

even though many uncertainties still remain." (Page 22 of the NRC Report)

"Without an understanding of the sources and degree of uncertainty, decision-makers could fail to define the best ways to deal with the serious issue of global warming." (Page 23 of the NRC Report)

The NRC exposes the reality that the technical elements of the WG1 report are modified after the fact to make it match up with the Summary for Policymakers. While "most" of these changes were acceptable to the chapter authors, the NRC suggests that "Some scientists may find fault with some of the technical details, especially if they appear to underestimate uncertainty." (Page 23 of the NRC Report)

"The IPCC process demands a significant time commitment by members of the scientific community. As a result, many climate scientists in the United States and elsewhere choose not to participate at the level of a lead author even after being invited." They go on to point out that "As the commitment to the assessment process continues to grow, this could create a form of self-selection for the participants. In such a case, the community of world climate scientists may develop cadres with particularly strong feelings about the outcome: some as favorable to the IPCC and its procedures, and others negative about the use of the IPCC as a policy instrument." (Page 23 of the NRC Report)

"In addition, the preparation of the SPM involves both scientists and governmental representatives. Governmental representatives are more likely to be tied to specific government postures with regard to treaties, emission controls, and other policy instruments." (Page 23 of the NRC Report)

TRAGEDY IN SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to bring attention to the worst tragedy ongoing and occurring in the world today; and that is the tragedy in the Sudan. As my colleagues well recall and are aware, Sudan is the largest country in Africa, becoming the first independent country in sub-Saharan Africa in 1956.

For almost four decades, the African giant with the population of 32.6 million people have been the scene of intermittent conflict. But how many people have really paid careful attention to these numbers? An estimated 2 million people have died in war-related causes and famine in southern Sudan, and 4 million people have been displaced.

Why did these many people have to die? Could we have done something to prevent the massive loss of life in Sudan? Indeed the answer is a resounding yes. But we chose to ignore or to engage only marginally.

We are the largest provider of humanitarian assistance to the Sudan, yet many continue to die. In 1998 alone, an estimated 100,000 people died due to

the government's refusal to allow the United Nations relief aid from going into that country.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some have written and others have talked about the tragedy as a religious conflict or a tribal conflict. The Sudanese conflict, Africa's longest running civil war, is deeper and more complicated than the claims of political leaders and some observers. Religion, indeed, is a major factor because of the Islamic fundamentalist agenda of the current government dominated by the northern-based National Islamic Front, the NIF government. Southerners who are Christians and animists reject the Islamization of the country in favor of secular agreement.

Social and economic disparities are major contributing factors to the Sudanese conflict. But the regime is not merely opposed by Christians or southerners. The NIF regime is a minority government led by extremist clique in Khartoum headed by Al Bashir. Muslim leaders have also been victims of the NIF government over the years.

The NIF government is clearly opposed by a majority of notherners inside and outside of the country. The National Democratic Alliance, a coalition of northern or southern opposition groups, have been actively challenging the NIF government's hold on power since it ousted the democratically elected civilian government in June 1989. In fact, the NIF government came to power precisely to abort a peace agreement between Sudanese People's Liberation Movement, the SPLM, and the majority northern parties in 1989.

But the NIF government is just one of the many obstacles of lasting peace in Sudan, and the second phase of the civil war erupted under the military dictatorship of Nimeiri. In fact, the abrogation of the 1972 Addis Ababa agreement in 1983, which ended the first phase of the civil war in the south by former President Nimeiri, is considered a major triggering factor for the current civil war.

Although, the NIF government has persuaded and pursued the war in southern Sudan with vigor, previous governments, both civilian and military, have rejected southern demands for autonomy and equality. This has gone on for the over 40 years that there has been a push for equality, now approaching 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, northern political leaders for decades treated southerners as second-class citizens and did not see the south as an integral part of the country. Southern political leaders argued that, under successive civilian and military governments, political elites in the north have made only superficial attempts to address the grievances of the south without compensating the north's dominant economic political and social issues and status.

