Madam President, I try

to come to the floor each week to address

the issue of the ongoing genocide

in Darfur. I am troubled that so much

time has passed and so little has been

done. When a great nation such as the

United States declares a genocide in

some part of the world, I think we have

a moral responsibility to do something.

Imagine, transport yourself back in

time to the genocides that have occurred

in the past. Imagine a declaration

by the United States of a genocide

involving Jewish people and others

during the Holocaust of World War II.

Imagine that we had recognized that

was going on and announced that our

Government knew it was going on and

ask yourself, if we had done nothing at

that point, having made the announcement,

what it says about the United

States.

President Bush and his administration

have done the right thing in declaring

a genocide in Darfur. The President,

a few weeks ago, gave a speech in

which he said we have to go beyond

this declaration to do something. Yet

it has not happened.

I want to give the President and the

Secretary General of the United Nations

adequate time to respond in a

way that will save lives, but as we wait

and negotiate and think about it, people

suffer. Millions remain displaced,

unable to return home. Humanitarian

assistance coming into Darfur continues

to hang by a thread. It could be

snapped at any moment by escalating

violence or chaos in the region.

There were several developments this

past week that reflect the turmoil and

complexity of the Darfur situation.

The shareholders at Berkshire Hathaway,

in Omaha, NE, at their annual

meeting, rejected a proposal that

would have required this giant investment

firm to sell its investment in

PetroChina, the large oil company in

the Sudan owned by the Chinese.

PetroChina is a subsidiary of a Chinese

Government firm known as the China

National Petroleum Corporation. It is

the largest company operating in the

Sudan, drilling and exporting much of

China’s oil. Berkshire Hathaway is the

largest independent shareholder in

PetroChina in America.

The second development was the release

of a new report by Amnesty

International detailing the transfer of

arms to the Sudanese Government.

Many of these arms have been supplied

by Russia and China.

Another thing happened this week:

China announced that it was sending a

unit of military engineers to assist the

African Union peacekeeping mission in

Darfur.

I would like to speak for a moment

about these three developments.

First, the vote at Berkshire Hathaway

was a disappointment. Warren

Buffett is my friend. I respect him very

much. I think he is one of the nicest

people I have ever met and is certainly

one of America’s great business leaders.

I used to look forward, when I

owned one share of his class B stock, to

his annual report. I thought it was

probably the most honest analysis of

business and business decisions that

one could read in the course of a year

in America. I had hoped, when the

shareholders came together in Omaha,

they would decide to make an issue of

this ownership of PetroChina.

The Los Angeles Times, last Friday,

detailed how Berkshire’s investments

in PetroChina are particularly challenging

for the Gates Foundation.

Berkshire chairman, Warren Buffett,

has pledged $31 billion—that is $31 billion—

worth of Berkshire stock as a donation

to the Gates Foundation. That

is an amazingly generous donation to

an organization that is doing lifechanging

work for the world’s poor and

suffering.

According to the L.A. Times, in its

own investments, the Gates Foundation

also currently holds about $22 million

in firms operating in Sudan that

benefit the Sudanese Government.

A Gates Foundation spokesperson

stated that:

These numbers really illustrate the

complexities of this situation, when

even mammoth foundations that do

enormous good work across the world

have to take an honest look at their

own investments. I believe each of us

should do the same. It is not an easy

process. Subsidiaries may be hidden

from open view, and it is difficult to

know what exactly lies beneath the

mutual fund statements we might receive.

My mutual fund statements certainly

have far fewer pages than Mr. Buffett’s

or Mr. Gates’. I have still wrestled with

how to ensure that my investments do

not include funds related in some way

to companies operating in Sudan. I am

trying to make this process honest but

easier for all Americans.

The second development I mentioned

that took place this week was the release

of a new report by Amnesty

International. The report states:

This report from Amnesty International

details the ways in which the

Sudanese Government violates the

United Nations’ arms embargo and disguises

some of its military operations

in Darfur. It offers a number of recommendations

to close loopholes in the

arms embargo and to better monitor

the flow of goods into Sudan. The report

also calls on all states to immediately

suspend the transfer of all

weapons, ammunition, and military

equipment and ‘‘dual use’’ equipment

likely to be used in the commission of

human rights violations in Darfur. The

report concludes that a global arms

trade treaty is needed to prevent the

flow of arms from fueling such catastrophic

conflicts in the future.

We must see what we can do to prevent

future disasters like the one playing

out in Darfur.

Finally, I would like to mention the

third development of the week. The

Chinese Foreign Ministry announced to

the press and in a letter to Members of

Congress that it was sending a unit of

military engineers to participate in the

peacekeeping operation in Darfur and

assist the African Union. This unit is

expected to number perhaps 300 engineers.

It is a welcome gesture.

China has taken other positive steps

as well, such as helping to convince

Khartoum to agree to the deployment

of 3,000 U.S. peacekeepers.

Those steps must be juxtaposed, however,

against some realities: China

helping Sudanese President Bashir

build a new Presidential palace;

against China investing billions of dollars

in the Sudanese oil industry;

against China reportedly transferring

arms to Sudan and seeking expanded

military cooperation; and against China’s

opposition to sanctions against

Sudan.

The international community has to

do more to stop the killing in Darfur.

China has to do more, and so do we as

American individuals and as a nation.

On April 18, President Bush stated in

his speech at the Holocaust Museum

that Sudan had a short time to end its

obstructions and accept a full-scale

peacekeeping mission or face serious

consequences. I applauded that statement.

