United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *109th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 2005 *No. 81*

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 20, 2005, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 2005

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONNER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 17, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JO BONNER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all, bless the work of Congress today. May the Members of this Chamber and all Americans find true significance in their work and rejoice with coworkers in the final product or collaborative service they produce for the good of others.

As we approach the weekend, we praise You and we bless You, Lord, for all fathers, both living and dead. Their very presence or their memory can instill in us strength wrapped in gentleness, forbearance revealed in practicality, and a self-giving love which is a reflection of Your own infinite life and goodness.

Grant stability to American family life, that children of this generation and the next may know peace of heart, and find refuge from a competitive and violent world in the recesses of home.

May fathers of this Nation be the first and best teachers of their children to find satisfaction in hard work, beauty and strong character, the ways of faith, the joys of family life, and the importance of justice.

This we ask of You, Eternal Father, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KUCINICH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute requests on each side.

ATLANTA'S ENVIRONMENTAL SUCCESS

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for metropolitan Atlanta. For the first time in quite a while, Georgians can breath easier and healthier.

According to the EPA, the air quality in the Atlanta area is better today than it has been for over a quarter century. In fact, the region has made significant strides when it comes to the environment. Custom fuel, periodic automobile emission checks, and curbing industrial emissions have all contributed to these much-improved results.

In fact, the environment is shaping up, and air quality is on the rise all across the Nation. Reports have shown that in the 1990s levels of air pollution decreased, for lead by 60 percent, for carbon monoxide by 36 percent, for particulates by 18 percent, and for ozone by 4.

We in Georgia are on our way to building on this news. Thanks to the commitment made by citizens and business and elected officials, a true partnership has developed. Today I congratulate the hard work of all of those who have made this possible and look forward to even more environmental success in the Sixth District of Georgia and all across this great Nation.

Printed on recycled paper.

THE PRESIDENT IS THE OBSTRUCTIONIST

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the President said, ''Those who obstruct reform, no matter what party they are in, will pay a political price.''

Ironically, it is not the Democrats that are slowing Social Security reform, but the President's insistence on the privatization of Social Security. The privatization of Social Security has become the poison pill to progress.

In a world where retirements have become less, not more secure, people like the security that comes with Social Security, as the United Airlines employees have just told us. The American people have overwhelming rejected the President's proposal for privatization of Social Security. It is time to move on.

We Democrats have retirement security ideas, such as a 401(k) automatic enrollment, direct deposit of tax returns into 401(k)s, a 50-percent government match for savings. Republicans have ideas as well, and we are not all that far apart. But before we can move forward, privatization of Social Security has to come off the table, just like it was removed in 1983, that led to a 75-year security of Social Security.

We can choose to lead, or we can endlessly debate the privatization of Social Security, a plan the American people have already rejected. Let us not allow the President's privatization to stand in the way of progress.

THE NEED FOR SENATOR DURBIN TO APOLOGIZE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, two suspected terrorists were arrested last week for plotting to blow up a supermarket in California. If they are convicted and sent to Guantanamo, they will be greeted by U.S. soldiers who treat them humanely and provide Korans, prayer rugs and nutritious meals.

However, the Democrat whip Senator DURBIN this week slanderously compared U.S. soldiers serving honorably at Guantanamo to mass murderers Hitler, Stalin, and Pol Pot. His statements were irresponsible, disrespectful and, most of all, dangerous.

By likening American troops to brutal tyrants who killed millions of innocent civilians and misrepresenting the vital mission at Guantanamo, the Democrat whip Senator DURBIN has put our soldiers and the American people at risk. His dangerous political diatribe will only embolden terrorists who seek to justify their determined war against our citizens at home and abroad.

Senator DURBIN should apologize to U.S. soldiers and American families for his smear and slander. As terrorists plot to infiltrate our country and murder innocent civilians, American leaders should not embolden their horrific agenda.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward Members of the Senate.

SUPPORT H.J. RES. 55, WITHDRAWING U.S. TROOPS FROM IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a bipartisan coalition of Members of Congress introduced H.J. Res. 55, which is a binding congressional resolution calling on President Bush to begin withdrawing the United States Armed Forces from Iraq on or before October 1, 2006.

This bipartisan binding resolution is entitled Homeward Bound, and it is about bringing our troops home. I would like to cite some provisions of the statement of policy which is in H.J. Res. 55. It says that it is the policy of the United States to announce, not later than December 31, 2005, a plan for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Iraq.

And, second, it is our policy to turn over all military operations in Iraq to the elected Government of Iraq, and provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq; and, finally, to initiate such a withdrawal as soon as possible, but not later than October 1, 2006.

Support H.J. Res. 55. Thank you.

ELECTION DAY IN IRAN

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today is election day in Iran. As cochair of the Iran Study Group, with my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), we saw 1,000 people stand for the Presidency of Iran. But the Guardian Council only allowed eight candidates to actually run.

We expect that Rafsanjani will win this election today, and when we does, with less than half of the Iranian people voting, he will have a choice before him and his nation: whether to continue Iran's policy of lying to the U.N. about its nuclear weapon program, of supporting terror, and continuing a policy of economic isolation and stagnation, or rejoining the international community and spurring economic growth in a new Iran as part of a worldwide community that does not support terror.

Mr. Speaker, we hope, we hope, that the new Iranian Government chooses wisely.

SUPPORTING CHAIRMAN SENSENBRENNER

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago the House Committee on the Judiciary convened a memorable hearing on the PATRIOT Act. Members of the Democratic minority called the hearing. All of the witnesses at the hearing opposed the PATRIOT Act, and, in fact, broadly opposed administration action. Since I was there, I can say with authority, throughout a contentious hearing the Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), was tough, fair and respectful to Members and witnesses regardless of their point of view.

Now, some have called the hearing undemocratic. Well, there were hard issues, strong disagreements, but they were debated under the rules fairly administered. Undemocratic? Hardly. This was democracy at work.

I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for his leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary and am proud to serve on it.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONSTITUENT REPRESENTATIVE OF HON. DEVIN NUNES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Marjorie Risi, Constituent Representative of the Honorable DEVIN NUNES, Member of Congress:

JUNE 15, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Superior Court for Fresno County, California, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE RISI,
Constituent Representative.

HENRY J. HYDE UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Pursuant to House Resolution 319 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2745.

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2745) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 16, 2005, amendment No. 3 printed in Subpart C of Part 1 of House Report 109–132 by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) had been disposed of.

It is now in order to debate the subject of human rights.

Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act. We have seen in recent years a steady stream of reports detailing mismanagement, corruption and outright abuse of the U.N. operations, from the Oil-for-Food Scandal in Saddam Hussein's Iraq, to reports of U.N. peacekeepers raping children in Bosnia and Sudan, to reports of nepotism, cronyism, and financial irregularities in the U.N. missions around the world.

We have seen clearly evidence of mismanagement and corruption, fraud and abuse in this institution. The U.N. Reform Act was developed to address these failings by streamlining U.N. programs, restoring accountability, setting clear budget and operational priorities. These are baseline reforms that many U.N. supporters agree have been needed for years, and that can be achieved within a reasonable timeframe to restore the U.N.'s functionality and credibility.

To drive the process of reform, this bill sets forth a strong enforcement mechanism by withholding 50 percent of U.S. dues if these reforms are not instituted by 2007. With this enforcement mechanism we can ensure that the U.N. lives up to the ideals it was founded to advance six decades ago.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman HYDE for his leadership, for his wisdom and for his statesmanship in developing this legislative package to bring a new era of oversight and accountability to the U.N.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished Democratic whip as much time as he might consume.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the question before this House today is not whether the United Nations should be reformed, but how the institution must be reformed. Virtually every Member of the House agrees with this proposition. If the U.N. is going to retain its credibility, it must implement meaningful reform in areas such as budgeting, oversight, and accountability, and certainly peacekeeping and human rights.

We, of course, are not alone in this assessment. The administration agrees. The congressionally established Task Force on the United Nations, which just issued its report on reform this week, agrees. Even top officials of the United Nations agree that reform is needed, and Secretary General Kofi Annan has issued a broad reform agenda.

It is well established, Mr. Chairman, that the U.N. suffers under poor management, low staff morale, and a lack of accountability and professional ethics. Even worse, the organization has been wracked by scandal; for example, revelations of corruption in the Food-for-Oil program in Iraq, and evidence that U.N. peacekeepers sexually abused women and children that they were sent to protect.

However, administrative incompetence and even corruption pale in comparison to the United Nations's failure to act to prevent genocide, most recently in Rwanda, Bosnia and Kosovo, and, yes, even as we speak in Darfur, Sudan.

Let no one be mistaken, Mr. Chairman, I believe the United States' national security interests are served and strengthened by our active participation in international organizations, including the United Nations, but, Mr. Chairman, we must not flinch from asking, can an organization established to promote tolerance, human rights and the peaceful resolution of disputes long survive when its members cannot summon the will to stop the slaughter of innocent men, women and children, or to enforce resolutions adopted overwhelmingly to achieve international stability and security?

The answer, I think, is self-evident. Specifically, I believe the U.N. ideal is undermined when members refuse to act against an international outlaw such as Saddam Hussein, who flagrantly flouts his obligations under countless Security Council resolutions.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we are mired in a war in Iraq, where the United States is bearing the overwhelming burden to act against an international lawbreaker against whom the United Nations unanimously passed 17 resolutions in 12½ years saying that he was in violation of the obligations imposed upon him by the United Nations, and which they, in a united way, agreed he had not complied with. As I have stated before, the member states of the United Nations must respond to such defiance with more than mere words. They must respond with action.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the motivation of Chairman HYDE's bill; however, I disagree with its method, an enforcement mechanism that would mandate a 50 percent cut in the United States contribution to the U.N. should the legislation's 39 proposed reforms not be implemented. As Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns of this administration told the Washington Post, this approach would undermine American credibility at the United Nations; it would undermine our, meaning the United States' effectiveness.

In contrast, the Democratic substitute offered by Mr. LANTOS is far superior. It maintains, Mr. Chairman, the link between achieving U.N. reforms and withholding a portion of the United States assessed dues; however, critically importantly, it gives the Secretary discretion to make such cuts, rather than mandating them.

As an aside, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that as long as we are a member of the U.N., we have an obligation, a duty, it is in our interest, to pay our fair share. Importantly as well, the substitute provides the Secretary with a waiver to the requirement to veto all new peacekeeping missions or to expand existing missions. To do otherwise, in my opinion, would be a significant mistake.

The Republican bill provides no waiver. In effect, it would block the United States from supporting any new peacekeeping mission, including involvement in a crisis like the one in Darfur, until peacekeeping reforms are completed.

Very frankly, the victims of genocide cannot wait for a recalcitrant United Nations to accomplish those reforms until such time as we act to save lives, prevent dislocation, and maintain the safety and human rights of the inhabitants of some country.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this substitute directs the Secretary of State to withhold 10 percent of our contributions to the U.N.'s peacekeeping budget when the U.N. fails to suspend the membership and act against a member which is engaged in or acquiescing in genocide.

Again, Mr. Chairman, none of us questions the necessity of U.N. reform. Reform is not optional, it is imperative. The underlying bill, however, is an unproductive and harmful response to real problems.

The Democratic substitute, the substitute offered by the ranking Democrat, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), gives us our best opportunity to strengthen and revitalize the U.N., and I urge my colleagues in a bipartisan way, on both sides of the aisle, liberals and conservatives, concerned about both the reform of the United Nations, but also the effective operation of an international organization, our best hope to maintain international law and order, to protect human rights and redeem the promises made when we created the organization we know as the United Nations.

And I thank my friend for yielding the time, supporting this substitute, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005 is, without a doubt, tough but necessary medicine designed to effectuate systematic and sustainable reforms at the United Nations bureaucracies, its missions, and programs. It is serious and refuses to accept business as usual. And nowhere is the need for massive reform more compelling than in the realm of human rights.

Over the years we have heard calls for reform. Time and again they have fallen on deaf ears. In a bizarre rendition of George Orwell's Animal Farm, countries which severely violate human rights of their own citizens are members in good standing at the U.N. Human Rights Commission and as such sit as judge and jury of human rights conditions around the world. ECOSOC, the United Nations body which appoints states to the Human Rights Commission, facilitates this cruel hoax, which guarantees dysfunction at the human rights body, and allows violators and violating countries to continue to be placed on the Commission with no accountability whatsoever because of its secret voting procedures.

Even U.N. officials have admitted the Commission is not doing its job. A U.N. high-level panel in December of 2004 concluded that the UNCHR's credibility and professionalism has been undermined due to the active undermining of the work of the Commission by members with poor human rights records.

In March, U.N. Secretary Kofi Annan told the Commission, and I quote him, ''unless we remake our human rights machinery, we may be unable to renew public confidence in the United Nations.''

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, in March I was in Geneva for the Human Rights Commission for the umpteenth time. I first started going back when Armando Valladares, that great human rights leader in Cuba, was appointed as our ambassador by Ronald Reagan. And I had seen over these many years that that body has gone from bad to worse. There was no resolution, for example, this year on Zimbabwe, called an outpost of tyranny by Secretary Rice. There was no resolution on Turkmenistan, the most repressive of the 55 countries of the OSCE, whose government bulldozes mosques, tortures Christians and closes rural hospitals. And there is no resolution on the People's Republic of China, despite the fact that they have an egregious human rights record and routinely torture and maim, especially those who are political dissidents, and those who practice their faith, whether it be Christian, Jewish, Tibet or the Muslims. China persecutes all of those individuals, by the tens of thousands, including the Falun Gong, and yet there was no resolution on China.

Resolutions, I am happy to say, against Belarus and Cuba were approved, but that was because President Bush himself and Rudy Boschwitz, who led our delegation, and Ambassador Moley and others did a Herculean job of getting countries that were likely not to support them to do so, but it took their personal lobbying. It was not about their human rights records, it was about trying to motivate these countries to do the work that they should have done otherwise.

Even the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Louise Arbour, a former Supreme Court Justice from Canada, told me in a conversation I had in Geneva just a few weeks ago that she believes the atmosphere at the Commission on Human Rights is surreal, her word, and that there is, quote, no intellectual engagement or serious consideration on the issues.

The current model is ill-suited to the task, she noted, in which the Commission is both the adjudicator and the implementor of human rights. She said, and I quote her again, the process needs to reinvent itself, and that is precisely what Congressman HYDE is trying to do with this, very strong language, very strong piece of legislation; to finally say, time to put away the games and speak truth to power, especially to these dictatorships.

I would just point out to my colleagues anecdotally that the Commission on Human Rights so often turns human rights on its head.

Bob Fu, the president of China Aid Association, and a victim of the Chinese gulag himself, who testified before my subcommittee in April, is just one more example of the hypocrisy of that body. Mr. Fu was physically expelled from the Commission when the Chinese delegation objected and said they felt threatened by the electric shock device that Mr. Fu was showing at a demonstration on how China mistreats and tortures its prisoners. His credentials were taken away, and he was given the boot.

But it is not just the Commission on Human Rights that is broken; other human rights bodies that deal with human rights have also strayed from their core mandates and have failed to act against severe human rights violators.

Mr. Chairman, despite almost universal acknowledgment of the problems which exist at the U.N. human rights system, there has been little reform; lots of lip service, lots of we will do it next week, we will do it next year; nothing tangible. In fact, it has actually gotten worse over these many years.

It is clear more pressure is needed, and the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005 is intended to end this deplorable state of affairs.

□ 0930

The legislation mandates that the U.N. adopt criteria for membership on any human rights body. It should be a no-brainer, but this legislation stipulates that countries which fail to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be ineligible for membership. You would think that would be a given. Well, it is not. This legislation tries to ensure that it is a given.

Likewise, countries that are subject to sanction by the Security Council, countries that are subjected to country-specific human rights resolutions, or countries that violate the principles of the human rights bodies they aspire to join would be ineligible for membership.

In addition to the other criteria, the bill mandates that no human rights body has a standing agenda item that relates only to one country or region. We all know what that is all about. Every time I have been over in Geneva, and I know the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and others have been concerned about this as well, there is a whole agenda item that focuses on Israel. And the Israel bashing is unconscionable, while China and other countries get by scott-free.

We had to fight to ensure that Sudan, as the killing and maiming was occurring in Darfur, was even on the agenda. Then there was this attempt made by a number of countries including Sudan and Cuba to water down the language.

Genocide is being committed, and they are worrying about upsetting the apple cart and using language that might cause somebody in Khartoum to be upset.

H.R. 2745 also mandates that the Economic and Social Council, ECOSOC, abolish secret voting, which is an outrage. That is one of the things that ensures that these violator states, these rogue states, get on to the Commission on Human Rights.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that in the Hyde bill there is very strong support for the work of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights and the need to strengthen and expand its authority to go into regions where human rights monitors are most needed, such as Darfur and eastern Congo.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill and to enact the human rights reform contained in this legislation. We need a United Nations which speaks strongly and clearly for the universal respect for and observance of fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of each and every human person, and equal rights of men and women as a foundation for freedom and justice and peace in the world.

More high-sounding words will not help the U.N. reform itself. We need the strength of this legislation to do it, and we have a responsibility to do it as the largest donor and as a world leader in the realm of human rights.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me first commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for crafting particularly powerful provisions with respect to the human rights issue. Let me pay tribute to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), an indefatigable fighter for human rights, for his powerful statement; and let me identify myself with his comments. And let me commend the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for his strong statement on the bill and on the human rights aspects of it.

Probably no issue relating to human rights is as hypocritical as the performance of the U.N. in recent years. The hypocrisy of the U.N. has reached astronomical proportions when it comes to human rights. The leading advocate of human rights, the United States, is excluded from the Human Rights Commission. The most outrageous violators of human rights are placed in positions of power within the Human Rights Commission. And if it would not be so serious, it would be a ludicrous theater of the absurd as we watch the so-called U.N. Human Rights Commission protect human rights violators and attack champions of human rights.

The gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and I stand shoulder to shoulder in our determination to improve the human rights mechanism of the United Nations. We feel that this hypocritical performance of recent years must come to an end. And it is absolutely mandatory that the current Human Rights Commission be abolished and a new human rights entity composed only of countries that respect human rights be created.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in Subpart D of Part 1 in House Report 109–132.

PART 1, SUBPART D AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting Chairman. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 1, Subpart D amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. ROYCE:

In section 201(b) (relating to human rights reforms at the United Nations), add at the end the following new paragraph:

(6) The practice of considering in the principal body in the United Nations for the promotion and protection of human rights country specific resolutions relating to human rights abuses perpetrated by the government of a Member State within such Member State shall not be eliminated.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''39'' and insert ''40''.

In section 601(a)(3)(B)(i), redesignate subclauses (XIII) and (XIV) as subclauses (XIV) and (XV), respectively, and insert after subclause (XII) the following new subclause:

(XIII) Section 201(b)(6).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as has been discussed today, the United Nations is in need of widespread reform. And one area where the United Nations has egregiously failed is its appalling human rights record and its appalling Commission on Human Rights. If this issue were not so serious, it would really be laughable.

The promotion and protection of human rights has been a core task of the United Nations since its founding in 1945. Yet over the years, the Commission on Human Rights has gone from, in fact, being a protector of human rights to an accomplice of dictators throughout the world.

Some of the worst violators of human rights work through their regional blocs to gain nomination and election to this commission in order to protect themselves and their allies from criticism.

This April our ambassador to the U.N. in Geneva said of the process, ''The inmates are very close to being in charge of the asylum.''

Mr. Chairman, the U.N.'s human rights mechanisms frankly are broken. Unless the United Nations recasts its human rights body, it may be unable to renew any level of public confidence. The Hyde bill takes several well-overdue steps to ensure that a future U.N. human rights body does not become the farce that today's is. Under the Hyde legislation, the United Nations would adopt the foundational principle that countries that fail to uphold the universal declaration of human rights would be ineligible for membership in that body as well as those who have been sanctioned by the Security Council.

This amendment would add another important reform in the area of human rights. The amendment simply states that country-specific resolutions shall not be eliminated within the human rights body. And this provision would be subject to the certification and withholding process of the underlying bill.

The amendment's purpose is to thwart attempts to eliminate country-specific resolutions within the Commission on Human Rights or any other future human rights bodies.

Believe it or not, in the recent past, several countries have informally advanced the idea of eliminating these resolutions which highlight the abuses of individual countries. The ''naming and shaming process,'' as it is called, is one of the most effective ways at the U.N. to pressure countries to curtail human rights abuses. Were it to be eliminated, we might as well shut down the human rights body all together, which is exactly what the violator countries would like to have us do.

This issue was brought earlier this year before the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations of which I serve as vice chair. Deputy Assistant Secretary of International Organizations Mark Lagon testified before the subcommittee that ''there has been a disturbing trend against which we have fought for developing countries to turn away from country-specific resolutions that single out and place under international scrutiny those countries with the worst of human rights records. Even more pernicious,'' he says, ''some countries argue for the elimination of all country-specific resolutions,'' and there is a growing consensus among states that practice these abuses, ''except those targeted at Israel under Item 8, the only agenda item devoted exclusively to one country.'' That is what they want to maintain while eliminating all other country-specific resolutions.

The sad reality is that there are countries out there that are working to eliminate what should be the core function of any U.N. human rights body, naming the human rights violators. Unlike this year where there was no resolution on Zimbabwe and no resolution on Sudan, there would not even be the possibility of bringing up a resolution focused on a specific country. Just when you thought it could not get worse. Again, it would be laughable if it were not so serious.

That is why this amendment is important. Some argue that the naming and shaming is too blunt an instrument. Instead, they prefer what they call ''quiet diplomacy.'' More often than not, silent diplomacy is the best friend of states who violate human rights.

When I meet with those who have been beaten and tortured for attempting to stand for election in Zimbabwe or victims of the Janjaweed in Darfur, Sudan, many tell me how much words of support and condemnation from the world mean to them and those in their country who are fighting for freedom.

This important leverage of naming and shaming must be kept if there is hope of reviving the United Nations' standing on human rights. I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me first commend my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), for his extremely valuable amendment, which of

course we are prepared to accept with the exception of the 50 percent penalty provision which applies to all of the amendments that we accept during our presentation of the Lantos-Shay substitute in which we will deal with the penalty provisions.

Without being able to single out perpetrators of human rights violations, the Human Rights Commission and its work is useless.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, from a distance, the United Nations headquarters gleams, its signature glass tower dominating the East River skyline of Midtown Manhattan. But a closer look reveals evidence of decades of neglect. Sandbags and tar paper dot the roof to plug leaks. The Under Secretary-General for Management's office shows signs of water damage. Asbestos hangs from ceilings. The buildings furniture and fixtures clearly date from the early 1960s.

The crumbling infrastructure of the headquarters is a metaphor for the state of the United Nations itself. Conceived in the waning days of World War II, the U.N. is a mid-20th century institution in a 21st-century world. While the U.N. was designed to prevent war between nations, it has been called upon with increasing frequency to stop intrastate conflict and solve the challenges of failed states and terrorism. In this new undertaking, the U.N.'s performance has been unremarkable.

In early March, I visited the United Nations and met with members of the U.S. mission and high-level officials of the Secretariat to discuss the ongoing reform of the world body and to assess the state of the relationship between the U.S. and the U.N. I came away impressed with the urgent need for reforms that I hope will lead to a more effective United Nations.

We need to strengthen the U.N.'s capacity to quickly and effectively deploy peacekeepers to halt and prevent genocides and other forms of intrastate and ethnic violence that have become prevalent in the post-Cold War period.

We need to end the obscene irony of having Libya and Sudan sit in judgment of human rights practices of others. We need to stop member states of the U.N. from dominating the agenda with innumerable attacks on our democratic ally Israel as a means of deflecting attention from the appalling lack of economic opportunity and political freedom in many parts of the world.

As by far the largest contributor in the U.N., this country has a huge stake in the success of these reform efforts. But even as we work to correct the U.N.'s problems, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the U.N. serves so many of our national security interests. U.N. peacekeepers instead of American troops are stationed in numerous hot spots around the globe from Haiti to the Middle East to the Congo. The U.N. helped structure and manage the recent Iraqi elections that were an important milestone.

The U.N. has coordinated the global response for Asian tsunami relief for nearly 6 months. It played a vital role in Afghanistan's transformation from a medieval theocracy to a nascent democracy. And the U.N. has also been a key player in the creation of the nation of East Timor.

U.N. experts have been instrumental in coordinating international efforts to fight diseases that in this age of jet travel move across borders and between continents easily and often with devastating results. These are significant contributions to America's national security, and we cannot discount their importance.

We must push the U.N. to change, but I have deep misgivings about the legislation introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). And as an aside, Mr. Chairman, we use the word ''distinguished'' here very readily, perfunctorily. It is an honorific. It is occasionally a soporific. But in the case of our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), I mean the word in all its sincerity. I think there is no chairman and indeed no ranking member held in higher regard by the members of the committee than our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. Chairman, I feel honored to serve in the same Congress with the chairman.

I believe the bill that we are considering today is too focused on unilaterally punishing the U.N. rather than using our prestige and diplomatic leverage to achieve reforms. If the idea is to use reform as a way to strengthen the U.N., I do not believe this is the right approach.

My misgivings are shared by the administration and by a bipartisan group of former U.S. ambassadors to the U.N. including Richard Holbrooke, Tom Pickering, and Jeane Kirkpatrick. Yesterday, Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns said the bill would undermine the credibility of the U.S. at the U.N.

I will be supporting the substitute, Mr. Chairman, authored by our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

In conclusion, I believe the substitute is a sensible and tough approach that will help us push a reform agenda and give us the flexibility to choose not to use punitive measures if our Secretary deems it is in the national interest.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in subpart D of part 1 of House Report 109–132.

PART 1, SUBPART D AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 1, Subpart D amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. FORTENBERRY:

In title I, add at the end the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SECTION 110. GENOCIDE AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES ACTION.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to ensure the formal adoption and implementation of mechanisms to—

(1) suspend the membership of a Member State if it is determined that the government of such Member State is engaged in or complicit in, either by commission or omission, acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity;

(2) impose an arms and trade embargo and travel restrictions on, and freeze the assets of, all groups and individuals responsible for committing or allowing such acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity to occur;

(3) deploy a United Nations peacekeeping operation or authorize and support the deployment of a peacekeeping operation from an international or regional organization to the Member State with a mandate to stop such acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity;

(4) deploy monitors from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the area in the Member State where such acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity are occurring; and

(5) authorize the establishment of an international commission of inquiry into such acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the mechanisms described in subsection (a) have been adopted and implemented.

In section 601(a)(1), insert ''section 110,'' after ''104(e),''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''39'' and insert ''40''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''ten'' and insert ''11''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, when a government of a member state of the United Nations

is engaged in or complicit in acts of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity, other member states must not stand idly by.

The U.N. is given the authority and mechanisms to discipline such members in article 5 of its charter; yet it often fails to do so.

This amendment explicitly directs the U.S. permanent representative to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to make every effort to see that member states are held accountable. This accountability would include the following actions:

One, suspending the membership of a member state if it is determined that the member state's government is engaged in or complicit in, either by omission or commission, acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity;

Two, imposing an arms and trade embargo, travel restrictions, and asset freeze upon groups or individuals responsible for such acts;

Three, deploying a U.N. peacekeeping operation or authorize and support the deployment of a peacekeeping operation from an international or regional organization;

Four, deploying monitors from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the area where such acts are occurring;

Five, authorizing the establishment of an international commission of inquiry into such acts.

Mr. Chairman, as an active member of the United Nations, America has a responsibility to help strengthen this important body for worldwide deliberation. The spirit of the United Nations is undermined when it fails to address blatant disregard for its own charter. Its very character and effectiveness are weakened. Those governments engaged in crimes against humanity should not maintain their full rights and privileges at the U.N.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their important leadership on the issue of U.N. reform, and the chairman, as well as his staff in particular, for working with me on this important issue of genocide.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, as I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for his very useful amendment. In substance we are in agreement with the amendment; but as I will point out when we offer our substitute, the punitive portions are particularly absurd in this instance.

Any permanent member of the Security Council can veto U.N. action. Assuming that China would veto action in the instance described by my friend from Nebraska, the United Nations would not be able to mount the action called for, yet we would penalize the U.N. for a veto by a member state. That is why the automaticity of the 50 percent withholding is simply illogical. It makes no sense.

The substance of the gentleman's amendment is sound and valid. We have no objections to it, and I want to commend him for his initiative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) will be postponed.

It is now in order to debate the subject of the Oil-for-Food program. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 10 minutes.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think every Member in this House agrees that the United Nations needs reform, and I believe that frankly reform at the U.N. is imperative.

The substitute bill that our esteemed ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), has offered in our markup in many, many ways mirrors the bill we are considering today. It endorses many of the same reforms that the Hyde bill also endorses. But there is a fundamental difference between the two bills, and that goes to the issue of what mechanism do we employ to try to bring about the type of reforms both bills endorse.

Now, the substitute that was offered in committee and will be offered on the floor authorizes the Secretary of State to push for reforms. The Hyde bill is tougher. It requires that reforms be made or U.S. dues are partially withheld. The majority of members on the Committee on International Relations consider that the leverage of dues is the necessary mechanism, and I believe the only mechanism, with a chance of actually bringing about these needed reforms.

Some have suggested that the bill here has too strong a pill in it. This is tough treatment. But I would ask Members to remember that reforming the United Nations is a tough game. Without strong leverage, I am afraid that the Secretary of State's voice would be lost in the din of voices at the U.N. that have resisted reform for years and years.

The Oil-for-Food scandal is the exclamation point when we speak about the need for U.N. reform. I think it is safe to say that we would not be here today promoting broad reform across the U.N. were it not for the magnitude of the malfeasance and graft in the Oil-for-Food program.

It was this scandal that propelled many to take a hard look at the United Nations. The portion of this bill that addresses the U.N.'s systemic weaknesses in its current oversight efforts is particularly welcome. The bipartisan Gingrich-Mitchell report released this week found that ''despite the effort of a few member states, the United Nations remains lacking in oversight and accountability.''

The underlying bill mandates the creation of a well-funded independent oversight board with the authority to initiate investigations into mismanagement and wrongdoing. It establishes procedures to protect U.N. employees or contractors who report allegations of misconduct; and it establishes policies to end single-bid contracts.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on International Relations has been investigating the United Nations Oil-for-Food program since March of 2004. In this Congress, the committee has established the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, chaired by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), on which I serve, which has looked deep into this scandal.

The U.N. Oil-for-Food program was established in December of 1996 to provide relief to Iraqi people who were facing hardships as a result of U.N. sanctions which were imposed on Baghdad after the 1990 invasion of Kuwait. Under the program, Iraq was permitted to sell oil to purchase food and medicine and humanitarian supplies. We entrusted the U.N. to contain a dictator who had used WMD on his own people and invaded a neighboring country.

By accepting oil for food, we put great trust in the U.N. and it failed. Lax oversight and corruption enabled Saddam's regime to raise billions in illicit revenue by requiring its trading partners to pay kickbacks in exchange for doing business in Iraq.

The seriousness of the Oil-for-Food's corruption cannot be underweighed. This program centered on issues of war and peace. Saddam Hussein's regime manipulated this program which helped the Iraqi dictator stay in power. Our country went to war in Iraq which has come at great cost in American lives and treasure. Those who did not

support this policy put even greater faith in Oil-for-Food.

With Oil-for-Food, we are not talking about run-of-the-mill waste and fraud that is standard at the U.N. We are talking about corruption of a program that seriously impacted our vital national interests, interests vital enough to send our servicemen and -women to Iraq.

The issues surrounding the Oil-for-Food program brings into question the ability of the United Nations to conduct a containment-oriented sanctions regime.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay tribute to the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) on the Oil-for-Food investigation. I also want to recognize the work of my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), and the ranking member on the investigations committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

It is now clear that the U.N.'s management of that program was plagued by sloppy administration which led to a failure to detect solicited bribes, collusion with contractors, interference with auditors who were assigned to ferret out abuse.

Even more sickening than these U.N. failings was the behavior of some member states such as France and Russia who jumped at the chance to participate in Saddam's crimes against the international community.

□ 1000

To win Russian support for lifting U.N. sanctions, Saddam granted one-third of the Oil-for-Food contracts, worth some $10 billion, to Russian firms. He also appears to have directed bribes in the form of tradable oil vouchers to key officials on Putin's staff, his former Chief of Staff Alexander Voloshin, and to Russian political parties and politicians, including the fascist Vladimir Zhirinovsky.

With respect to the amendments we are about to debate, we consider generally the amendments acceptable, but the withholding of U.N. dues on an automatic basis makes them in some cases unenforceable, and, in other cases, disproportionate to the events under discussion. We feel strongly that the United Nations must clean up its act if it is to continue to receive the support of the American people and this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain some of the difficulty we face here in the way in which this sanctions regime broke down. Because of the need to maintain consensus within the Security Council and the broader membership in the United Nations, somehow the United Nations inevitably seems to become neutral or perhaps even sympathetic to the very regime being sanctioned, in this case it was Saddam Hussein's regime, and that neutrality inevitably led to loopholes in the program that Saddam Hussein was able to effectively exploit.

When the Committee on International Relations began to look into the Oil-for-Food scandal, I stated that support for similar U.N. administrative programs will be zero unless the United Nations is forthcoming with information needed to investigate this scandal, and that the withholding of this information was a scandal in itself.

We all agree that the credibility of the United Nations is on the line. As reports continue to come to light, and they come to light even this week, they seem to offer more questions than answers. Wherever this investigation leads, the seriousness of this issue cannot be discounted.

Some have argued that U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan is making reforms, so why push him? The fact is that the Secretary General needs help. For one, he is a lame duck due to his necessity of leaving office in 2006. He may not realize it, he may not even appreciate it, frankly, but this bill will give Secretary General Annan the leverage he needs to make reform in his limited time left, should he choose to use it. Nothing focuses a bureaucracy like a threatened budget cut. Sometimes strong medicine is what is needed. This is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill, H.R. 2745. I also believe that these two amendments are probably superfluous. But, broadly speaking, clearly the Oil-for-Food scandal is a problem. It needs serious attention.

I think all of us in this House agree that the U.N. is in need of serious, ambitious reform, but the underlying bill seeks to achieve that reform by assuming once again that the United States can dictate to the rest of the world. The United Nations does need to clean up its act, and it has already begun to do so. It is establishing a Management Performance Board to monitor senior managers, appointing the top U.S. State Department finance expert as the U.N.'s new management chief, and consolidating a comprehensive antifraud and corruption policy, in part based on a recent model developed by the World Bank. These are just a few of the many actions the U.N. is taking.

In short, the organization's top bureaucrats are pressing for reform, and they need to, because the world is watching. But this U.N. Reform Act ignores this reality. It is self-destructive in its isolationism. In shifting funds from assessed to voluntary contributions, the Hyde bill attempts to legislate for the world by circumventing the General Assembly, where budgetary matters must be approved by consensus. Measures such as these breed resentment and weaken our credibility. At a time when the U.S. public image abroad is already suffering, member states do not need a new excuse to think of the U.S. as a bully.

The Hyde bill would halt the expansion or creation of new peacekeeping missions if the U.N. does not meet a very unrealistic time line for reform. Such a move would signal a U.S. disengagement from the world's problems, including the worst humanitarian crisis of our time, the genocide in the Sudan, and it would make the U.S. appear narrowly focused on our pocketbook, rather than grave humanitarian concerns. I would add, the Oil-for-Food scandal is not one where the U.S. has perfectly clean hands.

We have several golden opportunities these next few months to make the world safer and to fight global poverty. We have the G–8 meeting in Scotland in July and the U.N. General Assembly summit in New York City in September. The U.S. should be showing leadership regarding the proposed Peacebuilding Commission, which the administration supports, and increasing the effectiveness and amount of aid. The Hyde bill is an unfortunate distraction that detracts from U.S. leadership and undermines the potential of the U.N.

There is a price to be paid for putting the U.S. at odds with some of our closest allies. Our allies and other nations are going to be less willing to cooperate with the U.S. on antiterrorism or other efforts if the U.S. continues to refuse to be a global team player.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Lantos-Shays substitute, which removes these harmful provisions.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, most Americans probably do not realize it, but most other governments, friends and foes alike, put great stock in the United Nations, for better or for worse, and for this reason the U.N. impacts the United States very significantly. That is why in this era of great challenges, of great threats to our security, we must do all we can to shake the U.N. from the deep failings described by the Gingrich-Mitchell report and referenced in this legislation. That is why I am supporting this bill and asking my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), our distinguished chairman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to the last speaker who used the words ''bully'' and ''legislating for the world.'' The litany of reforms which we

deem essential in our legislation is mirrored in the Lantos bill, so if I am a bully, he is a bully. Actually, neither of us are bullies. We are a couple of nice guys. But these changes that are necessary, we all agree. The only difference is how to implement them.

So I thought I would just make that comment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT)

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that the former Speaker of this institution Mr. Gingrich considers that this is a moment where reform is attainable without the necessity of mandatory, automatic withholding of United Nations dues.

Let me read an excerpt from a press conference that the former Speaker held back on April 15 of this year: ''I know of no occasion where there has been as wide an agreement that the U.N. has to be reformed. I know of no occasion where we have had a Secretary General as open and direct as Kofi Annan has been the last 2 months about the need for reform. And I think the very reason that Senator Mitchell and I were willing to chair this particular project is our belief that this could be a remarkable moment to get some significant things done that will give the world a more transparent, a more accountable and a more effective United Nations.''

Mr. Chairman, I think what is particularly important about the Gingrich-Mitchell task force report is that it does not recommend the automatic withholding of dues. Presumably they agree with those eight former United States Ambassadors to the United Nations, individuals like Jeane Kirkpatrick, who is an icon to many who are of the politically conservative persuasion. And this is what those eight former U.S. Ambassadors had to say, that the base bill would ''create resentment, build animosity and actually strengthen opponents of reform.''

Do we just simply want to ignore their warnings? Do we want to proceed in a manner that is going to defeat what is clearly a consensus in this institution about the need for reform? This is being practical. This is about an effort to secure a more effective, more transparent organization.

The stars are aligned, I would suggest. Yes, as Speaker Gingrich says, this is a propitious moment for reform, and we, I would suggest, could very well derail that effort.

I would like to just make a brief observation about the Oil-for-Food program, and I see my friend, the Chair of my subcommittee, here. Let me suggest that the base bill, and even the substitute for that matter, does not address, if you will, a fundamental problem that very well may be inherent in the institution, because, as I have said over and over and over again, we can reform the Secretariat. I do not think that is a difficult chore. But we ignore the fact that it was the Security Council, the Security Council itself.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations,

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with my colleague and friend that this is a moment, a rare moment, when we actually have an opportunity to get something done that needs to be done. Unfortunately, what we hear from the other side of the aisle is let us pass this opportunity up by not making the demands that we are making contingent upon anything that we do.

In other words, we are now going to make our demands for accountability, make our demands for reforms, which we have done in the base bill, but if these reforms are not implemented, if the United Nations continues in its incompetent and corrupt way, as in the past, there is going to be no penalty for it. If that is the case, what will happen is we will have surely passed up this historic moment to bring true reform to an international organization.

□ 1015

I would suggest that those who think that withholding our dues and the threat of withholding our dues is wrong, because Mr. Gingrich, by the way, supports the withholding of the dues as a tactic, if they are opposed to withholding dues or any other form of implementation, they are not for reform. This requires more than simple talk

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in Subpart E of Part 1 of House Report 109–132.

PART 1, SUBPART E AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 1, Subpart E amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of section 104, insert the following new subsection:

(f) CERTIFICATION OF UNITED NATIONS COOPERATION RELATING TO OIL-FOR-FOOD PROGRAM.—

(1) ACTIONS.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following actions relating to the oil-for-food program have been taken by the United Nations:

(A) The United Nations Secretary General has authorized the release to a law enforcement authority of any Member State (upon request by the permanent representative to the United Nations of such Member State on behalf of such law enforcement authority) or to a national legislative authority authentic copies of any document in the possession of the United Nations, including any document in the possession of a person who was engaged on a contract basis to provide goods or services to the United Nations, that in the judgment of such requesting law enforcement authority or national legislative authority directly or indirectly concerns the oil-for-food program or a sanction imposed on Iraq related to the oil-for-food program.

(B) The United Nations has waived any immunity enjoyed by any United Nations official from the judicial process in the United States for any civil or criminal acts or omissions under Federal or State law that may have transpired within the jurisdiction of the United States in connection with the oil-for-food program.

(2) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term ''oil-for-food program'' means the program established and administered pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 986 (April 14, 1995) and subsequent United Nations resolutions to permit the sale of petroleum products exported from Iraq and to use the revenue generated from such sale for humanitarian assistance.

In section 601(a)(1), strike ''104(e)'' and insert ''104(f)''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''39'' and insert ''41''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''ten'' and insert ''11''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Hyde U.N. Reform Act. I appreciate the work that the chairman has done on this important topic and the work of the entire committee and staff.

I lived in the country of Namibia April 1989 through April of 1990. I worked with government officials and the future leaders of that country as it sought full implementation of U.N. Resolution 435. This experience gave me a firsthand witness of how effective the U.N. can be in ushering in democracy and helping a country in its peaceful and successful emergence from the authority of another country.

Several years later, after the fall of Saddam Hussein's regime, I traveled to Iraq with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE). While we were there, we saw the indulgences of Saddam, his sons, and his friends in the form of palaces and rooms full of booze, paintings, fine china, luxury furniture, and more. Several of these palaces were built and outfitted when the U.N. was supposed to be monitoring the sale of oil in exchange for food and medicine for the Iraqi people.

Sure, the lot of some Iraqis improved marginally under the Oil-for-Food program, but they were the lucky ones, and their conditions went from destitute to impoverished. We cannot characterize Saddam's agreement to the program as being driven by a genuine concern for Iraqis. His intention was malicious at the outset. He only agreed to the program after he was satisfied that he would be able to manipulate it.

My point is that I have seen the U.N. work, but, more often and more recently, I have seen it fail miserably. I will not recount the list of scandals, because it is too long. We have heard all about them already.

Let me just touch on a couple of points in the Oil-for-Food scandal, however, because that is the catalyst for the reform we are talking about today.

The GAO estimates that more than $10 billion of illegal transactions took place under the program. In January of last year, an Iraqi newspaper published a list of about 270 foreign officials, business people, and political entities that have benefited from the scheme, and many of those officials are from countries opposed to U.S. interests. Russia alone received more than $1 billion worth of oil vouchers.

Benon Sevan, the leader, the senior official responsible for the administration of the program, solicited and received on behalf of a third party several million barrels of allocations of oil. The U.N.'s own investigations under Paul Volcker have stated that Saddam's actions ''seriously undermined the integrity of the United Nations.''

The son of the Secretary General was employed by a contracting firm up until the time that the firm won a contract from the U.N. for the program. The Volcker Committee reported that ''Kojo Annan actively participated in efforts by Cotecna to conceal the continuing relationship with him.''

Just this week we are hearing about questionable communications between the Secretary General and that same contracting firm. Two of the senior investigators on the U.N.'s self-appointed investigation led by Paul Volcker recently resigned on principle and said that the inquiry downplayed Annan's role in the corruption in an interim report released in March. So now, the U.N.'s own investigation is under question.

We need effective investigations into this scandal, truly independent inquiries. We also need to serve justice where necessary and where possible under our law.

In the last Congress and once again in this Congress, I introduced the Oil-for-Food Accountability Act with cosponsors from both parties, I believe around 70 at last count. This amendment that I am introducing today contains provisions of that bill.

Specifically, this amendment would create a certification of U.N. cooperation that, one, requires the U.N. to provide documentary evidence to member states investigating the Oil-for-Food program; and, two, to waive privileges and immunities of any U.N. employee charged with a crime associated with the program.

Mr. Chairman, this scandal is far too big and too connected to the U.N. to not include these amendments as part of an underlying bill to reform the U.N. I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as in other instances, we have no substantive complaint about the gentleman's amendment. We believe the automaticity of the punitive provisions are counterproductive, and we will deal with that later on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) to address this issue.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first let me thank my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and I want to thank him for helping really to make some sense out of this entire U.N. reform effort with his substitute.

I rise in opposition to the deeply flawed Hyde bill and in support of the Lantos substitute.

I am glad that we are having this debate on the floor today. I think it is a very healthy debate. I do not think anyone will argue with the fact that the United Nations is in need of reform, but I question the end goal of this overall process with regard to the Hyde legislation.

Is the effort real reform, or is it the Republican leadership's, and I think it is, a very cynical attempt to maybe begin to send the message that we would like to help dismantle or, even worse, begin to pull back or withdraw from the United Nations. I say this because it seems very much in line with public statements of the administration's nominee for the United Nations Ambassador, Under Secretary John Bolton.

As many have observed, the nomination hearings have shown just how much disdain Under Secretary Bolton has for the United Nations and the U.N. system. What message does this send to our allies when such a nomination is made?

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that many of my colleagues on the other side are vocal critics of the United Nations, but I think the Hyde bill turns criticism really into contempt. It ensures that we return to arrears with the United Nations by requiring withholding of our dues for any one of a number of inflexible reasons. In effect, it is my belief that the Hyde bill sets up any U.N. reform effort to, quite frankly, fail. There simply is no reason to link much-needed U.N. reforms with the withholding of dues in such a drastic fashion.

Mr. Chairman, we should work to reform the United Nations, but, at the same time, also work to support the important programs and the initiatives at the U.N. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, contrary to Under Secretary Bolton's assertions, the U.N. has made a difference in keeping the peace and in diffusing conflicts and easing regional tension. But there is more that needs to be done. The Lantos substitute acknowledges this.

Our efforts should be working with our friends to promote peace and security throughout the world. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the United Nations is needed now more than ever. How can our commitment to peace and democracy be taken seriously when the administration's nominee has been quoted as saying such things as, ''The Secretariat building in New York has 38 stories. If you lost 10 stories today, it would not make a bit of difference.'' Or, ''If I were redoing the Security Council today, I'd have one permanent member because that is the real reflection of the distribution of power in the world.''

It is a dangerous and cynical message to be sending on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. I find it incredible, Mr. Chairman. It is very incredible that at the time when we have nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction pointed in all directions, that we would simply be looking to pull back from the family of nations. It is simply a terrible message to be sending to the rest of the world. In an interdependent world like ours, international organizations like the United Nations should be recognized as an indispensable partner not only in the administration's stated policy of spreading democracy throughout the world, but also in helping us in securing our national security goals.