In recent years, most political leaders in the north, now in opposition to

the current government, say that mistakes were made and that they are prepared to correct them. But the political mood among southerners has sharply shifted in favor of separation from the north.

Mr. Speaker, slavery has reemerged with a vengeance in Sudan. The inhumane practice is directly tied to the civil war in southern Sudan that has raged intermittently for over 40 years. The slaving of innocent southern Sudanese citizens have intensified since the National Islamic Front usurped power in 1989. It is now being condoned, if not orchestrated, by the NIF government and perpetrated by Arab militia allies.

Slavery in this time is wrong, but enough is not being done to stop it. The international community as a matter of fact has done very little, if anything, to prevent this terrible practice. Some organizations have resorted to freeing slaves or buying them back. But buying back freedom of slaves by these groups have raised some other questions, and some have said it has increased the trafficking in slaves.

But no one can question the yearning of families to free their loved ones from bondage almost at any price. If in fact one had a child in slavery, would not one want that child to be bought back? Nor can anyone question the moral impetus to provide assistance to these families by means of buying back their relatives from slavery.

The generous response, for example, by school children in Colorado have raised large sums of money for the purpose; and in many parts of the United States, it dramatizes the compelling case for buying back the freedom.

Sudan's human hunters are members of Arab militias and the popular defense forces which the government of Sudan has mobilized, trained, armed and unleashed on the civilian population in their racial and religious war against the southern Sudanese. Unlike the Arabized Muslim north, southern Sudanese are black Africans who mostly adhere to traditional beliefs but whose leadership is overwhelmingly Christian.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Sudan is certainly a major factor contributing to the slavery in Sudan. The war is essentially one of the southerners resistance in fighting against the domination of the north. But it is the government, the NIF government, which is perpetrating this terrible sin.

□ 2310

And until we change the NIF government in the north, this problem will exist. And so what we see in the Sudan in general is that innocent civilians are victims of this war.

In many wars that have been fought, armies fight each other. It is the military against the military. But in Sudan, it is the military against the people, the children, the women. This

is wrong. Just the other day the NIF government announced that it had resumed its aerial bombing of the south, after claims of suspension of these bombings. Who are those being bombed? Of course, children, women, the helpless, the poor, the hungry.

According to a report by the United States Committee on Refugees, the government bombed civilian targets last year 167 times. The NIF government uses the old Russian Antonovs and drops bombs on communities trying to hit schools and hospitals, disrupting the community. All day the community waits and listens to hear whether the planes will come over. And this is a continuous disruption of the community.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the number of people killed and maimed and displaced and enslaved; yet we as the international community have really failed to do anything significant to end the suffering. Over the years, I have visited southern Sudan on numerous occasions. I have been to Yei, to Labone, to Kukuma, to Loki, and on each trip I see the suffering. I must say with all sincerity that I can no longer see these innocent civilians and promise to end their suffering because I must admit that despite all of the efforts that I have done over the years, we have failed the people of Sudan.

But we have also failed other people. We have failed the people of Rwanda in 1994, when the world turned their back as close to a million people were victims of genocide. We cannot say we did not know this was happening. We did know, as we do know what is happening in Sudan. As I speak here before you this evening, more and more people will die. Dozens will be forced out of their homes. Many will be enslaved. Imagine waking up one morning and losing everything you have, your property, your dignity, your family, and, most importantly, your freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to wait any longer. The people of Nuba have become an endangered species. A few years from now, there will be no one left except the barren land. In the past several weeks, government forces burned, looted, and destroyed a number of villages, displacing tens of thousands of civilians. In fact, they attempted to destroy and capture the burial place of the recently deceased leader of Nuba, Commander Yusuf Kowa.

