

has been a nationally recognized leader on the subject of Sudan.

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that very kind introduction. I appreciate the support that the gentleman has given this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Sudan Peace Act, H.R. 2052. I certainly would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), for introducing this legislation. He has traveled, as I mentioned, to Sudan with me a year or so ago, with Senator BROWBACK, and saw firsthand the conditions and has been a strong advocate for change there.

As you know, it is a very sad situation in Sudan, and we have many people, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). We have on our side, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and others who have fought.

But we also have people outside the anti-slavery organization, Charles Jacobs and Mrs. Nina Shay and others. But I also would like to commend the NAACP that at its last several conventions talked about this problem of slavery and has opposed the government of Sudan, and for the talk show host, Joe Madison, who has really given his listening audience an opportunity to hear about the Sudan and has gotten a great new constituency, and Reverend Fauntroy here in Washington, Reverend Jessie Jackson, who intends to go to Sudan soon, and Reverend Al Sharpton, who has been there.

□ 1330

We have seen more people become involved.

But this issue is not a simple issue of north versus the south. There are many very good Northerners who want to see the end of this war, also. We have many people in the Muslim faith who do not support the National Islamic Front government. The fact is that it is a bad government. They are really perpetrating misery on their people, and it is a strong, small group of people who have just been holding power against people of good will.

So the bombings continue, and aerial bombings were reintroduced just last week. The government made an official statement that they were going to end aerial bombings 2 weeks ago, and last week said they have rescinded that and they are starting bombing again.

They take these Antonovs, these Soviet-built planes, and it disrupts the community because the community hear the planes and they keep wondering, when are the planes coming, therefore making it difficult to have a normal life. The planes on occasions hit churches and schools and hospitals.

Another thing that is happening is many of the educated south Sudanese,

many are lacking education now. The schools are not adequate. Therefore, the people of the south are losing out on education.

This is a horrible, horrible situation, beginning back in 1956 when it was the first African country to receive its independence; a proud country, a country that fought victoriously against Egypt and the British to retain its independence.

The people there are good people, but they are being treated horribly by a terrible government. Slavery still goes on. People are still being starved as a weapon. We need to have a strong reassertion that this government must be changed.

We must ask the Bush administration and Secretary Powell, who has spoken out against this, and he has spoken out about Sudan more than any other area in Africa, we want him to continue to push. We want to see capital market access cut off from foreign countries trying to get funds from our capital markets to continue to use this blood money.

We would like to see the end to slavery, and youngsters like Ms. Vogel's class out in Colorado who raise funds and send them over with church groups to repatriate slaves with their families.

So we have a lot of work to do. We have heard the statistics: close to 2 million dead, and as a result, there have been over 4.3 million people displaced. We need to have a strong envoy to go there and to tell the Khartoum government that time has run out. We no longer will allow this to go on. It has gone on too long.

There is no reason in this new millenium, when we have supersonic transports and people going to outer space and living in outer space, that we would have on Earth a country that uses weapons of war against its own people, primarily women and children.

We must have a movement in this country to focus on Sudan. We must make this a number one priority. I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this peace act.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, although I do not contest for 1 minute the sincerity and the good intentions of the many, many cosponsors. I do not question the problems that exist in Sudan. There is no doubt that it is probably one of the most horrible tales in human history.

But I do question a few things. First, I question whether this is a proper function for our government. I raised this question in the committee, suggesting that it could not be for national security reasons, and it more or less was conceded this has nothing to do with national security but it had to do with America's soul. I was fas-

cinated that we are in the business of saving souls these days.

But I do have serious concerns about its effectiveness, because we have a history of having done these kinds of programs many times in the past, and even in Africa. It was not too many years ago that we were in Somalia and we lost men. Our soldiers were dragged in the streets. It was called nation-building. This is, in a way, very much nation-building, because we support one faction over the thugs that are in charge.

I certainly have all the sympathy and empathy for those individuals who are being abused, but the real question is whether or not this will work. It did not work in Somalia. We sent troops into Haiti. Haiti is not better off. How many men did we lose in Vietnam in an effort to make sure the people we want in power were in power?