So please support the Lantos amendment. It does achieve what we need to do with regard to United Nations reform rather than trying to blackmail in pursuit of political interests.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, before yielding the balance of my time to the distinguished chairman, let me just point out, if this is contempt, the only difference, because the Lantos substitute is the same substance, is that this maybe is contempt with teeth as opposed to toothless contempt. It is the same bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say, in response to my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), that contempt is not animating our legislation, and I really question the wisdom of penetrating motives, which seems to be a habit with some people. Blackmail was another phrase used. We have a difference of opinion on how to implement the same reforms. That is what we are talking about, what will be effective and what will not.

I do not think we need to question or ascribe contempt for the U.N. We are trying to make the U.N. work. When you pay $442 million a year, you ought to have something to say about how the place operates.

Years ago there was a phenomenon called the Stockholm Syndrome, and I will tell my colleagues about the Stockholm Syndrome later, then.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the observation of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and comment regarding the former Speaker in terms of the issue of withholding. It was yesterday that Mr. Gingrich said, and I am quoting again from reports of his statement, ''Withholding should not be our first resort, but should remain as our last resort.'' I would submit that this is precisely the logic that is put forth in the Lantos substitute.

One further comment, and I am not going to speak of the Stockholm Syndrome, but with all due respect to my dear friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), his amendment is dangerous because he very well might be jeopardizing investigations, criminal investigations that are ongoing now, because we know what happens when this institution receives information. It appears in the press.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) be allowed to make his statement.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A request to extend controlled debate on an amendment must be congruent with the terms of the order of the House. How much time is the gentleman asking for?

Mr. LANTOS. As much time as he requires.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman to be a little more specific.

Mr. LANTOS. I could not be more specific, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) each will be recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Well, I will not abuse the privilege.

Let us get the whole story out on Mr. Gingrich, what he says about withholding. On Wednesday, at the press conference held with himself and Senator Mitchell, Mr. Gingrich stated that he ''supports Mr. HYDE's efforts,'' so that ought to be put into the mix.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in Subpart E of Part 1, House Report 109–132.

□ 1030

PART 1, SUBPART E AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 1, Subpart E, amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BARTON of Texas:

In section 104(a), add at the end the following new paragraph:

(7)(A) The IOB shall review the Final Report of the Independent Inquiry Committee (IIC) into the United Nations Oil for Food Program (OFF). The IOB's review should focus on the adequacy of the IIC's Final Report or any subsequent reports of the IIC or of any possible successor to the IIC. The IOB's review of the IIC's Final Report should address the Final Report's treatment of and adequacy in the following areas:

(i) OFF's operations from inception through the transfer of power from the Coalition Provisional Authority to the interim Iraqi government;

(ii) claims of oil smuggling, illegal surcharges on oil and commissions on commodity contracts, illegal kick-backs, use of oil allocations to influence foreign government officials and international people of influence, and use of funds for military purposes;

(iii) the involvement, directly or indirectly, of any entity, bureau, division, department, specialized agency, or employee (including the Secretary General) of the United Nations, including any employee of the specialized agencies of the United Nations or any employee or officer of the Secretariat;

(iv) the IIC's findings, discovery and use of evidence, and investigation practices; and

(v) the extent of cooperation by the United Nations with requests by Congress for testimony, interviews, documents, correspondence, reports, memoranda, books, papers, accounts, or records related to the Oil for Food Program.

(B) Subsequent to the IOB's review, the IOB shall determine in a written report whether the IIC investigation is incomplete or inadequate in any respects and whether any additional investigation is justified. If the IOB determines that additional investigation is warranted, it shall appoint, in accordance with paragraph (5), a special investigator and staff consisting of individuals who are not employees of the United Nations and to identify specific areas within the OFF to investigate.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to comment favorably on how refreshing it is to come to the floor and be exposed to the civility of the debate between the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). It shows the Congress at its best in terms of debating the high issues before our country. And I want to compliment both gentlemen for their civility and their decorum in this debate.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his leadership on this issue, his dedication to trying to find a solution that reforms the United Nations and puts that body back in the realm that it originally was right after World War II when it was the epitome of world cooperation and hope for the future. Unfortunately, its image has been tarnished, and justifiably so.

My amendment deals with one of the blights on the United Nations, and this is their ill-fated Oil-for-Food program. I was the first subcommittee chairman to hold an investigation on that program back in the mid-1990s under the Clinton administration. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and I, on a bipartisan basis at the time, since he was a member of the Democratic Party, held several hearings in the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. We could see even back then that it was a program headed for disaster.

In the last several years, my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, in addition to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE's) committee and the Committee on Government Reform, have launched independent investigations into the Oil-for-Food program, and I have to tell you that the United Nations does not cooperate.

I can tell you of an incident that happened just this week. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce is going to hold a hearing in the near future in which we try to bring to light some more of the corruption in that program. We have not deposed, but we have interviewed a U.N. employee who wants to testify, volunteers to testify, on the record. So I had my chief of staff call Paul Volcker, distinguished former Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, and ask Mr. Volcker if this particular individual could testify. Mr. Volcker said he could not. Here is the person appointed by the U.N. to get to the bottom of the corruption in the Oil-for-Food program, distinguished former Chairman of the Federal Reserve System of the United States of America, and he refused to let an employee of the U.N.,

who wanted to testify, testify before a committee of the Congress of the United States. I think that is inexcusable.

So what my amendment would do, if accepted, and my understanding is that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) would accept it, and I hope that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) would also accept it, would simply say that this independent oversight board that the base bill creates has to conduct a thorough investigation of Mr. Volcker's investigation and any successor investigations, and it sets out some guidelines, the most important of which is that the U.N. has to cooperate with congressional committees and their request for testimony, interviews, documents, correspondence, memoranda, books, papers, accounts and records related to the Oil-for-Food program; and if they do not, then we can require, again under the auspices, under the base bill of the oversight board, that an independent committee has to be appointed that is made up not of U.N. officials, not of U.N. employees.

That is all the amendment does. It attempts to get to the bottom of the Oil-for-Food scandal by requiring that they cooperate with the various congressional committee investigations underway, and if they do not, that we have to appoint another board outside the U.N. to get the investigation on track.

I hope that we accept this on a voice vote by unanimous consent. I am told that it is going to be supported by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and I strongly appreciate his support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for a very useful amendment, which we will be pleased to accept on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise as well to reflect on the words of the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a distinguished friend, as I heard him this morning acknowledging the relationship, but also the excellence between the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Ranking Member LANTOS) and referring to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) as one of the more outstanding Members of this body. And I associate myself with those words and thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his service and as well his leadership on a number of issues.

I think this question of U.N. reform is a difficult question, and I think it is an important question. I am reminded of my history and my childhood. My history tells me that President Wilson's effort at the League of Nations, if it had succeeded, we might have had a better life, and we might not have had World War II and the tragedy of the Holocaust. But it failed.

And so we come now to the United Nations, almost 60 years old. And I am reminded of Ralph Bunche, one of the first African Americans to serve at the United Nations and to be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, how proud so many of us were as we read that in history, knowing that the United Nations was reflective of the world's diversity and its concerns and its policies. So I think the United States is better off because the United Nations exists.

And the Lantos substitute, in essence, captures that spirit, the spirit of the necessity of reform, but yet that we are better off because the United Nations exists. It appropriately gives the right kind of stick, and that stick, Mr. Chairman, deals with providing the guidelines, the regulations, the standards, the moral compass, but it gives the Secretary of State, the chief diplomat of the United States, the discretion to withhold funds, and so that Secretary of State can engage on the world forum and speak with their fellow foreign ministers and discuss a world that would be better off with peace.

In addition, I am gratified that the Lantos amendment thoughtfully does not give an automatic cut-off of new U.N. peacekeeping missions. How many of us are reflecting on our life and wish that we had been in a place, in a position to go into Rwanda and save the million lives? The U.N. did not act. The world did not act as we would have preferred it to act. The peacekeepers could not stop the violence. And so reforms are necessary, but we know that peacekeeping is necessary.

Those many Members of Congress who have gone into the refugee camps, as I have done in Chad, and seen that the only body that was there was a representative of the U.N. High Commission on Refugees, the only physical body that could get into help the starving people of Sudan.

And the Lantos amendment substitute has compassion and heart, and it has a strong voice and a strong stick. That is the balance of diplomacy that we need. That is why I ask my colleagues to support the Lantos substitute, because the United Nations makes the world better. It makes America better. And we, as leaders of the world and world peace, need to work with the United Nations, a strong United Nations and a reformed United Nations. Vote for the Lantos substitute.

I rise in strong support of the Lantos Substitute to United Nations Reform Act of 2005. The goal of reforming the United Nations to be a stronger and more effective organization is a worthy one, one which the Secretary-General is working towards, a goal which most nations of the world are in favor of. This substitute amendment will help alter a bill that has a worthy goal, but which is flawed in its method of achieving those goals.

The Hyde bill on U.N. reform contains many serious flaws which if implemented would not be welcome by the international community. Peacekeeping is one such area where this bill contains deeply flawed logic. The Hyde bill points to peacekeeping reforms that everyone agrees are needed. These reforms are in fact endorsed by the U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations and in most cases, these reforms are already underway to address recent concerns raised about sexual exploitation and abuse in peacekeeping missions. However, the Hyde bill says that starting this fall, the United States must prevent the expansion of existing missions or the creation of any new U.N. peacekeeping missions until all specified reforms are completed and certified by the Secretary of State. The truth is that some of these requirements simply cannot be met by the fall. True reform takes time. Reforms will require careful implementation at the U.N. as well as by the 100-plus troop contributing countries, and in some cases will require additional U.N. staff and funding which of course is not provided by this legislation. And yet, the Hyde bill will likely prevent Security Council resolutions to enable the creation or expansion of important U.N. missions in places like Darfur in Sudan, Haiti, Congo and Afghanistan. We as the United States of America have always prided ourselves on helping those who cannot help themselves, on aiding those who are being massacred simply because of who they are, but now this bill seeks for our Nation to turn a blind eye to these people. We, as the 109th Congress cannot allow ourselves to be the ones who cut off assistance to these desperate people.

Not only does the Hyde bill take a wrong approach to peacekeeping, but it will also create great problems with the budget at the United Nations. The Hyde bill claims to ''pursue a streamlined, efficient, and accountable regular assessed budget of the United Nations,'' yet in reality the approach taken by the bill will wreak havoc on the U.N. budget process and will result in the automatic withholding of U.S. financial obligations to the U.N. regular budget. This flawed bill attempts to shift funding for 18 specific programs from assessed contributions to voluntary contributions. To achieve these goals, the bill mandates the withholding of up to $100 million in U.S. dues to the U.N. regular budget. While this idea may have merit, the U.S. should work with its allies to advance it through the Budget Committee at the U.N. instead of starting from the point of . withholding dues, which should be our Nation's last resort. Furthermore, the Hyde proposal links 50 percent of U.N. dues to a list of 39 conditions, not only at the U.N. Secretariat, but also at various U.N. specialized agencies over which the U.N. has no direct control. All of this will create a new U.S. debt at the U.N., since many of the conditions are so rigid and specific that they are not achievable. In the end, all that any of this will do is create resentment towards the United States in the international community. As the Washington Post editorialized, ''This is like using a sledgehammer to drive a nail into an antique table: Even if you're aiming at the right nail, you're going to cause damage.''

The Hyde bill also calls for certain steps supported by the U.N. and the U.S., such as

the strengthening of the U.N.'s oversight function, the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission, and reforms in U.N. peacekeeping. However, it calls for these reforms to be funded solely within existing resources. If the U.S. withholds dues as this bill calls for, even less funding will be available to support these reforms. This bill also calls for the creation of new positions in several departments, including the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, without allowing resources to fund these positions.

The Lantos substitute is a more constructive and cooperative approach to U.N. reform. This is not a time when the United States needs to be taking an aggressive approach against the United Nations and the international community. The Lantos bill gives the Administration much more flexibility to negotiate the reform proposals with other Member States, and references the withholding of dues as an option of the Administration rather than something that will occur automatically.

The Lantos substitute also waives certain provisions of the Hyde bill if it is in the national security interests of the United States. This is particularly important when it comes to the provisions on U.N. peacekeeping, since new or expanded missions may be necessary to support international peace and stability. We can not predict where or when we will have to mobilize the international community next and in this world of uncertainty we need to have flexibility instead of the rigid and overly harsh approach of the Hyde bill.

The Lantos substitute amendment does not completely alter the United Nations Reform Act. The Lantos substitute supports many of the same reforms as the Hyde bill—such as the inclusion of Israel as a full Member State at the U.N., a series of reforms to address recent problems in U.N. peacekeeping, overhaul of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, and administrative and management reforms necessary to make the U.N. more effective, transparent and accountable. Clearly, those who believe in the United Nations as a tool of international cooperation can get behind the Lantos substitute. We as a Nation, should all support the United Nations because it is a tool of international cooperation, an ideal to which we should all aspire.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 90 seconds.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I find it ironic that the Volcker action is supported by a former Attorney General of the United States, Dick Thornburgh, in a very thoughtful op ed piece, because he understands what investigations are about.

I would describe the amendment put forth by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) as the tip-off amendment. Give the information so that in the course of an investigation, those who might be targets or subjects of an investigation know what you have and can anticipate the questions.

I would also comment, and I have never met Mr. Volcker, but I have read the reports to date. They have been extremely harsh and critical and underline the need for reform.

At the same time, a comment was made, and I think it has to be addressed. Everyone involved in the independent inquiry under the leadership of Mr. Volcker and the jurists from South Africa is not a United Nations employee. In fact, many of them are former career Federal prosecutors from our own Department of Justice. I had an opportunity to discuss this matter with them. They understand how to conduct an investigation. Let them conclude their investigation, and then I am sure they would be happy to disseminate any documents they might have.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we all vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. CHABOT:

In title I (relating to the mission and budget of the United Nations), add at the end the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 110. ANTI-SEMITISM AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to—

(1) ensure the issuance and implementation of a directive by the Secretary General or the Secretariat, as appropriate, that—

(A) requires all employees of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to officially and publicly condemn anti-Semitic statements made at any session of the United Nations or its specialized agencies, or at any other session sponsored by the United Nations;

(B) requires employees of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to be subject to punitive action, including immediate dismissal, for making anti-Semitic statements or references;

(C) proposes specific recommendations to the General Assembly for the establishment of mechanisms to hold accountable employees and officials of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, or Member States, that make such anti-Semitic statements or references in any forum of the United Nations or of its specialized agencies; and

(D) develops and implements education awareness programs about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism throughout the world, as part of an effort to combat intolerance and hatred;

(2) work to secure the adoption of a resolution by the General Assembly that establishes the mechanisms described in paragraph (1)(C); and

(3) continue working toward further reduction of anti-Semitic language and anti-Israel resolutions in the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the requirements described in subsection (a) have been satisfied.

In section 601(a)(1), insert ''section 110,'' after ''104(e),''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''39'' and insert ''40''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''ten'' and insert ''11''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, first let me commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), our most distinguished colleague, for his outstanding leadership in bringing this well-crafted and much-needed legislation to the floor.

Since being elected to Congress almost 11 years ago, I have had the distinct honor of serving on both of the committees that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) has led, first the Committee on the Judiciary, and now the Committee on International Relations. And I can sincerely say that I have not served with a more honorable and decent man. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your great service to our country.

I am pleased to be offering this amendment today with another distinguished and universally respected Member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, and it is an honor to be doing this amendment with him.

I am pleased to be offering the amendment. Our amendment would add a new section to this legislation requiring the U.S. delegation to the U.N. to make every effort to officially and publicly condemn anti-Semitic statements made at any session of the United Nations. It requires U.N. employees to be subject to punitive actions, including immediate dismissal, for making anti-Semitic statements or references. It requires the development of educational awareness programs about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism throughout the world, and it requires a certification that these requirements have been carried out.

The United Nations has for some time been a breeding ground for the dissemination of anti-Semitic and anti-Israeli propaganda. It took 16 years to reverse a General Assembly resolution that declared Zionism to be a form of racism and racial discrimination. And it was only reversed after considerable pressure from the United States, coupled with Israel's decision to make its

participation in the Madrid Peace Conference conditional upon repeal of that resolution.

As noted in H. Res. 282, a bipartisan resolution introduced by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia, and adopted in this body last week, the U.N. Human Rights Commission took several months to correct in its record a statement by the Syrian Ambassador that Jews allegedly had killed non-Jewish children to make unleavened bread for Passover.

If that were not enough, the president of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in 1997 refused to challenge an assertion made by the Palestinian observer that the Government of Israel had injected 300 Palestinian children with the HIV virus. What an absurdity.

Speaking from experience, Mr. Chairman, I can assure my colleagues of the anti-Israel activity at the U.N. In 2001, I was honored to be nominated by President Bush to serve as one of the two congressional representatives to the U.N., along with the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

□ 1045

During the year-long appointment, I traveled back and forth from New York several times to meet with our ambassador at that time, John Negroponte, and our diplomatic delegation.

On one occasion, I went to New York to participate in a special summit on children. Throughout the conference, we discussed resolutions on childhood disease, HIV/AIDS, humanitarian assistance, child trafficking, and other critical issues. Throughout the final day, our delegation trudged through the minutiae of resolutions in committee and in plenary session. Aside from the occasional objection to a comma or a whereas from the Chinese or the French, the day passed uneventfully, or so I thought.

As I was getting ready to leave that evening, I learned from our diplomatic corps that the real battle was not fought in the committees or on the floor. It was fought behind the scenes as our American delegation successfully fought off an attempt from the Arab bloc to deny Israel its credentials to even participate in the children's summit. So much for the children.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, even though I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment of my friend from Ohio.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) claims the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For years, it has been a pathological preoccupation of the United Nations to engage in isolating and persecuting the democratic State of Israel. Weeks before 9/11 in Durban, South Africa, an international conference was called under U.N. auspices to deal with the subject of racism and anti-Semitism; and a conference which was designed with noble goals turned into a lynching party, the target of it being the State of Israel.

I think the gentleman's amendment is long overdue; and the responsibility of our representative at the United Nations to oppose in any form anti-Semitism and the singling out of the State of Israel for persecution and denunciation is long overdue.

My expectation is that statements such as the ones we heard from Mr. Brahimi, Kofi Annan's representative to Iraq earlier this year, will no longer be heard or be allowed to be made.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It provides additional support for the one democratic state in the Middle East and prevents the recurrence of the upsurge of anti-Semitism which under Hitler led to the Holocaust in many countries of the world.

This is a singularly useful amendment, and I ask all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for offering this very important amendment, which would hopefully lead to the creation of a code of conduct to ensure that U.N. employees and officials, as well as U.N. member states, reduce, hopefully eliminate absolutely, anti-Semitic language and anti-Semitic resolutions.

I point out to my colleagues, we have had an ongoing series of hearings in my subcommittee, as well as in the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, concerning this spike in anti-Semitism that we have seen.

The first hearing we held was back in 1995, and then in 2002 we saw a particularly alarming spike in countries that make up the OSCE region, particularly in France and the Netherlands and some of these other countries.

Part of it is some of the hatred is being carried by emigres into their new home, that is to say, France and places like that; and as was pointed out by my colleague, some of the absolute, some of the most despicable, slanders against Jewish people are being carried uncontested.

We now, in the OSCE, have had three major summits. Last week in Spain in Cordova at a summit, nations sent ambassadors and heads of states and foreign ministers to Spain, as we did in Vienna and as we did in Berlin last year, to look at what the best practices ought to be to try to end this scourge of anti-Semitism; and very good action plans have been adopted.

The U.N. needs to take a page out of the OSCE and develop the kind of action plans and sensitivity to this terrible prejudice because, if left unchecked, it will fester and lay the seeds for acts of violence against Jews as well as desecration of cemeteries, as well as synagogues.

So let me finally say that last year, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), Senator VOINOVICH, and I all crafted the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act, which created an office within the State Department and also mandated that global reports be done. I urge Members to read those reports, one of which just came out earlier this year. It is a very, very disturbing read about this growing menace of anti-Semitism; and the U.N., rather than being a part of the solution, has for too often been part of the problem.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for his comments.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time 60 years ago, at the end of the war that took the lives of 30 million people, when the ancient sin of anti-Semitism seemed finally to have exhausted its appeal, even among the most hateful of men.

When it was hoped, at long last, that Jews could take their place among the other free peoples of the world, that they could rise from their unique experience in that war, live their lives and pursue their happiness free from the genocidal evil that haunted our race.

In the decades since, however, that hope has been ignored, undermined, and even attacked by two generations of U.N. bureaucrats and diplomats who remind one of Yeats's observation: ''The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity.''

The best, in this case, is the world's effete, elite diplomatic corps, among whom anti-Semitism is considered a harmless amusement, like smoking or bribery.

The worst, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, are the leaders and legitimizers of a bloody cult, bent not only on the destruction of Israel but on the slaughter of the Jewish people.

Either in the interests of consensus or for more malicious ends, the institutions of the United Nations have become infected by a relentless hostility to Israel, Zionism, and Jews themselves.

The U.N., which could not bring itself to offer even the mildest rebuke to the

aggressors in three wars aimed at Israel's destruction or even against the campaigns of terror waged against Israeli civilians, has littered Lower Manhattan with its countless condemnations of Israel's self-defense.

The U.N., whose charter calls on all nations to ''practice tolerance and live together in peace,'' for 2 decades declared that ''Zionism is a form of racism.''

The U.N. General Assembly has hosted countless forums for slander against Jews, like the charge that Israel had injected Palestinian children with the HIV virus, that contain no mention of the deceitfulness of the attacks.

In too many parts of the world, Mr. Chairman, including those parts which should be most sensitive to unchecked anti-Semitism, the U.N.'s tolerance of such hostility is dismissed as diplomatic necessity. It is, instead, diplomatic terrorism.

Hatred of Jews, unchecked, begets violence against Jews; and violence against any race of people ultimately leads to violence against all races of people.

The United Nations should know better than to allow its institutions to be poisoned by hatred.

Hopefully, this amendment by the gentleman from Ohio will help the U.N. learn that valuable lesson.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) will be postponed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2745) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO OFFER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2745, HENRY J. HYDE UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005, OUT OF THE SPECIFIED ORDER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2745, pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), or his designee, may be permitted to offer the amendment numbered 5 in Part 2 of House Report 109–132 out of the specified order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

HENRY J. HYDE UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2745.

□ 1057

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2745) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132 by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) had been postponed.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2 AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2 amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. PENCE:

In section 101, add at the end the following new subsections:

(e) SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to ensure that the difference between the scale of assessments for the five permanent members of the Security Council is not greater than five times that of any other permanent member of the Security Council.

(f) DENIAL OF USE OF VETO.—If the Secretary of State determines that a permanent member of the Security Council with veto power is not in compliance with the requirement described in subsection (e), the President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to deny to such permanent member the use of the veto power of such permanent member until such time as such permanent member satisfies the requirement of such subsection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized on his amendment.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with an amendment that I believe brings fairness and common sense to the United Nations and specifically to the administration of the Security Council.

The Security Council is tasked with some of the most difficult decisions in the United Nations. Of the 15 member states that serve on the council, only five have veto power. These nations are China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset, I realize the United States has the largest economy in the world. We pay more in assessed dues to the United Nations than any other member state, but I do not believe that all nations are able to pay equally to the U.N. However, those member states, I would humbly offer today, that serve as permanent members on the Security Council with veto power should be assessed equally balanced dues to the United Nations.

Where I grew up down south of Highway 40 we have an old saying that you have got to pay to play; but that is not the way it really works at the United Nations, at least with regard to the veto power of the Security Council.

The United States, for instance, was assessed dues in the last year of approximately $440 million, 22 percent of the U.N.'s total assessment. China, a country home to over 1 billion people, with a rapidly growing economy, was assessed dues of $36.5 million or 2.1 percent of the U.N. assessment.

□ 1100

Let me say again, the United States' $440 million, 22 percent of the U.N.'s assessment; and China, a voting member with veto power on the Security Council, paid just $36 million, less than 10 percent, and with only 2.1 percent of the U.N.'s assessment.

The Pence amendment today would direct the President of the United States to have the United States' permanent representative to the U.N. use the voice vote and influence of the United States to make every effort to ensure that the difference between the scale of assessments of the five permanent members of the Security Council is not greater than five times that of any other permanent member of the Security Council.

In addition to that, if the Secretary of State determines a permanent member of the Council with veto power is not in compliance with that requirement, the President could direct the U.S. permanent representative of the U.N. to use his voice vote and influence to make every effort to deny such permanent member the use of veto power.

Not only does common sense and fairness argue for the Pence amendment, but there are serious issues that will come before the Security Council

in the immediate future. For instance, China is, in many respects, acting on the global scene contrary to U.S. interests. Recently China state-owned oil companies began massive investments in Iran's energy sector. This is in direct violation of the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act. In the event serious decisions have to be made on the Security Council on U.N. sanctions against Iran, China and Russia, who have complicated relationships with Iran, are almost certainly to veto any measure. They can play, but they do not have to pay.

If China and Russia will have an equal right to veto tough action at the Security Council, should they not also, Mr. Chairman, have an equal obligation to support the work of the United Nations in the form of dues?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Pence amendment to bring justice and fairness and common sense to the assessment of dues at the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to commend my friend from Indiana for presenting this very useful amendment, which we are very pleased to accept.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, Cordell Hull is the father of the United Nations, and has been recognized as such. His birthplace is located in the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee, where he served as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Mr. Hull received the Nobel Peace Prize as a result of his work forging the alliances to establish the United Nations. He had observed the failures of the League of Nations and, as a result, saw the unleashing of the horrible occurrences of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise today to honor Mr. Hull, although it would be fitting to do so. It is my firm belief that the United Nations has prohibited a third world war. We today are at the edge of an attempt to undermine this viable world organization that has perhaps saved us from a catastrophic confrontation between the countries of the world. As we debate these issues, 6 million souls of those whose lives were taken during the Holocaust are crying out for us to preserve this vehicle that has carried the message of peace in the world. The souls of tens of millions, both civilians and soldiers, who lost their lives during World War II are also being felt, I believe, inside this Chamber.

The United Nations has been an entity of the world that we have looked to as we have confronted aggressor nations. I recall as a boy the young men from our community who went to Korea in what was called a U.N. police action. The U.N. also played a major role after Iraq invaded Kuwait, when the nations of the world came together to demanded Saddam Hussein and his army withdraw from that country, and then authorized military action that successfully forced Saddam and his army from Kuwait.

After the September 11 attack, Congress authorized the President and this current administration to invade Iraq if there was evidence that Saddam's thugs were a threat to America, possessed weapons of mass destruction, or had been training the terrorists that attacked this country. This Congress had confidence in the current administration and their abilities to make decisions involving Iraq, and we gave them that authority.

The Lantos substitute puts us in exactly the same posture of confidence in this President as the Iraqi resolution. The Lantos substitute gives the President and this administration the right to withhold funds from the leaders of the U.N. if they do not adhere to the concerns we have in this Congress.

It is difficult for me to see how any Member of Congress who voted to authorize the President to invade Iraq and gave him and his administration that authority would today show a lack of confidence in this administration. We need to be sure the leaders of the U.N. understand our disenchantment with many of the occurrences that have happened. But to cripple this viable world organization that has ministered to the lesser amongst us, fed the hungry, housed the homeless, clothed the naked, cured the sick, provided clean water and a safe environment for many in the world is something America cannot afford to lose.

Bear in mind, my support of the U.N. will never include letting the United Nations impose in any way on the sovereignty of this Nation, as our Constitution would prohibit. Mr. Chairman, I encourage adoption of the Lantos substitute.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Colleagues, there is an old saying south of Highway 40: You have to pay to play. Having an equal veto on the Security Council when the United States pays ten times what China pays is unfair to the American people. It is unjust, and it defies logic. The Pence amendment will amend this inequity.

If China and Russia will have the equal right to veto tough action at the Security Council level, they should also have the equal obligation to support the work of the United Nations in the form of dues.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to pass and accept the Pence amendment, and I thank the gentleman from California for his gracious acceptance, compliments, and leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in Part 2 House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2 Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

In section 107(b)(2), add at the end the following new subparagraphs:

(E) The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories.

(F) Any other entity the Secretary determines results in duplicative efforts or funding or fails to ensure balance in the approach to Israeli-Palestinian issues.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), our chairman, for his extraordinary leadership in bringing this important legislation which reforms the United Nations to the House floor today. It has been an honor for me to serve on the Committee on International Relations with Chairman HENRY HYDE, a legendary gentleman of public service. I also appreciate the civility of my neighbor, the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. Chairman, for too long the United Nations has taken an unbalanced approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Nongovernmental organizations and commissions within the U.N. that monitor human rights abuses have often resorted to an anti-Israel campaign under the guise of protecting

human rights. As a result, numerous organizations exist within the U.N. that are not constructively engaged in establishing peace in the Middle East, but, rather, serve to continue inflaming anti-Israel sentiment throughout the region due to one-sided reporting of human rights abuses.

Chairman HYDE's legislation in section 107(b)(2) seeks to end duplicative efforts and fundings to organizations within the U.N. that focus on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The legislation requires the Secretary of State within 60 days of enactment to audit the enlisted organizations and report to the appropriate congressional committees recommendations to eliminate these duplicative efforts.

My amendment adds The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories to the list of organizations that are to be audited and reported upon. This Committee was established by the U.N. General Assembly in 1968. In its most recent report dated September 23, 2004, it notes that the Palestinian people's hopes for their own homeland and a better future have been considerably diminished.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The prospects of Palestine and Israel living side by side in peace for mutual benefit grows stronger every day as world leaders continue to work together to resolve this conflict. This Special Committee goes so far as to criticize Israel for building a security wall, without mentioning how the wall has made Israel more secure from suicide bombers, whose sole purpose is to commit the most egregious human rights violations by killing innocent Israeli civilians. Under these circumstances, it is entirely appropriate to add this U.N. Special Committee to the list of entities to be audited and reviewed.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. We will not forget September 11.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although we accept the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my friend from Iowa the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific (Mr. LEACH).

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to speak to the broader subject for a moment. At issue clearly before this body is our problem with the U.N., and there is near consensus on both sides of this subject. At issue also is the manner in which reform is to take place, and here there is a difference of judgment.

The deepest question before this body is whether we want to abide by the rule of law as we attempt to advance a new regime of law. And here we all have to recognize that the U.N. Charter, a treaty binding on all parties, including the United States, provides that, and I quote, ''expenses of the organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly.''

In 1962, the International Court of Justice held, sustaining a position of the United States, that apportionment of expenses by the General Assembly creates the obligation of each member to bear that part of the expenses apportioned to it.

The bill before us presumptuously implies that the United States is free from an international obligation to pay its assessments. This position runs counter to elemental principles of international law. The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, for instance, provides that ''every treaty in force is binding on the parties to it and must be performed by them in good faith.'' It further specifies that ''a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations.''

This body has every reason to direct the executive branch to attempt to initiate the compelling list of reform proposals contained in this bill, but this domestic lawmaking body does not embellish its reputation by refusing to honor our country's treaty commitments.

Violating the Law of Nations is neither an appropriate nor effective technique to express exasperation with the United Nations.

The goals of this legislation are thoroughly laudable, but we must all understand that the framework we adopt to advance them puts us on trial.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished deputy majority whip.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations for too long has failed in its mission to serve as a world mediating body. One of the great and glaring failures of the U.N. is most evident in its treatment of the State of Israel. For 57 years, Israel has been a glowing light of democracy and a staunch American ally in the Middle East. Sadly, in the eyes of the U.N., Israel's defense of its democracy and its citizens is worthy only of condemnation.

Israel is treated as a lesser nation, with reduced membership privileges. While genocide in Yugoslavia and Rwanda went unrecognized, the U.N. found time to hold repeated emergency sessions to condemn Israel for acting in its own self-defense. Nearly a third of the criticisms of the Security Council have been devoted to one single country: Israel. While the U.N. Commission on Human Rights often consists of delegations representing maniacal tyrannies, it has issued over a quarter of all official condemnations to a single democracy: Israel. It is no wonder we have lost confidence in the U.N.

The goal of the United Nations should be to spread freedom and democracy throughout the world, not entrench tyranny. I urge the passage of this legislation and hope we can bring long overdue change to a very troubled world body.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

□ 1115

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina has an excellent amendment that is already encompassed in the Lantos substitute. The vote of the day will be on the Lantos substitute amendment. That will determine what policy this House establishes.

Let me first address those who are supporters of the U.N., or only mildly skeptical, and urge them to vote for the Lantos substitute because it undoubtedly ameliorates the underlying legislation. That amendment makes this legislation less draconian and less harsh. If and when the Lantos amendment is passed and becomes part of the legislation, then Members can decide on final passage, whether to vote for an ameliorated bill. But please do not give up the opportunity to ameliorate this bill simply because you do not feel that the amelioration is fully sufficient.

Now, let me address those who are quite skeptical of the United Nations, who want to get tough in demanding reform. The question is what strategy do we use. Do we use the straitjacket strategy where we do not trust the administration, we think they are insufficiently dedicated to the cause of U.N. reform, and so we impose upon them a straitjacket, a formula that says even if 38 out of 39 reforms are adopted, if one of those 14 that is special is not adopted, 38 out of 39 is not enough? We force our negotiators to walk into the room wearing a straitjacket.

Or do we adopt the Lantos approach where we empower the administration, state our goals, provide the power to withhold a substantial part of our dues, and let them begin to negotiate? That question depends on whether Members think the Bush administration is tough enough, are they sufficiently dedicated to U.N. reform.

What has this administration done to show where it stands on being tough on

U.N. reform? The answer is two words: John Bolton. Whoever represents us at the U.N. will be representing a President and carrying out the policies of a President who, when asked who in the world could best represent us, selected John Bolton. It will either be John Bolton or someone selected by a man who wanted John Bolton.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).

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

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Chairman, in yesterday's New York Times, the administration took a very positive step forward. They adopted a position in favor of expanding the permanent membership of the U.N. Security Council. I rise in strong support of this move. In news accounts, there are many countries that are mentioned. The countries include India, Japan, and Germany as potential members, potential new members to the Security Council.

Given the changes that we have seen in the past decades in the international community, especially the recent rise in the Chinese economy and recent press reports about the military buildup within China, I think it is entirely appropriate that this important body, the permanent members of the Security Council, be changed and expanded to reflect today's world and today's reality.

I rise in strong support of the administration's new position, and I rise in strong support of expanding, changing, and modernizing the membership of the United Nations Security Council.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2 amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

In section 101, add at the end the following new subsection:

(e) LIMITATION ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNRWA.—The Secretary of State may not make a contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) in an amount greater than the highest contribution to UNRWA made by an Arab country, but may not exceed 22 percent of the total budget of UNRWA. For purposes of this subsection, an Arab country includes the following: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Dijibouti, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Iraq, and Yemen.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In initial discussion with regard to this amendment, I would like to associate myself with regard to the remarks made by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) about the chairman of the Committee on International Relations. It is an outstanding privilege to be on the floor of this Congress with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and to work to improve on a bill that he has courageously stepped forward with to address the issue of United Nations reform.

I have an amendment here before this Congress that addresses one component of our United Nations contribution, and it is the component that goes to UNRWA, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian refugees. This is something that was established for about 650,000 refugees years ago when the nation of Israel was formed, and today there are 2.5 million refugees trapped in a bind between the Arab world that does not want to accept them and pushes them toward Israel.

We have contributed to that significantly over the years. In fact, the United States contribution has grown to approximately one-quarter of the world's contribution to fund the UNRWA budget. We need to put a limit on that. We need to hold the Arab world accountable to fund their neighbors and some of their residents. So with the United States contributing approximately a quarter of that overall budget, the highest contributor from the Arab world is Saudi Arabia, contributing less than one-seventieth that contributed by the United States.

This amendment caps the amount we would contribute to UNRWA at 22 percent of the overall contribution and limits the United States contribution to an amount no greater than the greatest amount contributed by the Arab nations. And included in that list of Arab nations for full disclosure purposes is Iran as well, a neighbor, but not technically an Arab nation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment. I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for introducing it. Last year, the United States paid over 25 percent of the UNRWA budget, over $127 million. No Arab country paid as much as $2 million, and only two Arab states paid as much as $1 million.

This is a long-standing absurdity; but in a year when Saudi Arabia earned a windfall profit of some $58 billion, this situation is obscene. It is an insult to the United States taxpayer. And it is sickening, Mr. Chairman, that Saudi Arabia and much of the Arab world, cynically ignoring this situation, continue to lecture to us that we are not doing enough to help the Palestinian people.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment stops short of prescribing the range of reforms to which I believe UNRWA needs to be subjected. It must do a better job of ensuring that its assistance does not go to anyone who engages in terrorism, as U.S. law requires; that their textbooks need to be rewritten to promote Israeli-Palestinian peace; that UNRWA needs to stop perpetuating a culture of camps and dependency. It must promote programs to encourage Palestinians to leave the refugee camps that are a breeding ground for misery and terrorism and build a prosperous life on the outside.

Soon I will propose comprehensive reform of UNRWA, but today is not that day.

For today, I only want to rationalize the process of supporting the UNRWA budget. I do not want to take one penny of humanitarian aid from the Palestinians, nor do I want to increase the burden on a state like Jordan, which has done so much, far more than any other Arab state to help Palestinian refugees.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to see oil-rich Arab states pay a small portion of their fair share, and I want to see the U.S. taxpayer treated with respect. Our amendment makes an important start toward accomplishing these goals. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for offering this amendment. It is sorely needed as we examine both the plight of Palestinian refugees and the propaganda that emanates from those who prey upon the frustrations of Palestinian refugees.

Mr. Chairman, UNRWA stands for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees, created in the wake of hostilities in 1948. This seeks first on a humanitarian basis to aid those who have been afflicted, and as is so often the case, the United States of America, maligned internationally by many, has stood front

and center and has borne the financial burden of one-quarter of the world's expenditures for UNRWA. And others around the world, we should point out, have also stepped in. But the fact is that the United States, Sweden, Japan, and Italy pay individually into UNRWA more than all the Arab nations combined.

It is a fair question to ask in terms of geopolitical proximity, i.e., neighbors living closest to those experiencing the problems, why do those nations not step forward to pay their fair share? Why do those nations who in their satellite news organizations that chronicle the plight of the Palestinians, why do those same nations not step forward? Saudi Arabia ranks 16th in contributing country with $1.8 million in funding. A nation that earns billions from its natural wealth of petroleum offers less than $2 million. This amendment is wise and fair. Adopt this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his support of this amendment and the work that he has done on human rights. This is an amendment that is constructive and sends the right message. It encourages resources coming from the right people to support some people who do need some support.

I urge its adoption.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCOTTER

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. MCCOTTER:

In title I (relating to the mission and budget of the United Nations), add at the end the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 110. UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL AND LEBANON.

(a) RESOLUTION 1559.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to ensure that the Security Council is undertaking the necessary steps to secure the implementation of Security Council Resolution 1559, including—

(1) deploying United Nations inspectors to verify and certify to the Security Council that—

(A) all foreign forces, including intelligence, security, and policing forces, have been withdrawn from Lebanon; and

(B) all militias in Lebanon have been permanently disarmed and dismantled and their weapons have been decommissioned; and

(2) continuing the presence of United Nations elections monitoring teams in Lebanon to verify and certify to the Security Council that—

(A) citizens of Lebanon are not being targeted for assassination by foreign forces, in particular by foreign forces of Syria, or by their proxies, as a means of intimidation and coercion in an effort to manipulate the political process in Lebanon;

(B) elections in Lebanon are being conducted in a fair and transparent manner and are free of foreign interference; and

(C) that such foreign forces, or their proxies, are not seeking to infringe upon the territorial integrity or political sovereignty of Lebanon.

(b) UNITED STATES ACTION.—If the steps described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) have not been verified and certified to the Security Council by July 31, 2005, or by the date that is not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is sooner, the President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to secure the adoption of a resolution in the Security Council imposing punitive measures on the governments of countries whose forces remain in Lebanon in violation of Security Council Resolution 1559 and who directly, or through proxies, are infringing upon the territorial integrity or political sovereignty of Lebanon.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls upon the President of the United States to ask our permanent representative to the United Nations to use his voice, his vote, and every means that he possibly can to enforce Security Council Resolution 1559.

□ 1130

Security Council Resolution 1559 calls upon a full Syrian withdrawal of intelligence forces and their troops; it calls upon for free and fair elections within Lebanon; and, in the end, it guarantees and ensures the sovereignty of Lebanon.

I do not expect there will be much opposition to this. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for all of his support in championing the cause of Lebanese freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). Does any Member claim time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the amendment. I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, very quickly, while I strongly disagree with the underlying framework that mandates a dues cutoff if all these conditions are not met, this particular condition, I think, seeks a very important goal of American foreign policy and the implementation of U.N. Security Resolution 1559 and the withdrawal of all foreign forces and the disarming and dismantlement of all the militias in Lebanon. So I compliment the gentleman for proposing this, and ask him to reconsider the underlying structure of the bill on which we will be voting.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, at least the gentleman will get half a loaf, I suppose. I do want to point out, in fairness to the United Nations, that they have sent their second verification team into Lebanon in the wake of the assassination of a popular journalist to again ensure that foreign forces and the intelligence network has been removed.

For too long the people of Lebanon have wept for decades over their dead, and now they see the dawn of freedom at the end of the dark days. It is critical that the United States and United Nations and every nation of the world do everything within its power to ensure that the peaceful seeds of revolution continue and perhaps light the way for other nations suffering from an oppressive yoke to break free of their dictators and tyrants and enter the world's democracies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

In title II (relating to human rights and the Economic and Social Council), add at the end the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 203. UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to—

(1) establish a Democracy Fund at the United Nations to be administered by Member States of the United Nations Democracy Caucus;

(2) secure political and financial support for the Democracy Fund from Member

States of the United Nations Democracy Caucus; and

(3) establish criteria that limits recipients of assistance from the Democracy Fund to Member States that—

(A) are not ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body, in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 201(b); and

(B) are determined by the Secretary of State to be emerging democracies or democracies in transition.

(b) POLICY RELATING TO FUNDING FOR THE DEMOCRACY FUND.—It shall be the policy of the United States to shift contributions of the United States to the regularly assessed budget of the United Nations for a biennial period to initiate and support the Democracy Fund referred to in subsection (a).

(c) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the requirements described in subsection (a) have been satisfied.

In section 601(a)(1), strike ''and section 202'' and insert ''section 202, and section 203''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''39'' and insert ''40''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''ten'' and insert ''11''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the few times that the United Nations has implemented even a modicum of reform, it has been when the United States has leveraged its contribution to press for those changes.

It has been almost a year since President Bush addressed the U.N. General Assembly and raised the creation of a U.N. Democracy Fund. The U.N. Secretary General favorably has referred to the fund, but there is no fund. We have been down this road many times. The U.N. will pay lip service, but its rhetoric rarely, if ever, translates into concrete action.

This is obviously an important issue for my good friend the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), as he included such a fund in the Advanced Democracy Act and includes a $10 million authorization of funds for the Democracy Fund in his own substitute to the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act. I would therefore assume that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), would want to ensure that it actually becomes a reality and it does not perish in the abyss that is the United Nations currently. That is why we need the certification that is provided in my amendment.

Since the distinguished ranking member agrees that the United Nations needs reforming, particularly on the human rights front, he would want to ensure that there are safeguards in place for the administration of the moneys that are donated to the U.N. Democracy Fund, and he would not want the same corrupt officials that administered the Oil-for-Food program to now administer the U.N. Democracy Fund.

As the distinguished ranking member is aware, the member countries of the U.N. Democracy Caucus have asked for an agenda, one that includes tangible criteria and objectives, and my amendment does that. It makes the Democracy Caucus responsible for the U.N. Democracy Fund.

The United Nations was created from the ashes of the Second World War in an effort to prevent future atrocities and to fight the rise of the oppressive, power-hungry, dictatorial rulers who threaten peace and security. Yet, as we have witnessed with grave concern, the United Nations has become a rogues gallery, where pariah states proceed with virtual impunity. There is no effective mechanism to support new and transitioning democracies.

My amendment addresses this deficiency by calling for the establishment of a Democracy Fund at the U.N. to provide grants and in-kind assistance for emerging democracies. It would seek a wide spectrum of participation, one that reflects democratic experience from old and new. But it provides safeguards that are going to ensure that only countries that uphold and defend human rights and democratic values can benefit from and participate in the Fund's activities.

My amendment also calls on the U.S. permanent representative to the U.N. to work to secure political and financial support for the Democracy Fund from fellow democracies, and it calls for a shift in U.S. contributions to provide start-up funds for this endeavor.

This amendment translates the vision of a Democracy Fund into a concrete initiative. We need to make sure that we are accountable to our U.S. taxpayers. We have got to take immediate steps to weaken brutal, evil regimes, as the underlying Hyde U.N. Reform Act proposes, while we empower and assist those countries who embody and uphold democratic values, as this amendment seeks.

We are once again, Mr. Chairman, engaged in a test of wills and a battle of ideas, a battle between those who hate, who incite to violence, who oppress and subjugate, against those who stand for the democratic beliefs that we cherish and to which we are committed.

Thus, whether your views are shaped by former President Ronald Reagan, who said, ''Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction . . . it must be fought for, protected''; or whether your views have been shaped by former President John F. Kennedy, who said, ''In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility,'' Mr. Chairman, let us not shrink from our responsibility, and let us pass this amendment.

The United Nations was created from the ashes of the second World War in an effort to prevent future atrocities against innocent human beings and a means to combat the rise of oppressive power-hungry dictatorial rulers that threaten peace and stability.

This commitment is underscored in the Preamble of the U.N. Charter which reaffirms: ''faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small,'' and in the promotion of justice and better standards of life ''in larger freedom.''

Yet, as we have witnessed with grave concern, the United Nations has become a rogue's gallery, where pariah states proceed with virtual impunity.

Even when dealing with dictatorships such as the one in Myanmar, what the brutal Burmese military junta hears from the U.N. leadership are mere statements expressing ''concern'' over the arrests of members of opposition parties.

In addition, there is no effective mechanism to support nascent and transitioning democracies.

The amendment I have sponsored seeks to address this deficiency by calling for the establishment of a Democracy Fund at the United Nations which will provide grants and in-kind assistance for emerging democracies, and which will focus on supporting the development of civil society and democratic institutions.

The Democracy Fund would seek a wide spectrum of participation—one that reflects the democratic experience from old and new, while providing safeguards that will ensure that only countries that uphold and defend human rights and democratic values can benefit from and participate in the Fund's activities.