The people of southern Sudan are also being exterminated systematically. The handful of educated southern Sudanese are aging and many have died. This generation of southern Sudanese is growing up in an environment of war and suffering. And unless this situation is quickly reversed, there can be no peace in Sudan. Those who beat the drums of reconciliation must remember the sacrifices paid by millions of Sudanese. There can be no peace if

there is not a just and lasting peace. Indeed, ending the war must be a priority, but we must address the root causes of the war if we are going to achieve a lasting peace. The NIF government is the obstacle to peace, as was the case with Hitler during World War II. They must be eliminated from Khartoum.

Since the development of Sudan's oil sector, hundreds of thousands of people have been displaced and thousands have been killed. Revenues from oil, blood oil, are being used to buy deadly weapons to kill innocent civilians. Foreign oil companies, like Talisman and PetroChina, are collaborating with the genocidal regime in Khartoum. We must put an end to the killing fields in the oil fields of Sudan.

The United States Government cannot ignore or look with indifference on the destructive role of oil development. The extraordinary nature of human destruction and suffering in Sudan and the deep complexity of the publicly traded oil companies in Sudan's ongoing catastrophe mark this as a singular moment, one in which America's moral outrage is appropriately reflected in actions which deny market listings to NIF's willing corporate accomplice. We must finally put an end to allowing these companies to have access to capital markets.

Yesterday, The Washington Post printed a front page story about the devastation being caused by the oil development and the exploration in southern Sudan. It is called, "Oil Money Is Fueling Sudan's War. New Arms Used to Drive Southerners From Land," by Karl Vick, Washington Post Foreign Service. And in the article it says, "Today, four oil companies are producing more than 200,000 barrels of oil a day and more firms are exploring other reserves. Export revenues have doubled the government's defense budget over the last 2 years, and a multitude of eyewitness reporters say that new guns are being used to drive tens of thousands of Sudanese like Veronica and her family off their land to secure the oil underneath it."

"The fighting follows the oil," says John Ryle, an independent investigator, who recently released a report that documented a broad government effort to clear the petroleum concession, sometimes using helicopter gun boats stationed at oil field airports. They all say the same thing, an aide worker said. People came and destroyed their homes and they had to flee. Time after time we hear that from the people, because it is the grab for the oil by this brutal government and these companies that are looking the other way to make a profit from the blood of the people as they drill the oil for wealth.

The fighting follows the oil, as we said. They all say the same thing. They have to flee. The situation has further

stoked Western outrage over the Sudanese government's human rights record. While no American companies are involved, fortunately U.S. law prohibits them from doing business in Sudan, the involvement of Canadian and European firms in extracting Sudanese oil has prompted disinvestment campaigns. And that is what we must do. The same way that we did with firms in South Africa, we must urge our people to disinvest from the Talismans and other companies that are drilling oil in the Sudan.

"These are war crimes," said Eric Reeves, a Smith College professor who works against companies doing business in Sudan. The criticism has fallen hardest on Talisman Oil, as I mentioned a Calgary-based firm that was little known outside of Canada until it bought a 25 percent stake in Sudan's most promising oil field. The Muglad Basin is classical geography for oil, a sedimentary plain exposed by two plates being pulled apart. Unfortunately, the same area roughly defines the boundaries between Sudan's north and the south.

Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the British based NGO Christian Aid stated the following: "In the oil fields of Sudan, civilians are being killed, being raped. The villages are being burned to the ground. They are caught in a war for oil. Part of the wider civil war between the north and the south has been waged for decades, but now oil is a key factor."

□ 2320

This makes it different. Since large-scale productions began 2 years ago, oil has moved the war into a new league. Across the oil-rich regions of Sudan, the government is pursuing a scorched-Earth policy to clear the land of civilians and to make way for exploration of oil by foreign oil companies. The Christian Aid report, "The Scorched Earth," shows how the presence of international oil companies is fueling the war.

Companies from Asia, from the west, including the U.K., have helped to build Sudan's oil industry offering finance, technology, expertise, and supplies to create a strong and growing oil industry in the center of the country. In the name of oil, government forces and government-supported militias are entering the land of civilians, killing and displacing hundreds and thousands of southern Sudanese.

