

took at the fair detected their cancer, and they are now on the road to a full recovery. Barb and I are grateful that we are able to offer this service, and that it is making a difference for South Dakotans.

Many individuals have had their own lives or the lives of family and friends touched by cancer; I am so grateful that my own battle with this disease had a successful outcome. Prostate cancer is often not an easy subject to discuss, but uncomfortable though the topic may be for some, we must remember that early detection saves lives. My wife Barbara is a two-time cancer survivor, and her experience taught me that early detection and swift treatment is the best defense in fighting any form of cancer.

I am proud to add my voice to those who are working to fight prostate cancer, and to commend them on their indefatigable efforts to raise awareness of the risks, to promote early detection and treatment, and to further our efforts to understand and eliminate this disease. I urge men to discuss their risks and screening options with their doctor, and I urge women to raise this important topic with the men in their lives. Through screening and early detection, we truly can save lives.

HEARING CANCELLATION

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was supposed to hold its third hearing on Darfur in as many years this week, but it was postponed because the administration couldn't field the appropriate witnesses. In a region where each day means hundreds of innocent lives lost and thousands more terrorized and displaced, time is not on our side.

I want to begin my statement today by acknowledging that there have been some positive developments over the past month relating to the international community's response to the violence in Darfur. I welcomed the passage of United Nations Resolution 1706, a U.S.-backed initiative authorizing a 22,000-strong U.N. peacekeeping force for Darfur. The President's appointment of Andrew Natsios as his Special Envoy to Sudan was long overdue. And, while it isn't perfect, the recently passed bipartisan Darfur Peace and Accountability Act is a first step that reaffirms the United States' determination to lead the way on the long path ahead to achieving a sustainable peace in Sudan.

Unfortunately, none of these developments have changed conditions on the ground. Nor have the strong words that our Government or the international community used to condemn the perpetrators of violence in Darfur over the past few years. In December 2003, the administration issued a statement expressing "deep concern" about the humanitarian and security situation in Darfur and calling "on the Government of Sudan to take concrete steps to con-

trol the militia groups it has armed, to avoid attacks against civilians and to fully facilitate the efforts of the international humanitarian community to respond to civilian needs."

Had Secretary Rice or Ambassador Bolton found the time to speak with us this week, they no doubt would have reiterated the administration's boast that the United States has been the largest single contributor of humanitarian aid to Darfur and the most generous supporter of the existing African Union force. Similarly, some of my colleagues in the Senate are quick to point out that we were the first to condemn the atrocities in Darfur as genocide in July 2004 and have appropriated more than \$1.5 billion to ease the suffering of innocent Darfurians since then.

I do not wish to imply that these statements and funds are unimportant. But they are not enough.

For those of us with a long history of engagement in Africa, today's crisis in Darfur is eerily familiar. After all, this is the same regime we saw attack its own citizens in indiscriminate bombing raids and obstruct humanitarian access during two decades of bloody civil war with southern Sudan. The genocide underway in Darfur should not be considered in isolation but in the larger context of Sudan's tumultuous history. We cannot afford to forget that more than 2 million Sudanese were killed and 4.5 million displaced in the north-south civil war that ended with last year's Comprehensive Peace Agreement. That fragile peace, as well as May's Darfur Peace Agreement, now hang in the balance as the Sudanese Government renews its practice of organized atrocities as a method of governance.

More than 2 years after our Government called the violence in Darfur a "genocide," the United States must lead the international community in taking action to stop the ongoing violence and to mitigate further violence.

First, the United States must throw its entire weight behind concerted diplomatic action to convince Khartoum to allow a U.N. peacekeeping force into Darfur. This means that the full array of economic and political incentives at our disposal should be devoted to pressuring those who persist in supporting Khartoum—namely, China, Russia, and the Arab League—to isolate the genocidal regime until it stops targeting civilians and cooperates with U.N. peacekeepers. These countries must not allow their complacency to become complicity in the crimes against humanity being perpetrated in Darfur.