The safeguards embedded in my amendment include: A requirement that the Fund be administered by member countries of the U.N. Democracy Caucus; membership criteria that block repressive regimes; and certification that the Fund is in force within the parameters set forth.

The success of the Fund will largely depend on the active involvement and direction of both the donor states and the emerging democracies themselves.

For this reason, my amendment also calls on the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations to work to secure political and financial support for the Democracy Fund from fellow democracies, while calling for a shift in U.S. contributions to provide the start-up funds for this endeavor.

President Bush proposed the creation of a Democracy Fund at last year's U.N. General Assembly meeting and the Secretary General's recent report U.N. reform highlighted the Democracy Fund. However, the Fund still does not exist. This amendment translates the vision of a Democracy Fund into a concrete initiative.

Concurrently, it provides for accountability and for the most efficient use of U.S. funds. It doesn't just simply authorize millions of additional U.S. dollars to a United Nations system plagued by allegations of graft and corruption—a United Nations system that has sexual predators in peacekeeping missions and tyrants dictating the human rights agenda. It places control over the Fund in the hands of

those most knowledgeable about the needs of nascent democracies—fellow democracies.

My colleagues, we are, once again, engaged in a test of wills and battle of ideas—a battle between those who hate, who incite to violence, who oppress and subjugate, against those who stand for the democratic beliefs we cherish and to which we are committed.

Thus, whether your views have been shaped by former President Ronald Reagan who said: "Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction . . . It must be fought for, protected . . ."; or by former President John F. Kennedy who said: "In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility,"; we must take immediate steps to weaken brutal, evil regimes, as the underlying Hyde UN Reform Act proposes, while we empower and assist those countries who embody and uphold democratic principles, as this amendment seeks.

I ask my colleagues to render their strong support to the Ros-Lehtinen amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the amendment, but I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentlewoman for raising the subject of the U.N. Democracy Fund, but this is a wonderful illustration of the road we are embarking on here.

The gentlewoman seeks to add a condition which must be met, or else we will slash the dues to 50 percent. In other words, if the rest of the world that are member nations of the United Nations do not create and support this U.N. Democracy Fund, we will cut our dues.

The Lantos substitute authorizes a contribution to the U.N. Democracy Fund. The condition that the gentlewoman proposes on the base bill threatens to cut funds. It does not authorize any contribution by us to a very important fund. The gentlewoman spoke eloquently about what we want to achieve here, and then says we are cutting it unless somebody else does it. The Lantos substitute says this is a wonderful idea; we authorize $10 million in contributions to this fund.

There is also a second issue. The gentlewoman properly encourages contributions to democratic governments, but it is most important to push democracy in those places where there are not democratic governments. There is no eligibility in her amendment for contributions from this U.N. Democracy Fund to nongovernmental organizations and dissidents and democratic forces in nondemocratic governments.

But, by and large, the gentlewoman is focusing on an issue that is important. Unfortunately, it is in the context of a mandatory imposed cut.

I will just end by quoting a woman I know the gentlewoman respects, our former Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, who said on this subject, ''Withholding U.S. dues to the United Nations may sound like smart policy but would be counterproductive at this time, so soon after the Helms-Biden process was completed. It would create resentment, build animosity and actually strengthen opponents of reform.''

Withholding the dues to the U.N. is the wrong methodology. When we last built debt with the U.N., the U.S. isolated ourselves from our allies within the U.N. and made diplomacy a near impossible task. In other words, everything we share in common and want to achieve is undercut by the base bill to which the gentlewoman is proposing a condition.

I am going to support her amendment. I simply wanted to use this time to point out what I think are a few flaws in the amendment, the absence of a positive authorization of money for the U.N. Democracy Fund, and remind people why the underlying bill is in this case wrong-headed.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there be 4 additional minutes of debate on this matter, equally divided between the two sides.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), our distinguished friend.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to have been yielded time to speak. I am grateful that we got this time extended without objection, and I join the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) in supporting the gentlewoman's amendment, without some of his reservations, but these are the kinds of things that grow as they move.

The idea of a United Nations Democracy Fund is so critically important. There are so many things happening in the world today where we need to encourage those democracies, whether they be in Lebanon or the Ukraine or many other places around the world where democracy is beginning to grow, beginning to flourish, and to do those things that encourage the institutions to grow and perpetuate and maintain and sustain democracy. A free press, the rule of law, civil society that works in a democratic way, the protection of minority rights are all the kinds of things that the gentlewoman's fund and the concept would promote around the world.

It is a critical element. Sustaining democracy, sustaining peace is more than just having the instruments of war, which are important to have, but also having the instruments of peace, the instruments of democracy.

Democracy is more than just the absence of war. Democracy is the kind of society that the United Nations needs to encourage, needs to encourage in a greater way, and through all its institutions I think we need to be prejudiced towards the democracies of the world. One of the ways we can do that is to grow those democracies.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this concept in this bill, and later perhaps in other versions and other ideas, and I encourage our colleagues really not only to vote for it today, but to sustain this thought as we talk about our position in international agencies.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I am so glad the gentleman brings up this important topic. As the gentleman from California has pointed out, our friend, in his own statement, the times we have had reform in the United Nations is when we have used our leverage of this assistance. I think that making sure that we are accountable to the taxpayers, that is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I appreciate the comments by my friend, the majority whip from Missouri.

□ 1145

He references respect for the rule of law, and we all concur.

But I think there is a certain irony here, because as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), alluded to, in fact, what we are doing here today, if the base bill should become law, is we are disrespecting the rule of law. We are walking away from our treaty obligation.

Now, we have been accused of embracing the concept of unilateralism. I cannot imagine, I cannot imagine what the rest of the world is contemplating as we are here debating whether we simply will abrogate, without a formal process of abrogation, renouncing the charter, just simply not meeting our charter obligations. In many respects, this is not just simply about the United Nations; this is about the rule of law. Do we pick and select and choose what treaties we have ratified and are signatory to, which ones we will abide by?

I do not have to repeat the arguments, the eloquent and, I think, accurate arguments put forth by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), but that is what we are doing here, if the base bill should pass. We will preach and speak about respect for the rule of law, which is obviously essential in democracy; but by our action, we will open ourselves to charges of hypocrisy. We do not need that now in this time, where our own GAO is telling us that there is increasing anti-Americanism

spreading throughout the world, which puts our national security interests at risk. This amendment, although well intentioned, I think creates that potential.

I know the gentlewoman from Florida is conversant with what is happening in the United Nations now. There is a critical mass for reform. There are like-minded democracies that support the democracy theme, that want to achieve the same goals that we want to. Yet not a single one of them is taking the same approach in terms of effecting and bringing about the same reform that we all wish to accomplish, because they know that if we begin to selectively abrogate our responsibilities under international treaties, which we have signed on to, that that creates a very, very slippery slope.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman talks about responsibilities and abrogating our responsibilities, I am sure that the gentleman, my good friend, would agree that we also have an obligation to our taxpayers, those who are funding so many of their dollars to the United Nations; and we have seen so many scandals unfolding from the U.N., and I believe that this amendment gets to accountability and transparency.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

In title I, add at the end the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 110. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO EXPANSION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL.

It shall be the policy of the United States to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to oppose any proposals on expansion of the Security Council if such expansion would—

(1) diminish the influence of the United States on the Security Council;

(2) include veto rights for any new members of the Security Council; or

(3) undermine the effectiveness of the Security Council.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer an amendment addressing another and very important issue, and that is the possible expansion of the United Nations Security Council.

My amendment would state that it should be the policy of the United States Government to use its voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the U.N. to oppose any proposal on expansion of the Security Council if that expansion would either diminish the influence of the United States on the Security Council, or if it included veto rights for any new members of the Security Council or, finally, and most importantly, if it would undermine the effectiveness of the Security Council.

Currently, there are five permanent members and there are 10 rotating members to the Security Council. It takes a vote of nine members, that is 60 percent of all there, a majority, to advance any initiative to the Security Council.

Now, the recent proposal that we have heard about expanding it says we should expand it up to 24 members. That would mean we would need 15 member countries to support any initiative to get it through the Security Council. Now, why is that a problem?

Well, one blatant example of how the number of countries on the council and their competing interests have hindered the ability to move forward and get substantive and important resolutions passed, the one most important one that has been discussed on this floor of recent is the genocide that has occurred in Sudan. It has been extremely difficult for the United States to try and get any member of the Security Council to come to an agreement on this and a resolution, such as China, who has economic interests in the area, and African countries, who have their own regional difficulties and disagreements in the area as well. If we increase the size of the Security Council, we would have an even harder time moving important missions through the Security Council such as this.

Now, for those who believe that the United States should play an active role in the Security Council, you should support this amendment. The more that the United States' influence is lessened in the council, the more the United States will have to act unilaterally to deal with international crises.

The expansion of the U.N. Security Council could undermine the effectiveness and its ability to respond to threats to international peace and security. So I think it is important that Congress send a message to the administration and the U.N. that we do not want to diminish the influence of the United States on the Security Council. My amendment would do just that, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There is no Member in this body who wants to see the influence of the United States diminished in the Security Council. It is my personal judgment that adding democratic friends and allies, such as the world's largest democracy, India, or Japan, a proven friend and ally, standing with us in many difficult situations around the globe, will only strengthen our influence at the United Nations.

I see no reason to oppose this amendment. We accept it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just very briefly, to respond, any increase in the members where they have the veto power in the Security Council will possibly have the effect of diminishing the U.S. role there, because that means that that additional member would be able to block what is in the interests of the United States and the interests of the American taxpayers and citizens of this Nation.

Likewise, any proposal to increase the size, even without the ability to veto, would diminish the ability of the United States to get important initiatives through, just as I stated before, because even if they are other democratic nations, they may have competing interests with those of the United States, and, therefore, compete with what we are trying to do in the Security Council.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

There is no one who favors granting veto power to any new Security Council member. It is a fact that with Russia moving in a totalitarian direction and China being a nondemocracy, adding democratic nations as permanent members of the Security Council will enhance our influence, but we are in accord of not granting veto power to any new member.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2 amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

In section 101, add at the end the following new subsection:

(e) POLICY RELATING TO ZERO NOMINAL GROWTH.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to enforce zero nominal growth in all assessed dues to the regular budget of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and its funds and programs.

(f) 5.6 RULE.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to actively enforce the 5.6 rule at the United Nations, requiring the Secretariat to identify low-priority activities in the budget proposal. The United Nations should strengthen the 5.6 rule by requiring that managers identify the lowest priority activities equivalent to 15 percent of their budget request or face an across the board reduction of such amount.

(g) ANNUAL PUBLICATION.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to ensure the United Nations is annually publishing a list of all subsidiary bodies and their functions, budgets, and staff.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer another amendment, and this one is to reform the U.N. budget process.

The amendment seeks to control the overall growth of the U.N.'s budget and establish priorities within the U.N. budget process and also to increase transparency and accountability in it and its subsidiaries, and it does so basically in three ways.

Just to step back for a moment, the U.N.'s budget right now, the biennial budget, is around $3.6 billion; but over the last 10 years, we have seen that budget grow by almost $1 billion. That is a 39 percent increase. Now, I wonder if any of us would think to say that the U.N.'s productivity over the last 10 years has also increased by 39 percent. I would rather guess not.

My amendment, first of all, would help to rein in that bloated, out-of-control bureaucracy at the U.N. by stating that it shall be the policy of the U.S. to make every effort to enforce a zero nominal growth in the regular budget of the U.N., its specialized agencies, and the funds and programs that it has.

Secondly, another part of my amendment seeks to strengthen the United Nations rule 5.6. Now, this is a rule that was set up to instruct the Secretariat to identify low-priority activities in the U.N.'s budget proposal. Unfortunately, the U.N. has looked at that rule over the years and failed to designate almost any programs as low priorities under 5.6.

So my amendment would indicate that every activity that the U.N. is involved in cannot simply be a top priority proposal or rule right now. So, instead, my amendment would say that the U.N. must look to the 5.6 rule and identify 15 percent of their budget request as their lower-priority activities. If they fail to do so, they will face an across-the-board reduction of such amount.

Finally, the third point and the last part of my amendment is it seeks to address the lack of transparency and accountability at the U.N. My amendment seeks to ensure that the U.N. is annually publishing a list of all its subsidiary bodies and functions, their budget, and their staff as well.

Now, the much talked-about Gingrich-Mitchell U.N. Task Force that went to the U.N. last year, they went to the U.N. and asked for a similar list and the U.N. simply could not provide one. Well, if we want to rein in this out-of-control bureaucracy that the U.N. is, I believe that it is essential that we know who is working for them, how much they are paying them, and exactly what is it that they are doing.

Now, one example of one of these subsidiary agencies that would appear to have outlived its usefulness and is wasting some vital resources is the Economic Commission for Europe. This commission was created right after World War II, and it was designed to help Europe to know how they can grow economically and develop. Now, I, quite frankly, would argue that we have passed the point that Europe needs any more help from the U.N. and advice from the U.N. on how to grow and develop, and that this is an agency and a portion of the U.N. that can be dissolved.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is an important step in making the U.N. a more transparent, accountable, and functioning world body; and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, we do not object to this amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee will resume its sitting.

HENRY J. HYDE UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1200

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. GOHMERT:

Page 76, after line 9, add the following new title (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VII—UNITED NATIONS VOTING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2005

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''United Nations Voting Accountability Act of 2005''.

SEC. 702. PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES THAT OPPOSE THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—United States assistance may not be provided to a country that opposed the position of the United States in the United Nations.

(b) CHANGE IN GOVERNMENT.—If—

(1) the Secretary of State determines that, since the beginning of the most recent session of the General Assembly, there has been a fundamental change in the leadership and policies of the government of a country to which the prohibition in subsection (a) applies, and

(2) the Secretary believes that because of that change the government of that country will no longer oppose the position of the United States in the United Nations,

the Secretary may exempt that country from that prohibition. Any such exemption shall be effective only until submission of the next report under section 406 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2414a). The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a certification of each exemption made under this subsection. Such certification shall be accompanied by a discussion of the basis for the Secretary's determination and belief with respect to such exemption.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''opposed the position of the United States'' means, in the case of a country, that the country's votes in the United Nations General Assembly during the most recent session of the General Assembly and, in the case of a country which is a member of the United Nations Security Council, the country's votes in the Security Council during the most recent session of the General Assembly, were the same as the position of the United States less than 50 percent of the time, using for this purpose the overall percentage-of-voting coincidences set forth in the annual report submitted to the Congress

pursuant to section 406 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991;

(2) the term ''most recent session of the General Assembly'' means the most recently completed plenary session of the General Assembly for which overall percentage-of-voting coincidences is set forth in the most recent report submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 406 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991; and

(3) the term ''United States assistance'' means assistance under—

(A) chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the economic support fund);

(B) chapter 5 of part II of that Act (relating to international military education and training); or

(C) the ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' account under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect upon the date of the submission to the Congress of the report pursuant to section 406 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, that is required to be submitted by March 31, 2006.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The United Nations, at its inception, was one of the most noble undertakings in modern human history. Its vision was of world governments working in concert to ameliorate, if not eradicate, world problems. This ideal, however, has over its more recent course become a body where some member nations appear more focused on institutional anti-Americanism than addressing the growing maladies that face the world's citizens.

If the U.N. member nations insist upon open antagonism toward the United States at seemingly every turn, then the time has come to reexamine our role as their benefactor. It is counterintuitive to financially reward countries whose motivation is in opposition to American efforts. In order to correct this problem of incongruity, I propose a simple solution.

My amendment would cause the United States to end all financial assistance to those countries who vote against us more than 50 percent of the time in the United Nations. That also includes an end to training the soldiers of nations who oppose us. The ban on our funding antagonistic nations, however, would not begin until March of 2006. March 31 of 2006, the next report will come out that says how everyone voted on each position. This will give all such countries notice of the coming consequences of their action.

The rationale is simple. They are sovereign nations, they can make their own decisions, but we do not have to pay them to hate us. Throwing money at our enemies has made them more contemptuous, not less.

I share the concerns of many Americans about the U.N., its bureaucracy and its approach to world problems. They run counter to U.S. values and interests. The U.N. is currently an inefficient bureaucratic organization badly in need of reform, and too often it has become a forum for radical anti-American rhetoric and policies that would violate many of our Nation's most cherished freedoms, laws, customs and recognized human rights.

My amendment simply stops the flow of American tax dollars to countries that claim to be our allies and who are happily taking the hard-earned tax dollars from American pockets, then using the money to spew anti-American venom all over the world.

My constituents in east Texas have told me, I have heard it around the country time and time again, they are fed up with this anti-American rhetoric coming out of the U.N. that their money is paying for. Surely we can find a better use of this money than to fund nations that oppose all we hold dear. On numerous occasions I have had citizens ask me why government is sending their money overseas to support governments and countries that are against the amendments and things for which we stand.

Some say we should be more loving and send these billions of dollars anyway. Friends, your heart may be good, but you are not using your head. I have relatives and friends that I love with all my heart. I would give my life for them, but if they are doing things to demean and destroy the very things I am fighting to preserve, I would not send them money.

Accordingly, and in conclusion, we do not have to pay these countries to hate us. We do not have to fund our opposition. If a foreign nation wants to take the tax dollars of hard-working Americans, well, then they better start helping us seek truth, justice and freedom's ways at least 50 percent of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who claims time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to control 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not know of anything I have done more reluctantly than object to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT's) very good amendment, not only well-intentioned, but it makes a statement that is very hard to disagree with. But I must because I can conceive of circumstances where it is in our national interest to help support another country that does not vote with us in the U.N., but having a stable country in certain portions of the world can be in our national interest. And I would rather leave that flexibility with the State Department and with the Defense Department so that these grants that are made support our security interests and not necessarily make us feel good because we are rewarding a country that votes with us. Egypt almost never votes with us, but it is important to have the largest Muslim country, other than Indonesia, supporting the aims that we have and goals in the Middle East.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), my distinguished chairman, in opposing this amendment. I think the chairman, as always, shows great wisdom in opposing this amendment. But I am particularly thrilled that the chairman has embraced the principle of providing our Secretary of State flexibility in dealing with this issue, and I very much hope that during the course of the remaining few minutes of our debate, the chairman will see the wisdom of providing Secretary Rice with flexibility on similar issues.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has just administered the perfumed icepick.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support him in his opposition. I point out that the nation of Colombia, for whom we have provided billions of dollars in terms of dealing with the interdiction and eradication of drugs, would fall because they vote against us 90 percent of the time. I presume that most of that aid would be eliminated by this amendment.

And I would also point out for those of you who support CAFTA that at least five of the countries I have been able to determine here vote against us, so that if we extend the logic of the gentleman's argument, I would suggest that maybe during the course of that debate, when it comes to the floor, if it should come to the floor, that that should be a precondition to approval of the CAFTA trade agreement.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), this is a marvelous amendment. The spirit in which it is offered is exemplary, and it is a very difficult thing to oppose it. But I see a problem with it that needs a little work. But I congratulate him and the spirit in which his good amendment was offered, but I

hope it is not accepted in its present form.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response, and of course I have nothing but utmost respect for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and it is a pleasure for me to support your amendment, and all three of the distinguished gentlemen that spoke bring up a good point. The Secretary of State does need flexibility, and that is why in this amendment I provided flexibility. If the Secretary of State certifies that there has been such a change in the regime attitudewise, personnelwise, that he or she firmly believes that the next session they will be voting with us more than half the time, then that makes an exception, and they will get funding.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I am nearly done. But that makes an exception. That gives them flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I just heard the gentleman advocating for flexibility for our Secretary of State. Does this flexibility extend to the bill as a whole, in the gentleman's view?

Mr. GOHMERT. It extends in whole if they are going to vote with us more than 50 percent of the time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2 AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2 Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 110. STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to work to strengthen and expand the Social Protection sector of the International Labor Organization (ILO) in order to allow the ILO to issue more field and regional units of the ILO, to increase site inspections of working conditions, and to issue more reports on such conditions to the international community.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following requirements have been satisfied:

(1) Member States are broadening the scope and the instruments of social security schemes, improving and diversifying benefits, strengthening governance and management, and developing policies to combat adverse effects of social and economic insecurity.

(2) ILO constituents are targeting and taking effective action to improve the safety and health conditions at work, with special attention to the most hazardous conditions in the workplace.

In section 601(a)(1), insert ''section 110,'' after ''104(e),''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''39'' and insert ''40''.

In section 601(a)(3)(A), strike ''ten'' and insert ''11''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Kucinich amendment would add another requirement for U.N. reform, that the International Labor Organization must be strengthened and expanded; specifically, the social protection sector. It is not the intention of this amendment to limit the U.S. contribution to the U.N. The intention of my amendment is to make it the policy of the United States at the U.N. to place the highest priority on the improvement of international labor rights. Therefore, it is necessary that this amendment has the same certification requirement for the strengthening of the International Labor Organization as the other reform criteria have. Labor rights, which are the same as human rights, should not be treated with any less importance.

The ILO does an important job, and they do it well. My amendment would urge the U.S. representative to the U.N. to use the voice, vote and influence of the United States to encourage the International Labor Organization to do even more. I believe the most important work of the ILO is in the social protection sector, which is responsible for coming up with the tools, instruments and policies to ensure that men and women have working conditions that are as safe as possible, that respect human dignity, take into account family and social values, allow for adequate compensation in the case of lost or reduced income, permit access to adequate social and medical services, and respect the right to free time and rest. In a global economic context of sweatshops, child labor, exploitative labor practices and unfettered capitalism, the work of the ILO social protection sector is vastly important.

The social protection sector sends on-site inspectors to investigate labor conditions around the globe. The hard evidence gathered by these inspectors is published in highly regarded in-depth reports for consumption by policymakers, decisionmakers, journalists and various labor and human rights groups throughout the international community. These reports have served as a basis for labor rights campaigns. They have served as a basis for government reforms. They have served as a basis for campaigns against unfair trade agreements with exploitative labor provisions.

The following are examples of recent reports in paper published by the ILO: Global Report 2005, a global alliance against slave labor; an economic study of the costs and benefits of eliminating child labor; a report by the Director General, A Fair Globalization, the Role of the ILO; Towards a Fair Deal for Migrant Workers in a Global Economy; Eleventh Synthesis Report on the Working Condition Situation in Cambodia's Garment Sector.

The ILO is responsible for gathering evidence for and disseminating the following facts: that there are 48,000 children working in floriculture in Cayambe and Cotopaxi in Ecuador. Conditions in Cotopaxi are worse than in Cayambe. In Cotopaxi all employees are involved in all stages of production, including fumigation, and younger children fumigate most frequently. In medical exams of 105 children between the ages of 9 and 18, 27 percent had experienced migraines, 50 percent blackouts; 32 percent experienced shaking.

It is estimated that in Brazil as many as 25,000 persons are subjected to slave labor conditions, mostly in the Amazonian States of Para and Mato Grosso.

In a number of countries freer trade has replaced or undercut domestic industrial and agricultural industries displacing workers, while structural adjustment programs have restricted government spending to cushion unemployment.

□ 1215

Job creation in some countries under Structure Adjustment Programs has lagged behind the increased number of unemployed, and the net result of these job losses due to trade and structural change has been a large number of people without opportunities for decent work in their homelands.

It was estimated at the end of 1998 that some 1 billion workers, or one-third of the world's labor force, were either unemployed or underemployed.

It is essential that we know about preexisting labor and living conditions in different regions around the world as steps are taken towards a globalized economy. It is essential that the world learn about the negative consequences that accompany this economic model. The ILO is the foremost international

institution responsible for gathering information and making recommendations amid this context.

The only thing wrong with the ILO is that while its recommendations and conventions are important, they are not enforceable. Nevertheless, the ILO's work is significant, influential and does make a difference.

Mr. Chairman, we should be encouraging and expanding the important work of the ILO so that we will make better informed decisions and develop more sound policies to eradicate the worst labor abuses around the world. With the expansion of the social protection sector, more field and regional units would be established, which would allow more on-site inspections to occur and more reports to be published. A strengthened ILO would have a civilizing effect on corporate behavior.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As someone who appreciates the work performed by the International Labor Organization and efforts to bring about and secure labor rights for oppressed people in countries under dictatorial rule, it is with difficulty that I rise in opposition of the gentleman's amendment, but I must.

Had the amendment called on the U.S. permanent representative to the U.N. to work to strengthen the ILO, to increase site inspections, as we had wanted to do, I am confident that we would have gladly supported the gentleman's amendment.

However, this amendment before us today does not seek to reform the ILO, but seeks to use the U.N. to dictate and determine domestic policies of the U.N. member states, policies such as Social Security schemes and employee benefits; and these are issues that in the U.S., for example, we in the Congress are working on and are responsible for. We should not use legislation that seeks to reform the U.N., an international institution, as a means of influencing very specific domestic policy initiatives.

The bill before us, the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005, deals with bringing accountability to the U.N.'s budget process. It does not concern itself with dictating internal, substantive outcomes on the U.N.'s budget process.

In short, today, we are focused on reforming how the U.S., how the U.N. makes the decisions, not on what decisions it makes or what the member states make.

The gentleman from Ohio would have been, I believe, better served by offering his amendment, as others have, by it having called upon the President to direct the U.S. permanent representative to work to ensure enhanced funding for the international labor rights organization, which I believe is a worthy goal, and on that very issue, in fact, this is already being done.

The amendment suggests that the ILO is not doing enough in the social protection sector. However, the 2006–2007 budget that was agreed to shows a significant increase in the budget for the activities of this sector.

The 2004–2005 budget for the protection sector was $72.7 million in 2006, and the 2007 budget is $91 million.

Overall, the International Labor Organization budget increased 12 percent from $529 million during the 2004 and 2005 biennium to $594 million in 2006 and 2007. That is $297 million per year.

The amendment also requires an increase in the field presence by the ILO. However, the organization is currently undertaking a review of the field structures to determine the most effective overseas profile, and this amendment would have the effect of preempting the outcome of this study.

I have been a proud supporter of labor organizations. We want to make sure that they help the oppressed people in all of these countries and do not abuse their people. However, I do not think that this amendment, dictating what member states do with their domestic policies, would get to the heart of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my good friend for yielding.

I merely wish to express my support for the gentleman's amendment. I think it is worthwhile and ask my colleagues to vote for it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. PEARCE:

In section 201, add at the end the following new subsection:

(f) PROHIBITION ON CONTACT WITH MEMBER STATES SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS.—An employee from of any United Nations entity, bureau, division, department, or specialized agency may not have unauthorized contact, including business contact, with a Member State that is subject to United Nations sanctions.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise with this amendment today that would prohibit any employee of a United Nations entity, bureau, division, department, or specialized agency from having any unauthorized contact, particularly business contact, with a government that is subject to United Nations sanctions.

The purpose and ideals of the United Nations are to maintain international peace and security and to engage in collective action to preserve both.

It also is to promote friendly relations among nations founded upon the principles of human rights and self-determination.

Finally, it is to achieve multilateral cooperation on the critical global crises of our age.

I support these goals and ideals, but these purposes are being undermined and threatened by corruption and mismanagement within the U.N. today. That is why I am here today in support of this overall legislation and offering this particular amendment.

One of the most blatant examples of fraud, corruption, and abuse in the United Nations is that of the United Nations employees enriching themselves through personal deals with rogue governments.

In 1991, the United Nations placed sanctions on Iraq for Saddam Hussein's persistent noncompliance with the provisions of the cease-fire that ended the first Gulf War.

In an effort to mitigate the sanctions impact on the Iraqi population, the Oil-for-Food program was created in 1996 to allow the Iraqis to sell oil in order to pay for humanitarian goods. Under the auspices of the United Nations, the oil was to be sold with the proceeds to be deposited with the Banque National de Paris. Humanitarian goods were then to be supplied to Iraq using those funds.

However, Saddam Hussein was allowed to choose his own business partners for this program, those buyers for Iraq's oil, as well as the suppliers of humanitarian goods.

For each 180-day phase of the program, Iraq developed a list of allocations identifying companies and individuals to whom it would be willing to sell oil. Saddam personally reviewed who would receive the oil.

Mr. Hussein would then complete oil contracts based on the allocations list. As this process evolved, Saddam began to give special allocations for the benefit of particular individuals or entities that were perceived to support his brutal regime.

It is abominable for U.S. taxpayers' funds to be used to pay U.N. employees who take advantage of international sanctions and make deals to receive kickbacks.

That is exactly what happened with the U.N. Oil-for-Food program.

While visiting Iraq in the course of his official duties, director of the Oil-for-Food program, Mr. Benon Sevan, requested special allocations from the Iraq oil ministry for African Middle

East Petroleum Company to help a friend. That friend turned out to be former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros Gali's nephew.

It was later found by the Independent Inquiry Committee into the U.N. Oil-for-Food program that what Mr. Sevan sought was more than just for his friend.

Mr. Sevan was in a position of influence and could lift restrictions on various parts of the Oil-for-Food program.

So the Saddam Hussein regime granted the oil allocations to AMEP and Mr. Sevan. AMEP purchased the oil from Iraq, but then sold it to oil companies for as much as $750,000 per transaction more than what they paid for it, all while giving the proceeds to Mr. Sevan for making the deal. Additional oil allocations granted through the years of the program as restrictions were lifted on aspects of the Oil-for-Food program.

When the program came under scrutiny, Mr. Sevan blocked the proposed audit of his office.

Because of these personal deals, Saddam was able to skirt around the restrictions of sanctions, siphoning off as much as $10 billion in the form of illicit revenue while the Iraqi people starved.

Saddam Hussein used much of this money to purchase weapons, many of which are being used to kill Americans and Iraqis today as the Allied forces continue to fight terrorism in that country.

Actions such as Mr. Sevan's personal dealings with the sanctioned Iraqi Government undermine the United Nations' purposes.

I ask that my colleagues support this amendment that makes clear to the United Nations that the United States will not tolerate U.N. employees making deals with rogue governments subject to U.N. sanctions.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my friend and colleague.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding the time, and I want to express my enormous respect for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), my dear friend, with whom I agree on some things but not on this issue, although the majority of the bill I know is consistent with the gentleman from California's (Mr. LANTOS) and my view, although I do rise in strong support of the Lantos substitute and in opposition to the underlying bill, but it is with great respect; and I appreciate the opportunity to work with my colleague on this and many other issues.

It is no secret that the United Nations is going through a period of intense soul-searching, precipitated by increasing evidence that it has become an ineffective and unwieldy institution that long ago lost sight of its reason for being.

When the world changes, its institutions must change with it or become irrelevant, and so the U.N. has embarked on a mission to adapt to the changing times. As the Nation most involved in the founding of the U.N., the United States has an obligation to play a key role in this reform process.

Reform cannot, frankly, come quickly enough. The U.N. suffers today from a credibility gap around the world and for good reason. The Volcker Commission has exposed some uncomfortable truths about the Oil-for-Food program. The U.N. has dragged its feet in addressing some of our world's worst crises, such as the Darfur genocide, and has been impotent on human rights issues; and the record of the U.N. and many of its member states with respect to Israel has, frankly, been abominable.

In many ways, the U.N. is broken; but we must remember that it remains and must remain a central actor in global affairs. The organization has provided critical resources to nations coping with great poverty and social dislocation.

The U.N. Population Fund has reduced the number of unintended pregnancies around the world through basic family planning services.

UNICEF is the premier organization combating childhood disease in poor countries.

Agencies like the United Nations Development Program have raised living standards by improving governance, health, and education.

For millions around the world, the U.N. is not some distance bureaucracy. It is a hot meal for a hungry family. It is a doctor for a pregnant mother. It is protection for a first-time voter, and it is peace for a war-ravaged village. Indeed, even when the U.N. efforts fall short, and they often do, progress toward international cooperation is made, and recognition of common interests and values is encouraged.

As many have said, the U.N. is the kind of organization we would have to invent if it did not already exist. A strong U.N. is good for the United States and good for the world.

So enacting the Hyde bill, which is more about punishment than reform, simply does not serve, in my judgment, the best interests of this country.

In requiring a mandatory 50 percent cut in the United States dues to the U.N., unless 32 of 39 specific reforms are achieved, the Hyde bill provides no flexibility whatever to the State Department to negotiate with other U.N. member states. Rather than providing Secretary Rice a tool to encourage ongoing U.N. reform negotiations, it ties her hands.

The Lantos substitute would call for most of the same reforms as the Hyde bill, while providing the Secretary of State with room to maneuver to get real reforms passed.

□ 1230

It is a common-sense way to achieve the changes we all agree are needed with the right balance of diplomacy and muscle. And while I support the goals of the chairman, I cannot endorse his means, and I urge my colleagues to support the Lantos substitute and defeat the underlying bill.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to wrap up my comments by saying that we all know what corruption looks like, smells like, and acts like. We are seeing corruption at many different levels in the U.N., and I would request that all Members support this amendment, which would limit the unauthorized contact between the United Nation employees and the nations which have been sanctioned.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

In section 601(b)(1) (relating to the withholding of United States contributions to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations), strike ''50 percent'' and insert ''75 percent''.

In section 601(b)(3), strike ''11 percent'' and insert ''5.5 percent''.

In section 601(b)(4)(B), strike ''50 percent'' and insert ''75 percent''.

In section 601(d)(2), strike ''50 percent'' and insert ''75 percent''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have a chart here which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) prepared, and I think you can see all the scandals at the United Nations. This has been shown several times. I think it is a good reminder to all of us that the U.N. is obviously in need of serious reform. I commend Chairman HYDE and his reform bill for doing just that. I think it ensures the reforms that we need.

My amendment is very simple. The main part of the Hyde bill is to withhold U.S. contributions to the regular assessed budget of the U.N. unless they make real and substantial reforms in the way they operate. So his underlying legislation calls for a 50 percent

withholding, and my amendment simply increases that to 75 percent. I think you can think over it in terms of a glass half full, half empty, his 50 percent. My amendment would make it 75 percent empty, which I think for most people is a real clear sign we should do something. So it is not just adding more teeth, it is also one of symbolism.

I think just to review, we all know the U.N. is not as effective as it could be, not to mention all these scandals. The number one scandal is the Oil-for-Food program that we are still investigating, and we still have not got to the bottom of this scandal.

I think the American people, understandably, have sort of lost faith in the United Nations. It does not seem to be fulfilling its founding mission, as long as it continues to coddle dictators and appease terrorists. There is an ever-growing list of grievances against the United Nations, and suggested reform is desperately needed. If not, we will continue to pour hundreds of millions of American taxpayers' dollars down into what I call a bottomless pit. So leveraging our dues this way is the only way we can ensure the U.N. makes the necessary change.

Now, the question would be what is the difference, as I mentioned, between 50 and 75 percent? I think in real dollars and real impact, this will be more important, to move it to 75 percent. For many of us who feel strongly about this, it gives a little more weight to it.

I would also say, Mr. Chairman, that I had a dream last night, and this dream was of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the international Relations. In this dream he was puzzling how much to withhold from the U.N. until they enact the necessary reform—so in his great wisdom. As he sat in his chair in my dream, he set in a magnificent chair, and there were clouds and harps all around him, and he was deliberating very carefully whether to do 50 percent or 75 percent. He finally decided, after much deliberation, to do 50 percent. But I could tell in this dream that in his heart of hearts he wanted to have 75 percent.

So, Mr. Chairman, the dream I had of you convinced me that I should come down to the House floor today and offer 75 percent as a humble way to extend your feelings that were in my dream.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my good friend from Florida for an improved version of the underlying Hyde bill.

I refer to the Hyde bill as a guillotine on autopilot, and I think it is in the true American spirit that the gentleman now has a more effective, faster-working, more suicidal guillotine which he is offering to this body.

I do not think this proposal deserves really any serious comment. If, in fact, 38½ of the 39 Hyde commandments are fulfilled, we should not automatically chop off 75 percent of our dues to the United Nations.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reclaim my time, because the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is very eloquent, and I would like to continue to have a little less say on my amendment. If he is accepting my amendment, I would sure appreciate his support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is with painful reluctance that I object to my dear friend's dreams and his emanating bill. He is on the right track, God knows, but it is overkill. I think 50 percent bites just enough; 75 percent might kill the patient. And so with reluctance and admiration, and a hope that he gets a good night's sleep tonight, undisturbed by dreams, I must object to the amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. With pleasure, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is yet another occasion that Chairman HYDE and I stand shoulder to shoulder on attempting to reform the United Nations. I strongly concur with the chairman, this is overkill. It is over-overkill.

Using the gentleman's logic, it is difficult to see why he is not proposing a 95 percent automatic dues cut-off. But maybe upon reflection he might propose that on a future occasion.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that tonight I will try to get more sleep, because I have spent so much more time dreaming, and perhaps tonight he will be in my dreams. And I will be dreaming that he wished that we would have had the amendment at 95 percent instead of the 50 percent.

My colleagues, when you come down to the House floor to vote on the amendment, I want you to vote ''yes'' for the Stearns amendment because in your heart of hearts, in fact in the heart of hearts of Chairman HYDE in my dream, he wanted 75 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 13 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 13 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. LANTOS:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''United Nations Reform and Institutional Strengthening Act of 2005''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Statement of Congress.

TITLE I—MISSION AND BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Sec. 101. United States financial contributions to the United Nations.
Sec. 102. Weighted voting.
Sec. 103. Certification requirements.
Sec. 104. Accountability.
Sec. 105. Terrorism and the United Nations.
Sec. 106. Equality at the United Nations.
Sec. 107. Reforms at the specialized agencies.
Sec. 108. Report on United Nations reform.
Sec. 109. Report on United Nations personnel.
Sec. 110. Anti-Semitism and the United Nations.
Sec. 111. United Nations cooperation relating to oil-for-food investigation.

TITLE II—HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Sec. 201. Human Rights.
Sec. 202. Economic and Social Council (ecosoc).
Sec. 203. International responsibility to protect.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Sec. 301. International atomic energy agency.
Sec. 302. Sense of Congress regarding the Nuclear Security Action Plan of the IAEA.

TITLE IV—PEACEKEEPING

Sec. 401. Sense of Congress regarding reform of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.
Sec. 402. Statement of policy relating to reform of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.
Sec. 403. Certification.
Sec. 404. United States Contributions to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.
Sec. 405. Genocide and the United Nations.
Sec. 406. Rule of construction relating to protection of United States officials and members of the Armed Forces.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Sec. 501. Positions for United States citizens at international organizations.

Sec. 502. Budget justification for regular assessed budget of the United Nations.
Sec. 503. Review and report.
Sec. 504. Government accountability office.
TITLE VI—CERTIFICATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF CONTRIBUTIONS
Sec. 601. Certifications and withholding of Contributions.
Sec. 602. Diplomatic Campaign to Achieve Reform.
TITLE VII—UNITED NATIONS RENEWAL AND TOOLS TO FULLY IMPLEMENT UNITED NATIONS REFORM
Sec. 701. Synchronization of U.S. assessed Contributions to International Organizations.
Sec. 702. Increased funding for United States assessed contribution to the United Nations to support reform efforts.
Sec. 703. Buyout of United Nations personnel.
Sec. 704. United Nations democracy fund.
Sec. 705. United States personnel to international organizations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL.—The term ''Economic and Social Council'' means the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

(3) EMPLOYEE.—The term ''employee'' means an individual who is employed in the general services, professional staff, or senior management of the United Nations.

(4) GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—The term ''General Assembly'' means the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(5) MEMBER STATE.—The term ''Member State'' means a Member State of the United Nations.

(6) OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES.—The terms ''Office of Internal Oversight Services'' and ''OIOS'' mean the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of State.

(8) SECRETARY GENERAL.—The term ''Secretary General'' means the Secretary General of the United Nations.

(9) SECURITY COUNCIL.—The term ''Security Council'' means the Security Council of the United Nations.

(10) SPECIALIZED AGENCY.—The term ''specialized agency'' means any of the following agencies of the United Nations:

(A) The Food and Agriculture Organization, or FAO.

(B) The International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA.

(C) The International Civil Aviation Organization, or ICAO.

(D) The International Fund for Agricultural Development, or IFAD.

(E) The International Labor Organization, or ILO.

(F) The International Maritime Organization, or IMO.

(G) The International Telecommunication Union, or ITU.

(H) The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, or UNESCO.

(I) The United Nations Industrial Development Organization, or UNIDO.

(J) The Universal Postal Union, or UPU.

(K) The World Health Organization, or WHO.

(L) The World Meteorological Organization, or WMO.

(M) The World Intellectual Property Organization, or WIPO.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF CONGRESS.

Congress declares that, in light of recent history, it is incumbent upon the United Nations to enact significant reform measures if it is to restore the public trust and confidence necessary for it to achieve the laudable goals set forth in its Charter.

TITLE I—MISSION AND BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 101. UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION WITH RESPECT TO THE REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to make contributions toward the amount assessed to the United States by the United Nations for the purpose of funding the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

(b) UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—Section 11 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287e-3) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 11. UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

''(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations—

''(A) to pursue a streamlined, efficient, and accountable regular assessed budget of the United Nations;

''(B) to make efforts to shift funding mechanisms of some of the organizational programs of the United Nations from the regular assessed budget to voluntarily funded programs; and

''(C) to shift funding from entities whose efforts are found duplicative or unbalanced under section 106(b) of the United Nations Reform and Institutional Strengthening Act of 2005 to programs under subsection (b) of this section or other related programs.

''(2) FUTURE BIENNIUM BUDGETS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to seek to shift funding mechanisms of operational programs of the United Nations and to reduce the funding for programs specified in subsection (c) in future resolutions agreed to by the General Assembly for the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONAL PROGRAMS.—To the extent that any organizational programs are shifted from the regular assessed budget to voluntarily funded programs, the Secretary shall seek to use funds created by any reduction in the amount of the United States assessed contribution to the United Nations to make voluntary contributions to programs at the United Nations which—

''(1) conduct internal oversight;

''(2) promote human rights;

''(3) provide humanitarian assistance; and

''(4) are organizational programs which have been shifted from assessed to voluntary contributions.

''(c) PUBLIC INFORMATION AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY AFFAIRS AND CONFERENCE SERVICES.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to reduce by 20 percent the amount budgeted by resolution of the General Assembly for the 2008–2009 biennium compared to the amount budgeted by resolution of General Assembly for the 2004–2005 biennial period for the following organizational programs:

''(1) Public Information.

''(2) General Assembly affairs and conference services.''

SEC. 102. WEIGHTED VOTING.

It shall be the policy of the United States to actively pursue weighted voting in the United Nations with respect to all budgetary and financial matters in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee and in the General Assembly in accordance with the level of the financial contribution of a Member State to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

SEC. 103. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the conditions described in subsection (b) have been satisfied.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conditions under this subsection are the following:

(1) NEW BUDGET PRACTICES FOR THE UNITED NATIONS.—The United Nations is implementing budget practices that—

(A) require the maintenance of a budget not in excess of the level agreed to by the General Assembly at the beginning of each United Nations budgetary biennium, unless increases are agreed to by consensus and do not exceed ten percent, or unless the Secretary of State certifies that any increase that would be inconsistent with this paragraph is important to the national interest of the United States; and

(B) require the identification of expenditures by the United Nations by functional categories such as personnel, travel, and equipment.

(2) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

(A) EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary General has used the existing authorities to take measures to ensure that program managers within the United Nations Secretariat conduct evaluations of such programs in accordance with the standardized methodology referred to in subparagraph (B) of United Nations programs approved by the General Assembly.

(B) DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA.—The Office of Internal Oversight Services has developed a standardized methodology for the evaluation of United Nations programs approved by the General Assembly, including specific criteria for determining the continuing relevance and effectiveness of the programs.

(C) REPORT.—The Secretary General is assessing budget requests and, on the basis of the evaluations of programs conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) for the relevant preceding year, reports to the General Assembly on the continuing relevance and effectiveness of such programs and identifies those that need reform or should be terminated.

(D) SUNSET OF PROGRAMS.—Consistent with the July 16, 1997, recommendations of the Secretary General regarding a sunset policy and results-based budgeting for United Nations programs, the United Nations has established and is implementing procedures to require all new programs approved by the General Assembly to have a specific sunset date or a date by which such programs should be evaluated for continuing relevance and effectiveness.

SEC. 104. ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) CERTIFICATION OF CREATION OF INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT BOARD.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the establishment of an Independent Oversight Board (IOB) have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) An IOB or an equivalent entity is established. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the IOB shall be an independent entity within the United Nations and shall not be subject to budget authority or organizational authority of any entity within the United Nations.

(2) The head of the IOB shall be a Director. The IOB shall also consist of four other board members who shall be nominated by the Secretary General and subject to Security Council approval by a majority vote. The IOB shall be responsible to the Security Council. The Director and board members shall each serve terms of six years, except that the terms of the initial board shall be staggered so that the terms of not more than two board members will expire in any one year. No board member may serve more than two terms. An IOB board member may be removed for cause by a majority vote of the Security Council. The Director shall appoint a professional staff headed by a Chief of Staff and may employ contract staff as needed.

(3) The IOB shall receive operational and budgetary funding through appropriations by the General Assembly and shall not be dependent upon any other bureau, division, or department of the United Nations for such funding.

(4) The IOB shall have the authority to evaluate all operations of the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Board of External Auditors of the United Nations. Every three months or more frequently when appropriate, the IOB shall submit, as appropriate, to the Secretary General, the Security Council, the General Assembly, or the Economic and Social Council a report on its activities, relevant observations, and recommendations relating to its audit operations, including information relating to the inventory and status of investigation by the Office of Internal Oversight Services. The IOB may direct the Office of Internal Oversight Services or the Board of External Auditors to initiate an investigation.

(5) In extraordinary circumstances, and with the concurrence of the Secretary General and Security Council by majority vote, the IOB may augment the Office of Internal Oversight Services with a special investigator and staff consisting of individuals who are not employees of the United Nations, to investigate matters involving senior officials of the United Nations when allegations of serious misconduct have been made and such a special investigation is necessary to maintain public confidence in the integrity of the investigation. A special investigation staff shall comply with all United Nations financial disclosure and conflict of interest rules, including the filing of an individual annual financial disclosure form in accordance with subsection (c).

(6) The IOB shall recommend annual budgets for the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Board of External Auditors.

(b) CERTIFICATION OF UNITED NATIONS REFORMS OF THE OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) The OIOS is designated as an independent entity within the United Nations. The OIOS shall not be subject to budget authority or organizational authority of any entity within the United Nations.

(2) The head of the OIOS shall be a Director.

(3) The OIOS shall receive operational and budgetary funding through appropriations by the General Assembly and shall not be dependent upon any other bureau, division, department, or specialized agency for such funding.