The fact that this is continuing is an outrage. We must focus our attention to that, and in that regard the involvement of Talisman Energy Company has prompted me to introduce legislation, H. Con. Res. 113, which calls for divestment in Sudan's oil companies. It also calls on the President to deny oil companies the ability to raise capital or trade equities in the United States capital markets, and calls on oil companies to freeze oil production. Talisman

Energy's role in scorched-Earth warfare against civilians in southern Sudan has been documented clearly.

A Canadian-British team just back from Sudan has established clearly and authoritatively that Talisman's concession at its air strips, that they are allowing offensive military missions, including attack helicopters to be used from their air strips, gun boats, helicopter gun ships, and it was confirmed by information held by the Canadian Foreign Ministry for over 2 months and leaves only one question: When will the foreign minister, John Manley, halt clearly and start to really pressure this Canadian corporation in its behavior in the Sudan. We cannot allow this to continue. For the most part in the 1990s, the United States and its European allies worked together to contain and isolate the National Islamic Front government in the Sudan, considered by Washington to be a threat to regional stability.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. policy objectives have long been forged in three main areas: the massive destruction to end the civil war; to attempt to stop terrorism which was being conducted in Sudan; and to improve the human rights issues in that country.

In early 1990, the United States attempted unsuccessfully to achieve its policy objectives through diplomatic means. By the mid-1990s, in response to the NIF's defiant attitude and intransigence, the U.S. diplomatic efforts were replaced by a policy of containment and pressures.

This evolution in approach culminated in November 1997 when the Clinton administration imposed comprehensive sanctions on the NIF government after really reviewing its policy.

The sanctions restrict imports and exports from Sudan, financial transactions, and prohibit U.S. investment. This was done by the Clinton administration, and it was a bold move in the right direction.

On August 20, 1998, U.S. Naval forces struck a suspected chemical weapons facility in Khartoum in a terrorist training camp in Afghanistan in retaliation for the U.S. embassy bombings in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. More than 250 people were killed in the embassy attacks, including 12 Americans. The bombing of Khartoum was seen by observers as a message to the NIF regime to stop supporting terrorist groups.

In December 1999, hardliners within the ruling NIF government ousted the founder of the party, Hassan el-Turabi, and his allies from the party and the government in Khartoum. This well-planned move by the NIF leadership was designed to pave the way for rapprochement with the international community and to escape the consequences of U.S. sanctions. Government, eager to reestablish relations

with Khartoum, allowed themselves to see the current NIF leadership as having become more moderate, a very cleverly orchestrated plan on the part of the NIF government to give way to allow European governments to say there is a change in Khartoum, but there was no real change in Khartoum.

In contrast, many observers saw the rift within the NIF as a struggle between the old generation and the younger, highly ambitious Islamists. It appeared that there is little ideological difference between el-Turabi and the current crowd that are running Khartoum.

In fact, those now in power have taken a tougher, more strident ideological stance than the reckless fundamentalists of the el-Turabi faction. Indeed, a closer look at the leadership reveals that this group was the author of the NIF's extremist policies in the 1990s, so there is no change. Only a change to the worse.

Mr. Speaker, the desire of some governments in Europe and the Middle East to embrace the National Islamic Front government under the guise of the changing of the guard in Khartoum is driven in large part by commercial interests, and it is clear European oil companies have large stakes in Southern Sudan and are now operational and on the verge of becoming even more prosperous as they go and explore oil.

Unsurprisingly, officials in the NIF government have given a red carpet treatment to European governments. Despite U.N. sanctions, the U.N. Security Council sanctions which intended to restrict the travel of senior Sudanese officials, members of the European Union began this critical dialogue, as they call it, with the National Islamic Front government regime several years ago, rejecting the U.S. policy of containment of the NIF regime. They saw an opportunity to move ahead commercially, and we have to appeal to our allies that they must also have a standard of dignity and not to allow themselves to be corrupted by these pariah regimes.