So often these well-intended programs just do not work and frequently do the opposite by our aid ending up in the hands of the supposed enemy. I seriously question whether this one will, either. Maybe in a year or 2 from now we will realize that this is an effort that did not produce the results that we wanted. It is a \$10 million appropriation, small for what we do around here, but we also know that this is only the beginning, and there will be many more tens of millions of dollars that will be sent in hopes that we will satisfy this problem.

Members can look for more problems to solve, because right now there are 800,000 children serving in the military in 41 countries of the world. That is another big job we would have to take upon ourselves to solve considering our justification to be involved in Sudan.

Mr. Chairman, with HR 2052, the Sudan Peace Act, we embark upon another episode of interventionism, in continuing our illegitimate and ill-advised mission to "police" the world. It seemingly matters little to this body that it proceeds neither with any constitutional authority nor with the blessings of such historical figures such as Jefferson who, in his first inaugural address, argued for "Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none." Unfortunately, this is not the only bit of history which seemingly is lost on this Congress.

Apparently, it is also lost on this Congress that the Constitution was a grant of limited power to the federal government from the citizens or, in other words, the Constitution was not designed to allow the government to restrain the people, but to allow the people to restrain the government. Of course, the customary lip service is given to the Constitution insofar as the committee report for this bill follows the rule of citing Constitutional authority and cites Art. I, Section 8, which is where one might look to find a specific enumerated power. However, the report cites only clause 18 which begs some further citation. While Clause 18 contains the "necessary and proper" clause, it limits Congress to enacting laws "necessary and proper" to some more specifically (i.e. foregoing) enumerated power. Naturally, no such "foregoing" authority is cited by the advocates of this bill.

Without Constitutional authority, this bill goes on to encourage the spending of \$10 million of U.S. taxpayers hard-earned money in Sudan but for what purpose? From the text of the bill, we learn that "The United States should use all means of pressure available to facilitate a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, including (A) the multilateralization of economic and diplomatic tools to compel the Government of Sudan to enter into a good faith peace process; [note that it says "compel . . . good faith peace"] and (B) the support or creation of viable democratic civil authority and institutions in areas of Sudan outside of government control." I believe we used to call that nation-building before that term became impolitic. How self-righteous a government is ours which legally prohibits foreign campaign contributions yet assumes it knows best and, hence, supports dissident and insurgent groups in places like Cuba, Sudan and around the world. The practical problem here is that we have funded dissidents in such places as Somalia who ultimately turned out to be worse than the incumbent governments. Small wonder the U.S. is the prime target of citizen-terrorists from countries with no real ability to retaliate militarily for our illegitimate and immoral interventions.

The legislative "tools" to be used to "facilitate" this aforementioned "comprehensive solution" are as frightening as the nation-building tactics. For example, "It is the sense of the Congress that . . . the United Nations should be used as a tool to facilitate peace and recovery in Sudan."

One can only assume this is the same United Nations which booted the United States off its Human Rights Commission in favor of, as Canadian Sen. Jeremiah S. Grafstein, called them recently, "those exemplars of human rights nations . . . Algeria, China, Saudi Arabia, Uganda, Armenia, Pakistan, Syria and Vietnam."

The bill does not stop there, however, in intervening in the civil war in Sudan. It appears that this Congress has found a new mission for the Securities and Exchange Commission who are now tasked with investigating "the nature and extent of . . . commercial activity in Sudan" as it relates to "any violations of religious freedom and human rights in Sudan." It seems we have finally found a way to spend those excessive fees the SEC has been collecting from mutual fund investors despite the fact we cannot seem to bring to the floor a bill to actually reduce those fees which have been collected in multiples above what is necessary to fund this agencies' previous (and again unconstitutional) mission.

