and Bacardi in Greece. Last year, SPI recorded sales of $680 million. This success, however, has merely brought the company to the forefront of the debate over who owns these trademarks.

It is also my understanding that from 2000 onwards, certain entities within the Russian State have started various actions against SPI to obtain its trademark registrations.

In late 2001, in a case brought by the Russian State Trademark Organization, the Russian courts ruled that the original privatization of the company that owned the brand before SPI was invalid (on a technicality) and returned the rights for 17 brands controlled (now) by the SPI Group to the Russian Ministry of Agriculture.

Since then, SPI, while producing the product in Russia, has been forced to move its bottling plant to Riga in Latvia, after the Russian authorities seized and blocked its exports from the Russian port of Kaliningrad. Various heated legal battles have been fought in a number of Russian and foreign courts as SPI continues to sell Stolichnaya internationally. In Russia, a company resurrected by the Government markets its own Stolichnaya brand after confiscating back the trademark there.

On 4 March 2002, the Leninsk-Kuznetskiy City Court seemingly resolved the dispute by ruling that the Ministry of Agriculture had illegally registered 17 trademarks belonging to SPI, including the Stolichnaya trademark, and ordered that SPI be reinstated as the registered trademark owner.

However, Russian authorities ignored the Leninsk-Kuznetskiy City Court's ruling and employed intimidation and police-state tactics to grab the company's assets and trademark rights for its own purposes. Some examples of these tactics include:

The Government's Federal Security Service, in a letter dated March 5, 2002, ordering Kaliningrad Customs to prohibit bulk export of Stolichnaya produced by SPI in Kaliningrad.

The confiscation of more than 150,000 cases of SPI products seized in Kaliningrad along with related packaging material.

The filing of criminal charges levied against Audrey Skurikhin, president of SPI Spirits-Russia, and its Kaliningrad facility.

As a result of these events, it is my understanding that the Ministry of Agriculture currently produces these products in Russia with virtually identical labeling and uses libel and intimidation to force distributors and customers to stop doing business with SPI. In addition, the Russian Patent Agency gave the rights for the re-nationalized trademarks to the newly incorporated company of the Russian Ministry for Agriculture.

International courts have ruled in favor of SPI. Court rulings in October 2002 in Hamburg, Germany and May 2003 in Rotterdam, Netherlands, rejected the lawsuits brought against SPI, substantiating SPI's claims.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the SPI case is about something larger and more fundamental for Russia and its relationship with the United States and other nations of the world—adherence to the rule of law and political, social and economic freedom. SPI is an example of the need to uphold the rule of law and ensure a better business environment for Russian business. A stable and democratic Russia, based on a rule of law, is critical to U.S. interests; not only for U.S. firms interested in doing business there, but also for the overall, long-term U.S.-Russia relationship. Many of my constituents depend on adherence to the rule of law and copyright protections to ensure that their products, particularly software and biotechnology, are not stolen. We should not let this SPI case set precedence or be a harbinger for software and other U.S. industries.

THE WORLD MUST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, after visiting Darfur, Sudan, and seeing firsthand the horrific conditions and oppression, and I have here a picture of a camp that was burned down by the Janjaweed, but having seen the horrific conditions and oppression, and having talked to eyewitnesses, I believe genocide is taking place in Darfur.

The United States and others around the world said never again after the genocide in Rwanda. So now I call on the United States, the United Nations, and world leaders to call it what it is, genocide, and to take action before more die. We have the ability to prevent further deaths and to stop genocide in its tracks. Our actions should follow our words.

Amnesty International just released a new report. It documents hundreds of cases of women who have been raped in Darfur. To highlight one story, I quote:

''I was sleeping when the attack on Disa started. I was taken away by the attackers, they were all in uniform. They took dozens of other girls and made us walk for 3 hours. During the day, we were beaten. And they kept telling us, 'You, the black women, we will exterminate you, you have no God.' At night, we were raped several times. We were not given food for 3 days.''

This story echoes the stories of rape that I heard when I was in Darfur. We were given a letter by 44 women who were raped. The translation is heartbreaking.