(4) All United Nations officials, including officials from any bureau, division, or department of the United Nations, may—

(A) make a recommendation to the OIOS to initiate an investigation of any aspect of the United Nations; or

(B) report to the OIOS information or allegations of misconduct or inefficiencies within the United Nations.

(5) The OIOS may, sua sponte, initiate and conduct an investigation of any bureau, division, department, or employee (including the Secretary General) of the United Nations or contractor or consultant for the United Nations.

(6) At least every three months and more frequently when appropriate, the OIOS or another responsible office shall submit to the IOB a report containing an inventory and status of its investigations.

(7) The OIOS shall establish or approve procedures for providing ''whistle-blower'' status and employment protections for all employees of the United Nations, who provide informational leads and testimony related to allegations of wrongdoing. Such procedures shall be adopted throughout the United Nations. Such status and protection may not be conferred on the Secretary General.

(8) The OIOS shall annually publish a public report determining the proper number, distribution, and expertise of auditors within the OIOS necessary to carry out present and future duties of the OIOS, including assessing the staffing requirements needed to audit United Nations contracting activities throughout the contract cycle from the bid process to contract performance.

(9) The Director of OIOS shall establish a position of Associate Director of OIOS for Specialized Agencies and Funds and Programs, who shall be responsible for supervising the OIOS liaison and oversight duties for each specialized agency and funds and programs of the United Nations. With the concurrence of the Director and the relevant specialized agency, the Associate Director may hire and appoint necessary OIOS staff, including staff serving within and located at a specialized agency and funds and programs permanently or as needed to liaison with existing audit functions with each specialized agency and funds and programs.

(10) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish a position of Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations or an equivalent position, who shall be responsible for the oversight and auditing of the field offices attached to United Nations peacekeeping operations. The Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations shall—

(A) receive informational leads and testimony from any person regarding allegations of wrongdoing by United Nations officials or peacekeeping troops or regarding inefficiencies associated with United Nations peacekeeping operations; and

(B) shall be responsible for initiating, conducting, and overseeing investigations within peacekeeping operations.

(11)(A) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish a position of Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity or an equivalent position, who shall be responsible for auditing and inspecting procurement and contracting within the United Nations. The Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity shall—

(i) receive informational leads and testimony from any person regarding allegations of wrongdoing by United Nations officials or regarding inefficiencies associated with United Nations procurement or contracting activities; and

(ii) be responsible for initiating, conducting, and overseeing investigations of procurement and contract activities.

(B) Not later than 12 months after the establishment of the position of Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity, the Director, with the assistance of the Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity, shall undertake a review of contract procedures to ensure that practices and policies are in place to ensure that—

(i) the United Nations has ceased issuing single bid contracts, except during an emergency situation that is justified by the Under Secretary General for Management;

(ii) the United Nations has established effective controls to prevent conflicts of interest in the award of contracts; and

(iii) the United Nations has established effective procedures and policies to ensure effective and comprehensive oversight and monitoring of United Nations contract performance.

(c) CERTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS OFFICE OF ETHICS.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the establishment of a United Nations Office of Ethics or an equivalent entity (UNOE) have been established by the United Nations:

(1) A UNOE is established. The UNOE shall be an independent entity within the United Nations and shall not be subject to budget authority or organizational authority of any entity within the United Nations. The UNEO shall be responsible for establishing, managing, and enforcing a code of ethics for all employees of the United Nations. The UNEO shall be responsible for providing such employees with annual training related to such code. The head of the UNEO shall be a Director.

(2) The UNEO shall receive operational and budgetary funding through appropriations by the General Assembly and shall not be dependent upon any other bureau, division, department, or specialized agency of the United Nations for such funding.

(3) The Director of the UNEO shall, not later than six months after the date of its establishment, publish a report containing proposals for implementing a system for the filing and review of individual annual financial disclosure forms by each employee of the United Nations at the P–5 level and above and by all consultants for the United Nations compensated at any salary level. Such forms shall be made available at the request of the Director of the Office of Internal Oversight Services. Such system shall seek to identify and prevent conflicts of interest by United Nations employees and shall be comparable to the system used for such purposes by the United States Government. Such report shall also address broader reforms of the ethics program for the United Nations, including—

(A) the effect of the establishment of ethics officers throughout all organizations within the United Nations;

(B) the effect of retention by the UNEO of annual financial disclosure forms;

(C) proposals for making completed annual financial disclosure forms of each employee and consultant available to the public, on request, through the mission to the United Nations of the Member State of which the employee or consultant is a national;

(D) proposals for annual disclosure to the public of information related to the annual salaries and payments, including pension payments and buyouts, of employees of and consultants for the United Nations;

(E) proposals for annual disclosure to the public of information related to per diem rates for all bureaus, divisions, departments, or specialized agencies within the United Nations;

(F) proposals for disclosure upon request by the Ambassador of a Member State of information related to travel and per diem payments made from United Nations funds to any person; and

(G) proposals for annual disclosure to the public of information related to travel and per diem payments made from United Nations funds to any person.

(d) CERTIFICATION OF UNITED NATIONS ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the establishment of the position of a Chief Operating Officer or an equivalent position have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) There is established the position of Chief Operating Officer (COO). The COO shall report to the Secretary General.

(2) The COO shall be responsible for formulating general policies and programs for the United Nations in coordination with the Secretary General and in consultation with the Security Council and the General Assembly. The COO shall be responsible for the daily administration, operation and supervision, and the direction and control of the business of the United Nations. The COO shall also perform such other duties and may exercise such other powers as from time to time may be assigned to the COO by the Secretary General.

SEC. 105. TERRORISM AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to work toward adoption by the General Assembly of—

(1) a definition of terrorism that builds upon the recommendations of the Secretary General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, and includes as an essential component of such definition any action that is intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do, or abstain from doing, any act; and

(2) a comprehensive convention on terrorism that includes the definition described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 106. EQUALITY AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) INCLUSION OF ISRAEL IN WEOG.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to expand the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) in the United Nations to include Israel as a permanent member with full rights and privileges.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and every six months thereafter for the succeeding 2-year period, the Secretary of State shall notify the appropriate congressional committees concerning the treatment of Israel in the United Nations and the expansion of WEOG to include Israel as a permanent member.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVIEW AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To avoid duplicative efforts and funding with respect to Palestinian interests and to ensure balance in the approach to Israeli–Palestinian issues, the Secretary shall conduct an audit of the functions of the entities listed in paragraph (2) and submit to the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, a report containing recommendations for the elimination of such entities.

(2) ENTITIES.—The entities referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The United Nations Division for Palestinian Rights.

(B) The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

(C) The United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative to the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority.

(D) The NGO Network on the Question of Palestine.

(E) The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East.

(F) The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories.

(G) Such other entities as the Secretary determines to constitute duplicative efforts and funding or fail to ensure balance in the approach to Israeli-Palestinian issues.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION BY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to seek the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report required under subsection (b)(1).

(2) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—Until such recommendations have been implemented, the Secretary of State is authorized to withhold from United States contributions to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations for a biennial period amounts that are proportional to the percentage of such budget that are expended for such entities.

(d) GAO AUDIT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of—

(1) the status of the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report required under subsection (b)(1); and

(2) United States action and achievements under subsection (c).

SEC. 107. REFORMS AT THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES.

(a) BUDGET REFORM.—The Secretary of State shall direct the United States representative to each specialized agency to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States ensure that each specialized agency—

(1) has developed a standardized methodology for the evaluation of the programs of the agency, including specific criteria for determining the continuing relevance and effectiveness of the programs, patterned on the work of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations under section 103;

(2) provides the results of such evaluations to the governing body of such agency; and

(3) has established and is implementing procedures to require all new programs of such agency have a specific sunset date.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Secretary of State shall direct the United States representative to each specialized agency to use the voice, vote and influence of the United States to ensure that each specialized agency—

(1) has a strengthened internal inspection capability or has agreed to allow the Office on Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations to conduct an investigation or audit of any program in such agency, including any employee or contractor of, or consultant for, such agency; and

(2) has adopted whistleblower protections patterned on the protections developed by OIOS under section 104 of this Act.

(c) ETHICS.—The Secretary shall direct the United States representative to each specialized agency to use the voice, vote and influence of the United States to ensure that each specialized agency—

(1) is using a system for the filing and review of individual annual financial disclosure forms developed by the United Nations Ethics Office established by section 104 of this Act or a system patterned after such system; and

(2) has established its own ethics office or is using the services of the United Nations Ethics Office to review and otherwise implement the ethics system described in paragraph (1).

(d) AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary is unable to certify that one or more of the policies described in this section has been implemented for any specialized agency, the Secretary is authorized to withhold up to 50 percent of the United States contribution to the regular assessed budget of such specialized agency, beginning with funds appropriated for such contribution for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 108. REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United Nations reform since 1990.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall describe—

(1) the status of the implementation of management reforms within the United Nations and its specialized agencies;

(2) the number of outputs, reports, or other items generated by General Assembly resolutions that have been eliminated;

(3) the progress of the General Assembly to modernize and streamline the committee structure and its specific recommendations on oversight and committee outputs, consistent with the March 2005 report of the Secretary General entitled ''In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all'';

(4) the status of the review by the General Assembly of all mandates older than five years and how resources have been redirected to new challenges, consistent with the March 2005 report of the Secretary General referred to in paragraph (3); and

(5) the continued utility and relevance of the Economic and Financial Committee and the Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee, in light of the duplicative agendas of those committees and the Economic and Social Council.

(c) UPDATE.—Not later than one year after submitting the report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report updating the information included in the first report.

SEC. 109. REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(1) concerning the progress of the General Assembly to modernize human resource practices, consistent with the March 2005 report of the Secretary General entitled ''In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all''; and

(2) containing the information described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report shall include—

(1) a comprehensive evaluation of human resources reforms at the United Nations, including an evaluation of—

(A) tenure;

(B) performance reviews;

(C) the promotion system;

(D) a merit-based hiring system and enhanced regulations concerning termination of employment of employees; and

(E) the implementation of a code of conduct and ethics training;

(2) the implementation of a system of procedures for filing complaints and protective measures for work-place harassment, including sexual harassment;

(3) policy recommendations relating to the establishment of a rotation requirement for nonadministrative positions;

(4) policy recommendations relating to the establishment of a prohibition preventing personnel and officials assigned to the mission of a Member State to the United Nations from transferring to a position within the United Nations Secretariat that is compensated at the P–5 level or above;

(5) policy recommendations relating to a reduction in travel allowances and attendant oversight with respect to accommodations and airline flights; and

(6) an evaluation of the recommendations of the Secretary General relating to greater flexibility for the Secretary General in staffing decisions to accommodate changing priorities.

SEC. 110. ANTI-SEMITISM AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to—

(1) ensure the issuance and implementation of a directive by the Secretary General or the Secretariat, as appropriate, that—

(A) requires all employees of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to officially and publicly condemn anti-Semitic statements made at any session of the United Nations or its specialized agencies, or at any other session sponsored by the United Nations;

(B) requires employees of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to be subject to punitive action, including immediate dismissal, for making anti-Semitic statements or references;

(C) proposes specific recommendations to the General Assembly for the establishment of mechanisms to hold accountable employees and officials of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, or Member States, that make such anti-Semitic statements or references in any forum of the United Nations or of its specialized agencies; and

(D) develops and implements education awareness programs about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism throughout the world, as part of an effort to combat intolerance and hatred;

(2) work to secure the adoption of a resolution by the General Assembly that establishes the mechanisms described in paragraph (1)(C); and

(3) continue working toward further reduction of anti-Semitic language and anti-Israel resolutions in the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the requirements described in subsection (a) have been satisfied.

SEC. 111. UNITED NATIONS COOPERATION RELATING TO OIL-FOR-FOOD INVESTIGATION.

The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to make efforts to ensure that the United Nations provides all appropriate and necessary information to the relevant law enforcement authority of a Member State relating to a prosecution initiated by such authority regarding the oil-for-food program of the United Nations and that the United Nations waives immunity regarding any official charged with a serious criminal offense under such prosecution.

TITLE II—HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

SEC. 201. HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use its voice, vote, and influence at the United Nations to ensure that a credible and respectable Human Rights Council or other human rights body is established within the United Nations whose participating Member States uphold the values embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(b) HUMAN RIGHTS REFORMS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to seek to ensure that the following human rights reforms have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) A Member State that fails to uphold the values embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights shall be ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body.

(2) A Member State that is subject to sanctions by the Security Council or under a Security Council-mandated investigation for human rights abuses shall be ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body.

(3) A Member State that is subject to a country specific resolution relating to human rights abuses perpetrated in that country by the government of that country that has been adopted, within the preceding 3-year period, by a United Nations or regional organization that has competence regarding such matters shall be ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body. For purposes of this paragraph, a country specific resolution shall not include consensus resolutions on advisory services.

(4) A Member State that violates the principles of a United Nations human rights body to which it aspires to join shall be ineligible for membership on such body.

(5) No human rights body has a standing agenda item that only relates to one country or one region.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the human rights reforms described under subsection (b) have been adopted by the United Nations.

(d) PREVENTION OF ABUSE OF ''NO ACTION'' MOTIONS.—The United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations shall work to prevent abuse of ''no action'' motions, particularly as such motions relate to country specific resolutions.

(e) OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS.—

(1) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to continue to strongly support the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has been given greater authority in field operation activities, such as in the Darfur region of Sudan and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in furtherance of the purpose and mission of the United Nations.

SEC. 202. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (ECOSOC).

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use its voice, vote, and influence at the United Nations to—

(1) abolish secret voting in the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC);

(2) ensure that, until such time as the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations is abolished, only countries that are not ineligible for membership on a human rights body in accordance with paragraph (1) through (4) of section 201(b) shall be considered for membership on the Commission on Human Rights; and

(3) ensure that after candidate countries are nominated for membership on the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council conducts a recorded vote to determine such membership.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the policies described in subsection (a) have been implemented.

SEC. 203. INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The situation in Darfur, Sudan, declared to be genocide by the U.S. House of Representatives in H.Con.Res. 467 (adopted on July 27, 2004), demonstrates the need for an internationally agreed framework for effective action to prevent genocide or other crimes against humanity that threaten a large scale loss of life.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the United States and other members of the international community should endorse the Secretary General's initiative described in his report entitled ''In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all'' to require that—

(1) the government of every country has the responsibility to protect its civilian population from genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity; and

(2) in the case of a government that is unwilling or unable to do carry out its responsibility under paragraph (1) in the face of such gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, members of the international community must use diplomatic, humanitarian, and other necessary means to help protect civilian populations and save lives.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

SEC. 301. INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY.

(a) ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE.—

(1) OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to establish an Office of Compliance in the Secretariat of the IAEA under the direction of the Deputy Director General for Safeguards.

(B) OPERATION.—The Office of Compliance shall—

(i) function as an independent body composed of technical experts who shall work in consultation with IAEA inspectors to assess compliance by IAEA Member States and provide recommendations to the IAEA Board of Governors concerning penalties to be imposed on IAEA Member States that fail to fulfill their obligations under IAEA Board resolutions;

(ii) base its assessments and recommendations on IAEA inspection reports; and

(iii) take into consideration information provided by IAEA Board Members that are among the five nuclear weapons states as recognized by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (21 UST 483) (commonly referred to as the ''Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty'' or the ''NPT'').

(C) STAFFING.—The Office of Compliance shall be staffed from existing personnel in the Department of Safeguards of the IAEA or the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security of the IAEA.

(D) OPERATION.—The Office of Compliance shall operate in consultation with IAEA inspectors and enforcement actions shall be

based on inspection reports, IAEA Board of Governors resolutions, Director General reports, and shall take into consideration information provided by IAEA Board Members that are among the five nuclear weapons states as recognized by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(2) SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SAFEGUARDS AND VERIFICATION.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to establish a Special Committee on Safeguards and Verification.

(B) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Special Committee shall—

(i) improve the ability of the IAEA to monitor and enforce compliance by Member States of the IAEA with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

(ii) consider which additional measures are necessary to enhance the ability of the IAEA, beyond the verification mechanisms and authorities contained in the Additional Protocol to the Safeguards Agreements between the IAEA and Member States of the IAEA, to detect with a high degree of confidence undeclared nuclear activities by a Member State.

(3) PENALTIES WIT RESPECT TO THE IAEA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to ensure that a Member State of the IAEA that is under investigation for a breach of or noncompliance with its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations has its IAEA privileges suspended, including—

(i) limiting its ability to vote on its case;

(ii) being prevented from receiving any technical assistance; and

(iii) being prevented from hosting meetings.

(B) TERMINATION OF PENALTIES.—The penalties specified under subparagraph (A) shall be terminated when the investigation is concluded and the Member State is no longer in such breach or noncompliance.

(4) PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to ensure that a Member State of the IAEA that is found to be in breach of, in noncompliance with, or has withdrawn from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty shall return to the IAEA all nuclear materials and technology received from the IAEA, any Member State of the IAEA, or any Member State of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

(b) UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—Voluntary contributions of the United States to the IAEA may only be used to fund activities relating to Nuclear Safety and Security or activities relating to Nuclear Verification.

(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to—

(A) ensure that funds for safeguards inspections are used giving first priority to address countries that are initiating or developing nuclear activities; and

(B) block the allocation of funds for any other IAEA development, environmental, or nuclear science assistance or activity to a country—

(i) the government of which the Secretary of State has determined—

(I) for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or other provision of law, is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(II) has not dismantled and surrendered its weapons of mass destruction under international verification;

(ii) that is under investigation for a breach of or noncompliance with its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; or

(iii) that is in violation of its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

(3) DETAIL OF EXPENDITURES.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to secure, as part of the regular budget presentation of the IAEA to Member States of the IAEA, a detailed breakdown by country of expenditures of the IAEA for safeguards inspections and nuclear security activities.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to block the membership on the Board of Governors of the IAEA of a Member State of the IAEA that has not signed and ratified the IAEA Additional Protocol and—

(A) is under investigation for a breach of, or noncompliance with, its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; or

(B) is in violation of its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

(2) CRITERIA.—The United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA shall make every effort to modify the criteria for Board membership to reflect the principles described in paragraph (1).

(d) NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.—

(1) UNITED STATES ACTION.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to make every effort to ensure the adoption of a resolution by the IAEA Board of Governors that makes Iran ineligible to receive any nuclear material, technology, equipment, or assistance from any IAEA Member State and ineligible for any IAEA assistance not related to safeguards inspections or nuclear security until the IAEA Board of Governors determines that Iran—

(A) is providing full access to IAEA inspectors to its nuclear-related facilities;

(B) has fully implemented and is in compliance with the Additional Protocol; and

(C) has permanently ceased and dismantled all activities and programs related to nuclear-enrichment and reprocessing.

(2) PENALTIES.—If an IAEA Member State is determined to have violated the prohibition on assistance to Iran described in paragraph (1) before the IAEA Board of Governors determines that Iran has satisfied the conditions described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of such paragraph, such Member State shall be subject to the penalties described in section 301(a)(3), shall be ineligible to receive nuclear material, technology, equipment, or assistance from any IAEA Member State, and shall be ineligible to receive any IAEA assistance not related to safeguards inspections or nuclear security until such time as the IAEA Board of Governors makes such determination with respect to Iran.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for the succeeding 2-year period, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this section.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ACTION PLAN OF THE IAEA.

It is the sense of Congress that the national security interests of the United States are enhanced by the Nuclear Security Action Plan of the IAEA and the Board of Governors of the IAEA should recommend, and the General Conference of the IAEA should adopt, a resolution incorporating the Nuclear Security Action Plan into the regular budget of the IAEA.

TITLE IV—PEACEKEEPING

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REFORM OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) although United Nations peacekeeping operations have contributed greatly toward the promotion of peace and stability for the past 57 years, and the majority of peacekeeping personnel who have served under the United Nations flag have done so with honor and courage, the record of United Nations peacekeeping has been severely tarnished by operational failures and unconscionable acts of misconduct; and

(2) if the reputation of and confidence in United Nations peacekeeping operations is to be restored, fundamental and far-reaching reforms, particularly in the areas of planning, management, training, conduct, and discipline, must be implemented without delay.

SEC. 402. STATEMENT OF POLICY RELATING TO REFORM OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

It shall be the policy of the United States to pursue reform of United Nations peacekeeping operations in the following areas:

(1) PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.—

(A) GLOBAL AUDIT.—As the size, cost, and number of United Nations peacekeeping operations have increased substantially over the past decade, an independent audit of each such operation, with a view toward ''right-sizing'' operations and ensuring that such operations are cost effective, should be conducted and its findings reported to the Security Council.

(B) REVIEW OF MANDATES AND CLOSING OPERATIONS.—In conjunction with the audit described in subparagraph (A), the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations should conduct a comprehensive review of all United Nations peacekeeping operation mandates, with a view toward identifying objectives that are practical and achievable, and report its findings to the Security Council. In particular, the review should consider the following:

(i) Activities that fall beyond the scope of traditional peacekeeping activities should be delegated to a new Peacebuilding Commission, described in paragraph (3).

(ii) Long-standing operations that are static and cannot fulfill their mandate should be downsized or closed.

(iii) If there is legitimate concern that the withdrawal from a country of an otherwise static United Nations peacekeeping operation would result in the resumption of major conflict, a burden-sharing arrangement that reduces the level of assessed contributions, similar to that currently supporting the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, should be explored and instituted.

(C) LEADERSHIP.—As peacekeeping operations become larger and increasingly complex, the Secretariat should adopt a minimum standard of qualifications for senior leaders and managers, with particular emphasis on specific skills and experience, and

current senior leaders and managers who do not meet those standards should be removed or reassigned.

(D) PRE-DEPLOYMENT TRAINING.—Pre-deployment training on interpretation of the mandate of the operation, specifically in the areas of force, civilian protection, field conditions, the Code of Conduct described in paragraph (2)(A), HIV/AIDS, gender, and human rights issues should be mandatory, and all personnel, regardless of category or rank, should be required to sign an oath that each has received and understands such training as a condition of participation in the operation.

(2) CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINE.—

(A) ADOPTION OF A UNIFORM CODE OF CONDUCT.—A single, uniform Code of Conduct that has the status of a binding rule and applies equally to all personnel serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations, regardless of category or rank, should be promulgated, adopted, and enforced.

(B) UNDERSTANDING THE CODE OF CONDUCT.—All personnel, regardless of category or rank, should receive training on the Code of Conduct prior to deployment with a peacekeeping operation, in addition to periodic follow-on training. In particular—

(i) all personnel, regardless of category or rank, should be provided with a personal copy of the Code of Conduct that has been translated into the national language of such personnel, regardless of whether such language is an official language of the United Nations;

(ii) all personnel, regardless of category or rank, should sign an oath that each has received a copy of the Code of Conduct, that each pledges to abide by the Code of Conduct, and that each understands the consequences of violating the Code of Conduct as a condition of appointment to such operation, including immediate termination of the participation of such personnel in the peacekeeping operation to which such personnel is assigned; and

(iii) peacekeeping operations should conduct educational outreach programs within communities hosting such operations, including explaining prohibited acts on the part of United Nations peacekeeping personnel and identifying the individual to whom the local population may direct complaints or file allegations of exploitation, abuse, or other acts of misconduct.

(C) MONITORING MECHANISMS.—Dedicated monitoring mechanisms, such as the personnel conduct units deployed to support United Nations peacekeeping operations in Haiti, Liberia, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, should be present in each operation to monitor compliance with the Code of Conduct, and—

(i) should report simultaneously to the Head of Mission, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and the Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations (established under section 104(b)(9)); and

(ii) should be tasked with designing and implementing mission-specific measures to prevent misconduct, conduct follow-on training for personnel, coordinate community outreach programs, and assist in investigations, as OIOS determines necessary and appropriate.

(D) INVESTIGATIONS.—A permanent, professional, and independent investigative body should be established and introduced into United Nations peacekeeping operations. In particular—

(i) the investigative body should include professionals with experience in investigating sex crimes, as well as experts who can provide guidance on standards of proof and evidentiary requirements necessary for any subsequent legal action;

(ii) provisions should be included in a Model Memorandum of Understanding that obligate each Member State that contributes troops to a peacekeeping operation to designate a military prosecutor who will participate in any investigation into an allegation of misconduct brought against an individual of that Member State, so that evidence is collected and preserved in a manner consistent with the military law of that Member State;

(iii) the investigative body should be regionally based to ensure rapid deployment and should be equipped with modern forensics equipment for the purpose of positively identifying perpetrators and, where necessary, for determining paternity; and

(iv) the investigative body should report directly to the Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations, while providing copies of any reports to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Head of Mission, and the Member State concerned.

(E) FOLLOW-UP.—A dedicated unit, similar to the personnel conduct units, staffed and funded through existing resources, should be established within the headquarters of the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and tasked with—

(i) promulgating measures to prevent misconduct;

(ii) coordinating allegations of misconduct, and reports received by field personnel; and

(iii) gathering follow-up information on completed investigations, particularly by focusing on disciplinary actions against the individual concerned taken by the United Nations or by the Member State that is contributing troops to which the individual belongs, and sharing that information with the Security Council, the Head of Mission, and the community hosting the peacekeeping operation.

(F) FINANCIAL LIABILITY AND VICTIMS ASSISTANCE.—Although peacekeeping operations should provide immediate medical assistance to victims of sexual abuse or exploitation, the responsibility for providing longer-term treatment, care, or restitution lies solely with the individual found guilty of the misconduct. In particular, the following reforms should be implemented:

(i) The United Nations should not assume responsibility for providing long-term treatment or compensation by creating a ''Victims Trust Fund'', or any other such similar fund, financed through assessed contributions to United Nations peacekeeping operations, thereby shielding individuals from personal liability and reinforcing an atmosphere of impunity.

(ii) If an individual responsible for misconduct has been repatriated, reassigned, redeployed, or is otherwise unable to provide assistance, responsibility for providing assistance to a victim should be assigned to the Member State that contributed the troops to which the individual belonged or to the manager concerned.

(iii) In the case of misconduct by a member of a military contingent, appropriate funds should be withheld from the troop-contributing country concerned.

(iv) In the case of misconduct by a civilian employee or contractor of the United Nations, appropriate wages should be garnished from such individual or fines should be imposed against such individual, consistent with existing United Nations Staff Rules.

(G) MANAGERS AND COMMANDERS.—The manner in which managers and commanders handle cases of misconduct by those serving under them should be included in their individual performance evaluations, so that managers and commanders who take decisive action to deter and address misconduct are rewarded, while those who create a permissive environment or impede investigations are penalized or relieved of duty, as appropriate.

(H) DATA BASE.—A centralized data base should be created and maintained within the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations to track cases of misconduct, including the outcome of investigations and subsequent prosecutions, to ensure that personnel who have engaged in misconduct or other criminal activities, regardless of category or rank, are permanently barred from participation in future peacekeeping operations.

(I) WELFARE.—Peacekeeping operations should assume responsibility for maintaining a minimum standard of welfare for mission personnel to ameliorate conditions of service, while adjustments are made to the discretionary welfare payments currently provided to Member States that contribute troops to offset the cost of operation-provided recreational facilities.

(3) PEACEBUILDING COMMISSION.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Consistent with the recommendations of the Report of the Secretary General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, the United Nations should establish a Peacebuilding Commission, supported by a Peacebuilding Support Office, to marshal the efforts of the United Nations, international financial institutions, donors, and non-governmental organizations to assist countries in transition from war to peace.

(B) STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission should—

(i) be a subsidiary body of the United Nations Security Council, limited in size to ensure efficiency;

(ii) include members of the United Nations Security Council, major donors, and Member States that contribute troops, appropriate United Nations organizations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund; and

(iii) invite the President of ECOSOC, regional actors, Member States that contribute troops, regional development banks, and other concerned parties that are not already members, as determined appropriate, to consult or participate in meetings as observers.

(C) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Commission should seek to ease the demands currently placed upon the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to undertake tasks that fall beyond the scope of traditional peacekeeping, by—

(i) developing and integrating country-specific and system-wide conflict prevention, post-conflict reconstruction, and long-term development policies and strategies; and

(ii) serving as the key coordinating body for the design and implementation of military, humanitarian, and civil administration aspects of complex missions.

(D) RESOURCES.—The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission and the related Peacebuilding Support Office should be staffed with existing resources.

SEC. 403. CERTIFICATION.

(a) NEW OR EXPANDED PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS CONTINGENT UPON PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS REFORMS.—

(1) NO NEW OR EXPANDED PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—Beginning on January 1, 2007, and until the Secretary certifies that the requirements described in paragraph (2) have been satisfied, the President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to oppose the creation of new, or expansion of existing, United Nations peacekeeping operations unless the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such creation or expansion is in

the national interest of the United States, and includes with the certification a written justification therefor.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS REFORMS.—The certification referred to in paragraph (1) is a certification made by the Secretary to the appropriate congressional committees that the following reforms, or an equivalent set of reforms, related to peacekeeping operations have been adopted by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations or the General Assembly, as appropriate:

(A) A single, uniform Code of Conduct that has the status of a binding rule and applies equally to all personnel serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations, regardless of category or rank, has been adopted by the General Assembly and mechanisms have been established for training such personnel concerning the requirements of the Code and enforcement of the Code.

(B) All personnel, regardless of category or rank, serving in a peacekeeping operation have been trained concerning the requirements of the Code of Conduct and each has been given a personal copy of the Code, translated into the national language of such personnel.

(C) All personnel, regardless of category or rank, are required to sign an oath that each has received a copy of the Code of Conduct, that each pledges to abide by the Code, and that each understands the consequences of violating the Code as a condition of the appointment to such operation, including the immediate termination of the participation of such personnel in the peacekeeping operation to which such personnel is assigned.

(D) All peacekeeping operations have designed and implemented educational outreach programs that reach local communities where peacekeeping personnel of such operations are based for a significant period of time, explaining prohibited acts on the part of United Nations peacekeeping personnel and identifying the individual to whom the local population may direct complaints or file allegations of exploitation, abuse, or other acts of misconduct.

(E) A centralized data base has been created and is being maintained in the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations that tracks cases of misconduct, including the outcomes of investigations and subsequent prosecutions, to ensure that personnel, regardless of category or rank, who have engaged in misconduct or other criminal activities are permanently barred from participation in future peacekeeping operations.

(F) A Model Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations and each Member State that contributes troops to a peacekeeping operation has been adopted by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations that specifically obligates each such Member State to—

(i) designate a competent legal authority, preferably a prosecutor with expertise in the area of sexual exploitation and abuse, to participate in any investigation into an allegation of misconduct brought against an individual of the Member State;

(ii) refer to its competent national or military authority for possible prosecution, if warranted, any investigation of a violation of the Code of Conduct or other criminal activity by an individual of the Member State;

(iii) report to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations on the outcome of any such investigation;

(iv) undertake to conduct on-site court martial proceedings relating to allegations of misconduct alleged against an individual of the Member State;

(v) assume responsibility for the provision of appropriate assistance to a victim of misconduct committed by an individual of the Member State; and

(vi) establish a professional and independent investigative and audit function within the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the OIOS to monitor United Nations peacekeeping operations.

SEC. 404. UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) 25 PERCENT LIMITATION.—Section 404(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 287e note; Public Law 103–236) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2006 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated for 'Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities' for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 shall not be available for the payment of the United States assessed contribution for a United Nations peacekeeping operation in an amount which is greater than 27.1 percent of the total of all assessed contributions for that operation.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect and apply beginning on October 1, 2005.

SEC. 405. GENOCIDE AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES ACTIONS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to make every effort to ensure the formal adoption and implementation of mechanisms to—

(1) suspend the membership of a Member State in the United Nations if genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity are determined to be occurring in such Member State, regardless of whether such acts are being committed by the government of such Member State or by a third party;

(2) impose an arms and trade embargo and travel restrictions on, and freeze the assets of, all groups and individuals responsible for committing or allowing such acts to occur;

(3) deploy a United Nations peacekeeping operation or authorize and support the deployment of a peacekeeping operation from an international organization to the Member State with a mandate to stop such acts;

(4) deploy monitors from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the area where such acts are occurring in the Member State; and

(5) authorize the establishment of an international commission of inquiry into such acts.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Unless the Secretary certifies that the mechanisms described in subsection (a) have been adopted and implemented, the Secretary is authorized to withhold up to ten percent of United States contributions to the peacekeeping budget of the United Nations.

SEC. 406. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES OFFICIALS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Nothing in this title shall be construed as superceding the Uniform Code of Military Justice or operating to effect the surrender of United States officials or members of the Armed Forces to a foreign country or international tribunal for prosecutions arising from peacekeeping operations or other similar United Nations related activity.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SEC. 501. POSITIONS FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

The Secretary of State shall make every effort to recruit United States citizens for positions within international organizations.

SEC. 502. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION FOR REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) DETAILED ITEMIZATION.—The annual congressional budget justification shall include a detailed itemized request in support of the assessed contribution of the United States to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

(b) CONTENTS OF DETAILED ITEMIZATION.—The detailed itemization required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) contain information relating to the amounts requested in support of each of the various sections and titles of the regular assessed budget of the United Nations; and

(2) compare the amounts requested for the current year with the actual or estimated amounts contributed by the United States in previous fiscal years for the same sections and titles.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS AND NOTIFICATION.—If the United Nations proposes an adjustment to its regular assessed budget, the Secretary of State shall, at the time such adjustment is presented to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions of the United Nations (ACABQ), notify and consult with the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 503. REVIEW AND REPORT.

Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall conduct a review of programs of the United Nations that are funded through assessed contributions and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing—

(1) the findings of such review; and

(2) recommendations relating to—

(A) the continuation of such programs; and

(B) which of such programs should be voluntarily funded.

SEC. 504. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS REFORMS.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and 12 months thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the status of the 1997, 2002, and 2005 management reforms initiated by the Secretary General and on the reforms mandated by this Act.

(b) REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF STATE CERTIFICATIONS.—Not later than six months after each certification is submitted by the Secretary of State to the appropriate congressional committees under this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each such certification. The Secretary shall provide the Comptroller General with any information required by the Comptroller General to submit any such report.

TITLE VI—CERTIFICATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 601. CERTIFICATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The certifications required under sections 103, 104(a) through 104(d), 110, 201(c), 201(e), and 202 of this Act are certifications submitted to the appropriate congressional committees by the Secretary of State that the requirements of each such section have been satisfied with respect to reform of the United Nations.

(b) ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION MECHANISM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event that the Secretary is unable to make any certification described in subsection (a), the Secretary may nonetheless satisfy the requirements referred to in such certification by certifying that—

(A) the United Nations has implemented reforms that are either substantially similar

to or accomplish the same purposes as the requirements referred to in any such certification; or

(B) in the case of the policies described in subsections (a) and (c) of section 11 the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (as amended by section 101 of this Act) or the requirements of sections 201(c) and 202(b) of this Act, substantial progress has been made in implementing such policies or requirements.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this subsection, reforms are ''substantially similar to or accomplish the same purposes as'' if the reforms are—

(A) formally adopted by the organ or committee of the United Nations that has authority to take such action or are issued by the Secretariat or the appropriate entity or committee in written form; and

(B) are not identical to the measures required by a particular certification but in the judgment of the Secretary will have the same or nearly the same effect as such measures.

(3) WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION AND CONSULTATION.—

(A) WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days before submitting an alternate certification in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written justification explaining in detail the basis for such alternate certification.

(B) CONSULTATION.—After the Secretary has submitted the written justification under subparagraph (A), but not later than 15 days before the Secretary exercises the alternate certification mechanism described in clause (i), the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees regarding such exercise.

(c) WITHHOLDING OF UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.—If the Secretary is unable to make one or more of the certifications described in subsection (a) or (b), the Secretary is authorized to withhold from expenditure until such time as the Secretary deems appropriate up to 50 percent of the contribution of the United States to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations for a biennial period, beginning with funds appropriated for the United States Assessed contribution for fiscal year 2008.

(d) CONSULTATION ON PROGRESS OF REFORMS.—Beginning six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every three months thereafter until all the certifications under subsection (a) and (b) are made, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees regarding the progress in adoption and implementation of the reforms described in this Act.

(e) DURATION OF FUNDS.—

(1) ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE U.N.—Any amounts of funds appropriated for the United States assessed contribution to the United Nations that are withheld under subsection (c) are authorized to remain available until expended in fiscal years after the fiscal year in which all certifications are made under subsections (a) and (b).

(2) ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS TO SPECIALIZED AGENCIES.—Any amounts of funds appropriated for the United States assessed contribution to a specialized agency that are withheld under section 107(d) are authorized to remain available until expended in fiscal years after the fiscal year in which the Secretary makes the certification with respect to the policy or policies described in section 107 by reason of which the funds were withheld.

(f) BIENNIAL REVIEWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct biennial reviews, beginning two years after the date on which the Secretary submits the last of the certifications under subsections (a) and (b), to determine if the United Nations continues to remain in compliance with all such certifications. Not later than 30 days after the completion of each such review, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the findings of each such review.

(2) ACTION.—If during the course of any such review the Secretary determines that the United Nations has failed to remain in compliance with a certification that was submitted in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to exercise the authority described in subsection (c) with respect to the biennial period immediately following such review and subsequent biennial periods until such time as all certifications under subsection (a) or (b) have been submitted.

SEC. 602. DIPLOMATIC CAMPAIGN TO ACHIEVE REFORM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in order to achieve the reforms required by this Act, the President must undertake an extensive diplomatic campaign, in combination with like-minded countries at the United Nations to achieve those reforms, including acting through the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use its voice, vote and influence at the United Nations and direct diplomatic intervention at the highest levels of government in Member States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Sixty days before exercising the authority to withhold funds under section 601(c), the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees and submit a report on how the exercise of such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(c) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of efforts by the United States to achieve the reforms required by this Act to date;

(2) an analysis of why reforms sought by the United States have not been achieved; and

(3) an explanation of how United States policy will be furthered by conditioning or withholding funds for assessed contributions to the United Nations, as well as an analysis of how withholding such funds are expected to affect programs, operations, staff, and reforms of the United Nations and United States interests.

TITLE VII—UNITED NATIONS RENEWAL AND TOOLS TO FULLY IMPLEMENT UNITED NATIONS REFORM

SEC. 701. SYNCHRONIZATION OF U.S. ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the early 1980s, the United States Government began to pay United States assessments to certain international organizations in the last quarter of the calendar year in which they were due. This practice allowed the United States to pay its annual assessment to the United Nations and other international organizations with the next fiscal year's appropriations, taking advantage of the fact that international organizations operate on calendar years. It also allowed the United States to reduce budgetary outlays, making the United States budget deficit appear smaller.

(2) The United States, which is assessed 22 percent of the United Nations regular budget, now pays its dues at least 10 months late, and often later depending on when the relevant appropriation is enacted.

(3) This practice causes the United Nations to operate throughout much of the year without a significant portion of its operating budget. By midyear, the budget is usually depleted, forcing the United Nations to borrow from its peacekeeping budget, since the organization is prohibited from borrowing externally. As a result, countries that contribute to United Nations peacekeeping missions are not reimbursed on a timely basis.

(4) For years, continuing this practice is inconsistent with the purposes of this Act to encourage the United Nations to engage in sound, fiscally responsible budgetary practices.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Beginning in the fiscal year in which all certifications under subsection (a) and (b) of section 601 have been made, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated to a process to synchronize the payment of its assessments to the United Nations and other international organizations over a multiyear period so that the United States can resume paying its dues to such international organizations at the beginning of each calendar year:

(1) For the fiscal year after all such certifications have been made, $150,000,000.

(2) For the second year after all such certifications have been made, $150,000,000.,

(3) For the third year after all such certifications have been made, $150,000,000.

SEC. 702. INCREASED FUNDING FOR UNITED STATES ASSESSED CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS TO SUPPORT REFORM EFFORTS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should support an increase in the 2006–2007 United Nations biennium budget and future United Nations budgets to support the creation of new offices or institutions and the strengthening of existing offices in order to fully implement the reforms required by this Act.

SEC. 703. BUYOUT OF UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should support an increase in the appropriate United Nations biennium budget to fund a buyout of United Nations personnel to the extent that the buyout is a targeted buyout of personnel that do not have the skills necessary for the United Nations in the 21st century.

SEC. 704. UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND.

There is authorized for fiscal year 2006 for a voluntary contribution to the United Nations International Democracy Fund $10,000,000.

SEC. 705. UNITED STATES PERSONNEL TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

The President is authorized to detail any United States Government officer or employee to the United Nations on a nonreimbursable basis for up to three years to assist in the implementation of the reforms described in this Act, including providing for any necessary housing, education, cost-of-living allowances, or other allowances authorized under the Foreign Service Act the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me thank all Members of the House for a singularly civilized, substantive, and I believe informative debate. I particularly want to thank my dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, with whom I have

had the privilege of serving now for some 25 years, and with whom I have had the privilege of sharing the leadership of the Committee on International Relations for the past 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan substitute offered by me and my distinguished Republican colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), is a rational and logical proposal to promote U.N. reform while giving the Secretary of State sufficient flexibility to do her job. With our substitute amendment, we align ourselves strongly on U.N. reform issues with our Nation's foreign policy leadership, including Secretary of State Rice and eight former U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, including a former distinguished Republican Senator, John Danforth, and the revered Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick.

We are fighting to ensure that the United States is better armed to propose serious U.N. reform and not forced to cut off funds to the United Nations in an arbitrary manner that is counterproductive to our national interest.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment addresses four primary deficiencies, fatal deficiencies, in the Hyde bill. First, our substitute does not sever the link between achieving U.N. reform benchmarks and the possibility of withholding half of our U.N. dues, which is the Hyde proposal. Rather, though the benchmarks are the same as in the underlying bill, the Lantos-Shays amendment would give Secretary Rice the authority to withhold up to 50 percent of our U.N. dues, not mandate such a cut.

This is the fundamental distinction between the Hyde and the Lantos bills, and I want to reiterate it so every Member of the House will be clear on what they are voting on. The Hyde bill is a guillotine on autopilot, while our bill gives desperately needed discretion to Secretary of State Rice.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the Hyde bill would prohibit the United States from supporting any new U.N. peacekeeping mission unless a far-reaching set of peacekeeping reforms is adopted. My substitute keeps these reforms, but provides Secretary Rice with a waiver in the event that a new mission is required, such as preventing genocide.

I want to repeat this, too, Mr. Chairman. The Hyde bill would prevent a U.N. peacekeeping mission to prevent genocide in an automatic, rigid, nonnegotiable and arbitrary fashion. The Lantos-Shays substitute provides our Secretary of State the authority to waive that restriction.

Our substitute also ensures that we do not withhold funds from the United Nations when it is separate specialized agencies, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization or others, which have failed to make necessary reforms. It is a non sequitur, it is fundamentally flawed logic to hold the U.N. accountable for shortcomings of organizations that the United Nations does not control. It boggles the mind that we would penalize the U.N. for the failure of an agency that the U.N. does not control instituting necessary reforms.

Our amendment also incorporates a number of the amendments that have been adopted in this 2-day debate on anti-Semitism, the Oil-for-Food scandal, nonproliferation and others.

Mr. Chairman, there are touches of a Greek tragedy as we move towards the vote. Many of my Republican friends would like to vote for the Lantos substitute because they recognize the wisdom of flexibility to be given to our Secretary of State. I find myself in the delicious but unaccustomed position of having the support of the White House, the Secretary of State of a Republican administration, eight former Ambassadors to the United Nations, a united front on the Democratic side, and a handful of bold Republicans who are prepared to break party discipline and vote for what is in our national interest.

□ 1245

Newt Gingrich, who has been referred to repeatedly, clearly does not favor the rigid and automatic requirement in the chairman's bill. He favors our initiative, as do I.

I stand shoulder to shoulder with the chairman in calling for these reforms, but my alternative offers the Secretary of State desperately needed flexibility that she wants and needs.

There is an additional item that we should recognize. This is a very fast-moving world. A year ago there were Syrian troops in Lebanon. A year ago many developments globally were not even on the horizon. Why should we freeze ourselves into autopilot for a 4-year period when none of us are clairvoyant, none of us can predict what conditions our Secretary of State and our country will confront in 2007 or 2008 or 2009.

I have the highest respect for the chairman. We have worked together on countless issues. We have brought most pieces of legislation to this House on a bipartisan basis. In a sense, this too is a bipartisan piece of legislation in terms of its substance. Where we part company is in making the legislation, in terms of the chairman's preference calling for automatic 50 percent reductions in U.N. dues if everything is not done perfectly.

I have used the phrase 39 amendments or commandments. We have adopted a few more. We are now up to 46 commandments. So if 45½ commandments are fully complied with, do we really want to cut our contribution to this international organization which we so desperately need all across the globe? Do we really want to cut our contributions by 50 percent, giving the President, the Secretary of State and this body no flexibility? I do not think so.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to say to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) what an absolute pleasure it is working with him. He brings to these very critical issues intellect, dignity, and a fierce patriotism. I have been very proud and pleased to have had this association.

One of the most interesting aspects of today's debate is the fact that we have focused very little on what the U.N. needs to do, and we spent most of our time on how we should ensure these reforms are actually implemented. We have heard from our opponents quote after quote from informed and not-so-informed sources that withholding dues is absolutely the death knell of the U.N. They are victimized by effective reform.

Well, how our opponents can make this charge and then support the Lantos substitute suggests a conflicted state of mind. It is clear that the Lantos substitute is nearly identical to our bill except for the powers given to Secretary Rice. I assert she does have flexibility under our bill as well. She can waive the withholding, decide what level of withholding, if any, is appropriate under the Lantos bill. He cedes to her total control over the purse strings. But every Member voting for the Lantos bill, and God bless them, every one of them is voting to withhold dues. I tip my hat to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for achieving consensus in his party for securing unanimity among his flock on the conclusion that the U.N. will not reform unless dues are withheld. That is a signature achievement. Of course the Democrats withhold dues in a fashion different than we do. We legislate them. We say we have had enough waivers, enough resolutions, enough statements; it is time we have some teeth in reform.

It is not impossible to achieve this notwithstanding the naysayers. There are 2 years before the certifications even kick in, 2 years for the U.N. to get its act together; and then you can do 32 of the 39 reforms, still be certified, and no funds are withheld and still you have another year to accomplish the remaining reforms. So both measures have nearly identical reforms and both measures withhold dues. Only it is the Secretary of State who has the authority in their substitute, and we legislate it.

What does history show? History shows when Congress stands tough, when it says if you do not reform, we are not going to pay, then change occurs.

Does anyone remember Kassebaum-Solomon? The amendment eventually led to the implementation of consensus-based budgeting, a reform that no one said could be achieved.