This new approach, according to EU officials, seek to achieve reform through dialogue and quiet persuasions without pressure, they say. Supporters of this policy argue that the policy of containment and isolation has failed to achieve its desired objectives. But many observers see the European approach as a synonym for a policy of appeasement, one that too obviously serves the commercial interests in Sudan, once again simply because of the potential lucrative oil sector.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this so-called critical dialogue is empty rhetoric designed to cover those wishing simply to do business with the NIF government. It is ironic and frustrating to many of us in Washington that America's allies in Europe continue to turn a blind eye to the abuses of the NIF government.

Certainly if the objectives of the so-called critical dialogue were to moderate the behavior of the NIF government to improve human rights conditions, to stop the bombing, to end the government controlling the food supply, then we would say fine, let us move in that direction; but it has not done that, and the policy followed by the Europeans has failed miserably.

□ 2330

The government continues to bomb civilian targets in the south. The NIF militia continues to enslave women and children at alarming rates. And the government has become increasingly intransigent in the peace process. They really do not want peace, and they feel the new strength provided to them by the oil revenues.

There were high level contacts between Washington and Khartoum in late 2000, just last year, intended to test and verify Khartoum's seriousness about reform. The United States delivered a road map for the regime to follow if it sought improvements with relations to the United States. Special envoy, former Congressman and former chairman of the Africa Subcommittee from Florida Harry Johnston became that special envoy and visited Khartoum twice to engage the government in discussions on human rights, humanitarian issues, the IGAD process led by Mr. Moi from Kenya, and other areas to try to see whether the government had new ideas, whether they were really interested in having a relationship with the U.S. by ending some of these horrible situations that they have engaged in through the years. The NIF regime balked at any kind of change. And the United States said that enough was enough. There was an attempt to have a lifting of the U.N. sanctions and to get Sudan into the U.N. Security Council as an alternative member, but an aggressive push by the U.S. prevented it in late 2000. That was a victory for us.

What has become clear, though, is that the U.S. and its European allies differ fundamentally on the proper approach to Sudan and basic principles for engagement. We must try to be in sync with our European allies because together we can make a difference in this world, but we have to attempt to get on the same page. Advocates of a tough policy believe that without pressure and support for the democratic forces in Sudan, change is unlikely to come in the near future. Some of our allies in Europe and the Middle East believe that the NIF has changed and further reforms will come through critical dialogue and expanded economic interactions.

The Bush administration undoubtedly will have to weigh both approaches in formulating its new policy toward the NIF regime. Indeed, there are those who are advocating the European line here in Washington, that we

should abandon the tough policy toward the NIF government. They say it has not worked in the past, so we ought to just start to have engagement like the Europeans. President Bush courageously spoke out about the issue in the Sudan on several occasions since he took office. Secretary of State Colin Powell has spoken on this issue more than any other issue in Africa to date. He said in his confirmation hearings that this was an area that they were going to concentrate on. And as I have indicated, he has spoken out against what has happened there.

There are encouraging signs, but the administration must now move forth and needs to articulate its policy clearly. It must do so soon.

I recently read an article about the possible appointment of Chester Crocker, former assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs under the Reagan administration as the special envoy to Sudan. I know Dr. Crocker. He is well known in the African circles. He is extremely familiar with Africa, its issues, its problems. He has studied and taught about the continent for many, many years. And he has a good grasp of the continent.

However, I think it is not the person, it is the policy; and I believe that the policy that we saw as it related to the apartheid government in South Africa, the policy of constructive engagement during those horrible years, lead me to have some questions about whether constructive engagement is the policy at hand today. I fiercely disagreed with the policy, as did the majority of the American people during the South Africa regime.