Second, it means bolstering the courageous but inadequate African Union peacekeeping force that has been doing its best to protect the people of Darfur for more than 2 years. At this point, the A.U. force is our only vehicle for establishing stability throughout the region. Unfortunately, in its current form, it is incapable of doing so without significant assistance from the international community. The United

States must lead a renewed international effort to provide whatever financial, logistical, technical, and military resources are necessary for the deployment of the robust United Nations peacekeeping force as soon as possible.

Third, the U.S. Government must engage fully in the work required to find a political solution to conflict in Darfur. This means establishing a peace process that will expand the Darfur Peace Agreement to incorporate all militias and political factions in Darfur, along with the Government in Khartoum. While I do not doubt the good intentions of former Deputy Secretary Zoellick, his efforts to create a peace agreement were hasty and incomplete. We will need sustained, detailed, and aggressive engagement with all of the parties to the conflict before we can expect lasting results. While I would like to think that building on the Darfur Peace Agreement might work, it may not. We need to be prepared to start from scratch and build an agreement in which all parties can find common ground.

We also need to begin preparing to introduce additional, more forceful options to stop the genocide. We must signal to Khartoum that the international community will not tolerate continued violence and that it is prepared to use forceful measures to stop it. A NATO-enforced no-fly zone over Darfur would halt the Sudanese Government's indiscriminate bombing campaign and escorts for humanitarian envoys would ensure that aid reaches those who desperately need it. We need to explore this option and identify other avenues to create humanitarian space throughout the region.

The President's new special envoy must get to work immediately. He must work to bring an unprecedented diplomatic force on Khartoum, and he must begin preparing other, more aggressive options should conditions continue to worsen.

Finally, we must signal clearly to those who commit crimes against humanity that the world is watching and that they will be held accountable for their actions via targeted and aggressive sanctions—including financial and travel restrictions—and criminal prosecution. This climate of impunity must be eliminated so that organized atrocities do not become a widespread governance tool.

I would like to close by saying that we should not lose sight of the broader, long-term objective of sustainable peace throughout Sudan. We must devise a comprehensive strategy for expanding the Darfur Peace Agreement to include those parties that have not yet signed and for instituting and strengthening mechanisms to prevent parties from backsliding into full-scale conflict.

Our experience with the Sudanese Government over the past two decades has shown that words mean little. Without immediate and vigorous action, these are only more empty promises to the people of Darfur. Time is

not on our side; we cannot afford to delay any longer or defer to the obstructionist tactics of brutal regimes. The people of Sudan deserve more than our outrage; they deserve our action. And the time to act is now.

THE NEED FOR REAUTHORIZATION OF PUBLIC LAW 106-393

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to make a few comments regarding the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, or County Payments Act as it has been nicknamed.

Today is a sad day for the 780 counties that benefit from the County Payments Act because with the last day of this fiscal year, the act expires.

In 2000, the Congress passed Public Law 106-393 to address the needs of the forest counties of America and to focus on creating a new cooperative partnership between citizens in forest counties and our Federal land management to develop forest health improvement projects on public lands and simultaneously stimulate job development and community economic stability.

The act has been an enormous success in achieving and even surpassing the goals of Congress. This act has restored programs for students in rural schools and prevented the closure of numerous isolated rural schools. It has been a primary funding mechanism to provide rural school students with educational opportunities comparable to suburban and urban students. Over 4,400 rural schools receive funds because of this act.

Next, the act has allowed rural county road districts and county road departments to address the severe maintenance backlog. Snow removal has been restored for citizens, tourists, and school buses. Bridges have been upgraded and replaced and culverts that are hazardous to fish passage have been upgraded and replaced.

In addition, over 70 Resource Advisory Committees, or RACs have been formed. These RACs cover our largest 150 forest counties. Nationally these 15-person diverse RAC stakeholder committees have studied and approved over 2,500 projects on Federal forestlands and adjacent public and private lands. These projects have addressed a wide variety of improvements drastically needed on our national forests. Projects have included fuels reduction, habitat improvement, watershed restoration, road maintenance and rehabilitation, reforestation, campground and trail improvement, and noxious weed eradication.