Does anyone remember UNESCO? We withdrew in protest. We stopped paying

our assessed dues. Let me repeat that: we stopped paying our assessed dues. Reforms of that agency were made and we rejoined.

Does anyone remember the genesis of the Office of Internal Oversight Services? In the mid-1990s, the U.S. threatened to withhold funding, and lo and behold the U.N. created an oversight function.

Even with Helms-Biden, Congress leveraged the fact that in order for us to pay arrears, the U.N. had to undertake certain reforms. All of these requirements were legislated and directed actions which resulted in reforms that were actually implemented.

Look, if we want to reform the United Nations, we have to legislate the reforms and have some teeth in the sanctions if they fail to. The U.N. will go sailing its merry way on if it reforms. If it does not reform, there is a penalty.

The eight ambassadors that wrote this letter prove our point. There is a mind-set in the upper realms of diplomacy that worships at the theater of the U.N. and could not possibly bring itself to withholding dues, so I do not think it will work. I implore Members to put some teeth in the sanctions.

Simon Bolivar, the great South American patriot, had a phrase for political futility. He said it was plowing in the sea. I suggest when it comes to sanctions against the U.N. for failing to reform, if Members leave it to the discretion of the State Department, we are plowing in the sea.

Mr. Chairman, let us begin real reform of the U.N., a monumental task, a long road ahead. Let us begin it here and now, June 17, right in this room; and let us begin it with your vote.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee of Asia and Pacific Affairs.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, let me say I may consider the Lantos-Shays alternative imperfect, but it represents a credible political balancing and is clearly preferable to the underlying bill.

But listening to the debate over the past 2 days, I sense a lack of perspective not only for treaty obligations but for the U.N. itself.

Corruption exists in all societies. It is rife, indeed endemic, in some. At the U.N., it is isolated; it is not endemic. I have known hundreds and hundreds of people who have worked for the U.N. itself or U.N. agencies. They are honorable, decent people doing a decent job. It is true that a few thousand dollars here and a few thousand dollars there pretty soon adds up to a loss of confidence in institutions of governance, and we have that problem at the U.N. Hence, we cannot ignore scandal, but scandal does not define the United Nations; it defines a problem that must be dealt with there and elsewhere.

We should do this, but we should do this with the understanding that the world would be a far worse place without the U.N. and that the activities and actions of its various organizations and agencies have made this a better world society. So improvement, not destruction, is the goal.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to state improvement is our goal, too. A healthy U.N., rather than a vast, sprawling, bureaucratic cesspool which is where it is headed. Everyone agrees to that.

Now this notion that we are obliged by the treaty to pay our dues and that it would be an international default if we did not, that was argued before back in the 1980s. Contributions to the U.N. are made subject to authorization and appropriation of the U.S. Congress. We have a duty to the taxpayer first to ensure that there is good stewardship of their dollars. We have to hold the U.N. accountable.

All countries benefit from an efficient, transparent, and accountable U.N. It is not only in our interest. We have not signed away part of our sovereignty. We are paying big dues: $442 million a year just on the dues part. Peacekeeping is another $1 billion. To say we do not have an obligation to make the providers that we purchase with our dues perform honorably and efficiently does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Lantos-Shays substitute and to direct Members' attention to a serious flaw in the peacekeeping section, which I respectfully submit are reasons enough to vote against the substitute.

The substitute amendment gives the U.N. until 2007 to complete even the most basic tasks. This is completely unnecessary, and I submit only encourages some states who view rape and exploitation of young women and children by U.N. peacekeepers as a mere public relations problem and thus an opportunity to dig in their heels and stall the reform process.

□ 1300

Prince Zeid has told some of us, I met with him last week, that sustained pressure is needed to get results. We have been here before. In 2002, we knew about the exploitation of children by U.N. personnel in the Congo. I have already chaired two hearings on it myself in my subcommittee. Yes, the U.N. is moving in the right direction, but there needs to be considerable pressure brought to bear to make this happen.

What is perhaps most troubling about the substitute is that it authorizes an up to 10 percent withholding of U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping. I want to be clear on this point. The Hyde bill supports full funding of all existing missions, while the substitute authorizes up to a 10 percent cutoff of our assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping. The withholding is linked to a certification requirement which is, plain and simple, bad policy. The intent is good. I have no doubt about that. But it is flawed.

The substitute requires the Secretary of State to certify that the U.S. permanent rep at the U.N. has made every effort to ensure the formal adoption and implementation of mechanisms to suspend the membership of a member state if genocide, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity are determined to be occurring in that member state regardless of whether the acts are being committed by the government or by a third party. ''Third party'' is the problem. There are countries like the Congo, and we have also seen it in Uganda, where there are ''third-party'' groups of terrorists and killers and maimers who the government would like to see done away with and are actively cooperating with the international community and the U.N. itself to try to mitigate this terrible problem.

Under this language, which is very different than the language that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) offered, we would be in a strange and, I think, even bizarre situation where even where there has been an effort made by the state, there could be an explusion and a cutoff of peacekeeping money, 10 percent assessed contribution cutoff. It would be wrong for a state to lose their membership when there was no omission, no commission on their part with regards to crimes against humanity and that is where the Fortenberry amendment got it right.

I think we can all agree that genocidal governments do not deserve to have an equal voice at the U.N. with other peacekeeping and peace-loving nations. But we should not punish those governments which are fighting against those who would commit such heinous acts. I think that language is, as I said, egregiously flawed. The Hyde amendment does get it right.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lantos substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the substitute legislation offered by the ranking member of the House International Relations Committee, Mr. TOM LANTOS.

As a former U.S. Ambassador, I know and appreciate that the United Nations serves a most useful purpose. It is the only international body that allows those countries that support the United States and those that do not to sit down in peaceful dialogue to address issues of concern and to work together. To maintain the opportunity to resolve our differences, we must not cut the funds we provide to the United Nations.

Mr. LANTOS' bill supports the necessary reforms we all recognize are needed for the

United Nations but does so without malice. Like H.R. 2745, the substitute supports the goal of reforming budgeting procedures, but it eliminates the devastating automatic withholding of 50 percent of the dues we owe to the United Nations. We should not tie the hands of our Secretary of State nor should we give those who do not support the United States, an issue in which to embarrass us. The substitute gives the Secretary of State the authority to make the cut but does not mandate such cuts. A more preferable position.

The substitute also keeps the peacekeeping reforms of H.R. 2745 but does not mandate the vetoing of any new or expanded U.N. peacekeeping operation that does not serve our national interest. Again, the flexibility contained in the substitute is preferable to H.R. 2745.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is the world leader and we should be a leader in all areas including serving as a model country in its relationships to the world community. This means pushing for reforms in the United Nations when such reforms are necessary but it also means being a good citizen and doing our part to fulfill our responsibilities and to be a good world citizen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Lantos substitute.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great respect for both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) in this. While we can all agree that our country, as the biggest contributor to the U.N., must help the organization become more efficient and effective, the Lantos-Shays substitute finds a compromise that I think reflects where the majority of Americans come down on this issue. The Gingrich-Mitchell task force takes serious issue with much of the damaging policies that have occurred at the U.N., but it refrains from calling for mandatory withholding of dues. President Bush has also signaled his opposition to many of these provisions, which may hinder our Ambassador's dealings with the organization.

Under the Lantos-Shays substitute, we can send the same message to the international community without undermining our efforts to promote democracy and protect those in need.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lantos/Shays substitute. Chairman HYDE has been an indispensable Member of this body for many years, and I commend you for bringing this important debate before us.

While I strongly agree with Chairman HYDE, that serious and fundamental problems exist at the United Nations, I prefer the President's approach of continuing to pursue negotiations for reform through diplomatic means.

Regardless of preference for this bill, we can all agree that the U.N. and the international community should hear our outrage for the mismanagement of what is meant to be an example of unity and peace. I commend the Chairman and the full committee for trying to improve the accountability of those at the U.N. and hope this debate will trigger reforms in the functioning of this embattled, yet well-meaning organization.

The Lantos-Shays substitute reflects the significant reforms outlined in the Chairman's bill. However, it makes an all important distinction in rightly leaving the Secretary of State with the discretion to decide when, and if, the ultimatums are a hindrance to our national interests. Alternatively, automatically withholding funds may derail our international and global commitments and could have a devastating impact on poor nations around the world.

While we can all agree that our country, as the biggest contributor to the U.N., must help the organization become more efficient and effective, the Lantos-Shays substitute finds a compromise that I think reflects where the majority of Americans come down on this issue. The Gingrich-Mitchell task force takes serious issue with much of the damaging policies that have occurred at the U.N., but it refrains from calling for mandatory withholding of dues. President Bush has also signaled his opposition to many of these provisions, which may hinder our Ambassador's dealings with the organization.

Under the Lantos-Shays substitute, we can send the same message to the international community without undermining our efforts to promote democracy and protect those in need.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank our great esteemed chairman, Chairman HYDE, for yielding me this time.

By limiting instruments of persuasion to an authorization by the Secretary of State to withhold U.S. dues, this substitute would all but guarantee that few of these reforms would actually be implemented. Much of the world, including many at the U.N., would be excused if they saw any threats as a mere bluff. The historical record tells us very accurately that any level of success can only be done if we use our leverage. If we adopt the Lantos-Shays substitute amendment, we will not have that leverage.

My colleagues maintain that our legislation does not afford sufficient flexibility. Yet a fair reading of this text reveals that that is just not the case. First, the certifications for action are not required until the year 2007. Secondly, this legislation allows the Secretary of State to certify U.N. reforms that are substantially similar to, or accomplish the same goals and the same objectives as, the Hyde U.N. Reform Act. That is plenty of flexibility, Mr. Chairman.

If the U.N. does on its own institute these reforms, then we have no problems. The withholding provisions in the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act will only be triggered and implemented if the U.N. does not reform itself. The onus is on the U.N. to fulfill its stated commitment to reform.

The Constitution gives to Congress the responsibility for determining how the public's money will be spent. The Lantos substitute proposes to surrender that obligation, that principal source of congressional authority, to an unelected official of the executive branch who has not been entrusted with it by the Constitution. However burdensome that task is, Mr. Chairman, it is ours to carry out.

Reforming the U.N. is about lives. It is not just about policies. Let us carry out our obligation to the taxpayers by rejecting the Lantos substitute and by affirming the Hyde bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, it is time that we make real reforms at the United Nations that address the real problems, but I believe that the Hyde bill simply sets the United Nations up to fail by creating a series of requirements that will be almost impossible to meet. One might even argue that this is the actual goal of some U.N. critics. The United Nations is governed by 191 countries, including Syria, Iran, and North Korea, who would have to approve the majority of these changes. This seems highly unlikely as structured by the bill. Right now this bill is medicine which may kill the patient rather than cure a specific disease.

The Hyde bill ties the hands of the Secretary of State with a mandatory 50 percent withholding, even if the U.N. improves significantly. That is like kicking a child out of school who has moved from an F to a B because they did not get an A. The bill also keeps the U.S. from supporting any new peacekeeping missions until far-reaching reforms have been implemented, even in cases like a Sudan and when innocent civilians are at risk. We do not know when and where U.N. peacekeepers will be needed next, but we do know that we cannot risk the lives of innocent people or risk American interests around the world. We simply cannot create legislation which hurts our own security interests and our national interest while we are at war.

This is a time, when our own human and financial resources are stretched thin, for the United States to get the world to act with us rather than destroy the institution which unites the world.

I am concerned that the bill condemns us to lose only American lives, shed only American blood and spend only American capital instead of having the world share this responsibility with us. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hyde bill and to vote for the Lantos-Shays substitute that does the reforms we want, but gives the Secretary of State the flexibility to do the peacekeeping and to achieve the reforms we all want to see.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this has been a fine debate today, and

I believe that both sides have handled it very responsibly, but let us take a look at what the real issue is.

There is broad agreement on both sides as to the need for reform in the United Nations. This is not in contention. There is even broad agreement of what changes need to be made, what are the issues at the United Nations, a lack of accountability and some of these monstrous atrocities that we have seen, and the inefficiency and corruption that we have seen at the U.N. There is agreement on the problem.

The fundamental difference between the sides of this debate is whether or not there should be consequences if the United Nations does not reform. What is going on? The American people understand that in order to get an organization like the United Nations to reform, there must be consequences. Do we think the United Nations, this entrenched bureaucracy, will just say, Oh, we're enlightened by the wonderful debate that we've heard, you've appealed to our heart, that they are going to make the changes that are necessary to prevent corruption in their organization that they have lived with for years because we have touched their hearts, we have reached their intellect? No. We have got to make sure that there are consequences if they do not reform, or they will not pay any attention to us.

You remember the old show Truth Or Consequences? Unless we provide consequences for activities and actions that are wrong, we are not going to get any truth. There will be no truth unless they have consequences for telling us lies. For years we have lived with the lie that the United Nations is somewhat above corruption, that the United Nations represents the best of humankind. It will only represent the best of humankind and reach these higher standards if we say to them, if you are not living up to these standards, there is a price to pay.

The American people deserve to get their money's worth. We deserve to try to put pressure on the United Nations to live up to its standards. If we just give them a free pass, whether or not they reform or not, there will be no reform at the United Nations, and all of this will have gone for nothing.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield the balance of my time to my distinguished Republican coauthor, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I love HENRY HYDE. I have awesome respect for TOM LANTOS. I thank the gentleman from California for supporting the President in the war against Iraq and to go into Afghanistan. I thank him for being such a clear thinker along with the gentleman from Illinois on so many issues.

We are not part of the Kyoto agreement. We are not part of the land mine agreement. We are not part of other treaties. We are not part of the ICC, the International Criminal Court. I understand those things. We are in a war in Afghanistan, a war in Iraq, and we are telling the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, Forget it. We don't care what you think. We're going ahead. Mandatory, nuclear option. It is going to happen even if the U.N. does most of what we ask. Even if they do 80 percent of what we ask, it is still going to happen. Mandatory.

I cannot believe when our men and women are fighting in Iraq that we would move forward with legislation like this when we need to draw countries together. The problem is not all the reforms can physically happen, and some of them will not happen, and some in the U.N. might not even want them to happen. They are eager to have us withhold funds. They are eager to have more people hate the United States.

The United States, the President, the Secretary of State, they are working so hard, and they are making progress. We have a new manager, Chris Burnham, who is the Under Secretary running the whole management of the U.N. We are making progress.

Go with the Hyde bill, but with the flexibility to let our President and our Secretary of State have the ability to work with these countries to move them along and see progress.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his longstanding leadership on issues related to the United Nations and human freedom. No one has greater respect for him in this body than I do. But in this case, Mr. Chairman, I think and I believe that the Lantos substitute just falls a little short.

Six decades ago, the United Nations was formed to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

These words, from the preamble of the United Nations' historic Charter, today hover over that institution not as a symbol of its founding mission, but as a reminder of its abject failure.

□ 1315

Far from saving future generations from the scourge of war, the United Nations' history of hand-wringing, appeasement, and moral equivalence has exacerbated the scourge of war.

Far from reaffirming faith and fundamental rights and the dignity of the human person, the United Nations has overseen the degradation of human rights even of vulnerable human beings in its own care through routine abuses of power, corruption, and even horrific sexual exploitation of peoples at the hands of U.N. peacekeepers.

Far from reaffirming faith in the equal rights of nations large and small, the U.N. has instead adopted an institutional posture favoring belligerent tyrannies at the expense of freedom-loving democracies, standing with Palestinian terrorists against Israeli families, standing with Saddam Hussein against the civilized world, and too often standing with anyone against the United States of America.

Far from promoting justice and respect for international law, the United Nations has become one of the world's greatest apologists for tyranny and terror where justice is merely one point of view; a place where Sudan and Syria and Castro's Cuba are given a soap-box on which to lecture the free world on human rights; a place where international lawyers scheme to haul American soldiers before a rogue court, irrespective of constitutional rights; a place where an international humanitarian mission to feed and heal the Iraqi people resulted in $10 billion in siphoned bribes and kickbacks.

And far from promoting social progress and the better standards of life in larger freedom, the United Nations has become a hindrance to both progress and freedom. Just ask the besieged citizens of Israel whose every gesture of goodwill has been returned by violence from their enemies and condemnation from the U.N.

Diplomatic pretenses aside, Mr. Chairman, corruption has infected the United Nations. And yet given its organizational structure, how could it be otherwise? There is no independent financial oversight. There are no standards of transparency. Most U.N. divisions are exempt from democratic accountability. And most U.N. leaders are protected from the law by diplomatic immunity.

The rampant corruption that today infects the United Nations is not a function of its personnel. Not really. It is a function of its structure. That is what we get, Mr. Chairman, from an organization driven by consensus instead of principle. And as long as tyrants and terrorists get as much say in policymaking as democratically elected leaders, the U.N. will continue to betray its charter and betray the billions of people on this planet who look to it for hope.

This substitute essentially agrees with that conclusion. It just does not do enough about it. But what more do we need to hear, Mr. Chairman? The U.N.'s corruption is so breathtaking in its scope as to be almost universal: peacekeepers raping women that they are sent to protect; sexual exploitation of children at the hands of their humanitarian relief workers; institutional anti-Semitism so brazen that

Yasser Arafat was considered a moderate; $10 billion, $10 billion, stolen from sick and starving children in Iraq; bribery, embezzlement, misappropriation of funds, and conflicts of interests so extensive that the financial management of many of the U.N. agencies resembles that of a second-rate kleptocracy.

What further evidence could we possibly need?

The pervasive corruption at the U.N. is not a problem; it is a crisis. No one denies this. And in response to the overwhelming evidencing, the Democrat substitute says the reforms in the underlying bill should happen. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough to say that these reforms should happen. They must happen. And they must happen right now. We should not be asking the U.N.'s leaders to make these reforms. We need to tell them. The philosophy of flexibility and appeasement create loopholes that diplomats drive huge trucks through. And if they were serious about giving the administration flexibility, why did they not give it to the President instead of the Secretary of State? The President leads foreign policy in this country, not the Secretary of State.

The American people are today underwriting rampant corruption, 22 percent of it to be precise, and it needs to stop. Today the Congress must take this stand and clearly voice not simply our frustration but our expectation of concrete reform. We must act, Mr. Chairman. And as he has so many times in his decades with us, the gentleman from Illinois has shown us the way.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has brought before this House a comprehensive, almost exhaustive, package of reform that, if enacted, will finally bring the United Nations under some semblance of control. If and when these reforms are enacted, Mr. Chairman, the world will be safer and stronger. The American people will be assured their money is being well spent, and the United Nations charter to prevent wars, protect human rights, and advance the cause of human freedom will be reaffirmed.

And every man, woman, and child on this planet will owe a great debt of gratitude to HENRY J. HYDE.

I just ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Democratic substitute. Vote ''yes'' on the Hyde reform bill, and let us put the United Nations back on track to fulfill its promise to the human race.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, this is an instance in which both the proponents and opponents of the Lantos substitute share the same goal: reforming the United Nations. We differ over the best means to accomplish that goal, and that disagreement is fundamental.

The committee bill embodies a go-it-alone, take-it-or-leave-it approach to dealing with the United Nations that is entirely inconsistent with the tenets of an international organization founded on the belief that nations should be respectful of each other's views.

With the United States having so recently suffered the debacle of dealing with U.N. members in an imperious way before the invasion of Iraq, and then being surprised by the U.N.'s reluctance to join us on the course we had pre-determined, one would think that the Republican majority in the House would have learned a lesson about the kind of approach likely to produce international cooperation. This bill is evidence that they have not.

The committee bill mandates the withholding of dues if certain reforms are not implemented, dictates the scope of the reforms, and provides precious little time to have them agreed to and put in place. The bill creates a system designed to fail, and then imposes draconian consequences for the failure. Not only have eight former U.S. ambassadors to the U.N. come out strongly in opposition to the bill, but Secretary of State Rice has been noticeably silent about it.

The Lantos substitute fashions a better way to achieve needed reform at the U.N. without imperiling American interests in peacekeeping and other activities. That way is to provide the secretary of state with the maximum flexibility to employ diplomacy to expand the number of countries sharing our views on reform so that a broad-based mandate for reform is produced. By holding out the possibility that U.S. dues would be withheld if reform is not achieved, but not making withholding mandatory, the substitute creates the conditions for diplomacy to work effectively.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the interest that the United states has in a strong and effective United Nations, and to weigh carefully whether the steps we take in this bill will strengthen that institution or weaken it. Reform is the right way to go and the right way to achieve it is to adopt the Lantos substitute. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, the U.N. soon to celerate its 60th anniversary, is chartered to promote universal human rights, justice and social progress. These are perfect ideals that the global community must strive to put into action, but that does not mean the U.N. is a perfect organization. Recent scandals and the lack of transparency within the U.N. undermine the essential role the U.N. plays in world affairs. Reform is an urgent priority but the cure for fixing these problems should not be worse than the disease.

H.R. 2745 will hamstring the U.S.'s ability to create positive reform within the U.N., tarnish the image of the U.S. abroad when public opinion of the U.S., particularly in the Arab countries where is at an all time low, and defeat the Administration's public diplomacy efforts before Karen Hughes even assumes her new responsibilities in September. Additionally, H.R. 2745 would halt funding for any new or expanded peacekeeping missions. Unilaterally preventing the U.S. from supporting new peacekeeping missions puts an untold number of lives at risk and additionally, could endanger U.S. national security interests. In fact many of the peacekeeping reforms contained in the Hyde bill are endorsed by the U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and in most cases are already underway, to address recent concerns raised about sexual exploitation and abuse in peacekeeping missions.

Moreover, H.R. 2745 does not enjoy the full support of the administration. According to R. Nicholas Bums, under secretary of state for political affairs, "We have serious concerns with the bill. We are the founder of the U.N. We're the host country of the U.N. We're the leading contributor to the U.N. We don't want to put ourselves in a position where the United States is withholding 50 percent of the American contributions to the U.N. system."

Congress must provide the State Department with the tools and flexibility to push for positive changes within the U.N. The Lantos/Shays substitute would provide the authority, but not mandate, the Secretary of State to withhold dues from the U.N. if reform measures aren't implemented in a timely manner. The United States, as the world leader, must take an active, positive role in helping reform the U.N. The Lantos/Shays substitute is the step in the right direction for U.S. reform efforts and I will vote in favor of this substitute and against the U.N. Reform Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 1 printed in subpart D by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), amendment No. 2 printed in subpart D by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), amendment No. 1 printed in subpart E by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), amendment No. 5 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), amendment No. 9 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), amendment No. 12 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and amendment No. 13 in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PART 1, SUBPART D AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in subpart D of part 1 of House Report No. 109–132 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 32, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—373

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—32

Capuano
Clyburn
Conyers
Delahunt
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Jackson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McGovern
Meeks (NY)
Murtha
Olver
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Solis
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Watson
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Fossella
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Stark
Taylor (MS)
Walsh
Waxman

□ 1346

Messrs. SERRANO, GRIJALVA, RANGEL, and AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LEWIS of California, SPRATT, WELDON of Florida, NADLER, and RAHALL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 274, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would advise Members of its intention to run this next series of votes as 5-minute votes.

PART 1, SUBPART D AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 375, noes 29, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—375

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach

Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—29

Clyburn
Conyers
Delahunt
Dingell
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Jackson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick (MI)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Murtha
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Rahall
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Solis
Towns
Waters
Watson
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Stark
Taylor (MS)
Walsh
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (PA)

□ 1353

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART 1, SUBPART E, AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 366, noes 38, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—366

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—38

Capuano
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Dingell
Farr
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Miller, George
Nadler
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Payne
Rush
Sabo
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Solis
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Watson
Watt
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Lynch
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Obey
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Stark
Taylor (MS)
Walsh
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1400

Mr. NADLER and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in Part 2 of House

Report 109–132 offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—2

McKinney
Paul

NOT VOTING—26

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Stark
Velázquez
Walsh
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1407

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART 2 AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109–132 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 126, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—281

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen

Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—126

Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Case
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kirk
Kolbe
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
Marshall
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Price (NC)
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—26

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Chocola
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Stark
Walsh
Waxman

□ 1414

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 297, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—108

Akin
Alexander
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Emerson
Feeney
Foley
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Green, Gene
Hall
Hart
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hostettler
Hulshof
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Rehberg
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—297

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Istook
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (RI)
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Stark
Walsh
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1420

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 306, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—100

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boozman
Boustany
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Emerson
Feeney
Foley
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gohmert
Goode
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Petri
Platts
Pombo
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—306

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews
Baird
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (RI)
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Stark
Walsh
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1427

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 13 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 216, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Boehlert
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—216

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake

Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (RI)
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Stark
Walsh
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1434

Mr. BOEHLERT changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2745. There is a need for reform at the United Nations. No one disagrees with that, but the legislation before the House is an extreme and deeply flawed bill that would actually set back our efforts to strengthen and improve this important institution.

The problem with the amendment is its complete lack of flexibility. It requires the United States to withhold 50 percent of our dues if 32 of 39 specific goals are not met by 2007. Furthermore, 14 of those goals are mandatory, and if a single one is not met, our dues are withheld. Such a rigid approach weakens the Bush Administration's hand in negotiating the changes that we all agree are necessary there.

I want to quote from a June 14 letter to Speaker HASTERT and Leader PELOSI from eight former U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations. These ambassadors served in Republican and Democratic administrations alike, range broadly in their political persuasions, and include President Bush's most recent Ambassador to the U.N., John Danforth, as well as Madeleine Albright, Richard Holbrooke, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Donald McHenry, Thomas Pickering, Bill Richardson and Andrew Young.

In their letter, they write that ''withholding U.S. dues to the U.N. threatens to undermine our leadership and effectiveness at the U.N. and the reform effort itself—as well as the U.N.'s ability to take on responsibilities critical to protecting our national security. . . . Reforming the United Nations is the right goal. Withholding our dues to the U.N. is the wrong methodology.''

These distinguished former ambassadors go on to assert that, ''Withholding U.S. dues to the United Nations may sound like smart policy but would be counterproductive at this time. . . . It would create resentment, build animosity and actually strengthen opponents of reform.''

For these reasons, I will vote for the substitute offered by Ranking Member LANTOS. The Lantos substitute would give Secretary of State Rice the tools and flexibility needed to bring about reform at the United Nations.

Let me conclude by saying that the bill before the House is a perfect example of how the priorities of the Majority are out of step with the needs of the country. It is simply amazing that the House is debating this bill—a bill that the President would almost certainly veto if it ever reached him—when there are so many more important and unmet needs that the House has yet to address and could effectively address.

Millions of manufacturing jobs have left the United States over the last four years, and more jobs are leaving every day. The cost of gasoline remains near record highs, yet we still have no strategy to deal with it. Over 40 million Americans have no health insurance, and the cost of health insurance for all Americans continues to rise. These are the issues that the American people need us to address.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this flawed and unbalanced bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the United Nations Reform Act of 2005 as it is currently constituted. This legislation sends the signal to the world that our Nation has a disdain for the United Nations and I for one cannot support that idea.

There are many instances in which the U.N. has been instrumental in furthering U.S. foreign policy objectives. In the past year alone, the U.N. helped organize parliamentary elections in Iraq, reconstruction efforts following the Indian Ocean tsunami, and helped mediate the withdrawal of Syrian armed forces from Lebanon. A reformed U.N. could be even more complementary to U.S. interests abroad, but only if the U.S. does not alienate other Member States and create animosity in the process. The inflexibility of the Hyde legislation would create resentment among Member States, and the automatic withholding of dues would cripple the institution.

Hyde's unilateral approach to U.N. reform promises to thwart the growing international consensus for reform, which will be addressed by at least 174 nations at the September Summit in New York. We need a more flexible approach which does not dictate unrealistic deadlines for changes or threaten automatic withholding of dues, will achieve U.S. goals without causing widespread resentment among Member States whose support we depend on.

The Hyde bill on U.N. reform contains many serious flaws which if implemented would not be welcome by the international community. Peacekeeping is one such area where this bill contains deeply flawed logic. The Hyde bill points to peacekeeping reforms that everyone agrees are needed. These reforms are in fact endorsed by the U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations and in most cases, these reforms are already underway to address recent concerns raised about sexual exploitation and abuse in peacekeeping missions. However, the Hyde bill says that starting this fall, the U.S. must prevent the expansion of existing missions or the creation of any new U.N. peacekeeping missions until all specified reforms are completed and certified by the Secretary of State. The truth is that some of these requirements simply cannot be met by the fall, true reform takes time. Reforms will require careful implementation at the U.N. as well as by the 100-plus troop contributing countries, and in some cases will require additional U.N. staff and funding which of course is not provided by this legislation. And yet, the Hyde bill will likely prevent Security Council resolutions to enable the creation or expansion of important U.N. missions in places like Darfur in Sudan, Haiti, Congo and Afghanistan. We as the United States of America have always prided ourselves on helping those who cannot help themselves, on aiding those who are being massacred simply because of who they are, but now this bill seeks for our Nation to turn a blind eye to these people. We, as the 109th Congress cannot allow ourselves to be the ones who cut off assistance to these desperate people.

Not only does the Hyde bill take a wrong approach to peacekeeping, but it will also create great problems with the budget at the United Nations. The Hyde bill claims to ''pursue a streamlined, efficient, and accountable regular assessed budget of the United Nations,'' yet in reality the approach taken by the bill will wreak havoc on the U.N. budget process and will result in the automatic withholding of U.S. financial obligations to the U.N. regular budget. This flawed bill attempts to shift funding for 18 specific programs from assessed contributions to voluntary contributions. To achieve these goals, the bill mandates the withholding of up to $100 million in U.S. dues to the U.N. regular budget. While this idea may have merit, the U.S. should work with its allies to advance it through the Budget Committee at the U.N. instead of starting from the point of withholding dues, which should be our Nation's last resort. Furthermore, the Hyde

proposal links 50 percent of U.N. dues to a list of 39 conditions, not only at the U.N. Secretariat, but also at various U.N. specialized agencies over which the U.N. has no direct control. All of this will create a new U.S. debt at the U.N., since many of the conditions are so rigid and specific that they are not achievable. In the end, all that any of this will do is create resentment towards the United States in the international community. As the Washington Post editorialized, ''This is like using a sledgehammer to drive a nail into an antique table: Even if you're aiming at the right nail, you're going to cause damage.''

The Hyde bill also calls for certain steps supported by the U.N. and the U.S., such as the strengthening of the U.N. oversight function, the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission, and reforms in U.N. peacekeeping. However, it calls for these reforms to be funded solely within existing resources. If the U.S. withholds dues as this bill calls for, even less funding will be available to support these reforms. This bill also calls for the creation of new positions in several departments, including the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, without allowing resources to fund these positions.

Clearly, too many of the provisions of the Hyde U.N. reform bill will only cause resentment against the United States in the international community. Achieving reform by consensus in a body with 191 members is difficult, but this is not in itself a reason to bypass the consensus building process. The more Member States that are engaged in achieving reform, the more legitimate and effective the changes will be. The U.S. should lead the way by actively promoting a tough reform agenda and retaining the threat of withholding dues as a last resort. Reform should not, however, be a crusade led by the U.S. against the institution and its Member States. Unfortunately, this bill on U.N. reform will not lead to reform, but only to the weakening of the United Nations. With great respect for Chairman HYDE and his intent I regretfully will have to oppose H.R. 2745.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot vote for this bill.

I am not opposed to the ostensible purpose of the bill—in fact, I share the view that the United Nations needs to be improved so it can better carry out its indispensable role.

The U.N. is a critically important body that has taken on many of the world's problems and solved them—problems such as poverty, disease, and international disputes. And the U.S. has benefited from U.N. actions. Just recently, the U.N. helped with elections in Afghanistan and Iraq and helped negotiate the withdrawal of Syrian forces from Lebanon.

But it has serious problems, as exemplified by the oil-for-food scandal and offenses committed by U.N. peacekeeping forces.

So, I support U.N. reform—but I cannot support the approach the bill takes toward achieving that objective.

The bill would require the Secretary of State to push for reforms at the U.N. in the areas of budgeting, oversight and accountability, peacekeeping, and human rights. That is something that needs to be done. But if the Secretary of State cannot certify that the reforms have been achieved, starting in 2007, the Secretary would be required to withhold 50 percent of the U.S. assessed contributions to the U.N.'s regular budget. The assessed U.S. contributions are estimated at $362 million for 2005, and $439 million for 2006.

I think such a punitive and unilateral approach to reform will not work. I think its primary result would be to further isolate the United States while at the same time actually undermining ongoing efforts at reform and potentially jeopardizing the U.N.'s ability to focus on global threats and work toward greater global stability.

The substitute proposed by Representatives LANTOS and SHAYS would have been a better approach, and I regret that it was not adopted.

As it stands, the bill is problematic on a number of fronts. First, it would mandate withholding of dues from programs that do not get moved from the U.N.'s assessed budget to a system of voluntary contribution, a goal unlikely to be achieved.

Also, it would require the United States to veto Security Council resolutions establishing any new U.N. peacekeeping missions—including involvement in a crisis like the one taking place in Darfur—until the peacekeeping reforms called for by the bill have been completed. This is like forbidding firemen to respond to a blaze because we are unhappy about the way the department is organized and financed. I cannot support that.

The bill would cut U.S. contributions to U.N. conferences and public information programs by 20 percent unless the overall budgets for these programs are cut by 20 percent, and if the 20 percent target is not met by 2008, the bill would mandate the withholding of 50 percent of U.S. contributions. It also would require that 50 percent of annual dues be withheld even if just one of 14 mandatory benchmarks were not met. These go beyond stern—they are petulant. Their predictable result is not reform, but failure.

In short, the bill as it stands would simultaneously demand reform and make it impossible to achieve.

The substitute offered by Representatives LANTOS and SHAYS would have used carrots as well as sticks and would have given much greater flexibility to the Secretary of State.

The substitute included benchmarks very much like those in the base bill, but it gave flexibility to the Secretary of State to mandate the 50 percent cuts to our U.N. dues. Similarly, the substitute did not link the change from ''assessed'' to ''voluntary'' contributions to withholding a portion of our dues, and it would have allowed the Secretary of State to waive the peacekeeping reform requirements if it is determined that a new mission is in the U.S. national interest.

The substitute also included incentives by supporting an effort to pay our dues on time, an increased U.N. budget for the large number of new offices that will be needed to implement the reforms, a well structured buyout of unneeded U.N. personnel, and a contribution to the U.N. Democracy Fund.

The difference between the bill now before us and the Lantos-Shays substitute is that while the substitute was realistic in the way it set out a path toward reform, the majority's bill if fully implemented would effectively destroy the chances of achieving an effective and improved U.N.

Instead of adopting such an approach, the United States should engage the U.N. member countries in the process of reform and provide the U.N. with the resources necessary to accomplish reforms, rather than alienate the global community by threatening to withhold dues.

The Bush Administration itself is opposed to this legislation as it stands. I do not often agree with them, but I do in this instance and I therefore must vote against the bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2745, the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005.

H.R. 2745 is a common sense piece of legislation that would mandate timely change to a United Nations suffering from scandal, mismanagement and abuse. Specifically, it would withhold 50 percent of regular assessed budget contributions unless the U.N. enacts 39 specific budgetary, accountability, and human rights-related reforms necessary to providing needed transparency to the world body.

The need for this legislation could not be more evident. Over the past few years we have witnessed a United Nations mired in scandal. The U.N. Oil-for-Food program was a glaring failure that served only to benefit a tyrant and keep the Iraqi people in a state of despondency and despair. As a result, the Oil-for-Food program has become the biggest scandal in the history of the U.N. and one of the greatest financial scandals of modern times.

Scandals involving U.N. peacekeeping operations have also escalated. In Congo and Bosnia, U.N. peacekeepers were accused of widespread sexual exploitation and rape of refugees, betraying the trust of the very people they were there to protect. In Sierra Leone, peacekeepers were accused of systematically raping women. These actions are reprehensible in any society and unbecoming to an organization whose founding charter is dedicated to the promotion and respect for human rights and maintaining international peace and security.

In recent years, the U.N. has also abdicated their role as a protector of human rights. This legislation rightfully prevents some of the world's premier human rights abusers such as Cuba, Sudan and Libya from having a seat on the U.N. Commission of Human Rights.

Without H.R. 2745, we will be sending American taxpayer dollars to support an international organization that currently embraces mediocrity, corruption and waste as the status quo. The United Nations Reform Act will go a long way to employ proper checks and balances to an organization that I believe has lost control of both its purpose and mission, and no longer adequately represents the United States' interests, nor the interests of democracies around the world.

It is time for these common sense reforms. The American people who pay 22 percent of the U.N. dues demand that their tax dollars go to an organization that is transparent, and accountable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Mr. HYDE for his distinguished service in the House of Representatives and to support his work to bring accountability and transparency to the United Nations.

Throughout his career, Mr. HYDE has been a promoter and a defender of conservative issues, including the rights of the unborn and the need for a strong national defense.

While many of my colleagues are committed and dedicated to these issues, my friend from

Illinois has truly led by example in how he has advocated for conservative policies and championed family values.

He is well known for his consistency and tenacity in his beliefs, yet he is well-respected within the House by Members of both sides of the aisle. He has strongly disagreed with Members about issues that evoke emotional responses, yet he has maintained his dignity and gentlemanly conduct.

Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Mr. HYDE for his work to increase the credibility of the United Nations and to wish him well in his retirement. Unfortunately, I was committed to attend an event in my district, and I was unable to vote for the final passage of the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005. I would like the official record to reflect I support this important legislation.

HENRY, thank you for your service and best wishes to you and your family.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2745) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 319, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 184, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—221

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costello
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—184

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Boehlert
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews
Baird
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
Gillmor
Gingrey
Graves
Hooley
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (RI)
McDermott
Millender-McDonald
Pelosi
Reyes
Sessions
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark
Tanner
Walsh
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1451

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 17, 2005, I was not in Washington, DC, for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2745, the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005.

Regarding the amendments, I would have voted in favor of the Royce, Fortenberry, Flake and Chabot/Lantos amendments, and I would have voted against the Pence, Gohmert, Stearns and Lantos/Shays amendments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to official business that has great importance to residents of the 30th Congressional District of Texas, I was not present on June 17, 2005.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 274, On Agreeing to the Royce of California Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 275, On Agreeing to the Fortenberry of Nebraska Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 276, On Agreeing to the Flake of Arizona Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 277, On Agreeing to the Chabot of Ohio Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 278, On Agreeing to the Pence of Indiana Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 279, On Agreeing to the Gohmert of Texas Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 280, On Agreeing to the Stearns of Florida Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 281, On Agreeing to the Lantos of California Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 282, Final Passage of H.R. 2745, the United Nations Reform Act of 2005, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) regarding the schedule of the week to come.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished whip yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, Monday the House will convene at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider H.R. 2863, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006, and any recorded votes requested will be rolled until 6:30.

On Tuesday, the House will convene at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates and 10 a.m. for legislative business. We expect to consider several measures under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

For the rest of the week, the House will consider several additional bills under a rule: H.J. Res. 10, the Flag desecration amendment; the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 2006; and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 some time later in the week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information. If I may inquire, Mr. Leader, the Labor-Health bill was marked up yesterday, and the legislative branch bill was marked up as well. What days does the gentleman expect those bills to be on the floor?

Mr. DELAY. First, let me repeat what I mentioned in my statement. This is rather unusual, but we will be considering the Department of Defense appropriations bill on Monday afternoon. We will roll votes until 6:30 p.m., but Members should know that we will be having very important debate Monday afternoon, including amendments.

In terms of the rest of the week, I would expect us to consider intelligence authorization, Flag amendment, and legislative branch appropriations on Tuesday and Wednesday, and Labor-HHS would be reserved for Thursday and Friday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Flag constitutional amendment is on the calendar as well. Within the framework of the other bills, would that be left until Friday, or when will that be considered?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would expect the Flag amendment would follow right after the intelligence authorization bill, and then legislative branch right after that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that there has now been some agreement as it relates to the ability of the national intelligence director to move personnel. That obviously was a problem we had. The gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) did not feel that was appropriate. Apparently, there has been some discussion and that matter has been resolved. Would it be the gentleman's expectation there will be an amendment to the bill because that provision is still in the bill; or do you expect to have a provision in the rule itself which would be self-executing to remove the constraint from the intelligence authorization bill?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA), and the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), will be all in sync on that particular issue. They have been working together and working well to come to a solution to that. I would imagine it would be in a manager's amendment, whatever solution they come to.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what I understand the gentleman is saying is whatever is agreed to by those three will be how it is carried out?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, as far as I have been advised, that is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, two additional issues: campaign finance legislation, or Pence-Wynn, and CAFTA. Can the leader give us any thoughts as to when those might be considered as it relates to the July 4 break?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, as far as campaign finance reform legislation, we have no plans right now to consider any legislation.

As far as the Central America Free Trade Agreement, the President has not transmitted any proposed agreement so we will not make any decisions about scheduling until he does.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, lastly, the gentleman from Texas (Leader DELAY) had to leave early right after the votes last week, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and I discussed that I am concerned, the gentleman is concerned, everybody is concerned and everybody is talking about it in the papers, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is still not staffed and unable to proceed. The gentleman has expressed concern that that is the case. We have expressed concern that that is the case.

We believe, Mr. Leader, that under the rules the executive director and counsel need to be hired through agreement by both the Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. We believe that is what the rules says.

The impediment it seems, frankly, is that the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is still focused on having his chief of staff, who may be an outstanding individual, no aspersions whatsoever on his character or his integrity in working on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, but he has not been selected in a bipartisan fashion.

□ 1500

Could the leader advise me, the Speaker indicated he thought he ought not to get involved, but we appear to have an impasse. It seems to me as one of the leaders, I would certainly be prepared to work with you, with the Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) would, in trying to resolve this impasse so we could as an institution select bipartisan personnel that both sides could have confidence in that could then proceed to have an operating, effective Ethics Committee. I frankly hope we could do that. I think both of us and probably the entire institution is frustrated by the fact that we cannot get by this impasse.

It is, however, from our perspective, as the gentleman knows, a very important issue because if both sides are going to have confidence in the impartiality of investigations, of Republicans or Democrats, it will be because both sides participated in and had confidence in those who were selected to, from a staff standpoint, proceed with those investigations.

I would be glad to yield to my friend for his comments.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The gentleman is correct in saying that this gentleman is very interested in getting the Ethics Committee up and running. It is for the good of the institution. I do not agree with the gentleman in his assessment of the rules, because the rules also provide for other alternatives other than what he suggested.

I have to say that I think it is unfortunate that some—no one that serves on the committee am I saying this about—that some would use the Ethics Committee for political purposes. I think it is unfortunate. I think that the Democrats that serve on the Ethics Committee and the Republicans that serve on the Ethics Committee are more than capable of coming to some resolution.

The gentleman assumes and suggests that the leadership ought to get involved in it. I think the problem is that

the leadership has gotten involved in it. In the 20 years I have been here, the tradition of this institution to maintain the integrity of the Ethics Committee is that leadership should not be involved in these matters at the Ethics Committee level; that the Ethics Committee is a bipartisan committee set up to function as a bipartisan committee, and when leaders start dictating to the members on that committee, it undermines the credibility of that committee.

I would hope that the members of the committee could look at alternatives, and there have been alternatives suggested and allowed by the rules. For instance, if they can come to no resolution of one single director, you can have codirectors, allowed by the House rules. The ranking member can have a director hired by him, and the chairman can have a director hired by him, and the committee can function on the staff level as the committee is set up to function on the Members level.

I think the involvement of either leaders on both sides of the aisle should encourage, publicly or privately, for the members of the committee to work this out and not be involved in the decision-making, nor the discussion, nor negotiations. The leaders should stay out of it. I would hope that the Ethics Committee would come together and work together and function so that issues before this House protecting the integrity of this House and the credibility of this House as an institution can go forward.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, the leader and I have a different perspective on this. He is correct in that observation. First of all, let me say that clearly the leadership ought to stay out of any determinations or considerations or reference to complaints raised or under investigation or determination by the Ethics Committee. I agree with the leader on that.

I do not agree with the leader on the fact that the leadership does not have a particular responsibility to ensure that the Ethics Committee is operating, is functioning, is performing the responsibilities of ensuring the public that we are maintaining the ethics of this institution and the democratic processes in a transparent and open and honest fashion. That is not any different, very frankly, than the leadership appointing the members of the Ethics Committee. It does not stay out of that. It appoints the members of the Ethics Committee on both sides of the aisle. It, in fact, removes members from the Ethics Committee. The problem has arisen here where for the first time since I can remember as a Member of this House, we have an impasse and a failure to, in a bipartisan fashion, agree on a single director.

Mr. Leader, very frankly, I will tell you that the initial problem was raised and our perspective is that the rules were changed to provide for impasse, for gridlock, where five people could not agree to proceed with the investigation, and it would not proceed. I know we differ on that perspective, but that was our perspective. Frankly, for whatever reasons, we have now gone back to the rules that we believe provide for proceeding with investigations without providing for the possibility of partisan gridlock or partisan veto. If you had codirectors, which is what has been suggested, you have one director for the Republicans, one director for the Democrats, you provide indirectly what you have now abandoned in the rule change that you made in January and gone back to the old rule. The whole purpose of having one director, selected in a bipartisan fashion, I suggest to my friend, was to provide and to have a confidence level in proceeding in a way that would provide for an effective operation of the Ethics Committee.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I do not agree with anything he said, and I appreciate it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may meet next week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and 1 copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H–312 of the Capitol by 3 p.m. next Tuesday, June 21, 2005. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee on Thursday, June 16, 2005, which is expected to be filed with the House on Monday, June 20, 2005. Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of the Appropriations and Rules Committees by Monday, June 20, 2005.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 20, 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATS PLAY HOUSE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post ran an article today titled ''Democrats Play House to Rally Against the War.''

''Play house,'' Mr. Speaker. That is all the far left leadership seems to think about these days. If you have not read the article, basically Judiciary Committee Democrats are angry they are not running the committee and they are not the majority, so they are playing dress-up. Literally.

To quote the article, they pretended a small conference room was the Judiciary Committee hearing room. The ranking member banged a large wooden gavel and got the other Members to call him ''Mr. Chairman.'' He liked that so much he started calling himself ''the chairman.''

Mr. Speaker, here we are trying to reform the United Nations, trying to win the war on terror, and the far left leadership in the House is playing pretend. They have pretended winning the war on terror would be cost-free, and that raising taxes grows the economy. They need to stop playing dress-up, and they need to join us in moving forward on a positive agenda for the American people.

CAFTA

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, quoting from Roll Call, Lawmakers who are seeking to trade their votes on CAFTA should be forewarned: Such deals don't pan out.