The constructive engagement policy that Dr. Crocker authored in my view was a policy that did not serve the American people well, and it was really a policy that finally, with the leadership of Ron Dellums, the CAAA legislation was passed, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, in 1986, where many people in the House pushed this bill through. It went through both Houses, but was vetoed by the President. Dr. Crocker, of course, opposed the legislation. And it was the courageous vote of Senator LUGAR of Indiana that cast the 67th vote to override the first overridden law of President Reagan, and the good Republican Senator from Indiana said that it was the only right thing to do to end this apartheid government in South Africa.

We also have people in the White House who felt that Nelson Mandela should remain in prison. Vice President CHENEY was one of only five Members of the House who voted that Mr. Mandela after 23 years in prison at that time should not be allowed to be released from prison. It said nothing about the sanctions; it said nothing about the government of South Africa, just that Mr. Mandela should be freed. Mr. CHENEY voted no. Twenty-three

years was not long enough for a person to be imprisoned only because he wanted the right to vote.

And so the sensitivity of the envoy to Sudan is going to be very important, and it is going to be the way that people view the envoy. When a person was selected to do the negotiations in Northern Ireland, it was a very carefully done process. Senate leader Mitchell was selected to do the negotiations. Senator Mitchell was respected by both the Protestant majority and the Catholic minority. He was embraced by the Ulster regime and the Sinn Fein, the Gerry Adamses and the Trimbles and the Blair government and the Taoiseach government in Ireland. He was a person that did not have any dislike from any group.

I would hope that when we select an envoy for Sudan, it would be the same type of person that Senator Mitchell is. As a matter of fact, it does not have to be anyone who favors the south over the north. I have had the privilege of traveling with a Republican colleague of mine who served in the House, Republican Representative Tom Campbell from California. Mr. Campbell was a person who visited southern Sudan and visited other parts of Arab Northern Africa. He is a person who in my opinion would be the type of person that you would want to possibly be the envoy. He is a person who speaks foreign languages. He is a person who understands both views. He is a person that is not prejudiced to one side or the other.

□ 2340

He is a capable, caring, friend of Africa, who I think would make a difference.

Finally, I would say that tomorrow the House will consider H.R. 20, the Sudanese Peace Act, which I strongly support, one of the original cosponsors. The Sudan Peace Act will reassert the findings from the 106th Congress that the government of Sudan is committing genocide against its people of southern Sudan; that they are employing divide and conquer techniques to further fracture southern opposition to northern governance; that it is helping to allow paramilitary groups to conduct raids and enslave its population.

In the bill, we talk about the way that the government of Sudan is inflicting an ongoing campaign of aerial bombing its citizens, a scorched earth policy designed to drive out people from the land so they can then take the oil revenues.

In this legislation, it expresses a sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should use the State Department personnel to pursue multilateral and bilateral peace processes in Sudan and seek multilateral pressure on all combatants in the civil war and urges the President to use \$10 million appropriated in fiscal year 2001 to assist the

Sudanese opposition, the National Democratic Alliance, the NDA, for funding for office space and equipment and radio and vehicles and computers and staff and political effectiveness training.

It asks for continued support for humanitarian food distribution through OLS, the Operation Lifeline Sudan. But it also urges the President to develop contingency plans should the government of Sudan obstruct food delivery as it has done in the past; that we should have other ways to get food to people who are in need. It requires all businesses trading securities in the U.S. capital markets and operating in the Sudan to fully disclose the extent and nature of their operations, particularly oil operations, and requires the Secretary of State to collect information about the war to keep updated information, including slavery and rape and aerial bombings of the citizens.

So we are hoping that tomorrow this bill will come to the floor and be passed. We hope that this tragedy in Sudan will finally come to an end.

I am encouraged by the number of people now who have gotten on board. I am encouraged by the number of people who have said enough is enough. I am encouraged by the Congressional Black Caucus who have come back to support this whole question of a change in the Sudan.

