

SUDAN TEETERING ON THE EDGE OF DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. As the end of the session begins to revolve and move toward an end, you begin to hear a lot of discussions about the end of the session business or unfinished business. And I hope as we proceed toward the first conclusion of the 109th Congress, we will view the concept of unfinished business as not only domestic but international. I ask that this body and the administration, this Nation, not have on our clock another Rwanda.

I don't think our former President would mind when I make the remarks that one of the most difficult days and difficult times of that past administration was the failure to act expeditiously on Rwanda. And today we ask that Sudan not be another Rwanda, Sudan that is now teetering on the edge of disaster, human disaster, and the devastation of thousands upon hundreds of thousands of human beings. And what is the reason? The reason simply is one person, one man, one human being, one head of state, one president. The President of Sudan indicates that if the African Union peacekeepers were to set foot on the soil of Sudan, he would consider it an attack and therefore attack individuals dispatched by the world community.

Now, the question becomes, what is the response of this world community? Is it intimidation, to be intimidated? Is it false diplomacy, to sit back and allow this person to brutalize and to, if you will, reject the hand of friendship offered by the collective world community?

I ask that we not be intimidated and oppressed by the President of Sudan and that we demand that African Union peacekeepers who have been dispatched by the United Nations, the very body that has been sent to bring the world nations together to solve problems, do their job. And that requires sometimes enhanced diplomacy, not accepting diplomacy, and certainly a firm hand and firm attitude and firm action.

None of us are asking to provoke violence, but violence already exists in the Sudan. For those of us who have gone, some of us who went through Chad because the Sudanese Government refused to give a number of Members of Congress the diplomatic papers necessary, many just simply went. When I went to Chad and visited with the refugees there in the camps, Chad already as a neighboring country is overwhelmed and being, if you will, undermined by the hundreds of thousands of refugees and the lack of support and resources. I was glad to support an amendment to the foreign operations appropriations to ensure that some of those heavy burdens of Chad would be provided for.

But you have not and cannot understand the devastation of violence in

Sudan if you have not sat down on the ground with the women in a circle as I have in those refugee camps listening to women who would not look at me face to face, who hid their eyes and their faces, who didn't want to talk about the massive rapes over and over again by those who would intimidate, rape, murder their men and them and their children. Women who had to go out to get the firewood because the man could not. The men obviously were not raped, they were brutalized and murdered, and so the women sacrificed their bodies by going out to be raped, because if the men went out they would be murdered. Is this not a call to action? Is this not a reason to tell the President of Sudan to stand down and step aside?

We have gone into conflict and we have had rousing and vigorous debates on lesser items than this. And so to the President who is now at the United Nations, it is time to turn these three days of the general assembly around issues of severity. There is life or death matters going on in Sudan. And might I just say this: just a few weeks ago, there was some sort of survey that categorized the Members of Congress and their response to these issues. Unfortunately, it was a skewed survey, because one of the amendments that it scored was an amendment that this Congress utilize to make a point by taking money away from Egypt. Obviously, that is not the right way to go when you talk about solving the problem of Sudan. The way to solve the problem for Sudan is to put an allotment of dollars that doesn't take away from anyone and enhances both the resources necessary for bringing those violent perpetrators out of there and away from those refugees, and as well supporting the African Union peacekeepers.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2463. An act to designate certain land in New England as wilderness for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation system and certain land as a National Reservation Area, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2864) "An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOND, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. BOXER,

and Mr. CARPER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REAL SECURITY SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, 229 years ago today, American forces under the command of General Horatio Gates defeated the British at Saratoga, New York. This battle and the subsequent engagement at Saratoga several weeks later turned the tide of the American Revolution and were crucial in securing the survival of our fledgling Nation.

More than two centuries later, the United States is the most powerful Nation on Earth, but we face myriad challenges to our national security that our revolutionary forebearers could not have imagined.

Throughout much of our history, the security of our Nation was an issue that was above politics. America's leaders put aside their differences and, working together, ensured that our country remained strong and free. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that bipartisan tradition has been cast aside by our GOP colleagues who have sought for the last three decades to portray the Democratic Party as weak on defense or insufficiently concerned with defending the United States. Never mind that this wholly distorts the historical record of Democrats who have always, always answered the Nation's call to lead in the defense of our country. It was Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, who led America during the first World War and vowed to make the world safe for democracy.

□ 2115

It was Franklin Roosevelt, a Democrat, who guided this Nation and the entire free world through World War II.

It was Harry Truman, a Democrat, who made the tough decisions to use the atomic bomb against Japan to contain Soviet expansionism after the war and to confront the North Korean attack against South Korea in 1950.

It was John Kennedy, a Democrat, who went eyeball to eyeball with Nikita Khrushchev during the Cuban missile crisis.

These great leaders and their successors, including Lyndon Johnson and Bill Clinton, never shied away from the hard fights, and our friends on the other side of the aisle know it. Nevertheless, Republicans have continued to try to scare the American people into believing that only they can protect the country.

This shameful use of national security as a political wedge issue has reached new lows since the September 11 attacks. In 2002 and 2004 and again in this election season, Republicans from President Bush on down have used terrorism as a political issue. In so doing,