There is more, however. Buried deep within the bill in Section 9 we find what may be the real motivation for the intervention—Oil. It seems the bill also tasks the Secretary of State with generating a report detailing "a description of the sources and current status of Sudan's financing and construction of infrastructure and pipelines for oil exploitation, the effects of such financing and construction on the inhabitants of the regions in which the oil fields are located." Talk about corporate welfare and the ability to socialize the costs of foreign competitive market research on the U.S. taxpayer!

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this bill truly has it all—an unconstitutional purpose, the morally bankrupt intervention in dealings between the affairs of foreign governments and their respec-

tive citizens in our attempt to police the world, more involvement by a United Nations proven inept at resolving civil conflicts abroad, the expansion of the SEC into State Department functions and a little corporate welfare for big oil, to boot. How can one not support these legislative efforts?

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill for each of the above-mentioned reasons and leave to the ingenuity, generosity, and conscience of each individual in this country to make their own private decision as to how best render help to citizens of Sudan and all countries where human rights violations run rampant.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me, and I am grateful to him and to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

I thank the ranking member, and I must knowledge the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) as a one-man watchdog for human rights in the world, for which this body and our country are both grateful.

Mr. Chairman, here we have in this bill the first forward movement to do more than condemn. The unspeakable litany of violations in Sudan leave out none. I do not, therefore, want to go down them.

I do want to take issue with the last speaker. I am not sure about our national security, but I do believe that doing something about Khartoum is vital to the strategic U.S. interests in the world. Oil is the engine that is driving the war in the north against the southern Sudanese. They are winning the war. This war is almost over, if we do not do something about it. The southern Sudanese have been so weakened that time is running out.

In Khartoum, we see a regime that will soon be a mid-sized oil exporter at a time when the U.S. and the world have escalated oil needs. It is very important to build on the Clinton sanctions that have been in place since 1997.

I support the amendment, but minimally it seems to me we have to begin to focus, to scrutinize access to our markets. One way to do that is if we say that if they want access to our markets, tell us about their business operations in Sudan. If they want to get access, at least tell us. If we can deny them access constitutionally and legally, I would be for that.

Investors need to be forewarned that indeed we are trying to have significant impact on investments, and since we have reached our own folks, we ought to reach the multinationals, if for no other reason than to level the playing field.

Let me speak to another strategic interest. When is terrorism in the world not a strategic interest of the United States of America? Here we have a major supporter and exporter of international terrorism in Sudan, and we

have felt Sudan in our own country. The region has felt Sudan in multiple ways. Ask the President of Egypt, Mr. Mubarak, whose life was attempted on from the exporting of terrorism from this regime. We have very important strategic interests.

In fact, the last time the world gathered in this way, the last time we confronted a nation and tried to get worldwide support, was of course the sanctions against South Africa, which significantly weakened apartheid. Mr. Chairman, what is happening in Sudan is far more complicated, and if I may say so, far worse than the despotism we saw in South Africa.

When the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and I came to the floor just over a year ago, we were the only two on a special order trying to kind of wake up the consciousness not so much of this body, which had already passed a resolution of condemnation, but hoping that the world out there was looking at us somehow.

I want to simply praise the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for pioneering leadership when absolutely nobody was listening. Since then, since that special order, there have been hearings, press conferences involving the leadership on both sides of the aisle. There have been Sudanese, southern Sudanese ex-slaves who had come to the House of Representatives. We are getting somewhere if we take the leadership for which our Nation is known in the world.

Therefore, we must minimally pass this bill and go on to pass the amendment, if we possibly can. Let us make this start now. Let us signify by this bill that we have only begun to fight for southern Sudanese freedom.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who authored this legislation and who, along with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), wrote the Sudan Peace Act.

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I thank the committee chairman for bringing this bill forward. I thank the leadership for allowing this bill to come forward. I also want to thank the thousands and thousands of people that have communicated with Members of this body from all across this land in support of this piece of legislation.

It is amazing to me, as the gentlewoman just said a minute ago, how things have changed in such a short period of time; how hard it was a few years ago, and I know how hard it must have been for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) years before that, because of course he was involved with this before any of us were. But I know how hard it was just a short 2½ years ago to get anybody to pay the slightest bit of attention to the issues in Sudan.