It said, and this was to Senator BROWNBACK and myself, ''We are 44 raped women. As a result of that savagery, some of us became pregnant, some have aborted, some took out their wombs and some are still receiving medical treatment. Hereunder, we list the names of the raped women and state that we have high hopes in you and the international community to stand by us and not forsake us to this tyrannical, brutal, and racist regime, which wants to eliminate us racially, bearing in mind that 90 percent of our sisters at this village are widows.''

Women are systematically raped on a massive scale. These are crimes against humanity. The overall situation constitutes genocide.

Despite promises to rein in the militia, the violence continues to escalate. Over the weekend, U.N. humanitarian agencies reported that local authorities and militia continued to loot convoys and gang rape women.

The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment on the Crime of Genocide describes genocide as acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, national, ethnic, racial or religious groups. Specifically cited is:

Number one. Killing members of the group.

Thousands of black Africans have been killed. There are reports of mass graves.

Number two. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.

One woman told us that the Janjaweed told her that she was being raped to create ''lighter-skinned babies.''

Number three. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction in whole or in part.

It is clear that the eradication of the Darfurian African population will occur if people do not return to their homes.

Number four. Forcefully transferring children of the group to another group.

There are constant stories of the abduction of children.

No matter what we call it, Mr. Speaker, genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, people are dying on a massive scale, and that is not acceptable. What matters now is action.

The international community has a moral and a legal obligation to stop what is occurring, and those responsible must be brought to justice. The United Nations Security Council needs to take immediate action to end this crisis.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, a large peacekeeping force made up of troops in the African union is now needed to allow the Darfurians to return to their homes and to verify that the government of Sudan is disarming the rebels. We must remember that the government of Sudan armed the rebels. We need independent monitors to ensure that they are disarmed. We need monitors and forensic experts on the ground to preserve the evidence for a future war crimes trial.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, two points: Every day that we delay and hesitate, more people die. The United States must speak out loudly. We must not shy from calling it what it is: Genocide.

THE G–8 NATIONS MUST END HUNGER AND SUPPORT EDUCATION FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, I had the pleasure of participating in a press conference in Savannah, Georgia, to call upon the leaders

of the G–8 nations to get serious and to work to end child hunger and support education for all.

The press conference was organized by NetAid and supported by the Basic Education Coalition. David Morrison, the President of NetAid, and Eveline Herfkens, the executive coordinator of the U.N. Secretary general's Millennium Project, joined me at the podium. I was especially impressed by the efforts of the children of Savannah, who, with the support of NetAid, have launched a campaign to raise awareness and funds so that children around the world can have a chance to go to school.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that central to the American Dream has been the desire by parents to make sure that their children receive a better education and get a chance at having a better life than they did. This was true when our country was founded, and it is still true today. So it is fitting that the United States should lead the world in achieving universal basic education for the world's children.

Around the time of World War II, the United States discovered another important key to good education: Food. Many of the soldiers volunteering for the military, who we now refer to as the greatest generation, had problems associated with poor nutrition or hunger. Ultimately, this discovery led to the U.S. establishing a full-fledged universal school lunch program, and today many of our schools also offer breakfast to those in need.

The combination of global basic education and school feeding programs contributes not only to achieving the Millennium Development Goal of universal primary education by the year 2015, but also to the Goal to cut hunger in half. But it is not going to happen unless donor nations make a significantly greater commitment of funds and resources.

Right now, wealthy nations commit an estimated $1.4 billion to basic education. For fiscal year 2004, Congress appropriated $326.5 million in foreign aid for basic education and another $37 million provided through the Department of Labor to combat child labor. Sadly, only $125 million was made available for global school feeding programs through all USAID and Department of Agriculture programs combined.

At this rate, the world will not be able to achieve universal primary education for another 150 years, or end child hunger for another century. So what should we do?

The G–8 leaders need to do much more than issue glowing statements in support of universal education. Photo-ops and juggling the books will not build schools or put more teachers and materials in the classroom or provide meals to students too hungry to learn. Only new money, new resources, and, most important, the political will to turn promises into reality can do that.