I commend Kweisi Mfume and the NAACP who has said this practice must end. I commend Joe Madison, a radio talk host, who has done an extraordinary job in bringing to his listening audience the tragedy of Sudan. I applaud Reverend Sharpton who has gone to Sudan with Mr. Madison, and Reverend Faunteroy and Reverend Jesse Jackson who intends to visit Sudan in the near future, and to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) who for many, many years has been in Sudan, probably the leading person dealing with this tragedy. He has done an outstanding job, and I have a great deal of respect for what he has done; and my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) in the House and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), and Senator BROWNBACK in the U.S. Senate, Senator FRIST, so many who have said enough is enough.

The newspapers are finally putting in its newspapers the truth about what is going on there. It has taken a long time. It has taken 50 years to get the attention it should get but it is getting that attention now.

Ebony Magazine will have an article in its August edition. We have schools. I went to a school in Bergen County, New Jersey, where they have a curriculum on the Sudan and it is attempting to get the board of education in that town to adopt a policy of teaching about the tragedy of the Sudan.

So they say if you start me with 10 who are stout-hearted men, I will soon give you 10,000 more. If I start you with 10 who are stout-hearted men or women, we should say today I will give you 10,000 more, and a trip of a thousand miles must begin with the first step.

There have been many steps but they have been quiet steps. The steps that we are hearing now are louder steps. They are more steps. They are bigger steps. They are steps that are making noise. They are people in high places who are now saying this place in the Sudan we have overlooked for so long now it is time for us to focus on it.

We have people who are saying that we cannot allow in this new millennium to have people still enslaved and children starving to death. We can no longer allow in this time and place that we should look the other way as we did when the tragedy was going on in Somalia and when the terrible situation was going on in Sierra Leone and when we saw civil war in Liberia, and when we watched dictators in Nigeria we looked the other way in many of these instances, but finally we are coming together on this question of Sudan.

I will continue to fight for the right of the people of that nation. I will continue to fight for those voices, people who have no voice, those who suffer daily. We all should be concerned. We all have a responsibility. We all must get involved. We all must call our Congress people and senators, talk to our church people and school friends to have our civic organizations and League of Women Voters put this on their agendas. The women's clubs and the sororities and the fraternities all must take this battle on. We must win. We will win. We are on the right side. No longer can the world run and hide. The world must now decide that enough is enough; that this country needs to be brought into the 21st Century.

I hope that tomorrow will be another step in that direction.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness in the family.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BIGGERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, June 13.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 13 and 14.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 13, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2413. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Papayas Grown in Hawaii; Suspension of Grade, Inspection, and Related Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV01-928-1 IFR] received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2414. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of User Fees for 2001 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [CN-00-010] (RIN: 0581-AB57) received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2415. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2001-2002 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV-01-985-1 FR] received June 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2416. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV01-932-1 FIR] received June 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2417. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2001 Tariff-Rate Quota Year—received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2418. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Methyl Anthranilate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-301127; FRL-6780-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2419. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for Fiscal Year 2002 budget amendments for the Department of Health and Human Services and International Assistance Programs; (H. Doc. No. 107-83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2420. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting FY 2001 supplemental appropriations proposal for the Department of Defense as well as two supplemental proposals, transmitted on June 1, 2001, for additional funding for the Department of Defense's Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund and reduces funding for the Department of Transportation's Miscellaneous Highway Trust Fund Account, are now recommended to be withdrawn; (H. Doc. No. 107-84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2421. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report that responds to the Supplemental Appropriations Act regarding the Department of Defense Healthcare Quality Initiatives Review Panel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2422. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the eleventh annual report on the assessment of the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637 nt.; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2423. A letter from the General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exception Payment Standard to Offset Increase in Utility Costs in the Housing Choice Voucher Program [Docket No. FR 4672-I-01] (RIN: 2577-AC29) received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2424. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies for fiscal year 1998, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 284b, 285b(b), 286b(b)(5), 286b-1, 286b-2(a), and 290i-3; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2425. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's authorization request for FY 2002-2003, pursuant to Section 607 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment