivatives exposure in the last three years and it wasn't just the supply-demand equation. Oil will rise again and we need solutions to energy supplies, but \$140 in July 2008 was ridiculous.

Let me say that again. An executive with J.P. Morgan testified yesterday

before our committee and said: We believe high energy prices are the result of supply and demand, not excessive speculation.

Last evening, an e-mail was sent from J.P. Morgan by their global chief investment officer and it says what we have been saying: There was an enormous amount of speculation pent up in energy markets.

I am trying to understand—and this is not to focus just on this company—J.P. Morgan. They testified they were an investment bank. We have had meetings with a lot of interest about this subject of excess speculation. I am trying to understand whether we are getting the straight story from people. What was the straight story here, the man they sent to testify or one of the top folks in J.P. Morgan who sent an e-mail to clients last evening? They directly contradict each other.

We have a whole lot of folks who are making a living these days saying: Well, the price of oil went to \$147 a barrel because of supply and demand, and I say to them: It doubled in a year. From July to July, the price of oil doubled. I defy anyone to tell me what happened to supply and demand in that year that justified the doubling of the price of oil. There isn't anyone in this Chamber and there is no one who has testified before my committees who can make that case. Why? Because the case is not valid. It isn't valid.

I have sent a letter to Mr. Jamie Dimon, the chief executive officer of J.P. Morgan, asking him to reconcile this. The company was willing to testify and they were one of the witnesses yesterday. I invited witnesses who had made the case that speculation was a significant part of this problem, of the runup of oil; others had invited those who believed that speculation was not. This testimony from J.P. Morgan was part of testimony invited by those who believe there is not a speculative component. But we have a right as a committee, it seems to me, to understand how does this happen. The company sends a representative to tell us there is no speculation and then sends an e-mail to clients the same day and says speculation is a significant part.

The reason I mention this is oil is a part of what is happening in this country today with our economy. The runup in the price of oil significantly weakened this economy. I am expecting a response from J.P. Morgan to try to tell me why the contradiction. Who is talking straight here? When do we get straight answers? If we are going to fix what is wrong, we have to know what happened and what caused it.

Now, I mentioned the subprime loan scandal. The subprime loan scandal. I described what I thought was going to happen 9 years ago on the floor of the Senate. We had a bill that came to us from Senator Gramm called Gramm-Leach-Bliley. Senator Gramm spent a career here trying to get rid of all regulation: Deregulate. Deregulate, he claimed. Financial modernization, he