Developing countries need an additional $5.6 billion to ensure that every child can go to primary school. For the U.S. to exercise genuine leadership, President Bush should make a firm commitment that the United States will provide at least $1 billion by fiscal year 2006 for basic education, and a minimum of $300 million for U.S. funded international school feeding programs. The other G–8 nations should make similar commitments and fulfill them.

I am pleased to note that the fiscal year 2005 foreign aid bill that we passed last week includes $400 million for basic education programs, and today we will vote on a resolution in support of global school feeding programs.

Our world will not achieve economic prosperity or social and political stability as long as children cannot go to school and continue to die from hunger. And we can only win the war against intolerance and terrorism when the children of the world are no longer hungry and illiterate, and their parents, families, and communities have hope for a better future.

On Sea Island, Georgia, the leaders of the world issued another set of glowing proclamations about how to create the better future. We now must wait and see if they have the political will to put their money on the table and make it happen.

A GREAT NATIONAL DEBATE AND OPEN GLOBAL DIALOGUE WILL WIN WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we know the President landed on the deck of an aircraft carrier and declared ''mission accomplished'' in Iraq. We know there have been more casualties in Iraq after the President's declaration than before. We know that Iraq was a wrong war at the wrong time in the wrong place. We know the justifications offered by the administration for war were either outright wrong or grossly misrepresented. We know that the work of the United Nations' weapons inspectors was finding the truth. We know Iraq did not pose a clear and present danger or an imminent threat to the United States. We know the President has led us into a blind, box canyon. We know we have diverted U.S. resources and international attention away from the hunt for the real terrorist. We need to remember that the war goes on. The U.S. casualties mount.

When the administration pulled out of Iraq, it left 160,000 U.S. soldiers in Iraq in harm's way. Not a day goes by without more U.S. soldiers being killed or injured in combat. Is the world safer or more dangerous? Did we succeed in Iraq because the administration pulled out on time, or did we fail in Iraq by going there in the first place?

A new book, published by a 20-year national security veteran, bluntly concludes that Iraq was ''a bloody and unsuccessful tool.'' Worse yet, the book is another voice saying that the war in Iraq will nurture more terrorism around the world. The book, entitled Imperial Hubris, ought to be required reading by every American, regardless of political party. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the author, you reach one inescapable conclusion: It is time for America to seriously debate and define a national terrorism policy.

Today, America has the so-called PATRIOT Act, passed in the middle of the night, that endangers the very freedoms the President claims to be defending. Today, we have a useless, so-called terror alert system fixed in permanent threat mode, as if scaring Americans on a daily basis somehow comforts them. Today, resolutions are rushed through the Congress, as if a rush to judgment will somehow make us safer. Today, we have a constant stream of terror rhetoric from the administration that speaks in broad generalities.

Some way, someday, somehow, someplace, something bad is going to happen. We will not be surprised. What we need to know as a Nation is, what are we going to do about it? Osama bin Laden may be the face of the terror, but the arms, the legs, and the rest of the body is much more than one person, and the issues involved are much deeper than the daily dose of rhetoric out of the White House.

America must face the choice before us; that we can confront the roots of terrorism by listening to everyone involved, by looking at all sides of the story, and acting from one of America's founding principles: Equal justice for all.

The Middle East is a place that wobbles on the brink of madness. A war without borders is a war carried on by people from place to place. A war without borders is a war against an invisible enemy standing in plain sight. We can confront the roots of terrorism by debating their cause, our role, and the worlds's future.

The alternative is to accept a world where we imagine that bullets and bombs can win a war without soldiers, where guns will prevail on a battlefield no one can walk on because we are standing on it, and where U.S. casualties risk going unnoticed by the Nation because the media has moved on, even as the blood of our beloved ones continue to flow.

Today, 160,000 soldiers are fighting and dying in Iraq. There is no end in sight, there is no homecoming anywhere soon. The bombs and the bullets and the madness are limitless, unless we choose to stop them. We best honor those who have fallen by resolving to face the consequences of war and by confronting the origins of terror. Words alone will not end the war on