I have spoken to the President personally

about this statement, and I

told him I believe those words were important

for the world to hear. I understand

President Bush did not impose a

new sanction on that day because he

wanted to give the Secretary General

of the United Nations several weeks to

seek a diplomatic solution.

A short period of time is coming to a

close. I am ready to work with the

President and my colleagues in Congress

to find new tools to bring to bear

in order to stop the violence in Darfur.

Along with several colleagues, I am

preparing to introduce legislation to

provide some of those additional tools

in this effort.

The most effective policy instruments

will be multilateral, meaning

many nations involved in achieving

this goal. But in the meantime, the

United States must act. We cannot let

more months pass while people continue

to suffer.

I hope by next week the President of

the United States will have reached a

conclusion that the Secretary General

has had his opportunity, that the

United Nations may not be able to

broker some diplomatic resolution. I

hope at that time the President of the

United States—and I will urge him to—

will make a decision that we should

step out in terms of sanctions against

the Sudanese Government.

What is at stake? Two hundred thousand

to four hundred thousand innocent

people who were killed—men,

women, and children whose villages

were destroyed, whose homes were destroyed,

children were killed, terrible

atrocities against humanity. Over 2

million people were displaced, forced to

trudge across the desert to try to stay

alive to make it to a refugee camp.

Why? Because the Government of their

country in Sudan has, frankly, ignored

the obvious, that the jingaweit militia

and other forces are killing their own

people. That is clearly genocide, and it

is a situation we can no longer tolerate.

I hope we can find bipartisan support

for decisive action. I hope we can say

to the Chinese: Yes, we applaud your

sending 300 engineers into this region

that is as large as the State of Texas.

Yes, we applaud the public statements

you have made encouraging the Sudanese

to accept the U.N. peacekeeping

force. But the Chinese can and must do

more.

China is the biggest customer in the

world for Sudanese oil. If the Chinese

make it clear they are not going to

continue their relationship with Sudan

unless something is done to end this

genocide, it can make a big difference.

I think it is important they do these

things. Certainly, to condemn violence

on one hand and then sell the arms and

ammunition to the Sudanese that is

being used against their own people is

duplicitous. It is not consistent. The

Chinese should think long and hard

about whether they can serve both

roles and try to convince the world

they are doing something meaningful.

In the meantime, I think we need a

divestment strategy. I think it is time

for the United States, first, to change

the law so State and local governments

can make decisions to divest in mutual

funds, in investment funds that relate

to companies doing business in Sudan.

Right now the courts have stopped that

kind of divestment. We can change

that law, and I have pending legislation

to do that. We need to have our

own policy in this country to put pressure

on the Sudanese to accept the

U.N. peacekeepers—not American soldiers

but U.N. peacekeepers—who will

come to the rescue of these poor people

who are suffering in Darfur. This is a

situation which calls on the United

States to keep its word. When the

President announced the genocide in

Darfur, he reminded us of what happened

in Rwanda. Under the previous

administration in Rwanda, the genocide

occurred which claimed as many

as 800,000 innocent lives. The administration

at that time, under President

Clinton, was warned and took no action,

would not declare a genocide. As

a consequence, the massacre occurred.

We know it could have been averted

with very few soldiers, maybe even as

few as 5,000 soldiers. Supplementing

the U.N. peacekeeping force could have

saved 800,000 lives. It is unimaginable

that we did not respond, or at least

help others to respond.

President Clinton, reflecting on this,

has said it is one of the real disappointments

and failures in foreign policy

during the terms he served as President.

Let’s not repeat that mistake.

I have urged President Bush, with a

year and a half left of his term, and so

many other things that he has to consider,

to remember a promise he made

when he announced the genocide in

Darfur. He said: Not on my watch.

Well, Mr. President, your watch is

drawing to a close, and you have a

chance, you have the power, unlike any

other person in the world, to make a

difference in Darfur. If the Secretary

General of the United Nations will not

respond in a timely way, we must respond.

Some may argue it might fail.

Maybe we won’t succeed, but at least

we will have tried.

I always think, when we come to

these discussions about this kind of

challenge, about one of my favorite

movies: ‘‘Schindler’s List.’’ At the end

of ‘‘Schindler’s List,’’ Oskar Schindler,

if you will remember, was a businessman

who started off with the goal of

making money and then decided that

he had a bigger goal in life, and that

was to save as many Jewish people as

he could by declaring that they were

workers and employees in his plant. He

managed to save so many lives.

At the end of the movie there was

this graphic scene where the workers—

the war was over and the workers were

finally free, and they wanted to show

their gratitude to Mr. Schindler. So

they asked the workers to give up the

gold fillings in their teeth, and they

knocked out the gold fillings in their

teeth and melted it into a ring that

they gave him as a gift for saving their

lives.

There was this touching scene at the

end of the movie where Liam Neeson,

who was playing the role of Oskar

Schindler, was standing by this car

about to leave the factory, and they

presented him with this ring. He broke

down, and his words are unforgettable.

He said: I should have done more. I

should have done more.

I think about that in the context of

Darfur. When it is all over, and history

is written, I don’t want to have to

stand here and ask any Senator to say:

I should have done more. We need to do

something, and we need to do it now. If

it is not successful in ending the genocide

in Darfur, at least we can say we

have given it our best effort. But today

we can’t say that. We haven’t done

nearly as much as we should or could

do to help these suffering people.

When history is written, it will perhaps

applaud our declaration of genocide,

but there won’t be much applause

for the little action that has followed.

It is not too late.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence

of a quorum.