A Public Citizen report catalogs promises made to lawmakers by the Clinton and Bush administrations on

trade votes from NAFTA to the 2002 TPA vote. Democratic and Republican administrations delivered on only 16 out of 92 promises; 16 out of 92 promises.

On textiles, the report highlights a promise made during consideration of the 2002 TPA vote to Representatives HAYES and MYRICK to hire 72 additional Customs inspectors, which was never fulfilled. HAYES is leaning against CAFTA, but MYRICK this week announced her support.

Quoting further from Roll Call:

That support is partly based on a pledge from ROB PORTMAN to seek an amendment to CAFTA to help producers of pockets and linings, proving that textile Members like Myrick seem to have learned nothing from the record of broken deals.

Quoting further from Roll Call:

Myrick said she has been assured by Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff that those positions would be filled by 2006.

Mr. Speaker, do not believe the deals when they try to buy votes on CAFTA.

CITRUS COUNTY VETERANS SUPPORT FLAGS IN THE CLASSROOM

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the Citrus County Coalition of Veterans. We just this week recognized Flag Day. I would like to recognize this very special group that provided flags to elementary and high schools in Citrus County.

Why did they do it? Because the Florida Legislature passed a law that said every classroom has to have a flag. Many parents were surprised that they did not already have flags, but I am very proud that in Citrus County, the Veterans Coalition, which is a combination of so many veterans organizations, that they actually stepped up to the plate, collected money from their members and from the community, and that they were able to provide the appropriate flags for the classroom.

Certainly having a real, tangible flag in each classroom will serve as a poignant reminder of the freedoms we enjoy in our great Nation.

Again, I would like to thank the Citrus County Veterans Coalition for their efforts to ensure that our schoolchildren truly understand the meaning of the Stars and Stripes.

RUNAWAY BRIDE STANDS TO REAP BONANZA

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in outrage over a reported deal to pay the runaway bride, Jennifer Wilbanks, half a million dollars.

Jennifer Wilbanks, purported to have been kidnapped, blamed Hispanics, worried her parents, cost untold hundreds of thousands of dollars and the compassion of millions of Americans concerned for her well-being, all in a stunt, a stunt that is now going to earn her one-half million dollars. This is insane. It is outrageous.

Police officers, firefighters, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts combing the country for this girl that we assumed was taken from her family and her fiance shows up in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and then apologizes in a tearful manner that she misled people. And now we are going to pay her half a million dollars.

This merely increases the likelihood that misguided and deranged young people will do stupid things in order to profit, and we fall prey to their pranks. I urge any media source thinking of paying her to reject the negotiations and treat her like the criminal she is.

DARK CLOUDS ON HORIZON

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today America has the number one economy in the world. It is the envy of the world. But there are dark clouds in the West, and an economic storm is brewing.

Last year our trade deficit was over $670 billion, our Federal deficit was over $300 billion, and our economy lost many high-quality, high-paying jobs. Many in Congress have blamed big corporations for letting profits outweigh people. They have called the CEOs Benedict Arnold CEOs.

Mr. Speaker, I think these Members are wrong and misguided. There are two divisions of costs for those who keep and create jobs in America. Entrepreneurs, small businessmen, small businesswomen and CEOs have costs they can control and costs they cannot control. It is the costs that they cannot control that have been driven by Congress. Barriers have been created by Congress over the last generation. Good intentions resulting in bad regulation has caused us to lose many of our jobs.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I am forming the Economic Competitive Caucus to deal with these issues by removing these barriers. With my colleagues' help, we will remove the barriers, bring back jobs, and make America competitive well into the future.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO RISK OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION FROM FISSILE MATERIAL IN TERRITORY OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109–35)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation is to continue beyond June 21, 2005. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on June 18, 2004 (69 FR 34047).

It remains a major national security goal of the United States to ensure that fissile material removed from Russian nuclear weapons pursuant to various arms control and disarmament agreements is dedicated to peaceful uses, subject to transparency measures, and protected from diversion to activities of proliferation concern. The accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation and maintain in force these emergency authorities to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 17, 2005.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SMART SECURITY AND TORTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the way we treat our enemies speaks volumes about our character as a Nation, and I am embarrassed to say that America's treatment of prisoners over the last several years does not speak highly of our national integrity.

Since 9/11 and especially over the last 2 years, news of prisoners being mistreated, beaten, sexually assaulted, and even killed while in U.S. custody has become all too commonplace. Prisoners have been tortured in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo Bay. Considering the widespread use of torture, no one can claim that these are isolated incidents, that it is merely the work of a few bad apples.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I fear there will be more appalling news about American abuses of Iraqi people coming. The fact that torture occurred in separate places and under the command of different interrogators leads me to believe that a more systemic failure took place.

One could say that the turning point, the day torture became a routine tactic employed by the United States, was August 1, 2002. That is the day the Justice Department sent a memo to the White House stating that torturing terrorists in captivity ''may be justified.'' It is just not that physical abuse has taken place under our watch. That is bad enough. What is just as appalling is that legal abuses have taken place here at home. We have kept people in prison for more than 3 years without charging them with a crime, and the administration has affirmed this practice through legal memos.

This approval of torture by the White House, the Pentagon, and the Justice Department is not only shameful; it also endangers the United States. At a time when the United States is courting the support of the international world, particularly the Arab world, the torture of foreign prisoners along with our invasion of Iraq gives the world's extremists what they believe to be a legitimate reason to hate the United States. There has been no better recruiting tool for al Qaeda than the events at Abu Ghraib and in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a better way to conduct foreign policy than by beating, torturing, and sexually assaulting our enemies. The United States has other options than to engage in the sadistic practices of torture. We in the United States are better people than that.

That is why I have reintroduced the SMART Security legislation with the support of 50 of my colleagues. SMART Security is a Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century; and it will help secure the United States for the future. SMART Security will ensure America's security by reaching out and engaging the Iraqi people. Instead of rushing off to war for the wrong reasons and then engaging in torture once we are there, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues.

Not every international problem has a military answer, and that is why SMART Security will prevent terrorism by addressing the very conditions which give rise to terrorism in the first place: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of proper education.

The situation in the Middle East requires the best America has to offer. SMART Security relies on the very best of America: our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership. This is the best way to encourage democracy in countries like Iraq. Not through wars that cost thousands of unnecessary deaths, not by throwing billions of dollars at our problems, and certainly not by torturing our enemies.

We have a responsibility to set a positive example for the rest of the world. We can end this shameful chapter in our Nation's history by pledging that the United States does not condone acts of torture.

To show the world that we mean business, we need to create a plan to begin bringing home the soldiers serving in Iraq. By ending the military occupation of Iraq, we will demonstrate that America is committed to peace in the Middle East and the rest of the world. It is time to start this process. We need to start it today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE USA PATRIOT ACT AND THE BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I came to have a little chat with the Members about immigration, and I intend to do that. But I cannot help but point out from the previous speaker that torture means many things. Perhaps the people who can best define torture would be prisoners of war in Vietnam, in Korea, and World War II. And I can say to the mothers of America that the people that we are accusing of torturing are people who want to kill their children as fast as they can. I would say to the fathers of America that the soldiers we are accusing of torturing are people that would like to kill their family as fast as they can. And I can assure the Members, having been in Vietnam, that pouring water on somebody, playing loud music, and lowering the air conditioner is not torturing anybody. It, though, however, may save an American GI.

Mr. Speaker, like most of the Members of the body, on October 24, 2001, I voted for the U.S. PATRIOT Act, which passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 357 to 66.

At the time many of us had concerns about whether or not the bill crossed the line on infringing on our constitutional liberties. We were assured that it did not. And when the new protections against terrorism were in place, we could actually see for ourselves that it did not.

So we approved that bill, based on the fact that our Nation had just suffered 3,000 dead in New York and Washington at the hands of illegal immigrant terrorists.

Since then we have put up with library and bookstore records examined by Federal agents. We have endured having our personal e-mail scanned by intelligence agents. We have seen our grandmothers forced to take off their shoes at airports, with no probable cause other than they have chosen to travel. All of these things are aggravating. We have been willing to put up with it as patriots if it means we can better defend ourselves against another 9/11.

But we have also seen nearly 200,000 American troops sent to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, where over 1,800 of them have given their lives.

All the while we have seen the administration and the Congress turn a blind eye to the continuing hordes of millions of illegal immigrants pouring across our northern and southern borders. There is no amount of eavesdropping, searches, or overseas military actions that will protect us against another 9/11 while we leave our borders wide open to terrorists with suitcase nuclear weapons or biological agents.

We can secure our borders within months. We can secure our borders within months with a simple executive order or an agreement between our border State Governors and the Secretary of Defense. Congressional investigators say somewhere between 36,000 and 48,000 troops would do the job. The Secretary of Border Control and Immigration says maybe it will take 50,000. Since we are in agreement on needing somewhere between 36,000 and 50,000, there is no reason not to start deploying these forces soon.

And that is just the first step. We then need to build up our border patrol to a level at which we do not need help and we can send our troops back home.

We ought to be able to do that over the next 5 years, as an adequate number of new border patrol agents are trained and placed on duty and we get new fencing, lighting, sensors, and other improvements in place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see us get to a point where we do not need the PATRIOT Act. We can let it quietly expire as we did with other internal security measures enacted during previous wars. But I would like for the Speaker and this Congress not to ask me to vote for any new so-called ''guest worker'' program while this outrage at our borders continues. The Members can count on me for a ''no'' vote right now.

When our borders are secure and we have absolutely stopped the invasion of our Nation by illegal immigrants, then and only then can we sit down and discuss how to solve this problem.

This week the Minutemen volunteers are heading back out into the Southwest desert to do the job the Federal Government is supposed to do. I do not want them to have to do that. As a matter of fact, they do not want to have to be doing that. But until Congress starts enforcing the immigration laws of this country, they will continue in growing numbers.

Mr. Speaker, protecting Americans against terrorists begins with illegal immigrants at our borders, not with our own citizens here at home.

□ 1530

CENTRAL AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT NOT GOOD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 13 months ago, President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a trade agreement among six Latin American countries with the United States. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most powerful Republican Member of the House, said last year when the agreement was signed in May of 2004 that Congress would soon vote on it. We did not. Then the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said we would vote on it before Memorial Day. We did not. Now the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) says we are going to vote on it before July 4. I think he means it this time.

But the reason we have not voted on the Central American Free Trade Agreement is pretty simple: A majority of Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, large numbers of Members of this House simply do not think our trade policy is working.

Every single trade agreement that has come before this Congress that President Bush has signed has been voted on within 60 days: Morocco, Chile, Australia and Singapore. The Central American Free Trade Agreement has not been voted on in almost 13 months because Americans, represented by their Members of Congress, have said we do not like the way our trade policy is working.

Just take a look. In 1992, the year I was elected to Congress for the first time, our trade deficit, imports versus exports, was $38 billion. Last year, 2004, our trade deficit was $618 billion. From $38 billion to $618 billion in a dozen years.

Now, that is just numbers, that is just economics maybe. But look what that means. What that really means is a huge loss in manufacturing jobs. In the last 6 years, for example, the States in red are States which have lost 20 percent, at least one out of five, of their manufacturing jobs: New York, 222,000; Pennsylvania, 200,000; Ohio, my State, 217,000; Michigan, 210,000 lost manufacturing jobs alone; Illinois, 224,000; Mississippi and Alabama together, 132,000; North Carolina, 228,000. The States in blue have lost 15 to 20 percent, between one out of six and one out of five, of their manufacturing jobs. Texas, 201,000; California, 354,000 manufacturing jobs.

Our trade policy, Mr. Speaker, simply is not working. The Central American Free Trade Agreement is going to be more of the same. It is a dysfunctional cousin of the North American Free Trade Agreement, which helped to begin this trend of a huge burgeoning trade deficit and the continuing loss of more manufacturing jobs.

The President has said he wants us to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement and he makes some promises. The President said the Central American Free Trade Agreement will mean more jobs for Americans, it will mean more manufacturing in the U.S. and more exports to the developing world, and it will mean an increase in the standard of living for all seven countries, not just us, but the six countries in the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Unfortunately, that is the same promise that presidents have made for a decade and a half. They promise more jobs for Americans, they promise more manufacturing exports, they promise a higher standard of living in the developing world. And we end up with this: We end up with wages stagnant in the developing world, continued poverty in Mexico or China or wherever these trade agreements are, whichever countries these trade agreements affect, and more lost jobs in the U.S.

The people that have supported CAFTA like to tell us we will start selling more products to Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Nicaragua. What they do not tell us is that people in those countries simply cannot afford to buy American products.

The average wage in the United States is $38,000. The average wage in El Salvador is $4,800. The average wage in Honduras is $2,600. The average wage in Nicaragua is $2,300. People in El Salvador cannot buy cars made in Ohio. People in the Dominican Republic cannot buy software from Seattle. People in Nicaragua cannot buy textiles and apparel from North Carolina. People in Honduras cannot buy steel from West Virginia or Pennsylvania.

The fact is, these trade agreements are about one thing: These trade agreements are about exporting more U.S. jobs, outsourcing more U.S. work. That is why the largest companies in this country support CAFTA, because they want to move more production to these countries and continue to pay these very low wages instead of these higher wages.

When you see who lines up for this agreement, the people who support CAFTA are the largest companies in the United States. The people who oppose CAFTA are religious leaders in Central America, religious leaders in the United States. The people who support CAFTA, again, are the largest banks and the largest financial institutions in the United States. The people who oppose CAFTA are people representing workers, the environment, people who advocate for food safety. The people who support CAFTA are the most powerful people in our country. The people who oppose CAFTA are Central American trade unions and people who represent the poorest of the poor in Latin America.

This trade agreement simply will not work for Americans. It will mean more lost jobs for the United States. It will mean more manufacturing going offshore. It will mean a higher trade deficit with the United States, already going from $38 billion to $618 billion in just a dozen years. It will mean more stagnant wages in Central America. It will mean a pulling down of wages in the United States.

The fact is, we can pass a different CAFTA. We should defeat the Central American Free Trade Agreement and we should negotiate a CAFTA with labor standards, with protections for the environment, with protections for food safety.

Why do we have protections for the drug companies, and not workers in CAFTA? Why do we have protections for Hollywood films, but not for the environment or food safety?

Mr. Speaker, when workers in the developing world can buy American products, not just make them, then we will know finally that our trade policy is working.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Visitors in the gallery should not express approval or disapproval of House proceedings.

NECESSARY REFORMS AT THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is time for America to wake up. The United Nations is a mess, riddled with scandals. In fact, the U.N. itself is a scandal. The Oil-for-Food scheme and the sex trafficking by U.N. officials in Bosnia and the Congo are only two in a long list of egregious acts.

The Oil-for-Food program began as a humanitarian plan to soften the sanctions against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The U.N. would allow Iraq to sell a predetermined amount of oil each year, provided that the Iraqi government used the profits to buy food, medicine and other necessities for its citizens. Instead, Saddam and his cronies twisted this program. These villains got rich while the people of Iraq suffered. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan's own son benefited from the Oil-for-Food program.

Only after extreme international pressure did Secretary Annan appoint former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker to investigate the scandal ridden program. Volcker's report found grave conflicts of interest in the program.

The real question is, should the U.N. be above the law? It is blatantly obvious that the U.N. considers itself above the law of nations and answers to absolutely no one. Secretary Annan has said that he will waive diplomatic immunity for any U.N. official who has done wrong. However, his promise carries little meaning, because which government would prosecute the guilty U.N. officials? The officials are not U.S. citizens, their offenses did not take place on U.S. soil and none of the documents in question were required to follow U.S. law. There is no vote for U.N. leaders and no international referendum on its policies. The U.N. sets its own shabby standards for conduct.

These are some of the very reasons why so many of our constituents oppose U.S. membership in the U.N., and it is why many fear U.N. efforts to have the power to tax, field an army or create a court system. Possessing these powers would transform the U.N. into a global governing body. America must draw a line.

The United States provides large sums of money to the U.N. so that ''business as usual'' can continue. America must no longer blindly follow every policy, scheme, international conference and peacekeeping mission that the U.N. peddles.

The United Nations' greatest fear is that average Americans will no longer tolerate these international scandals and demand that America withdraw from the international organization. If this ever occurred, the U.N.'s thin veil of relevance would be completely ripped away.

Let us face it, the U.N. has failed. It has failed in its mission to promote world peace. While the U.N. claims to provide a forum where nations can air their differences and avoid the battlefield, more dictators have terrorized nations and more generations have been lost to genocide. Instead of removing threats to peace, the U.N. has encouraged, actually even nurtured, regimes that wage violence on their neighbors and oppress and torture their own people.

Instead of a peaceful, prosperous, stable trading partner, the U.N. condones brutal, murdering dictatorships that starve and torture their own people, while once-great powers tremble and use diplomatic double-talk to ignore their responsibilities. Most of these international thugs have two things in common: Each has a voice and a vote in the United Nations.

The United Nations has come under the control of outlaw nations and self-serving special interest groups. Each promotes an agenda to line their pockets with the world's wealth as they diminish the power of the United States and enslave the citizens of their Third World countries. How else could terrorist states like Libya and Syria have served on the U.N.'s Human Rights Commission, while Israel is condemned time after time? Why else would the U.N. refuse membership to a prosperous Nation like Taiwan, and give vicious brutes like Zimbabwe's Robert Mugabe a prominent voice at U.N. conferences?

The U.N. scandals are not isolated incidents. The scandals are ingrained in the very structure of the United Nations. The idea that a U.N. Secretary General can act as a global representative or that the U.N. staff can function as an honest and effective international servant is preposterous.

While the time has come for America to wake up, it is also time for Congress to act. That is why just today we approved the United Nations Reform Act of 2005. Now it is up to the U.S. Senate to follow our lead and demand reforms.

I applaud the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his hard work to finally bring accountability and integrity to the U.N. However, reform in the United Nations has been long overdue and action must come soon.

Secretary Annan's task is clear: Bring in the era of integrity and accountability you were charged with, or you will lose the United Nations' single largest contributor, the United States.

REEXAMINING THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, a large majority of Members of the United States House of Representatives voted on October 14, 2002, to allow the President to wage war, probably an extra-constitutional delegation of authority. There was no direct declaration of war, yet it was authorized under the War Powers Act by this body, so a great deal of the responsibility lies here.

The rationale at the time that was frequently mentioned in the weeks leading up to the vote was the potential for mushroom clouds, as mentioned by Ms. Rice, Mr. CHENEY, President Bush and others very prominently just before the vote in the House, just before an election, when Members felt great pressure. There was a lot of talk about the delivery system of Saddam Hussein for his widely believed-to-be-extensive arsenal of chemical and biological weapons and links to al Qaeda.

Now, I attended the briefings, saw the thin gruel that was presented to Members, and I certainly was not convinced, but I am sure many others were, particularly with a picture of a UAV, which looked like something that could not fly. It had aluminum patches riveted on it and it clearly could not carry anything. It seemed the Air Force guy giving the briefing did not think much of it either. Be that as it may, a large majority of this House bought into that rationale and authorized the President to go to war.

Subsequent to that, revelations about ''yellow cake'' and Niger and uranium and the potential for nuclear threat was totally dispelled shortly, well, actually internally in the administration before the President used it in the State of the Union, but publicly after that.

So much had been dispelled that on February 5, 2003, I introduced a resolution suggesting that Members of Congress had been misled, had not had good information, and should reconsider this extraordinary delegation of war-making authority to the President.

□ 1545

The Congress failed to act, and we know what proceeded from then.

But now, I would believe that a majority of the Members, not just those of us who opposed the war or some who now feel that they should not have supported the war, but a large majority, would want to have a full investigation of how this happened. How did this all happen? Was it the result of a massive failure of intelligence? If so, then why did the President pin the highest civilian honor, the Medal of Honor, on George Tenet, the head of the CIA who is now an expensive consultant and living in luxury. If he was responsible, then maybe he should suffer some consequences.

Well, that did not happen, but they want to blame the intelligence agencies. Now, is it all the intelligence agencies? Is it one intelligence agency? Is it because of total misinterpretation and incompetence by the administration, or was it selective use, cherry-picking of intelligence, or was it something even worse, deliberate manipulation? We do not know. We simply do not know.

The Senate held one set of hearings on the failure of intelligence. They promised that after the election they would hold yet another set and reveal a report on the use of the intelligence. They are now refusing to do that with an emboldened and enlarged Republican membership. So we do not know. The American people do not know. Something that is costing $1 billion a day, almost 1,800 American lives, more than 10,000 wounded, and we do not know exactly why this administration took us to war and under what auspices they took us to war.

Now we have a memo, the so-called secret Downing Street Memo from British intelligence, saying that as early as July 2002 that many of these facts were known.

Now, a number of us were disturbed by that and we wrote to the President on May 5. Mr. Speaker, 122 Members have now signed that letter. The President has not even acknowledged the letter from 122 duly elected representatives of the United States House of Representatives. He should answer that letter.

But, better still, the majority should stop stonewalling an investigation. If this was all very innocent or if it was just the incompetence of the intelligence agencies, then let us find those who were responsible. If it is something else, let us find those who were responsible. You should not stonewall this important information, so that we can learn from our mistakes and move forward with more confidence in the Congress and the administration when it might come to future threats against the United States of America.

Now, yesterday, we were sent to the basement, led by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), because we were told there were no rooms available to hold a hearing on this memo and these issues. Unfortunately, it turned out that all of the rooms in that vicinity, which were much larger, were vacant, as were many other hearing rooms.

This Republican leadership should have a full and fair and nonpartisan investigation of how America was led to war.

STATE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDS AND GRANTS AGREEMENT ON QUESTIONABLE BOSNIAN AMBASSADOR APPOINTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, my office expressed a deep and sincere concern to the State Department over agreeing to the designation of Bisera Turkovic as the new Bosnian Ambassador to the United States. At that time, State was postured to recommend an agreement on this appointment.

After several discussions, the State Department asked me not to go public with my concerns because there was a pending deal with the Bosnian government to send Bosnian troops to Iraq in July. In good faith, Mr. Speaker, my office agreed not to publicly raise our very grave and sincere concerns.

But, Mr. Speaker, our office was surprised and profoundly disappointed when we learned this past Wednesday, after literally months, that the State Department had granted agreement on this outrageous appointment without contacting us or informing us in any way.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush has repeatedly and strongly stated that in this fight against terrorism, that you are ''either with us or you are against us.'' Yet, I am beginning to wonder if our own State Department is with us.

Bisera Turkovic is one of the founders of the radical Islamist Muslim SDA Party in Bosnia, a party that has had, since its foundation, strong links with al Qaeda, numerous other terrorist organizations, and even the intelligence mechanisms of Iran.

In 1939, Bisera Turkovic's father, Alija Izetbegovic, started a group called the Young Muslims. After World War II, they were prosecuted as Nazi war criminals and spent time in prison together. Over the years, Dr. Turkovic was promoted by Izetbegovic and then founded the SDA Party in 1990.

Alija Izetbegovic was a close confidante of Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini. And when he became President Izetbegovic, he recirculated his 1970 Islamic Declaration and openly espoused his view that ''there can be no peace or coexistence between Islamic faith and non-Islamic faith.''

Mr. Speaker, soon after the beginning of the Bosnian civil war in 1992, Dr. Turkovic was accredited as Bosnian ambassador to Zagreb. It was this post, coordinating with others, that was constantly used by the SDA and their leadership to provide Bosnian passports, visas, humanitarian worker status, and logistical support to radical Islamist mujahideen coming into Bosnia to fight their own jihad there. Individuals such as Anwar Sha'ban, the spiritual leader of al Qaeda in Bosnia and the cousin of Osama bin Laden, Abu al-Madani, who was killed fighting soldiers in Sarajevo, and even Osama bin Laden himself entered Bosnia through Zagreb.

In violation of a U.S. embargo, the SDA also organized a massive flow of weapons from Iran through Croatia during Bisera Turkovic's time as ambassador.

When my office raised these concerns, Mr. Speaker, we were told that the actions during the war were Bosnian government policy at that time and that it was a long time ago. But, Mr. Speaker, can it possibly be the position of our State Department that despite the fact that we know that Iranian weapons were smuggled into Bosnia in contradiction to a U.N. embargo, and that foreign mujahideen were given documentation to enter Bosnia to fight a jihad, often fronting as humanitarian workers, that that is not enough evidence to deny diplomatic status to someone who was centrally involved and who remains a senior level official for the party that instituted these very policies?

My office has also raised issues of concern with regard to Bisera Turkovic's ethical fitness, Mr. Speaker; and the State Department has said that ''we can't deny appointees on the basis of being corrupt.''

Mr. Speaker, these actions on the part of our State Department are a disservice to our President, they are a disgrace to the United States of America, and they are a betrayal to the cause of human freedom. It is past time that the State Department start acting like it represents the interests of America and the citizens of this Nation. The people of this Nation deserve better than to be served by a State Department that aids our enemies and then lies to cover its actions.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is a pleasure to address the House, and I would like to thank the Democratic leader for allowing the 30-something Working Group, once again, to come to the floor to not only address the Members, but also make sure that we continue our commitment of sharing information as we get it on various issues that are facing 30-somethings throughout the United States of America; also to be able to address the issues that are facing everyday Americans, whether they be young or old, school age, or those that are yet unborn.

It is very, very important for us to come to the floor, especially in this democracy that we celebrate, and talk about some of these issues that are taking place, some that we are taking action on, others that we have had very little action on, and some that we are not acting upon at all.

The focus of the 30-something Working Group is to make sure that on issues that are ongoing, such as Social Security, an ever-growing Federal debt, a deficit that is in the trillions of dollars that will keep future generations and even the present generation indebted to this Federal Government, and also issues that are facing our young people as it relates to education, making sure that they are able to not only go to college, but when they leave college, that they do not find themselves in debt.

Just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out the issue of Social Security. I do, Mr.

Speaker, have some good news to report: one, that this issue of private accounts and taking benefits away from the American people is very unpopular with Americans; also, two, that it is unpopular with Members of the Congress.

Now, in the other body, there is a chairman of a committee over there that basically cannot get the Social Security bill rolling as long as they are talking about private accounts. As a matter of fact, there is an article today in The Washington Post that talks about the fact that even at the White House, and some of the leaders of this House have said, either we are going to deal with Social Security soon or we are not going to deal with it at all, and why put Members of the House in jeopardy to vote for private accounts that will take benefits away from the American people, not only those who are retirees, but also those who are receiving survivor benefits and those who are receiving disability benefits. It will take away benefits from them by using the private account formula.

The good thing about this, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that when we get off the agenda of trying to privatize Social Security, then we can do what we have been trying to do all along in a bipartisan way and coming up with great ideas and putting them into action to be able to strengthen Social Security. I hope, as a Member not only of this House, but as a member of the 30-something Working Group, that we can work in a way that, even though we are strengthening Social Security, the money that it will take to strengthen Social Security, that we will not only explain to the American people, but to make sure that ever Member of this House understands that we have to have a way to pay for it. Not just saying that we are going to throw a lot of money in there and not find a way to pay for it, because it is almost like, Mr. Speaker, taking a carton of milk out of the refrigerator and smelling it and saying, wow, it is sour, and putting it back in and maybe it will be fresh tomorrow. It will continue to be an issue for the American people in future generations, and that is something that we have to work on.

I would ask the Members to take a look at The Washington Post article today speaking of the strategy on Social Security. It is nothing that I am going to sit here and say ''we told you so'' as it relates to private accounts, but it is something that is encouraging. Hopefully, Republican leaders will start to say, well, maybe we need to back off this strategy of $944 billion going to Wall Street, and maybe we need to work on strengthening Social Security, making sure that those that elected us to come here know that Social Security is here for future generations, and also for this generation and the baby boomers.

I also believe that a great deal of credit should be given not only to the Members here in Congress, and I would like to commend the very few Members on the Republican side of the aisle that said, no way, Jose on privatizing Social Security. And I am so glad that they are standing against the Republican leadership, and I am so glad on this issue of Social Security, and I am so glad here on the Democratic side, from the beginning, the Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), also the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman MENENDEZ), and also the vice chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (JIM CLYBURN), of our leadership on this side of the aisle, all along, without any problems, have said that they are standing shoulder to shoulder with the Democratic Caucus to make sure that we strengthen Social Security, just like we did in the 1980s when Ronald Reagan was in the White House and Tip O'Neill was the Speaker of this House with a bipartisan bill to make sure that we shored it up.

Also, even when we start talking about the history of it, I am glad that President Clinton took the position he did when he took the position of balancing the budget and putting us into surpluses to make sure that we could shore up the Social Security Trust Fund and to know how we were paying for it. We were paying for it with an ever-growing surplus. But right now we do not have that surplus. The majority side and the leadership on the majority side have led us into an almost $7.8 trillion deficit, and I think that we have to work on that.

Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is here, and I am so glad that the gentleman is here, and that the 30-something Working Group is here on the floor once again.

□ 1600

But if I can read into some of the groups that have been out there sharing with the American people about the fact that why do we want to privatize Social Security when it is going to take away benefits; from right from the beginning we were saying you are going to lose somewhere up to 70 percent of the benefits. In some cases individuals will lose benefits, and even if they were not in the private account side of the privatization of Social Security, they would lose 30 percent of their benefits. So that is even saying, well, listen, I want to stay in a system that I have now. You still will lose.

I want to thank those groups for going out there because I say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) if it was not for them, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if it was left up to the mechanics of the Beltway here in Washington, DC, I think once again the American people would be a recipient of the Potomac two-step.

I would like to thank the Americans United to Protect Social Security; also thank Rock the Vote, College Democrats, Young Democrats, Progressive Democrats of America; also AFSCME, AFSCME Retiree Program, the National Council of Individuals With Disabilities, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Nurses Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Association of Community Organizations for Reform, the Alliance for Retired Americans, which is AARP, the largest senior organization here in the United States, America Votes, California Health Advocates, Campaign for America's Future, Center for American Progress, Center for Medicare Advocacy, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Center on Economic Policy and Research, Child Welfare League of America, Coalition of Human Needs, Code Blue Now, Consumers Union, Economic Policy Institute, Families USA, American Baptist Convention, Fair Taxes for All, Independent Living Services, Leadership Council on Civil Rights, Medicare Rights Center; also the National Academy of Social Insurance, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Association of Social Workers, the National Coalition on Nursing Home Reform, the National Conference of State Legislators, which is bipartisan, I must add, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, the National Education Association, the National Health Law Program, the National Organization of Social Security, the National Senior Citizens Law Center, the New Democratic Network.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I have just got a couple more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida is saying there is a lot of support against the President's Social Security plan.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure. Against privatization of Social Security. The Subcommittee on Social Security, also you have the Century Foundation, the U.S. Action, Visiting Nurses Association of America, American Corn Growers Association. That is good to have them on board. The Center For Rural Affairs, the Federation of Southern Cooperatives, the League of Rural Voters, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Family Farm Coalition, Progressive Student Initiative and the 21st Century Democrats.

I am going to put this list in for the record. But I just want to say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), it is always good, and all of the people were not mentioned because we would take a good part of this Special Order talking about those individuals that are out there. But I want to make a case in point.

Young people in America have risen up beyond the expectations of many individuals in the past as it relates to advocacy on this issue of Social Security.

So I am so glad that they are a part of it because that is the reason why the American people are being educated.

Americans United to Protect Social Security; Rock the Vote; College Democrats; Young Democrats; Progressive Democrats of America; AFSCME; AFSCME Retiree Program; The US PIRGS; National Council on Individuals With Disabilities; Americans for Democratic Action; American Nurses Association; American Public Health Association; Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America; Association of Community Organization for Reform Now (ACORN); Alliance for Retired Americans (AARP); America Votes; California Health Advocates; CALPERS; Campaign for America's Future; Center for American Progress; Center for Medicare Advocacy; Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP); Center on Economic Policy and Research; CHC; Child Welfare League of America; Coalition on Human Needs; Code Blue Now; Consumers Union; Economic Policy Institute (EPI); Families USA; Fair Taxes for All; Half The Planet; and HBC Dems.

Independent Living Services; Leadership Conference for Civil Rights; Medicare Rights Center; MoveOn; National Academy of Social Insurance; National Association of Area Agencies on Aging; National Association of Police Organizations; National Association of Social Workers; National Coalition for Nursing Home Reform; National Conference of State Legislators; National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare; National Education Association; National Health Law Program; National Organization of Social Security Claimants Representatives (NOSSCR); National Senior Citizens Law Center; New Democratic Network; Public Citizen; Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means; The Century Foundation; United Cerebral Palsy; USAction; Visiting Nurse Association of America; American Corn Growers Association; Center for Rural Affairs; Federation of Southern Cooperatives; League of Rural Voters; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; National Family Farm Coalition; Progressive Student Initiative; and 21st Century Democrats.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, what has been great, really, is to watch that debate kind of evolve since early January since the President came to this Chamber and talked to the American people and basically said he had an idea for how to fix Social Security; stated that the Social Security program is in crisis, which we have refuted many times here in this Chamber through the 30-something Working Group. And it has been interesting to watch the evolution of the debate and the support for the President's proposal in January not only among many Americans, but among young people, and as the young citizens of the country became more and more educated on exactly what the President's plan would do through some of the groups that you mentioned, through Rock the Vote and a variety of other groups, became educated on, you know, basically what the President's proposal would be.

And the issue that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and I and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), other members of the 30-something Working Group here have focused on that we think is the most poignant argument to make is this issue right here, the national debt. The President's proposal would add $5 trillion to the national debt over the next 20 years.

Now, as you can see here, and this is actually not updated, and we will have the new numbers next week. It is actually now $7.8 trillion this country is in debt that we owe; 7.8 trillion. The President's proposal over the next 20 years would add an additional $5 trillion to this number here and almost doubling the national debt. And if we keep going at the rate we are spending money here, we will double it in the next 20 years if we do not get our house in order.

But this is the main issue, and I think young people, when they saw the President's proposal, when they saw that his proposal would add $5 trillion, increase their taxes, push the responsibility of paying the bills off on the next generation, I think that is when you began to see the rug come out from underneath the President's proposal. And so we have got to keep focused on the national debt and the annual deficits that are costing each taxpayer that is in the country, or each citizen in the country, almost $27,000.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), for a child that was just born 10 minutes ago already owes $26,349.67, and even that number has gone up. When we have our new chart next week, we will be able to have that new number. Unfortunately it continues to go up, and there is no sight of that number going down. We cannot see the end of the tunnel as it relates to the Federal debt continuing. I see that you have a new chart.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is exactly what you were talking about just before I arrived here. This is the chart of the deficits over the past probably 40 some years, since the Johnson administration. We ran a pretty tight budget for a good many years. And into the Reagan administration you see a deep, deep dip, and into the Bush administration, and we were running $300 billion deficits every year.

And then when President Clinton came in with a Democratic House, with a Democratic Senate, in 1993 passed a budget without one Republican vote. Al Gore came to the Senate to break the tie to vote for it. And it led to record surpluses in the United States of America. This is where we were in the late 1990s; and back with the current President, back into an era of deficits, of borrowing money from the Chinese, borrowing money from Asian countries, putting in jeopardy the future of many of the young people who live in this country today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the bottom line is that it is important that we not only come to the floor to make sure the Members understand what has happened, because we want to make sure that no one suffers from what one may say amnesia of not knowing what has taken place in this Chamber when the leadership rose to the level of saying that we had to do something about the Federal deficit and we did. I think it is also important for us to understand if we are ever going to have an about-face as it relates to spending, without having a plan to pay for what we are spending, it is going to continue to carry on.

I do not look forward to not only our days left in the 109th Congress, but when the 110th Congress comes in to be able to talk about what took place in the 109th Congress, because we could not stop ourselves from spending irresponsibly. And, you know, serving on the Armed Services Committee, a lot of money, almost $150 billion are going into the war annually. With that, and the forecast of that continuing to take place, and I must say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), it is good to hear the Democratic leader and others push the card on the Republican leadership also as it relates to the White House of coming up with a plan, a plan on how we are going to proceed from this point, because the reason why we want to know what is the plan as it relates to training Iraqi troops is so that our troops can start focusing on other issues and be able to carry out action there in Iraq, versus every day patrol that Iraqi troops could be doing, the training of those troops are important. It is important that the majority side gives us that information so that we are able to make sure that we are on course in having the proper oversight over this war.

Now, we both support our men and women in uniform. We are both on the Armed Services Committee. We both appreciate their commitment and sacrifice, and we give our love and appreciation out to those families that are also making a sacrifice and, unfortunately, those that have made the ultimate sacrifice of losing a loved one.

But what I also think is important, Mr. Speaker, is that we make sure that we have a plan, a forecast plan, because there are domestic needs also that need to be addressed.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is right. A budget comes to this floor. We need something for our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, I am a yes vote. When education comes to this floor, leave No Child Left Behind, the fully funding of that program, I am a yes vote.

But guess what? It is just not happening. And our leadership, and on the Democratic Caucus side we want to prioritize our children's future just as much as we are prioritizing the future

of the Iraqi people. And so it is important that towns and cities and locations that we both represent, the gentleman being from Ohio, I am being from Florida, that they receive their just due of their Federal tax dollar and making sure they are a part of the solution and their own family needs, versus saying that, well, we are going to continue to make a sacrifice, you know, on behalf of the Iraqi people, versus the individuals that are living in our own communities that we go to church with every day. And it is counterproductive if we do not plan to be able to focus those same kind of dollars and those efforts towards helping local communities.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The gentleman is exactly right. And I think when you look at the number that we are going to spend in Iraq, probably by the end of this year it is going to be over $300 billion that we are going to spend in Iraq with absolutely no end in sight. No one has any idea of how much longer we are going to be there and what the cost in human life and U.S. treasure is going to be.

Now, imagine, 435 Members in this Chamber, $300 billion. You are talking about $6- to $700 million per Member of Congress. Now, the American people need to ask themselves, would you have rather given that money to your congressional Representative in the House of Representatives to spend in your community on building schools, on building clinics, on making sure everyone has health care, or on this mess that we have in the Middle East?

And I know people in Youngstown, Ohio, and Niles, Ohio, and Warren, Ohio, and Akron, Ohio, and Ravenna, Ohio, and Kent, Ohio, they would rather have the money spent in their districts. Because you are getting the same kind of calls that I am getting. No money for police and fire. No money for mental health levies. No money for their schools. And we have a boondoggle going on in the Middle East right now that no one even knows where the money is being spent. And money is being lost. U.S. taxpayer money is being lost.

Now, you mention how we have bills that come to the floor to fund education, fund veterans and fund some programs that we believe in and we support and how underfunded they are, and how many thousands of kids. We had a study in Ohio that said No Child Left Behind was underfunded in the State of Ohio by over $1 billion.

□ 1615

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Do you know that four States have sued the Federal Government for lack of Leave No Child Left Behind funding? Texas is one of those States.

I am going to tell you something, the bottom line is it is about priorities. Do we want to bring about the standardized testing of our children, making sure they are under the umbrella for them to learn, but better yet, we do not want to provide the dollars to make that happen? We do not want to give a teacher an environment where she can teach and children an environment they can learn?

We are saying that, well, you know, do not worry, you have to work it out, and matter of fact, we are going to penalize you if you do not reach the bar. This is why it is important if we worry about these domestic needs, we do something about it.

I want you to share that chart with the Members because I want to talk about what we have in plan and in store if we had Democratic leadership that was in the majority in this House, to be able to carry out some of these plans.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, what happened, what we had done here is we have a chart that we broke down and basically puts in the perspective, what has been happening down here. As you can see, on the left, it is the red chart. It is the cost in trillions of dollars over the next 10 years to make President Bush's tax cuts permanent, of which a majority went to people who make over $500,000 a year, $1.8 trillion is what we are going to spend over the next 10 years. This is our priority. Tax cuts for rich people.

The next is of that tax cuts for the top 1 percent, $800 million. Now, the top 1 percent in this country make a lot of money. So we are going to take $800 million from education and health and all these other programs, and we are going to give that $800 million back to the top 1 percent of the people in the country.

Now look at this. This is the bar for how much we are going to spend over the next 10 years for veterans budget authority, $300 million. $300 million. Why would we choose permanent tax cuts for people who make over four, five, six, seven, $800,000 a year? Warren Buffett, Bill Gates, they are going to get the big tax cuts. Our friends at Enron, Tyco, all the big dogs are going to get a tremendous amount of money, and yet, we are shutting out veterans.

We have thousands of veterans who are now in our hospitals in Bethesda and Walter Reed who are coming back single, double, triple amputees. This is a real problem, and I think this sends a message to the country that we just do not have the priorities that I think a lot of people in America have, and if you look at the polling, if you look at what the American people are saying, the approval rating, 33 percent for Congress, the President's approval rating is not much better.

The ultimate question is, does Congress or does the President or the administration represent your values? Do you think they are fighting on behalf of what you want and what you need? The answer is becoming more and more apparent that this Congress is out of touch with the American people, that this President's agenda is out of touch with the American people.

I think when you brought up priorities earlier, in a recent bill that was passed, big oil got a $2 billion subsidy. Can you imagine with the price of gas now and oil by the barrel going over $50, that we are going to take money from middle class Americans, take their tax dollars and give $2 billion of it for big oil companies to go explore and find more areas to get more oil? Is that not what they say, when the price increases, they need that money because it is expensive to go dig for oil, it is expensive to go drill? We are going to take taxpayer money to go do this, and I think that is a perfect example of how this Congress does not represent the values that many people in this country have.

Would you not rather have $2 billion spent on your schools? We have got to compete with 1.3 billion Chinese workers, over 1 billion Indian workers over the next couple of decades. We need to be investing into our kids. We need to be investing into our schools, making sure our kids are healthy with programs in their communities, in their schools, that they can learn Chinese and they can learn a different foreign language of the countries they are going to be competing with.

Why do the rich schools have two swimming pools and art programs? God bless them, we want schools to have them, but why do all schools not have a liberal education and liberal in the sense of speech and debate, art, visual arts, music, dance, all these things that provide for a well-rounded education?

Those are the first programs that end up getting cut, and it is because, back here, we are cutting taxes for the top 1 percent and cutting benefits for veterans and the No Child Left Behind program and the health and welfare of our average citizens.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What is important, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it is good for the Members to be able to note the fact that if the situation was different in this House, and when I say the situation, I am saying, if we were in the majority on this side and it was a Democratic House, the discussion about veterans at .3 percent would been a discussion, as a matter of fact, the action would be taken to make sure our veterans are treated the way they should be treated for the service and the freedom that we celebrate every day.

I think it is important because this is not the Kendrick Meek/Tim Ryan Report from Ohio and from Florida. This is what we are getting from the Congressional Budget Office. This is information that is publicly printed in a number of nonpartisan groups that are out there.

I think it is also important for us to talk about our new partnership for America's future, what we are talking about on the Democratic side, and it is good to make sure that everyone understands that by the Democrats being in the minority here in this House, we cannot agenda bills to come before a committee by House rules. We cannot

call a committee hearing. We cannot bring a bill to the floor because of the House rules, because we are in the minority. We cannot say, well, there will be no privatization of Social Security whatsoever and the bill will not come to the floor because we are in the minority.

To be in the majority, it is going to take the American people and also some individuals to continue to focus on the issues that are not happening on behalf of not only our patriots, and patriots come in two forms. Many of them are everyday Americans that are out there, trying to make sure they provide for their families. They go to church, the synagogues, what have you, to the mosques, if they go, and they work hard every day. They expect their piece of the American apple pie.

You have individuals that are going even a step further, those individuals that are wearing the uniform in a forward area, in Iraq and Afghanistan or wherever they may be, individuals that have served this country before. This is our veterans. Those individuals that not only have stories of war and conflict but have stories of real life experience.

When they signed up, we promised them that we would help them in their health care. We promised them that they would not have to wait 6 months to see the ophthalmologist. We promised them that they will receive the respect that they deserve out of this Congress as it relates to making sure they have the necessary funds to be able to carry out the rest of their lives, either with a disability or what have you.

I must report that that is not happening right now. It is important that hopefully we can get some sort of forward movement to get us moving down in the right direction.

We have the new partnership for America's future which is a Democratic plan that has six components, which brings about prosperity, national security, fairness, opportunity, community and accountability.

Accountability, Mr. Speaker, is pivotal in this debate as it relates to balancing the national debt or making sure that we do not have a deficit at about $8 trillion number. Accountability is making sure that we pass a Leave No Child Left Behind Act, that we fund it and that we stand by our States and we stand by our children or our future generations, to be able to do what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) was talking about, of making sure that they are prepared to carry out the jobs that we need them to carry out. We are being outcompeted in other areas because our kids are not carrying the mathematics and some other areas, the sciences, that they need.

So the Leave No Child Left Behind Act was put into place to hopefully bring about that kind of accountability, and guess what, it was a bipartisan effort. Guess what again, it is not a bipartisan effort to fund it. It is being underfunded, and if we were in the majority here in the House, it would have better funding. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader, has said that she will fully fund Leave No Child Left Behind. That is a major statement, and better yet, an action that would take place because she said it would happen.

Just like we are bold in saying we will make sure that the millionaires and billionaires get their tax cuts, we are going to make sure that our children are educated. Guess what, again, here is another thing. They are Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian, Green Party, Reform Party households. No one's picking and choosing. We are saying all of America's children should receive that kind of leadership and that kind of accountability.

A perfect example, when we talk about opportunity within our six principles and we talk about community and we talk about prosperity, we are the 30 Something Working Group. We have individuals that are going to school and leaving college with what, 20, $30,000 in debt. Am I correct?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They are leaving in debt. Better yet, the administration gives them a bad hand of cards in saying that we want you to go to college, we want you to educate yourself. Individuals are running around here, going to commencement ceremonies throughout the United States of America saying that we are with you, but better yet, as it relates to the Pell grant obligation, it is because they changed their formulary it is going to be $300 million coming out of that formula, which is going to take the cost up of Pell grants in the year 2005, 2006.

I do not think that is a message of what we should do, but I can tell you what we are doing on this end. There is legislation that has already been filed, and which I have signed on to and you are signed on to, to replace that $300 million back in so that the Pell grant opportunity for kids that want to better themselves and move on and educate themselves, that they do not have to end up paying what you may call this, I call it a $300 million tax. When you change the formula and you go up and you give them a greater responsibility, you are taxing them, but better yet, you want to make tax cuts permanent for those individuals that are slamming Cadillac doors here in the United States, eating lunch at some of the finest restaurants in this country, walking around here, not even worrying about how we are going to pay the rent. They are collecting the rent, but better yet, we want to send our young people into a fixed situation.