RACs are a new and powerful partnership between county governments and the land management agencies. They are rapidly building the capacity for collaborative public land management decisionmaking in over 150 of our largest forest counties in America and are reducing the gridlock over public land management, community by community.

The legacy of this act over the last few years is positive and substantial. This law should be extended so it can continue to benefit the forest counties, their schools, and continue to contribute to improving the health of our national forests.

If we do not work to reauthorize this act, all of the progress of the last 6 years will be lost. Schools in timber-dependent communities will lose a substantial part of their funding. These school districts will have to start making tough budget decisions such as keeping or canceling after school programs, sports programs, music programs, and trying to determine what is the basic educational needs of our children. Next, counties will have to reprioritize road maintenance so that only the essential services of the county are met because that is all they will be able to afford.

Thirty of our colleagues have joined Mr. WYDEN and myself in recognizing the importance of the reauthorization of this act by cosponsoring S. 267. And while we have run out of time in this fiscal year, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the lameduck session to address this issue.

REMEMBERING NATIONAL PUBLIC LANDS DAY

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, on September 30, will once again observe National Public Lands Day. For the 13th straight year, thousands of citizens across the country help clean up public parks, rivers, lakes, forests, rangelands, and beaches. These volunteers will hit the ground running and spruce up trails, build bridges, plant trees, and much more. I commend each and everyone of them for their important public service. Their work inspires us to step back and consider just what our public lands mean to us.

Almost 100 years ago, the great conservationist President Teddy Roosevelt addressed a special session of Congress on the subject of our natural resources and spoke words that should be listened to carefully by everyone who has an interest in keeping the United States the most prosperous and dynamic nation on the face of the Earth. "These resources, which form the common basis of our welfare, can be wisely developed, rightly used, and prudently conserved only by the common action of all the people . . ." Listen to those words and notice the wise approach of a man considered one of our most radical conservationists, a President who put 234 million acres into the public trust. This is not a man who lived on the ideological extremes. He did not advocate roping off all the land and allowing no admittance. Nor would he stand by and let the land be ransacked and misused. Let me speak again his words: ". . . wisely developed, rightly used, and prudently conserved . . ." That approach was correct in 1909, and it is the right one now.

Today's younger generation understands that our natural resources are

not limitless, that we can not endlessly exploit them. They are more environmentally savvy perhaps than their parents. And I believe they also grasp the need for smart conservation, for devising collaborative policies that ensure public access to public land now and in the future.

Some lands ought to have restrictions on use. I do not dispute that, and I do not advocate any careless "rollback" of environmental regulations. But this is not a time to exact an economic toll on our country by ignoring the resources available for use in our public lands. It is a time to tap into our ingenuity and devise ways to utilize them while responsibly mitigating any environmental impact. This is not an insurmountable challenge; Americans have accomplished more difficult tasks in our history.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize the issue of public ownership. These lands are owned by the people. We policymakers need to always keep that in mind and not just pay this fact lip-service. National Public Lands Day is a perfect time to remind ourselves who owns this land. We must be flexible with the different types of recreation and access to public land that people want.

Mr. President, in closing, let me add that Americans have always had a strong relationship with public lands and have always understood the need to preserve them for posterity. Sometimes we hear it said that people only care for what they themselves privately owned that what is held in common will often fall into disrepair. The work that will be accomplished this September 30th disproves that idea. And I am optimistic that future generations will be enjoying the same public lands we do today.

NOMINATION OF RICHARD HOAGLAND

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about an issue of great importance to the Armenian community, the nomination of Richard Hoagland to be the next U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Armenia.

I respect the office of the President and the powers that are granted to appoint individuals that are in support of the administration's agenda; however, there is justifiable concern about the recall of our Ambassador to a regionally important country and the subsequent nomination of his replacement. The reported reason for the recall of Ambassador Evans revolves around the failure of our Government to officially recognize the Armenian genocide. That is unacceptable.

Once again, I want to go on record as being opposed to the continued denial of the Armenian genocide. The bigger issue is not that of an appointment of this or any official who recognizes his duties and will be diligent in carrying them out but of acknowledging the genocide as part of an appropriate foreign policy.