We already know that on average kids are leaving school with 20, $30,000 in debt, which means they are going to be living at home with mom or dad or grandmother or someone because they cannot get a loan to be able to buy a house because you do not come out of college making a lot of money to be able to make that happen.

So I am glad on this side of the aisle, if anyone wants to know the difference between what is going on in the majority side, and I do not want to generalize because there are some individuals on the majority side who see it the way we see it. They see it the way we see it. They know that this is an important effort and that we have to make sure that we stand up for our children.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was talking to a young person in my district a couple of days ago, and he is so talented on the organ. He is a great singer, and he is a great song writer, and I go to his church in Youngstown, Ohio, frequently. He is the head musician and head of the choir.

□ 1630

And I talked to him, and he is going through a difficult situation. So I asked him, well, why not go to school? Why not sign up at Youngstown State and get a degree in music and teach music? You know what the initial thing he said was? I cannot afford it. I cannot afford it. There is no way I am going to be able to do it.

Part of this that we talk about here is nuts and bolts. We need money for this program, and we are going to reduce or increase the Pell Grant scholarship by $1,000 per student. And I know if the Democrats were in charge, we would do that. But it is not just about reducing the debt, it is about communicating to that person. And there are millions of people just like this young man who are talented and skilled and want to do better, but do not think anybody is on their side.

What we are trying to say is that if you put us in charge, if you give us a chance, we are going to be on your side. We are going to be your partner in this. We cannot do it for you. We cannot make this kid go to school. We cannot make him study. But there are millions of people out there who want to live a better life, and what the Democratic Party wants to do is help them do that; help them achieve their goals; help them move forward.

Whether it is with education or health care or clinics or whatever it is, we are offering solutions here to create incentives for people to be able to go and experience their dreams and to move on. We are in the hopes and dreams business here. That is what the Democrats are all about. And we want to be in charge because we believe that we have a better program, better solutions than just saying everybody gets a tax cut, especially the top 1 percent, because that clearly has not worked.

President Bush's dad called it voodoo economics. It has not worked yet. We are still waiting for what is going to happen here. Job creation is low and slow. People are taking up jobs that pay $10,000 less than the job they lost, without health care benefits. That is not progress.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It is important we move beyond personalities and look at what is actually taking place and what is not taking place. I think it is important looking at the numbers that we understand that it is just not happening.

When we dealt with the whole Medicare issue and we dealt with prescription drugs, the majority side, the leadership on the majority side came over and told us it would cost $350 billion. They also said that it would cost $400 billion. Now it is well over $400 billion; matter of fact, it is even closer to $500 billion.

There was the same information that came to this House regarding the weapons of mass destruction. We had prima facie evidence that there were weapons of mass destruction. But no weapons of mass destruction.

There was also an initiative that came to the floor by the majority, now majority side, that said we are going to do something about health care, and the President said, well, we are going to have these health care savings accounts, and everyone will be able to save, and everyone will be able to have good health care. Still, today, we have millions upon millions of working families without health care, families that go to work every day that do not have a health care plan.

Public hospitals and private hospitals are going under throughout this country, and not because they are bad managers. It is because they do not have the necessary attention or the funds that they need from this Federal Government to be able to provide health care to the everyday American.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield once again, I might just comment that we should just look at the way it is set up. Everyone screams, let us have universal health care, and America needs universal health care. America has universal health care. Unfortunately, it is through the emergency room. It is the most expensive, inefficient way to run a health care system, because hospitals who run emergency rooms, especially in cities that have high concentrations of crime and people accessing health care through the emergency room, they get charitable funds. The taxpayer is still paying.

So the question is are we going to pay for it up front and take care of someone when they have a cold, or are we going to wait until they go to the emergency room with pneumonia and it costs you 10 times more?

What we are saying is restructure, reform the health care system and have the courage to take on the big donors with all the nice cufflinks and the Cadillacs; take them on and say, we are going to act on behalf of the American people, not on behalf of specific interest groups that are making a ton of money.

Now, we cannot take on the pharmaceutical industry because they donate so much money to this body. So you either pick them, or you pick the people you represent back in your district. In the path of $400 billion, then $700 billion, then a $1 trillion prescription drug bill you do not do one thing about reimportation to help drive the cost down, or not do something as simple as giving the Secretary of Health and Human Services the ability to negotiate down the cost of the drugs?

Why not say to Pfizer and Merck, you want the contract for Medicare? Well, we are going to sit down and we are going to talk price. But no one had the courage to do that, because they get too much money from that industry.

But there is a choice. And what we are saying is we are going to make a choice to represent the people of the country who need help, your grandparents, your parents who cannot afford prescription drugs, instead of the pharmaceutical companies. People elect us to come down here and do this. They want us to say, we do not want to bankrupt the pharmaceutical companies, we want you to keep doing your research and doing what you do, but you have to play fair.

The bottom line is that a lot of the patents that the pharmaceutical companies get are researched out at the National Institutes of Health. They are publicly funded institutions. The taxpayers are paying for a good portion of this. Merck comes in and picks up a patent and only has to pay NIH .5 percent of their profits, and they go out and make billions of dollars at the expense of our grandparents, the 30-somethings' grandparents, or our parents.

There is a certain unfairness there. And what we are saying and communicating with these charts, and what we are talking about is we want a chance to lead this Chamber. We have ideas, and we will implement them, and we will help partner with the American people to make their lives better and improve their lives and give them opportunities that they do not have or have not had in many, many years.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is important that everyone understands that what my colleague and I are talking about here right now is doing something about the issues that are facing everyday Americans. Everyday Americans, Democrat, Republican, Independent, Green Party, Reform Party, you name it, we are out there trying to help them. We want to make sure that they get the butter from the duck.

We want to make sure, as we start talking about devolution of taxation, that when we cut funding to State and local governments, the difference between us and them is the fact that we can reach back in our pocket, and I will not even use my big credit card today, matter of fact I do not even have my credit card in my wallet, but I have my debit card. If we were to take a card out and say, fine, we will put another $3 billion on the credit card. That is fine, we will put it away. Matter of fact, no, we will not put it away, we will just throw it away. We will throw it away because we do not have to pay for it. It is someone else who has to pay for it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let our kids pay for it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let our kids pay for it. Let someone else worry about paying for it. But as relates to the State governments, they have to balance their budgets, and the reason why they have to balance their budget is that they have a balanced budget amendment. Many States do. They cannot deficit spend. So they cut education, tuition goes up, and in many of the States Medicaid reform, oh, my goodness, it is just a travesty what is happening in many of these programs that have helped so many people. And transportation dollars on the State level is drying up.

So when we get down to the county commissioners or the cities or the town, or what have you, municipal governments, which way are they going to turn?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Nowhere to go.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Then guess what? The local folks start seeing the millage rate go up from the school board. They start putting these local bond referendums on the ballots, because they do not have the money. Meanwhile, we are sitting up here in Washington talking about what is the problem, we have not raised your taxes? Yes, we have, we have raised your taxes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is right. They raise them at the local level, and in many instances those people at that level vote ''no'' on the school board levy. Some States, like Ohio, it is elected. It just cannot be assessed. So in Ohio, the average person who lost their job and are making $10,000 less, and their kids' college tuition is up, and here comes the school board levy and they vote ''no,'' who is hurt then?

We are all hurt then, because how are we going to compete with other countries who are focusing on educating their kids? How are we going to compete with an engineer in China who makes $5 an hour?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to correct myself, because in my last statement I said we here, as a Congress, raise taxes. No, we did not; the majority side who came up with a strategy on how we can cut funding in certain areas did, and that is the reason why those States are suing the Federal Government right now. We have given them an unfunded mandate.

When my constituents woke up at 7 a.m. on a given Tuesday morning last November, they did not go to the voting booth and take their voter registration card out and say, well, Congressman, I am going to vote for you to make sure you have better health care than I have, you and your family; or to make sure as relates to undue taxes or what have you that you can raise my taxes, and I will vote on me raising my

own taxes. That is why I am sending you to Congress.

No, better yet, I am sending you to Congress to make sure you do nothing about health care. Matter of fact, take my credit card, use it, because I am going to have to pay it off. I am going to let you use it. That is like sending someone to the mall that you know has a problem with shopping and saying, do not worry about it, take it to the maximum.

Can I have my credit card? I said I was not going to pull it out, but I am. My congressional spending card right here, the numbers are going up so fast, I keep having to change the numbers. The thing about our credit card, unlike any other credit card in the wallets of everyday Americans, is that it just keeps going and going and going and going to the tune of $7.8 trillion.

Now, I know my colleague wants to say something, but let me just say this. For those individuals on the majority side that want to say, boy, those Democrats, they just tax and spend, look at the deficit. I want to know where they are now? I cannot even hear them. I do not even see them. Where are they? Where are these fiscal conservatives? Where are they? They are nowhere to be found. You go out in the hall and say, conservative, it just keeps echoing, conservative, conservative, conservative. Where are they?

So we have not been in the majority here, I would say, for 10 years now? Maybe 10 years. Maybe 8?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Going on 11.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Going on 11. Once again, I want to make sure everyone understands that we have to be in the majority to be able to run this House. So everything that takes place in this House and comes to this floor and goes before a committee, the agendas in committees, and bills moving, and appropriations and all of that is done by the majority side because they are in the majority.

In some instances, to be very truthful, we are able to work out some bipartisan efforts sometimes. We have a lot of votes that go up on the board where we are all together on the post offices and the Federal buildings, the naming of those post offices and the Federal buildings. But when it comes to issues like the budget, the Federal deficit, health care, education, in many cases we are not together, and that is unfortunate.

This is nothing we would like to see continued. We would like to work in a bipartisan way. You know, I have Republican constituents, and I have Independent constituents, and I have all the other parties even though I am a Democrat. And they go and vote for what? Leadership. They are going to vote for leadership.

So I want to make sure that Members understand, and before my colleague got here I was sharing with the Speaker and the Members the fact that I am glad that there are some leaders in this Congress that have said we need an exit strategy on the privatization issue.

□ 1645

That is in The Washington Post today. It is just not flying back home to say we are going to private accounts, and if you are in the private account or not, you are still going to lose benefits, but this is what we are doing to shore up Social Security. We can shore up Social Security and strengthen Social Security without private accounts. I am glad we have leaders here that can carry that message on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are not against deficits for the sake of being against deficits. Many would like to borrow and spend as much as they can, and that is what this Congress has been doing. But when you borrow, you have to pay the interest payments.

Here is a very interesting statistic. Here is 2004, here is 2014, 10 years from now. The red is the interest on the debt that we pay every year, $7.8 trillion. That is the red. The light blue is education, the purple environment, and this last one here, a bluish-green is veterans. This red gets bigger because the interest payments that we have to pay every single year are getting huge. We do not like deficits because it diverts money from education, from the environment, from veterans, from health, Medicare, Medicaid, investments in which we will see a good return by having healthy, educated citizens who will create wealth and keep the system running.

With deficits, that money is going down the toilet. A bigger and bigger portion of the budget goes to pay deficits. It is a waste of money. For this Chamber to be run by a group of fellows who said in 1994 that they wanted to pass a balanced budget amendment and make it a Constitutional amendment to have to balance the budget, to give us this, I think, begs the question why do we not turn the Chamber over to the other party. That is what we are asking for.

The money we are borrowing is coming from outside of the United States. The turquoise here is domestically held debt, 2000 to 2004. The purple is debt held by foreigners. As we start to borrow more and more money, out in California it was not so much held by foreign interests, and as we move, we are borrowing more from the Chinese, Japanese, we are turning high deficits, high debt over to our children, and who do we owe? Asian countries we are competing directly against. Bad news, bad leadership, and we need a change. That is what this is all about here.

Mr. Speaker, as we are starting to wind things down here, I just wanted to mention we had a tragedy in my district. On June 13, we lost a soldier in Iraq from Austintown, Ohio, Sergeant Larry Kuhns, Jr., who was 24 years old. He was 3 weeks from coming home.

I wanted to take this opportunity to pass on condolences from this Congress to his family, to his wife, Courtney, their 23-month-old daughter, McKenzie, his mom, Kelly, and his mom's fiance, Jerry. We sometimes think we are important, but moments like this I think wake us all up and kind of allow us to recognize the gravity of some of the decisions we make. Whether it is sending kids off to war or putting the burden on them in the future, I wanted to mention Sergeant Kuhns and thank him and his family for his sacrifice to the country.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I send my condolences to the family. We appreciate the commitment of our men and women in uniform who pay the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman give our Web site out.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to send us an e-mail, tell us what the challenges in your life are, 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. Drop us an e-mail, and we will possibly read it here on the floor.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that we close out by not only thanking the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the rest of the leadership here on the Democratic side of the aisle for allowing us to take advantage of this hour, also the new Partnership for America's Future. We talked about the six principles if we had the opportunity to be able to lead within this House, which are values of prosperity, national security, fairness, opportunity, community, and also accountability.

Accountability is making sure that we deal with issues such as health care, making sure our troops have what they need as it relates to national security, making sure our children have opportunities, making sure that every American is paying tax dollars which are spent in the way that they are supposed to be spent and bring about the kind of fairness that they deserve from their Federal tax dollars. And also opportunity, making sure our children have opportunities, that we do what we are supposed to do as the Federal Government in holding up our end of the deal.

HONORING AUNG SAN SUU KYI

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, in this week where we as a House voted to reform the United Nations, hold them accountable for their actions, I rise to talk about a place in the world where the United Nations is not, but where it ought to be, and a brave woman who is doing the work of the entire United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute a woman born on June 19, 1945. I would like to read a poem that she wrote:

''Emerald cool we may be, as water in cupped hands. But of that we might

be, as splinters of glass, in cupped hands.''

This poem was written by a lady who may be small in stature, but is a giant and noble in character. She carries no weapons, commands no Army; yet this lady actually brings fear into the hearts of at least 400,000 sinister armed soldiers in her native country of Burma. The lady I am referring to is Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the pro-democracy movement in Burma whom the Burmese people affectionally refer to as ''The Lady.''

She is unassuming, but her vision for her country brings fright in the whole army of despots and tyrants that occupy her nation.

In her poem she says even though she and the rest of the pro-democracy movement are emerald cool and as harmless as water in cupped hands, their stand for liberty and democracy is like glass splinters in the hands of the military tyrants that have a stranglehold on her own nation of Burma.

Most Americans do not know where Burma is, much less hear about what occurs in this nightmare of a country. Burma's military regime has created a human rights nightmare for its people. It even arms children, 12, 13 and 14 year olds, and makes them become soldiers. Over 70,000 kids, more than any other country in the world, are armed and fighting for this nation's tyrants.

There are over 1,400 political prisoners who are locked up for supporting this basic concept of human rights and democracy. For something that is as trivial as owning an unauthorized fax machine, listening to radio signals, people are imprisoned in Burma for up to 7 years by the military.

Up to 2 million Burmese have fled the country as refugees and migrants. For those who remain in this country, a brutal campaign by the tyrants in control includes burning the villages and destruction of rice supplies. Killings by the Burmese military regime have resulted in the forcible displacement of 500,000 to a million people, civilians, people in Burma hiding from the military, hiding in their own nation.

These people cannot flee into neighboring Thailand, nor can they return to their homes. They are refugees within their country, unable to grow food and living in extreme poverty, all because of the military tyrants that control this nation.

Aung San Suu Kyi remains steadfast in her calls against the Burmese junta's reign of terror. Though under house arrest for 10 of the past 15 years by these evildoers, Aung San Suu Kyi has led her political party to an 82 percent victory in Burma's last election. While she should be the democratic leader of this country, the outlaw military regime annulled the results of the election.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago just before her most recent arrest, this regional hero was almost assassinated. In May 2003 when she was briefly arrested from house arrest, she took a trip to the Burmese countryside. The military regime forced hundreds of criminals out of jail and shaved their heads so they would look like Buddhist monks. They were drugged up on methamphetamine and ordered to attack this lady. Her car was in the middle of a motorcade, and in the middle of the night these criminals used clubs and iron rods to beat to death 100 of her supporters who were watching her.

Aung San Suu Kyi has never committed a crime. She is the mother of two children. Her husband passed away outside of Burma, and the regime refused to grant him a visa to spend his dying days with his wife. Despite overwhelming oppression, the Burmese people, following the example of Aung San Suu Kyi, The Lady, continued to courageously express their desire for human rights and freedom.

During The Lady's last pro-democracy speaking tour in 2003, she spoke to dozens of cities around her country. Hundreds of thousands of Burmese people showed up to hear her speak, or see her as she went by. In several towns, the regime cut the electricity off at night so she could not speak and so people could not see her. But the Burmese people simply held up their matches and lighters to create a light for her.

Even in the midst of overwhelming darkness and oppression, the people of Burma stand with courage. No, freedom's flame may not burn within the seats of power, but it burns within the hearts of the Burmese people. Light always defeats darkness, as it will here in Burma.

Over the last 8 months, the Burmese people have collected 300,000 signatures calling for change in Burma. In the United States, of course, petitions are really common; but in Burma, this is groundbreaking. Every single person who signs a petition risks his life. They plan to present these pleas to the United Nations Secretary-General.

The rallying cry for the Burmese people is ''do-yay, do-yay,'' which means ''our cause, our cause.'' It is a powerful symbol, revealing that the Burmese people realize their struggle for human rights is not their own and not to be imposed upon them by the outside world. Nevertheless, they have called on international support for their hope.

Aung San Suu Kyi has called on people around the world to take action, stating, Please, please use your liberty to promote our liberty. She specifically has called upon people around the world to encourage their governments to impose political and economic pressure on the Burmese military regime until they agree to change, knowing that unless they are pressured, the renegades will never sit down and discuss this concept of democracy.

''The Lady'' has encouraged broad public awareness of Burma with the message that a free world stands with the Burmese people.

□ 1700

Aung San Suu Kyi also requests that the people of the free world send as much encouragement and free information into Burma as possible, including music, poems, news broadcasts and images of people living in open, free, democratic societies.

She has also called on the United Nations Security Council to pass a resolution demanding change in Burma. The U.N. Secretary-General's office has miserably failed in this matter. It needs to undertake a full-court diplomatic press in order to create a transformation.

I just want to mention briefly and expand on this point. We have, as I said, yesterday and today in this House been debating the Henry Hyde United Nations Reform Act. No matter how Members of the House voted for Chairman HYDE's bill or Ranking Member LANTOS' substitute amendment, most colleagues here in this House are in agreement on one thing. The United Nations is ineffective, it is corrupt, it is not fulfilling its mission, and it has lost credibility as an international organization. It is the hot air in the balloon of a world organization.

When it comes to Burma, the United Nations has failed miserably. Kofi Annan has said a lot of words about the tragedy of Burma and the injustice against the little lady and these people. Yet he has actually done nothing. He says over and over again that, quote, he is concerned, he is interested, he is hopeful, yet to date Kofi Annan has not demanded any consequences for what is occurring in this nation of Burma. What good are words if there is no action to back them up?

November 21, 2002, Kofi Annan said that he was hopeful that there would be national reconciliation in Burma.

February 2, 2003, he said, the Secretary-General is concerned about the arrests by the Burmese authorities of 12 members of opposition parties.

May 13, 2003, he again said that he was hopeful, that famous word he continues to say, that national reconciliation and negotiations would begin in Burma.

May 31, 2003, he said he was concerned and called for negotiations and that he would be following closely with concern the situation in Burma.

On June 6, 2003, he called for the release of this lady, Aung San Suu Kyi.

On March 31, 2004, he called for negotiations, said he was concerned about this lady that is imprisoned in her own home and that she should be released from captivity.

It goes on and on and on, just asking, asking this military regime to do something about the people of their own nation. My grandfather used to say, ''When all is said and done, more is said than done.'' Here again we find the United Nations making a lot of talk and not doing anything about this nation that is imprisoned by its own government. My question to Kofi Annan is, why are there no consequences? Does Kofi Annan really expect to be taken seriously by the tyrants controlling Burma if he has no action to back up his words?

What about demanding a transition to democracy as the Burmese people have asked for? What about saying, Enough is enough. If Burma's regime does not heed 10 consecutive U.N. resolutions calling for Burma to simply participate in a dialogue with the democracy movement, then refer this issue to the U.N. Security Council and call for international economic sanctions.

Unfortunately, with Kofi Annan's track record as seen with the 14 plus resolutions alone on Iraq and his lack of action on the genocide in Sudan and other examples of ineffectiveness, Kofi Annan seems to be not willing to demand consequences, and there is no action. For the sake of the millions of people around the world and especially in Burma that are subject to slaughter and rape, displacement, starvation and victimization at the hands of their government, specifically the evil tyrants of Burma, we should stop talking in the United Nations and start doing something about it. Why do we have the United Nations? Is this not its mission? Is this not why the United Nations started, to help these tortured people?

But enough about the broken and ineffective United Nations. There is a voice for freedom in Burma, the lady, Aung San Suu Kyi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this question. Why are those 400,000 Burmese soldiers consistently afraid of the lady? The answer is, because she wants a democracy in her nation. Simple. She wants her people to be free, a free country like our country. The forces of evil in this world always fear the forces of good. Forces that promote life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are the forces that make all of us desire to be free. Every human being is created down in our soul with these God-given desires and rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, on this birthday of Aung San Suu Kyi, I am here to assure her that the United States has not forgotten her and her people. Even though the United Nations has dreadfully forsaken her cause, this country stands firm for all freedom-loving people, people who just want to control their own lives and their own country. Even though Burma's neighbors look the other way while making money in shady business deals, the United States is watching and I hope the United States does not abandon this nation of Burma. The United Nations and Burma's neighbors might be able to sleep at night while the people of Burma are beaten and pillaged, some slaughtered, but we hope that the United States will take note. Liberty's blaze burns bright and burns strong in this nation of Burma and her people.

So in closing, I am sending a special birthday greeting to this lady who is under house arrest, this lady, Aung San Suu Kyi, on her 60th birthday, wishing her a respite of peace in the darkness that surrounds her. The United Nations may do nothing but hopefully the United States is standing with her and the United States remembers her on her 60th birthday.

May God bless you, Aung San Suu Kyi, and God bless Burma and the people who desire freedom, freedom that all of us desire no matter who we are, what we look like, male or female, anyplace in this world.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the evening of June 16 and today on account of important matters in the district.

Mr. GINGREY (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of attending to family commitments.

Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today until 12:30 p.m. on account of attending the funeral at Arlington National Cemetery of Spc. Louis Niedermeier of Largo, Florida, who died in Iraq on June 1, 2005.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, June 24.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today and June 20.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 20, 2005, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

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, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of User Fees for 2005 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [CN-05-001] (RIN: 0581-AC43) received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2414. A letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Upper Midwest Marketing Area; Interim Order Amending the Order [Docket No. AO-361-A39; DA-04-03A] received June 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2415. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Malaysia To List of Regions in Which Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Subtype H5N1 Is Considered to Exist [Docket No. 04-091-2] received June 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2416. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oregon State Plan; Final Approval Determination [Docket No. T-027A] (RIN: 1218-AC13) received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2417. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received June 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2418. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Determination that Falconry Regulations for the State of Connecticut Meet Federal Standards (RIN: 1018-AT63) received June 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2419. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Rebuilding Plan [Docket No. 0408044227-5143-02; I.D. 072604A] (RIN: 0648-AP02) received June 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2420. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Spiny Dogfish; Open Access; Routine Management Measure; Closure Authority [Docket No. 050302053-5120-03; I.D. 042605G] (RIN: 0648-AT38) received May 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2421. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish Fishery; Amendment 2 [Docket No. 041229366-5088-02; I.D. 122304D] (RIN: 0648-AQ25) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2422. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 051705F] received June 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 68. Committee on Ways and Means discharged; Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

H.R. 358. Committee on Ways and Means discharged; Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 2957. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment of centers for the treatment of obstetric fistula in developing countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 2958. A bill to require notification of appropriate emergency response authorities when damage to underground pipeline facilities occurs or is discovered; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PICKERING, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2959. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of Parkinson's Disease Research Education and Clinical Centers in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WU, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BARROW, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (for himself and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 2961. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend and improve protections for sole community hospitals under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 2962. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the eligibility criteria for presumption of service-connection of certain diseases and disabilities for veterans exposed to ionizing radiation during military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2963. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve compensation benefits for veterans in certain cases of impairment of vision involving both eyes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 2964. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Chisholm Trail and Great Western Trail historic cattle-drive trails for study and for potential addition to the National Trails System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. UPTON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. NEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. HART, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 2965. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require Federal Prison Industries to compete for its contracts minimizing its unfair competition with private sector firms and their non-inmate workers and empowering Federal agencies to get the best value for taxpayers' dollars, to provide a five-year period during which Federal Prison Industries adjusts to obtaining inmate work opportunities through other than its mandatory source status, to enhance inmate access to remedial and vocational opportunities and other rehabilitative opportunities to better prepare inmates for a successful return to society, to authorize alternative inmate work opportunities in support of non-profit organizations and other public service programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the availability of emergency medical care for veterans in non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (for herself, Mr. WATT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG):

H.R. 2967. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 333 Mt. Elliott Street in Detroit, Michigan, as the ''Rosa Parks Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 2968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans for adoption expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 2969. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code to exclude all employment contracts from the arbitration provisions of chapter 1 of such title; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUHL of New York:

H.R. 2970. A bill to provide public safety officer disability benefits to officers disabled before the enactment of the Federal public safety officer disability benefits law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.R. 2971. A bill to provide for parental notification and intervention in the case of a minor seeking an abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2972. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Naphthalenesulfonic acid, 6-[(2,4-diaminophenyl)azo]-3-[[4-[[4-[[7-[(2,4-diaminophenyl azo]-1-hydroxy-3-sulfo-2-naphthalenyl]azo]phenyl]amino]-3-sulfophenyl]azo]-4-hydroxy-, trisodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2973. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Methylene Bis-Benzotriazolyl Tetramethylbutylphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2974. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bis-Ethylhexyloxyphenol Methoxyphenol Triazine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2975. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzenesulfonic acid, 2,2'-[(1-methyl-1,2-ethanediyl)bis[imino(6-fluoro-1,3,5-triazine-4,2-diyl)imino[2-[(aminocarbonyl)amino]-4,1-phenylene]az]]bis[5-[(4-sulfophenyl)azo]-, sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2976. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Chromate(2-), [3-(hydroxy-.kappa.O)-4-[[2-(hydroxy-.kappa.O)-1-naphthalen yl]azo-.kappa.N2]-1-naphthalenesulfonato(3-)][1-[[2-(hydroxy kappa.O)-5-[4-methoxyphenyl)azo]phenyl]azo-.kappa.N2]-2-nap hthalenolato(2-)-.kappa.O]-, disodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 2977. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 2nd Avenue in Brockway, Montana, as the ''Paul Kasten Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 2978. A bill to allow the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation to enter into a lease or other temporary conveyance of water rights recognized under the Fort Peck-Montana Compact for the purpose of meeting the water needs of the Dry Prairie Rural Water Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 2979. A bill to amend the Crow Boundary Settlement Act of 1994 regarding the distribution of capital gains from the Crow Tribal Trust Fund; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 2980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the nonrecognition of gain on real property which is involuntarily converted as the result of the exercise of eminent domain, without regard to whether such property is replaced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CASE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REYES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. HERSETH, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 2981. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand and improve the assistance provided by Small Business Development Centers to Indian tribe members, Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 2982. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to reorganize the bureaus of the Commission in order to better carry out their regulatory functions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS of California):

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Life Insurance Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H. Res. 328. A resolution recognizing the 25th anniversary of the workers' strikes in Poland in 1980 that led to the establishment of the Solidarity Trade Union; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BACA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 329. A resolution honoring former President William Jefferson Clinton on the occasion of his 59th birthday; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2983. A bill for the relief of Zhuljeta Zhegra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2984. A bill for the relief of Shpetim Daku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 42: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 63: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 181: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 226: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 269: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 282: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 294: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 303: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 406: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 421: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 457: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 475: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 500: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 535: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 537: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 559: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 566: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 616: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FORD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 688: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 697: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 699: Mr. BAKER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 772: Mr. BOYD and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 783: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 808: Mr. FEENEY, Mr. JINDAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 817: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 844: Mr. OWENS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 857: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 870: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 893: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 896: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 898: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 920: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 923: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 930: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 949: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 951: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 964: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 983: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 997: Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Miss MCMORRIS.

H.R. 1067: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1070: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1088: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1100: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1125: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1131: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1146: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1204: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1217: Mr. LEACH and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1222: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1258: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1288: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 1298: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. HART, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. HULSHOF.

H.R. 1312: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1319: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1333: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1345: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1372: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1447: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1449: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1456: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1478: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1498: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1545: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1578: Mr. ROSS and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1582: Mr. OLVER and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1663: Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1667: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1704: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1707: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1708: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1745: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1748: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1795: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1850: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1931: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 1946: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2108: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2196: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2207: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 2209: Mr. ROSS and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2238: Mr. LAHOOD and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2305: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2317: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2327: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2356: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. REYES, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2386: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2387: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 2389: Mr. BONILLA and Miss MCMORRIS.
H.R. 2423: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2429: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2458: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2498: Mr. AKIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BOSWELL, Miss MCMORRIS, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2553: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2567: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2600: Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 2637: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2642: Mr. WAMP and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2646: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. KELLER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2652: Mr. BOREN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2662: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BONO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 2679: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2680: Mr. OWENS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2717: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SABO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2721: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2726: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2736: Mr. NADLER and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2746: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2794: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2804: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2835: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 2861: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 2874: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 2876: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CASE, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 2877: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 2891: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2899: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2927: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 2930: Mr. UPTON and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2943: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 2945: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Con. Res. 24: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. DOYLE.
H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 15: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. FORTUÑO.
H. Res. 76: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 316: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mrs. KELLY.
H. Res. 318: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H. Res. 323: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H. Res. 325: Mr. SNYDER.
H. Res. 326: Mr. KIRK.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE ''CHILDREN'S EXPRESS LANE TO HEALTH COVERAGE ACT OF 2005''

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the ''Children's Express Lane to Health Coverage Act of 2005.''

Far too many children in this Nation are not covered by even the most basic health insurance. In my home State of California, 10 percent of the approximately 10 million children do not have health insurance. Close to 9 million children nationwide are in similar situations.

This does not have to be the case. Of the almost 9 million children who are uninsured, an estimated 6.9 million are eligible for public health insurance coverage. What is keeping them from obtaining coverage?

In many cases, children who are eligible for subsidized health care do not receive it because of the cumbersome and confusing process families must go through to obtain health insurance for their children.

The bill I introduce today, the Children's Express Lane to Health Coverage Act, a companion bill to the one introduced by my colleagues in the Senate: Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. COCHRAN, will streamline the process by which children are enrolled in both Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance Programs or SCHIP.

This legislation will allow States to streamline enrollment in Medicaid and SCHIP. It would allow a child's enrollment in WIC and similar assistance programs to serve as a gateway to health coverage, thus avoiding a separate lengthy and confusing application process.

The need for health care coverage for these children is urgent. Without health insurance, children do not see doctors with the regularity that is essential for their well-being and the well-being of their peers they come into contact with at school, at daycare and on the playground. Many children without health insurance end up in the emergency room with illnesses that could easily be treated in a doctor's office. Emergency room visits are extremely costly, both for parents and for hospitals. The cost of health care for everyone increases as a result.

For the good of our Nation's children and for the good of our Nation's communities, I ask my colleagues today to join me in support of this vital piece of legislation.

HONORING L.C. GREENE, A SOUTH CAROLINA LEADER

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to recognize the tremendous achievements of L.C. Greene, a life-long resident of South Carolina who has demonstrated a tradition of excellence and a commitment exceptional leadership throughout his life. From his distinguished twenty-three year career in the U.S. Air Force to his thirty years of service in municipal and county government, L.C. Greene has exemplified the qualities that are critical for leaders of good government.

After retiring from the military, L.C. Greene brought his leadership skills to the classroom. He later became the Emergency Medical Service Director for Aiken County, South Carolina. Because of his leadership skills and ability to handle crisis situations, L.C. Greene was then promoted to County Administrator, and served a total of eight years. During this time, Mr. Greene was awarded the Distinguished Service Citation, the highest Federal award to a civilian, by the U.S. Department of Defense, for his outstanding leadership and cooperation in the aftermath of a B-52 Bomber crash in Aiken County. He was also recognized by the U.S. Army at Ft. Gordon for the role he played in the recovery operation of this tragic accident.

After serving as a director for Lockheed Aircraft Support Systems for two years, Mr. Greene became the City Manager for the Town of Winnsboro, South Carolina, serving in that capacity for eight years. During his service to the citizens of Winnsboro, Mr. Greene played a critical role in the recruitment of the Mack Truck Assembly Plant, which invested $168 million and created over 2,000 jobs, and the Rite Aid Southern Distribution Center, which invested $80 million and created over 325 jobs. Mr. Greene was also recognized by the U.S. Senate for his innovative approach to public-private partnerships and was invited to Washington, DC for a briefing. Mr. Greene's leadership skills in the area of natural disaster were also called upon in Winnsboro as he led the emergency preparedness and clean-up efforts after the town was struck by three different tornadoes.

For the past fourteen years, L.C. Greene has been the Town Administrator for the Town of Lexington, which has become the fastest growing municipality in South Carolina. During this time, he has been instrumental in working with other state and local governments to form regional partnerships and cooperation, especially in the area of water and wastewater infrastructure. Mr. Greene is recognized throughout the state as having expertise in all facets of local government and is often called upon for assistance and advice from other municipal and county leaders as well as from state officials and past governors. He selflessly shares his wealth of information and wisdom in an effort to bring better government to all communities throughout the state.

Mr. Greene has consistently led with a management style that focuses on people and the improvement of the quality of life for the citizens of his community. Whether it is in obtaining grant funding for blighted and impoverished areas, recruiting industries that will build investment and create jobs, responding to the devastating effects that a tornado had on the Lexington community, sharing scarce water supplies with sister cities in need, sending utility personnel to other States devastated by hurricanes or building a special-needs park for handicapped children, Mr. Greene's commitment to finding better procedures and more cost-effective measures to achieve the highest level of services to the citizens at the lowest possible tax cost is an inspiration to all who know him. He exemplifies the true spirit of leadership through the development of friendship, team building, and cooperation for the greater good.

L.C. Greene is also a devoted family man, having been married to his wife Colleen for 48 years. They are the proud parents of five daughters and one son, fifteen grandchildren, and five great grandchildren. Mr. Greene has also served on various boards such as the South Carolina Retirement Advisory Board, the Central Midlands Environmental Protection Agency Committee, the South Carolina Local Government Assurance Group, Lexington County Municipal Association, and the Lexington Economic Development Association Board. Additional awards and recognitions include recognition by: the South Carolina Senate; Low-Country Regional Emergency Medical Services; the Strategic Air Command; and the Midlands Human Sources Development Commission for service to Low-Income Home Energy Program. Mr. Greene was also named as the Jaycees ''Boss of the Year'' and was named Who's Who in Executives and Professionals in 1996–97.

As L.C. Greene retires as Town Administrator of Lexington, it is only fitting that his selfless, lifelong commitment and service to his community, his State and his country be recognized by awarding the Order of the Palmetto. Truly, cities and counties are vital to the health of our State because they provide essential elements of our civilization. And, in order to have healthy, growing communities, there must be stalwart leaders of good government. L.C. Greene has been such a leader. When Mr. Greene retires on June 30th, he should take pride in knowing that our community and our State is better because of his exemplary service.

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

BROOKLYN REMEMBERS

HON. VITO FOSSELLA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, on May 17th, I was joined by 9/11 families, elected officials, and community leaders to unveil Brooklyn's official memorial dedicated to the events of September 11, 2001. This memorial pays tribute to the 283 men and women of King's County killed on that horrific day. The air was filled with sadness in the days and months that followed. Because of this, in October of 2001, I along with State Senator Marty Golden, realized that a memorial was the best way to honor the lives of these brave men and women. Within days community leaders organized a committee to raise private funds and started the process to design a memorial and make it a reality. Realizing that this was not only a New York State issue but also a national one, I worked hard to secure $50,000 to begin the groundwork for the memorial.

The memorial, entitled the ''Beacon,'' soars 25 feet in the air and is shaped like a speaking trumpet to resemble the device once used by the volunteer fire brigades of New York City to transmit warnings to the crowd and give orders to the firefighters. The thoughtfulness and simplicity of the design is second to none. It directly reflects the Bay Ridge community and the residents of King's County New York. The memorial was placed at the 69th Street Pier. This was fitting with its broad vista's of the harbor and downtown Manhattan, as it was the location to which many Brooklynites went to watch the tragic events of September 11, 2001 unfold.

Those whose lives were lost on September 11 will remain in our thoughts and prayers forever. The ''Beacon'' will help all of us, not only New Yorkers, but those all over our great Nation keep alive the names and memories of those who are no longer with us. It will allow us to remember their sacrifice and honor their lives. The memorial will serve as a reminder to future generations that our freedom must be cherished and never taken for granted because so many gave their lives in its name.

I would like to personally praise the outstanding efforts of the memorial committee. They raised the necessary funding, established a selection process, chose an outstanding artist, and organized the beautiful ceremony. They devoted their time and efforts without any compensation or recompense. Without their continued efforts and determination this memorial would not have been possible.

I would like to enter into the RECORD the names of the Brooklyn Remembers Committee:

Stephen Harrison, Robert Howe, Basil Capetanakis, Richard Conti, William Guarinello, Patrick Condren, Gene Brody, Howard Feuer, Denise Virga, Serge Allegretti, Corrado Manfredi, Craig Eaton, Joseph Caruanna, Anthony Troia.

TEEN DATING VIOLENCE EDUCATION ACT OF 2005

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, while teenage dating violence often does not get the widespread attention that adult domestic violence receives, it is no less of an insidious epidemic. Currently, girls and women between the ages of 16 and 24 are the most vulnerable to domestic violence, experiencing the highest per capita rates of non-fatal intimate partner violence. One-third of teens report experiencing some kind of abuse in their romantic relationships and approximately one in five adolescent girls report being physically or sexually hurt by a dating partner.

Both CNN and ABC News have recently run reports on the tragic consequences of teen dating violence. In one such incident, an Austin, Texas 16-year-old star football player stabbed his 15-year-old girlfriend to death. The perpetrator of this crime had a history of teen dating violence that started when he was in the 8th grade. This horrifying incident may have been preventable had the victim of this crime or his previous girlfriends had full access to information about legal steps they could have taken to ensure they would not be in further danger.

Unfortunately, this act of violence is not an isolated incidence. These situations play themselves out across this nation. Dating violence cuts across ethnic, racial and socio-economic lines.

We can take affirmative steps to ensure that this type of tragedy is not repeated in other forms. Preventative action is necessary.

Today, I introduce legislation that will empower young victims of dating violence with information about their legal rights. The ''Teenage Dating Violence Education Act of 2005'' mandates that domestic violence educational programs geared towards elementary and high school students include information about the legal rights of teenage victims of dating violence.

It is not enough to tell students that abusive relationships are wrong. We also need to specifically inform them on the various ways they can get out of those relationships. The legal system is one place they can turn. They deserve to know about these recourses. For victims of dating violence, knowledge really is power.

Teenagers who engage in dating violence in this country need to know that there are legal ramifications for their actions. Teenage victims of dating violence need to know that mechanisms in the legal system exist to help them.

Educating teenagers in this area is a matter of safety and a matter of common sense. We can do our part to make sure the cycle of violence is not perpetuated. We must do our part.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in support of this vital piece of legislation.

CELEBRATING THE BIRTH OF MISS SARAH GRACE POTTER

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, I am happy to congratulate Jim and Karen Potter of Potomac Falls, Virginia, on the birth of their beautiful baby girl. Sarah Grace Potter was born Wednesday at 12:37 p.m., weighing 7 pounds, 15 ounces and measuring 21 inches long. Sarah has been born into a loving home, where she will be raised by parents who are devoted to her well-being and bright future. Her birth is a blessing.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO NAME THE ''JOHN LEWIS CIVIL RIGHTS INSTITUTE''

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce legislation to honor the senior Member from the state of Georgia and my friend, JOHN LEWIS, for his work as an engineer of the civil rights movement. Along with my colleague in the other body, Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS, I proudly put my name as the original sponsor of this bill to name a historic building near the center of the struggle for equality—Auburn Avenue in Atlanta, Georgia—as the ''John Lewis Civil Rights Institute.''

Without question, Congressman LEWIS' work in the civil rights movement was crucial to the success of that struggle. He grew up in Alabama, and was inspired to get involved after hearing reports of the Montgomery bus boycott, orchestrated by the young Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. As a student at Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, Congressman LEWIS began organizing sit-ins at segregated lunch counters. He also participated in the freedom rides, challenging segregated bus stations across the South. For these simple acts of non-violent resistance, JOHN LEWIS was often violently physically attacked. But his resolve did not waver.

Congressman LEWIS served as Chairnan of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) which students of history recall as the central group working to organize and publicize the demonstrations by young people which were occurring across the region. This increasingly high-profile work lead him to be named as one of the ''Big Six'' leaders of the movement, and brought about his role as a speaker at the March on Washington in August 1963, a political and cultural event that changed the course of the nation.

But Congressman LEWIS' life-threatening commitment to change did not end there. In 1965, Congressman LEWIS led over 600 nonviolent protesters in the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama. Through the gripping media coverage of this disturbing event, the rest of America was finally forced to confront the violence and injustice being perpetrated against African Americans.

And his work for civil rights continues to this day. From his work during the height of the

civil rights movement, to his time as a Presidential appointee during the Carter Administration, to his service as an elected official first on the Atlanta City Council and finally as a Member of Congress, JOHN LEWIS has never wavered.

The victories our country can claim in this fight are in no small part due to the selfless sacrifices of JOHN LEWIS. For his humble service, for his commitment to justice and equality for all people, he deserves to be honored in this small way. I call on my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in working for the swift passage of this legislation.

CONGRATULATING THE SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, CHAPTER OF UNICO NATIONAL ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the Scranton Chapter of UNICO National on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Built from the initiative of Dr. D.J. Maldonato and Attorney John Morano, among others, the Scranton Chapter of UNICO was chartered in June 1955 and immediately began supporting community efforts through scholarships and the then Boys' Club.

Over the years, the Scranton Chapter of UNICO has grown in generosity and prestige, supporting scholarships for college students at six local colleges, supporting the good work of the St. Francis of Assisi Kitchen and the now Boys and Girls Club.

Scranton UNICO also contributes to the national effort to find a cure for cancer through the UNICO V Foundation.

Scranton UNICO also supports Italian studies through book donations and language classes.

Scranton UNICO promotes convivial camaraderie among its 330 members, the largest UNICO chapter in the United States of America.

UNICO was founded in 1922 as an Italian American service organization dedicated to performing good works as a means of uplifting the prestige of its members. UNICO stands for unity, neighborliness, integrity, charity and opportunity. The motto of UNICO is ''service above self.''

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Scranton chapter of UNICO as its members celebrate their 50th anniversary. Time and time again, UNICO members distinguish themselves by helping others and making their community a much better place to live.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK TING-KUO CHEN

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I pay tribute today to the life of Frank Ting-Kuo Chen, a man whose contributions to family and community cannot be understated. Frank was a man of great compassion and character. He will be deeply missed, but always be fondly remembered.

Frank's life is a true example of the achievement of the American Dream. Mr. Chen was born on January 1, 1941, in Taipei, Taiwan, the seventh child in a family of five sons and three daughters. In 1965 he married his love, Cha Cheng Chen, and they went on to celebrate 40 years of marriage.

Frank began his own company in Taiwan in 1970, where he manufactured and traded products that were distributed across the United States. He went on to hold several positions in public office, including serving as District Representative for the Chung Shan district in Taipei from 1976 to 1977. Frank had a passion for reading and worked for the newspapers China Post and the Stars and Stripes.

In 1977 Frank moved to the United States to give his children a better education. He settled in Moreno Valley, California, where he expanded his business and went on to achieve his lifelong dream of sending his children to college. Even with Frank's successful business career, he always made time for his wife and family. He is survived by Cha Cheng Chen, and his children, Suzanne, Ping and Lee.

Frank tirelessly devoted himself to his community, and in particular to facilitating the cultural exchange of Chinese Americans in the greater Los Angeles area. He was involved with numerous civic organizations in Southern California, and in particular the Chinese Students Association of the University of California at Riverside. He was later appointed as an official delegate of Taiwan's Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission, where he dedicated himself to providing assistance to immigrants and new residents in the Inland Empire. In 1988, he founded and served as President of the Inland Chinese Association, which has since grown to over 1,000 members. In 1989, he spearheaded the establishment of the first Inland Empire Chinese Language School. He later also led the movement to establish the Chinese Pavilion, a major landmark in downtown Riverside, to commemorate the early Chinese immigrants who inhabited the area in the late 19th century.

Although Frank is no longer with us, his legacy will never leave us. He dedicated his life to his family and his community, and in doing so improved the lives of thousands. His life is an example to all of us of how one person can make a difference. We are all truly better for having known Frank Ting-Kuo Chen.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, today, Congressman WEINER offered an amendment to H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice & Commerce Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. Representative WEINER's amendment, which ultimately failed, would have restored $126 million to the COPS program to help state and local governments hire police officers. The offset for the amendment came from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and would have returned that agency's funding to Fiscal Year 2004 levels, which actually represents a $30 million increase over what NSF received for Fiscal Year 2005. I voted for the amendment, because I believe and support the important work the COPS program allows, but I was troubled by the offset, knowing how important science and research are to my community.

I voted for Mr. WEINER's amendment because I have seen firsthand how important COPS programs are to local cities and communities like Cheektowaga, Jamestown and Dunkirk in my district in Western New York. In fact, since 1994, $25,609,762 in COPS grants have been awarded to law enforcement agencies in the 27th District of New York. These grants have funded 329 additional police officers and sheriffs' deputies to engage in community policing activities including crime prevention. In my district, 29 local and state law enforcement agencies have directly benefited from funding made available through the COPS Office, $1,848,680 has been awarded to add 16 school resources officers to improve safety for students, teachers, and administrators in primary and secondary schools and $3,268,820 has been awarded for crimefighting technologies. This funding has allowed officers to spend more time on the streets preventing crime through timesaving technology, information-sharing systems, and improved communications equipment.

Sadly, our underlying appropriations bill zeroes out funding for the COPS program, leaving local governments to foot the bill. Cutting the COPS program altogether is unacceptable—it is one of our most useful and successful tools in reducing crime.

I also recognize the importance of the NSF, which provides funding and guidance to laboratories, universities and research centers across the country. In New York State in Fiscal Year 2003, the NSF provided over 1,672 awards totaling approximately $389 million to more than 142 institutions in the State of New York as well as $1,816,000 in fellowships.

While I regret the offset of the amendment and the need to transfer NSF funding to allow the COPS program to continue, NSF would still have received more in Fiscal Year 2006 than it did in Fiscal Year 2005 to continue its mission. The COPS program, however, without Congressional action on the House floor, will cease to exist. Mr. Speaker, that is why I supported Representative WEINER's amendment.

CORPUS CHRISTI'S CALALLEN HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL TEAM, 2005 4A STATE CHAMPS

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Corpus Christi's Calallen High School Varsity Baseball team on winning the 2005 4A State Championship last weekend, winning the championship game 10–3. This is the second time the Wildcats have dominated Texas high school baseball, the first being in 2000.

The Cats' won their first victory against the Wichita Falls Riders—an impressive 12–2 game, with seven hits and a grand slam by sophomore Ryan Duke. The game was called in the fifth inning, by way of the 10-run ''mercy rule.'' But mercy was the last thing the Wildcats showed their next opponents, the Waco-Midway Panthers.

Calallen earned the title through sheer power at the plate, with 13 hits and 10 runs, all scored by the fourth inning. Leading the Cats at bat in the championship game were Seniors Jonathan Vest, Luke McCall, Wes Callihan, Randy Haughton, and Sophomore Ryan Duke.

Wildcat pitchers Seniors Chip Nance and Brandon Key, and Sophomore Ryan Duke provided the other power station for the Cats on the mound. Nance boasted nine strikeouts in six innings and held the Midway Panthers to five hits, earning MVP honors in the championship game.

South Texas is proud of these young men as is their coach, Steve Chapman, to whom the victory came as no surprise. With such talented players and excellent coaching, it seemed only right that this would be the year. Besides receiving an impressive ring to commemorate their victory, these boys have learned the endurance, discipline, self-sacrifice, and determination that it takes to be the champions.

In high school sports, as in life, the way to winning is hard work and a can-do spirit every day, both in practice and on the field. Sports teach young people many things, most importantly how to be gracious In defeat and in victory. That will be as important as how they play the game of life.

I congratulate the Wildcats, for their hard work which paid off handsomely. The following roster of players earned the title of Champions: Chip Nance, Wes Callihan, Jonathan Vest, Tyler Marrou, Cameron Lucky, Ryan Miller, Brandon Key, Corey Schick, Steven Vidaurri, Bucky Bryan, Randy Haughton, Sean Hoelscher, Paul Flores, Ryan Duke, Jared Verret, Daniel Alonzo, Luke McCall, Matt Brynestad, Kyle Plumley, and Jacob Kaup.

The Coaches who led them to victory are: Coach Steve Chapman, Asst. Coach Rudy Salinas, Asst. Coach Jon Irvine, Asst. Coach Micheal Watson, and Asst. Coach Jose Luis Lopez.

HONORING THE NETCONG FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Netcong Fire Department, in the Borough of Netcong, New Jersey, a patriotic community that I am proud to represent. On June 11, 2005, the good citizens of Netcong celebrated the Fire Company's Centennial Anniversary with special festivities and a parade.

For one hundred years, the Netcong Fire Department has been protecting and serving the residents of their community and surrounding towns. Featuring 48 fire companies mostly from Morris, Sussex, and Warren Counties, the firefighters on the parade committee have been planning the event for the past several years. Fritz Grogan, the parade's Grand Marshal, rode in a 1922 Brockway. He has 55 years of experience serving in the department, including a two-year term as chief in the late 1960s. Well over 1,000 people marched in the parade, and the event drew a crowd from all over New Jersey.

The Netcong Fire Department was formally created in 1905. It was badly needed, especially after a fire on Nov. 16, 1903. The blaze was so bad that even some buildings in neighboring Stanhope were set on fire by flying sparks, although none were destroyed. A history compiled by the department says its first piece of equipment was a two-wheeled hose cart pulled by the members. Equipment was housed at the Mansion house stables on Main Street and Maple Avenue, and the first firehouse opened in February 1906.

Currently the fire department, led by Fire Chief Michael Pellek, has about 100 members, half of whom marched in Saturday's parade. Last year the department responded to 113 calls, including one fatal fire, and this year it has already responded to 50.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the volunteers of the Netcong Fire Department on the celebration of 100 years of a rich history in the protection of one of New Jersey's finest municipalities.

TRIBUTE TO DISTRICT STAFF MEMBER, KATHY OLSON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very able district staff member, Kathy Olson, who is leaving our employ at the end of the month.

There is not one of us in this esteemed body who fails to appreciate what a key role our staff members play in helping us to serve our constituents. As you know, people often seek our assistance when all else has failed. By the time they reach their Member of Congress, they are frustrated, discouraged, and sometimes angry. It is always heartening when we can intervene to solve those serious and longstanding problems.

Often, it takes a tremendous amount of knowledge and research to find the one key that will enable us to resolve an issue for a constituent. With her high level of knowledge and understanding, Kathy is an unqualified expert on Social Security and Medicare. Through her keen intellect and tireless work ethic, Kathy has garnered a sound grasp of the most complicated of issues. I not only value her for the unselfish assistance that she has provided my constituents, but I also rely heavily on her expertise and counsel in dealing with Social Security and Medicare issues.

Kathy has taken constituent service to a high level of excellence. Although her professionalism and mastery of the issues are indeed outstanding, it is her inherent goodness and concern for others that has made her so effective. Kathy begins every case with a sympathetic ear and a sincere desire to help ease the pain for those who call my office.

There are countless examples that demonstrate her effectiveness, but the one that resonates most with me was when an agency referred a homeless and destitute woman to me who had exhausted all alternatives. In her eighties, this constituent had no Social Security benefits because she had no record of her birth. She didn't know her real name. She didn't know who her mother and father were. She spent a life of being dependent on abusive people who manipulated her. She had lived a life of hopelessness, and her declining years promised only more despair.

After months of frustrating research and chasing down tenuous leads, Kathy found the woman's identity and established a case that qualified her for benefits that would allow her to live the rest of her life in relative comfort and free of fear. Although the woman was deeply grateful for having a life of misery put behind her and a sense of hope restored, she was most appreciative of the photo of her mother that Kathy found during her exhaustive research. The woman had never seen a picture of her mother. Kathy not only assisted in giving her a life of dignity, she was able to give her a sense of self that most of us take for granted.

Kathy's demonstrated ability to work well with others and to get things done led me to ask her to take on an extra load to manage my academy selection process. She already had a very full agenda, but she cheerfully took on the new task and made many valuable improvements in how I select nominees. My selection committee consists of retired military officers with the ranks of major, colonel, captain, and general; men who expect top performance. Each member of the selection committee has shared with me their admiration of Kathy's professionalism and enthusiasm in coordinating a very complicated process.

After almost six years of serving constituents in the Second Congressional District of Oregon, both for my predecessor, Congressman Bob Smith, and for me, Kathy has chosen to leave the office to devote more time to her family. Her husband, Brian, and daughter, Alyssa, have been most understanding as Kathy's demanding job has taken so much of her time. They are rightfully proud of the great work that she has done and very pleased to have her able to spend more time with them in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sad to see Kathy Olson leave our team. Her unselfish service has helped countless families in the Second

Congressional District over the years, and it is only fitting that she now devote full attention to her own.

As you can tell, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the great and unselfish work Kathy Olson has done on my behalf, but I am most proud to join many, many others in calling her a friend. I know that I reflect the feelings of all of her fellow staff members in wishing her continued success and happiness.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROSTATE CANCER RESEARCH AND PREVENTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today in support of the ''Prostate Cancer Research and Prevention Act.'' This important piece of legislation will reauthorize through 2010 important programs at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) which will help increase awareness and surveillance of prostate cancer, address the serious issues of prostate cancer screening, and help unlock the mysteries of prostate cancer through research.

Prostate cancer is the second most common type of cancer found in American men. The American Cancer Society estimates that there will be about 232,090 new cases of prostate cancer in the United States in 2005 and that approximately 30,350 men will die of this disease. It is the second leading cause of cancer death in men, behind only lung cancer.

While these statistics remain alarming, the death rate for prostate cancer is actually decreasing in all racial and ethnic groups. While 1 man in 6 will still be diagnosed with prostate cancer during his lifetime, only 1 man in 33 will now die of this disease. More men, especially African-American men and others in high risk categories, are being made aware of the risk of prostate cancer and being encouraged to take steps to ensure early detection.

This awareness and action is critically important when dealing with all cancers, but especially cancer of the prostate—which grows slowly and without symptoms and is all too often undetected until in its most advanced and incurable stage. That is why reauthorizing the ''Prostate Cancer Research and Prevention Act'' is so important.

Reauthorizing the ''Prostate Cancer Research and Prevention Act'' will allow the CDC to continue to comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of various screening strategies for prostate cancer and to further expand public information and education programs about the issues regarding the disease. It will also allow the CDC to continue to make grants to States and local health departments to ensure that this information is being thoroughly spread, especially among communities and groups where the risk is highest. The bill also extends the authority of the National Cancer Institute at the NIH to conduct and support basic and clinical research to expand the understanding of the cause of prostate cancer and to ultimately find a cure for the disease. Reauthorizing these important programs will help continue the rising trend towards awareness and action and hopefully result in even fewer untimely deaths.

The American Cancer Society, the Men's Health Network and the Dean and Betty Gallo Prostate Cancer Center at the Cancer Institute of New Jersey join me in supporting this reauthorization of the ''Prostate Cancer Research and Prevention Act.'' These organizations know first hand the important roles education, awareness and research play, and I applaud each of them for their dedication to battling this disease.

As National Men's Health Week draws to a close and we prepare to celebrate Father's Day on Sunday, I encourage each of you to reflect on the serious health threat that prostate cancer continues to pose for men across the country—including the men closest and most important to each of us, and urge my colleagues in the House to support the ''Prostate Cancer Research and Prevention Act.''

IN HONOR OF JAMES H. GILLIAM, SR.

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. James (Jim) H. Gilliam, Sr., the founder and first chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Wilmington Urban League.

After a 13-year career with the Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Maryland, Jim came to Delaware in 1965 to serve as the Director of Neighborhood and Housing Services for the Greater Wilmington Development Council. Jim's determination soon lead him to become the Director of New Castle County's Department of Community Development and Housing, where he would serve with distinction until his retirement in March 1990. Regardless of retirement, he had much left to accomplish.

In 1999, with one million dollars in start-up funds and the assistance of more than 70 community and business leaders, Jim formed the Metropolitan Wilmington Urban League. In only nine-months, the Wilmington chapter of the National Urban League was formed; the fastest an affiliate has ever been organized. The formation of this wonderful organization was only the beginning of Jim Gilliam's many successes at the Urban League.

The Metropolitan Wilmington Urban League envisions a community where African Americans and other people of color from a wide array of income levels, backgrounds and experiences directly benefit from and contribute to a multi-racial alliance that is committed to principled advocacy, action-oriented public policy research and the coordination of public, private, and non-profit resources.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to once again commend Mr. James Gilliam. Under his skilled leadership, the Metropolitan Wilmington Urban League has been a tremendously successful community organization, and I have no doubt he will maintain the organization's commitment to excellence.

IN HONOR OF CHIEF TROY L. LOINING

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Troy L. Loining who will assume the position of ''Officer in Charge'' at the United States Coast Guard Station in Annapolis, Maryland on June 17, 2005.

Chief Loining enlisted in the United States Coast Guard in 1989 and began serving our great Nation aboard the United States Coast Guard Cutter Northland out of Portsmouth, Virginia. In 1999, serving as an Executive Petty Officer aboard the United States Coast Guard Cutter Adek based out of Sandy Hook, New Jersey, Chief Loining was awarded the George Ban Cleaves Award after he was selected as the ''District One Enlisted Person of the Year.''

Still serving aboard the Adek, Chief Loining was awarded the ''United States Coast Guard 911 Medal,'' for his service on September 11,2001 when all personnel in New York Harbor were immediately called upon for assistance and defense. Under new heightened levels of security, Chief Loining continued his defense of the United States while reassigned to the United States Coast Guard Cutter Line. In 2002, he received his official certification as ''Officer in Charge.''

Mr. Speaker, I am truly pleased that the United States Coast Guard has chosen Chief Troy L. Loining to assume the position of ''Officer in Charge'' in Annapolis, Maryland. Please join me today in honor and recognition of a person who has willingly served and defended his country.

HONORING ST. JOSEPH PARISH ON CHURCH BUILDING CENTENNIAL

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. Joseph Parish on their Church Building Centennial. The official celebration will take place at St. Joseph Parish in Joliet, Illinois on October 16, 2005.

St. Joseph Parish, Joliet's fifth Catholic church, was founded in 1891 by Slovenian immigrants. The first pastor, Reverend Francis Sustersic, arrived from Slovenia on May 12, 1891. The original church, which was blessed on October 16, 1891, was born of the love, labor and sacrifice of Slovenians, whose men toiled in the local steel mills. They provided a house of worship for their families and for their descendants who would preserve their Catholic Slovenian heritage.

The parish grew quickly and a second St. Joseph Church was consecrated on October 15, 1905, as an official place of worship under the Archdiocese of Chicago. The second church was built with Indiana Bedford limestone at a cost of $130,000. It was the first stone and steel structure and the largest and grandest church in Joliet. In 1949, St. Joseph Church became part of the newly established Diocese of Joliet.

Architecture of the church is considered ''modern Roman''. Three bells from the original church continue to toll in the current bell towers. The bells were named to honor St. Joseph, St. George, and Sancta Maria. The high altar remains the focal point of the church interior. The nineteen stained glass windows, magnificent rose window, Marian Shrine, and the angel bedecked gold-leaf dome serve to inspire the faithful in prayer and adoration.

Today, the Church is a tapestry of diverse cultures and ethnic backgrounds while maintaining strong familial ties to their Slovenian founders. 2005 marks the 100th Anniversary and the second year of a $1.5 million dollar restoration of St. Joseph Church.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to identify and recognize other organizations in their own districts whose actions have so greatly benefitted and strengthened America's families and communities.

HONORING MRS. RUBY FITZGERALD

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Ruby FitzGerald, a resident of Virginia's Eighth Congressional District that I am proud to represent. Mrs. FitzGerald has truly been a pillar of public service, devoting her career and herself to the betterment of our community. There are citizens who by their perseverance alone decide to make a difference, and she is certainly one.

Perhaps Mrs. FitzGerald's most significant influence on the citizens and residents of the City of Alexandria comes from her two decades of volunteer service to public safety. Mrs. FitzGerald first began volunteering at the Alexandria jail, teaching art to inmates there. Later, in 1986, Mrs. FitzGerald volunteered for the Alexandria Police Department, working in the Crime Prevention Unit. Since the Volunteer Program was formalized in 1989, Mrs. FitzGerald has donated more than 7,000 hours of service to the police department.

In her regular assignment, Mrs. FitzGerald has handled hundreds of phone calls from people requesting crime prevention tips, neighborhood safety and information about youth programs. Because of her contribution of time and knowledge, citizens and business people received helpful assistance and crime prevention officers were free to be out in the community, conducting security surveys and increasing police presence.

Mrs. FitzGerald's service was showcased in May of 2002 by United States Attorney General John Ashcroft. When Attorney General Ashcroft appeared in Alexandria to launch the ''Volunteers In Police Service'' (VIPS) initiative, he specifically recalled Mrs. FitzGerald's service and devotion, recognizing her volunteer work as an example for others to follow.

In addition to her exceptional service to the police department, Mrs. FitzGerald organized an annual holiday party for children in need. For years, as part of the Alexandria Crime Prevention Council, Mrs. FitzGerald collected gifts and coordinated a holiday event for the city's young people. In 2000, Frances Becker of the Carpenter's Shelter, Northern Virginia's largest homeless shelter, wrote of Mrs. FitzGerald, ''You went above and beyond with your generosity and truly made each and every child feel the love and generosity of the Christmas holiday. We are so fortunate to have angels like you.'' Mrs. FitzGerald has been her neighborhood's lead organizer for National Night Out since it was started. Her local neighborhood street, Summers Drive, is always one of the best organized National Night Out events held in the city. Lastly, Mrs. FitzGerald worked on the Crime Prevention Month display at Landmark Mall when the Crime Prevention Council was working on that event. The council hosted this event for several years, discontinuing it only when the mall attendance was getting low.

As if her work for the police department and children weren't enough, Mrs. FitzGerald has set up annual blood drives at police headquarters for as long as anyone can remember. She worked closely with the Red Cross and recruited dozens of donors every time.

Mrs. FitzGerald is one of those incredibly gracious and modest people who give to others for the truest of reasons, because she really, really cares. Mr. Speaker, the people of Virginia's Eighth Congressional District are losing Mrs. FitzGerald as she returns to her home state of Montana. That state is fortunate to inherit a gem of a person. We wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors, and thank her one last time for blessing our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained in my Congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on Rollcall Nos. 241, 242, 246, 248 and 250. I would have voted ''no'' on Rollcall Nos. 243, 244, 245, 247, and 249.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL J. STANTON THOMPSON

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to pay tribute to Rear Admiral J. Stanton Thompson, of Higginsville, MO, who will soon be retiring from the United States Navy after an outstanding 35 years of service.

On July 9, 2005, Stanton will be ending an outstanding career as a Rear Admiral in the United States Navy Reserve. Over the years, Stanton has dedicated his life to serving the American people.

Rear Admiral J. Stanton Thompson serves currently as the Special Assistant for Reserve Matters to the Commander, United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Command, Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colorado, and is credited with the integration of reserves in homeland defense and military support to civilian authorities. He also serves his country as a principal advisor to the Commander for Maritime Homeland Defense.

Rear Admiral Thompson's awards include: Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit (2 awards), Navy and Marine Corps Medal, Meritorious Service Medal (3 awards), Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal (three awards), Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, Joint Meritorious Unit Commendation, Navy Unit Commendation, National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Star and various other service and campaign awards.

Mr. Speaker, Rear Admiral J. Stanton Thompson has honored his country with 35 years of service. Following retirement, Stanton plans to contribute to his country and community by continuing to manage a 160-acre family farm and working at the USDA. I know the Members of the House will join me in wishing him all the best in the days ahead.

OSTEOPOROSIS EARLY DETECTION AND PREVENTION ACT OF 2005

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my Republican colleague, MELISSA HART, I am introducing the Osteoporosis Early Detection and Prevention Act of 2005. This bill will ensure that individuals at high risk for osteoporosis have access to screening tests for the disease. The legislation would require private insurance plans to cover bone mass measurement testing for those at risk for developing the disease.

Osteoporosis is a disease that has no symptoms and usually remains undiagnosed until a fracture occurs. Approximately 44 million Americans suffer from osteoporosis or are at risk of developing it, and 80 percent of those at risk are women. Every year, there are 1.5 million bone fractures caused by osteoporosis.

Since there is no known cure for osteoporosis, the most effective way to reduce the prevalence and cost of the disease is through prevention and early diagnosis. As a result, bone mass measurement tests are crucial to early detection because ordinary x-rays do not detect osteoporosis until the disease is so advanced that 25 to 40 percent of bone mass has been lost.

Bone mass measurement is a non-invasive, painless and reliable way to diagnose osteoporosis before costly fractures occur. By ensuring that high risk individuals have access to screening tests. The Osteoporosis Early Detection and Prevention Act will make a huge difference in defending men and women from osteoporosis.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI RICHARD A. LEVINE

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Rabbi Richard A.

Levine and to honor his years of commitment to education and tolerance in our community.

Rabbi Levine has worked hard for the Jewish community over the past 40 years. He was the first New Jersey Rabbi ever to serve as President of the Greater Philadelphia Board of Rabbis. He has served as a member of the board and president for countless Jewish organizations in the New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware area.

Locally, Rabbi Levine has been committed to helping children and teenagers in South Jersey. He is a very active participant in many programs of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation. In the greater community he has chaired a number of regional councils or committees, such as Operation Head Start, which is dedicated to the education of our youth. Rabbi Levine is a regular speaker at regional high schools, teaching students a myriad of topics including interpersonal relationships and family life. Leading over 30 tours since 1955 to Israel, Rabbi Levine has managed to educate new and old generations alike about the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to honor Rabbi Richard Levine today. He has certainly accomplished much for our community in the past 40 years, and I know Adath Emanu-El will miss him dearly. I thank him for his dedicated community service and wish Rabbi Richard Levine all the best in his future endeavors.

PAY UP: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, NOT HOSPITALS, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMMIGRATION

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, as California's Border Congressman, I am here to deliver some bad news and some good news about the health care providers in my district, the whole border region, and other parts of the country with large immigrant populations. The bad new is: they can't take it anymore!

They can't take the Federal Government's continued failure to assume the responsibility for fixing our broken immigration system.

They can't take the increasing cost of uncompensated emergency care for undocumented immigrants. The growing burden on hospitals, physicians and ambulance providers threatens to cripple the health care services that are available to all the residents of these communities.

In San Diego, UCSD is planning to close down a hospital, partly because of the growing costs of treating undocumented immigrants. The solvency of other hospitals is increasingly endangered. Continued neglect threatens the very existence of many of these hospitals and the health of communities throughout the Nation.

It's hard to blame the hospitals for their growing financial woes. Turning away uninsured, undocumented patients with medical emergencies would not only violate their moral and legal duties; it would endanger everyone's health by sending sick people back out into the community.

Instead, it is the Federal Government who is to blame. The Federal Government is responsible for immigration and therefore must take responsibility for the costs imposed on hospitals by a broken immigration system

As Congress continues to debate the best approach to reforming our immigration system, we must act now to shore up these hospitals and secure the health of communities throughout the country.

So, along with the bad news, I am also here to deliver some good news: I have joined with Congressman KOLBE to introduce bi-partisan legislation, the Pay for All Your Undocumented Procedures (PAY UP!) Act (H.R. 2934), to require the Federal Government to reimburse health care providers for these costs.

This legislation will bolster our hospitals and safeguard the health of both U.S. citizens and immigrants. I urge my colleagues to strongly support the PAY UP! Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNE M. NORTHUP

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, my vote on the Jones of Ohio amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Science, State, Commerce and Justice Appropriations Act (H.R. 2862) was not recorded. I respectfully request the RECORD to show that I intended to vote ''aye'' on the Jones amendment, Rollcall vote number 256.

CONCERNING THE DEATH OF PUERTO RICAN WRITER ENRIQUE LAGUERRE

HON. LUIS FORTUÑO

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. FORTUÑO. Mr. Speaker, today, Puerto Rico grieves the loss of one of our most famous and talented writers, Enrique Laguerre.

Born in Moca, Puerto Rico, on July 15th, 1905, Laguerre devoted his life to enrich society by creating literature and promoting the development of theatrical studies. His work as a playwright has taken root on the lives of three generations in our Island and the Hispanic community in general, with masterpieces like ''La Llamarada'', ''La Resaca'' and ''El Laberinto''.

In 1975, the Puerto Rico Institute of Culture decorated him with the National Literature Award; in 1985, the Puerto Rico Humanities Foundation declared him the Humanist of the Year; and as recent as in 1999, he was nominated for the Nobel Prize in Literature.

Enrique Laguerre, novelist, essayist, playwright, professor, poet and critic, is in fact one of the foundations of Puerto Rico's literary history.

At 99 years of age, Laguerre says farewell to all of us, leaving an invaluable legacy to be cherished by future generations.

As I mentioned, Puerto Rico grieves the loss of Laguerre, but we are also very thankful to the Almighty for the opportunity of having among us someone with such sensitivity and devotion towards the arts, humanities and society.

May God have him in his glory . . . rest in peace, Enrique Laguerre.

IN HONOR OF THE NORTHERN OHIO HATE CRIMES WORKING GROUP, 2005 CLEVELAND CONFERENCE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the Northern Ohio Hate Crimes Working Group (HCWG), as volunteers from participating agencies gather on June 20 and June 21 for the 4th Annual Hate Crimes Conference in Cleveland, Ohio. The mission of the HCWG has been constant since its creation in 1998—to provide programs of prevention and education regarding hate crimes; to build avenues of human rights and civil rights through community outreach, education and awareness programs; to create and strengthen bonds of communication, solutions and action between community leaders, elected officials, educators and law enforcement teams.

The HCWG is comprised of more than fifty organizations from Cleveland and Northern Ohio. The all-volunteer leadership and membership of HCWG reflects a rich palette of cultural diversity—a representation as diverse as the cultural fabric of Northern Ohio. The three-day conference serves to underscore the significant work of the individuals in our community who work with unwavering diligence to address and prevent hate crimes in our community—our police officers, teachers, social workers, business owners and leaders, community leaders and neighborhood volunteers.

As Eleanor Roosevelt said, ''Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home.''

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of every leader and member of the Northern Ohio Hate Crimes Working Group, sponsored by the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Ohio and the Cleveland Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Their vigilant dedication to stand united against hate crimes serves as a light of possibility for the attainment of peace and civil justice within our homes, schools and along our streets. This conference offers the Cleveland community a critical forum to gauge our collective and ongoing efforts, and presents the promise of unwavering protection of civil and human rights for every one of us.

SENATE APOLOGY: LONG OVERDUE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the importance of several issues of historical and contemporary significance involving racial violence in the State of Mississippi.

On Friday, June 10, 2005, the Washington Post ran an article detailing the story of James

Cameron; the only living survivor of a lynching. Cameron, a 91 year old native of Marion, Indiana, recalled the ordeal in which he was falsely accused of a rape and murder and then attacked by a mob of white citizens after being arrested and jailed. Once the mob had beaten, kicked, and humiliated three innocent men; they were all lynched. At some point during this process, someone cried out to the mob that James Cameron had nothing to do with the murder, and so he was then taken back to jail where he was eventually detained on robbery charges. Today, James Cameron is alive to see the passage of the U.S. Senate Resolution, apologizing for and acknowledging the failure of Senate to enact anti-lynching legislation.

Though it lacked the signatures of the two Senators representing the State with the most reported incidents of lynching, I commend the United States Senate for their resolution offering a formal apology to the victims of lynching and the descendants of those victims. In 1900, Congressman George White, an African American, introduced anti-lynching legislation which was fought off tooth and nail. Since then, it has taken more than 100 years for the Congress to offer an apology or acknowledge this failure.

The State of Mississippi has had the most lynching reports in the Nation. Since 1882 there have been 581 reported cases of lynching in the State of Mississippi. That tallies in at a whopping 4.7 reported cases each year. These numbers do not include the unreported cases and those ''conspiracy theories'' like Raynard Johnson of Kokomo, MS, found in his yard hanging from a tree with a belt wrapped around his neck in 2000.

It has been more than 40 years since the murder of Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner, who were lynched in Philadelphia, MS, and it has been more than 50 years since the murder of Emmitt Louis Till, who was lynched in Money, MS. Today, the case of the three civil rights workers and the case of Emmitt Louis Till have been re-opened so that the State of Mississippi can finally bring forth resolution in these murders. These cases have one similar thread; they are perpetuated by the fact that there has been no justice rendered.

The issuance of the U.S. Senate's apology, the re-opening of the case of the three civil rights workers and young Mr. Till are long overdue. It has taken our Nation decades to come to grips with these atrocities. The Senate apology and the justice sought in the murders do not mend the perceived racial rift that has transpired, but the actions are definitely a step in the right direction.

IN HONOR OF MR. SHANE MEYERS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN and Congressman MICHAEL HONDA, to honor Mr. Shane Lee Meyers, who has dedicated the last several years to establishing two websites that provide political information to the public. These websites, including the Election Volunteer Project (www.electionvolunteer.com) and the Join California site (www.joincalifornia.com). focus on the Santa Clara county area and serve to educate that region's voters in a non-partisan way by providing biographies of candidates for major public office. The Election Volunteer Project intends to eventually expand the websites to include all of northern California and perhaps even the entire state.

Mr. Meyers deserves recognition today for the great interest he has shown in improving the lines of communication between the public and their representatives at both the state and federal levels. A longtime resident of Capitola, he has volunteered a large portion of his time toward the website's public education effort. His efforts toward improving community political awareness are to be commended.

I would also like to add that Mr. Meyers is a recent graduate in electrical engineering from Cal Poly-San Luis Obispo. He is currently employed by Nokia as a Software Quality Assurance Engineer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the many accomplishments of Mr. Meyers and wish him continued success in the future.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF JOHN YANKEY, PH.D.

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Dr. John Yankey, the Leonard W. Mayo Professor of Family and Child Welfare at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, upon his retirement. His dedication, articulation, and energy toward the education of his students, social and organizational research, and the advancement of social justice touch all who come in contact with him and his work.

Dr. Yankey is a nationally renowned researcher and scholar in multiple areas, including the public human services sector, development of strategic alliances and fundraising among nonprofit organizations, and the related field of strategic planning. During his past 32 years as a professor, he has directed local and national studies in these and other areas. Dr. Yankey was instrumental in founding the Mandel School's Center for Public Sector Leadership, Fundraising Academy, and the Mandel Center for Non-Profit Organizations.

Professor Yankey taught diverse groups of students and consistently received the highest levels of student feedback and appreciation as evidenced by multiple Outstanding Teacher of the Year Awards. Though he primarily taught graduate social work students, he also worked with many public officials through the Ohio Executive Institute, an organization he helped to create and direct, as well as the leadership of many non-profit organizations.

Dr. Yankey has held several leadership and advisory positions with organizations such as the American Public Welfare Association and the Ohio Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. He has authored numerous publications and several popular text books including Skills for Effective Management of Nonprofit Organizations, which has become an important text for social work and nonprofit education programs.

Prior to his service at Case Western Reserve University, Dr. Yankey advanced through the West Virginia Department of Welfare from a part-time caseworker to the Assistant Commissioner for Welt Virginia's Child Welfare program. He has an undergraduate background in both secondary education and in the Baptist faith.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognizing Dr. John Yankey for his immeasurable contribution to the public and private human services sectors, the body of academic research and insight which he formed, and his drive to and success in shaping future leaders and professionals in human service-related fields.

BUFFALO SOLDIER: MOUND BAYOU RESIDENT, ONE OF AMERICA'S LAST

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Rev. C.L. Woodley. Rev. Woodley currently' presides in Mound Bayou, Mississippi and is one of the last Buffalo Soldiers in the Nation. I submit the following article by Robert Smith of the Cleveland News Leader in Cleveland, Mississippi.

The Rev. C.L. Woodley's moral conscience is still powerfully stirred by events he witnessed when he served in the U.S. Army during World War II.

''I pray for America. We're in bad shape and don't know it,'' the retired African Methodist Episcopal (AME) presiding elder says, reflecting on both past and present.

Woodley, 85, is one of the last of the Buffalo Soldiers—African Americans trained as horse-riding cavalrymen, who served the nation in both peacetime and war from the late 1860s up through the mid 1940s—Native Americans of the Great Plains were the source of the nickname.

A native of Stringtown, Woodley was drafted in 1941 and received his cavalry instruction at Camp Funston, Kansas. He later took part in U.S. military actions in North African and Italy.

However, he recalls with a laugh that he had experience as a rider before he trained with horses at Camp Funston. As a youth in the Stringtown area, in southwest Bolivar County, he was a jockey in mule races. Today, he still rides a bicycle in the mornings, he explained.

Turning the pages of his photo album, Woodley commented during an interview at his home about how he and other soldiers had to cross the burning, but not sunken, remains of a bombed ship to get from their vessel to shore when they arrived at Casablanca, Morocco. He became motor-pool sergeant for a contingent of replacement troops, who supported men on the fighting line, and the sound of shells and bombs exploding became a regular feature of their environment. ''We got it so bad until you could tell the sound of a German plane from an American plane,'' he said.

In addition to the dangers of combat, Woodley had disturbing experiences with which he still grapples. Among those experiences was the sight of hungry civilians begging for food—mothers asking U.S. soldiers for bits of their rations to feed to keep the civilians back.

''Our orders were to take that club and beat them back, but I told the commanding

officer I didn't have the heart to do it,'' he said, adding that he is concerned about how the U.S. treats civilians in present-day conflicts, such as the fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

''I don't know whether we'll ever get out of this war. There are way too many people getting killed,'' he said, voicing anxiety that America may be losing men and women it will need in the future. He sees a national indifference to the value of life expressed both in our foreign policy and in social practices such as legalized abortion.

''God is not dead,'' Woodley warns. ''I might lie to you but that Bible's going to come true.''

When he returned to Mississippi after his Army days, Woodley studied at Campbell College in the Jackson area and became an AME clergyman. He served for more than 40 years as a presiding elder in the church, which means he was responsible for helping the bishop to supervise preachers. He became senior presiding elder of the Eight AME District, comprised of Mississippi and Louisiana.

Woodley settled in Mount Bayou with his wife, Willie Thelma Woodley, who was a native of the historic settlement founded by former slaves of Joe Davis.

Shelton Woodley of Mound Bayou, one of the minister's sons, says his own service in the Vietnam War helped him to appreciate and better understand his father's experiences.

The elder Mr. Woodley, who stays busy keeping up the shrubbery at his home and at the Mound Bayou branch of the Bank of Bolivar County, says he hates to be idle. He recalls how hard work shaped him as a child.

''I picked 200 pounds of cotton in Stringtown, Mississippi, when I was nine years old,'' he says with a smile.

Most of us are aware of the contributions that men like Rev. C.L. Woodley and the Buffalo Soldiers have made to the preservation of our Nation and our democracy.

In the history of the Buffalo Soldiers there were not only men that served, but women as well. Cathy Williams, the only woman who served in 1866 as a Buffalo Soldier, also deserves recognition by the House; therefore, these are men and women of courage, bravery, and honor.

The remarkable irony of the history of the Buffalo Soldiers and many other African American soldiers like Rev. Woodley is that they fought to preserve the high ideals of liberty, freedom, and democracy; however, they were fighting for principles and privileges that they themselves were being denied on their own soil.

Mr. Speaker and to the Members of Congress, too many times do we celebrate the men and women of our armed services and veterans after they are no longer with us. I ask you to join in saluting Mr. Woodley and the men and women of the Buffalo Soldiers, to ensure him while he is living and well that we are grateful and indebted to him and others like him for his service in the United States Army.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 2005, I was absent for several votes for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted: Vote No. 251, Weiner Amendment regarding funding for COPS program, ''no''; vote No. 252, Inslee Amendment regarding funding for NOAA, ''no''; vote No. 253, Hayworth Amendment regarding contribution to U.N., ''no''; vote No. 254, Flake Amendment regarding Cuba ''no''; vote No. 255, Hinchey Amendment regarding medical marijuana ''no''; vote No. 256, Jones of Ohio Amendment regarding the EEOC ''no''; vote No. 257, Hostettler Amendment regarding Southern Dist. of Indiana case ''yes''; and vote No. 258, Sanders Amendment regarding Section 215 of PATRIOT Act ''no''.

IN HONOR OF BISHOP RICHARD R. WILLIAMS AND BISHOP ELAINE WILLIAMS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Bishop Richard R. Williams and Bishop Elaine Williams, as they are honored by their congregation for founding the Mt. Calvary III Deliverance Outreach Ministries International, Inc., a spiritual haven of assistance, support and services focused on the most vulnerable citizens of our Cleveland community.

Bishop Richard Williams and Bishop Elaine Williams, united in marriage for nearly twenty years, are also unified in their unwavering advocacy and service on behalf of at-risk children, and are united in their outreach work that includes offering educational programs and counseling services to youth and adults who are suffering from HIV and AIDS. Bishop Richard Williams has initiated and supported numerous HIV and AIDS prevention programs throughout our community. He is a certified instructor in the African-American HIV/Aids Program through the American Red Cross, and is state certified in Communicable Disease Management/First Aid.

His remarkable rise from the darkness of his own personal suffering, is an unending source of inspiration and strength for children and adults who are lost in a cycle of pain, struggle and uncertainty. The community outreach and ministry that exists at the heart of Mt. Calvary Ministries begins at home. Over the past eighteen years, Bishop Richard Williams and Bishop Elaine Williams have opened their hearts and homes as foster parents. The Williams' have welcomed the most vulnerable and at-risk children into their lives, from babies, to children, to high-risk teens, offering an abundance of love, guidance, security and hope, where none existed before.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Bishop Richard R. Williams and Bishop Elaine Williams, cofounders of the Mt. Calvary III Deliverance Outreach Ministries International, for nearly twenty years of compassionate service as teachers, mentors, foster parents and healers. Their unified commitment, kindness and caring for the children of our community has served to lift the spirits of countless individuals, and will forever reflect faith, hope and light throughout our entire community.

RECOGNIZING MR. THOMAS CONKLIN

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous career of Mr. Thomas Conklin, a physician and visionary.

After graduating from Louisiana State Medical School, Dr. Thomas Conklin became board certified in psychiatry and administration and established a private practice in his hometown of Ellington, Connecticut. Dr. Conklin left his practice with twenty years of experience in search of a place where he could administer medicine. In 1992 Dr. Conklin became Director of Health Services at the Hampden County Correctional Center in Ludlow, Massachusetts. Sheriff Michael J. Ashe Jr. once said upon meeting Dr. Conklin how amazed he was with his dedication, innovation, and willingness. Dr. Conklin saw a lack of attention from the local community towards inmates, especially through proper medical care. Dr. Conklin once called correctional facilities ''reservoirs of illness'' because these facilities can harbor many diseases like HIV, STDs, and Hepatitis which endanger the local population when released inmates bring these diseases out into the public. Instead of waiting for these diseases to breakout into the public, Dr. Conklin took a proactive approach by beginning a Public Health Model. This revolutionary system established relationships with inmates by using local health physicians and setting up neighborhood health centers.

As a result of Dr. Conklin's persistent efforts, today 100 percent of Hampden County inmates obtain a complete physical exam, and over 90 percent of those inmates being released keep medical appointments in the community. In 1998 the National Commission for Correctional Healthcare selected Hampden County Correctional Center as facility of the year. Dr. Conklin's efforts brought national attention to the growing risks from lack of inmate healthcare within corrections facilities. Dr. Conklin's model now serves as catalyst for other correctional facility health programs nationwide.

Dr. Conklin continues teaching other facilitators about the Public Health Model through producing publications and leading numerous health conferences. As a member of the NCCHC–NIJ expert panel on mental illness, he led Hampden County Correction Facility to new groundbreaking achievements. Through his compassion, Dr. Conklin has been able to make his dreams as a visionary become reality for all that helps regardless of their wealth or status. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Conklin's commitment and leadership during his forty years of service as physician and administrator are more than worthy of our recognition today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 13, I was absent for votes on

rollcall No. 241 and 242. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 241, and "yes" on rollcall No. 242.

THE CASE OF MALACHY MCALLISTER

HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my steadfast support of H.R. 2827, a Private Bill for the relief of Malachy McAllister, Nicola McAllister, and Sean Ryan McAllister offered by my friend from New Jersey, Mr. ROTHMAN. I would also like to recognize my colleagues Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KING of New York for their advocacy on behalf of the McAllisters.

Malachy McAllister is an Irish Catholic national who fled to the United States from Belfast in 1988. He left his homeland and moved to New York City with his wife and four children. Since then, Mr. McAllister has been living in the New York metropolitan area, building a new, safe home for his family, abiding by the laws of our land, and contributing to society.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration seems intent on deporting him to a country where his life will be put in danger.

While in Northern Ireland, Mr. McAllister did participate in an Irish National Liberation Army attack on a member of the Royal Ulster Constabulary and played a role in planning another attack. He was imprisoned from 1981 to 1985, and has paid his debt to society.

When released from prison, he and his family were attacked by British loyalists who fired 26 shots into his home. After fleeing to the United States he applied for political asylum, which was denied to him in 2000 and to his children and deceased wife in 2003. The McAllisters have appealed the decisions to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, but they have no further legal options if the appeal is denied.

The House and Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff should act to ensure that Mr. McAllister and his family can stay in America. H.R. 2827 makes Malachy, Nicola and Sean eligible for permanent resident status and halts pending deportation proceedings. If Mr. McAllister is returned to Northern Ireland, he will be in constant and immediate danger of persecution because of his political and religious beliefs and retribution for his past affiliations.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I believe the McAllisters should be granted political asylum. In the wake of September 11, we must make sure to balance security concerns with the historical role of the United States as a place of safe harbor for individuals fleeing political oppression. Mr. McAllister is the first person to express regret for his past actions and sorrow that they have led to his family's current position. He and his children deserve to live free of fear and continue building their American Dream.

IN HONOR OF MARDELLE RETZLOFF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Mrs. Mardelle Retzloff, upon the occasion of her retirement following forty-five years of outstanding service and ministry to others, in and out of the classroom.

Inspired by a true calling of spiritual and humanitarian duty, Mrs. Retzloff initiated her journey as an educator in 1954, when she began working at Jack and Jill Nursery School in her native city of Aurora, IL. In 1960, she earned a Bachelor's degree in Education. That same year, she accepted a position at Milwaukee Lutheran High School, where she taught English and history. She taught there, and within the Milwaukee Public School District, for nearly twenty years before moving to Cleveland.

In 1979, Mrs. Retzloff joined the staff at St. Paul Lutheran School in Westlake. Her devoted service at St. Paul's has enhanced the lives of two generations of children in her kindergarten classroom. Beyond the classroom, Mrs. Retzloff, her husband, Richard, and her children, Barbara and John, have offered their strength and hope to the most vulnerable children of our community. As foster parents to thirty-six children, Mr. and Mrs. Retzloff have given these children a loving, stable home, offering light and hope where none existed before.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Mardelle Retzloff, for her years of dedicated service as teacher, mentor, foster parent and friend. Her commitment, kindness and caring for the children of our community has served to lift the spirits of countless individuals, and will forever reflect faith, hope and light throughout our entire community. I wish Mrs. Retzloff and her family an abundance of peace, health and happiness, today, and in all the years to come.

INTRODUCTION ON THE GROSS OVERCHARGING UNDERMINES GASOLINE ECONOMICS, OR GOUGE ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Gross Overcharging Undermines Gasoline Economics, or GOUGE Act.

As the travel season approaches, many children are out of school and families are happily looking forward to vacations. What they won't be happy about is the skyrocketing cost of getting to their destinations. Unfortunately, whether traveling on the road or in the air, this summer's vacationers will be hit hard by the escalating cost of gasoline.

From March to April of 2005, the cost to fill up a tank of gas rose by more than 10 percent. That's more than twice the increase for the same period last year! But the detrimental effects of high gas prices don't just stop at the pump—they domino throughout every segment of the economy. For a basic item like a loaf of bread, it costs more to fertilize the wheat, more to transport the wheat to the baker, more for the plastic bag to package the bread, and more to get it to the grocery store.

Meanwhile, President Bush has suggested little to lessen the impact of high gas prices. In fact, the President doesn't believe anything can be done. In April 2005, he was quoted as saying, "An energy bill wouldn't change the price at the pump today. I know that and you know that."

With all due respect, Mr. President, plenty can and must be done. The Internet is full of comments from people reporting sudden gasoline price increases. In some cases, consumers have witnessed a 10-cent increase in less than 24 hours. There is no possible reason or explanation for these overnight increases. While states across the country are doing what they can to deal with complaints, they have limited recourse to make lasting, beneficial changes until there are consistent federal guidelines.

The GOUGE Act that I am introducing today addresses federal guidelines against gas gouging in four parts. First, the bill imposes a penalty on gas retailers who raise prices on any given day at a rate that is twice the inflation rate. Prices are compared to a base price index derived from the contract price on the New York Mercantile Exchange and adjusted for regional variances. These variances take into account stringent pollution controls, altitude requirements, and special reformulations across the country. The penalties would be no less than $5000 for the 1st offense, no less than $10,000 for the 2nd offense, and no less than $25,000 for the 3rd offense or thereafter.

A steady supply of oil is critical to cost effective gasoline production as well as national security. The second part of my bill helps to ensure this supply through use of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR).

Following the oil embargo in 1975, the SPR was created to provide a domestic inventory of crude oil, and was intended to be used in emergency situations when the supply of crude oil to the United States is disrupted. The first such use of the SPR was in 1991 during the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait by then President George H. W. Bush.

The current Administration, however, has a very different policy on the SPR. In November 2001, President George W. Bush ordered the SPR be filled to its current 700 million barrel capacity with oil from the government's share federally leased oil sites. Since then, maintaining this capacity has had a detrimental affect on oil price increases. First, continuing to fill the SPR at the same time it is 98% full takes oil from the open market, decreasing supply and thereby potentially increasing prices. Second, these additional fills to the SPR are being made while crude prices remain high and volatile. My bill suspends these new fills and releases an additional million barrels per day onto the open market for 30 days to significantly ease market concerns that lead to artificially inflated prices. The laws of supply and demand clearly support this idea as a basic tenet of economics.

Third, the GOUGE Act directs the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to report on antitrust practices throughout the oil industry and

to make recommendations to protect consumers from price gouging. This report is essential for putting the oil industry on notice and developing sound federal price gouging legislation.

Finally, my legislation establishes a Pricing and Economic Impact Commission to review the effect of oil supply and demand on the U.S. economy and national security. The Commission will be comprised or 23 members. The President will appoint 11 members total (including at least 1 each) from the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Commerce, the Council of Economic Advisors, and the Office of Science and Technology. There will also be 12 members appointed by the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, our economy depends on reasonable gasoline prices to produce and transport items we use everyday. Without some kind of protection, we all pay higher prices for everything from food to pharmaceuticals. Now that the bubble on fuel cost has burst, prices will only increase. Without action, the supply demands of this summer will soon give way to increased requirements for the winter heating. My legislation works to protect consumers from arbitrary price increases by gas retailers, make effective use of the Strategic Petroleum Preserve, and monitor price irregularities in the oil industry.

I ask for my colleagues' support and urge the House Leadership to bring it swiftly to the House floor for consideration.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING MAJOR STEVEN O'DELL

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to recognize the long and distinguished career of Major Steven O'Dell who is retiring after serving our nation's military with distinction for 25 years.

Major O'Dell as born in St. Joseph, Missouri. Major O'Dell received a BS in Criminal Justice from Missouri Western State College and a Masters of Science Degree in Adult and Continuing Education from Kansas State University. Major O'Dell was commissioned in August 1980. He also attended the Field Artillery Officer Basic Course at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

Major O'Dell has received numerous decorations and badges for his outstanding efforts in the United States Army. These decorations and badges include the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, and the Southwest Asian Service Medal. Major O'Dell has not been able to achieve this level of distinction on his own, however, and I would be remiss if I did not recognize the support, love I and encouragement that his family has offered to him throughout his career.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House will join me in paying tribute to Major O'Dell for his exceptional commitment to his fellow soldiers, the United States Army, and the safety and security of America. As he prepares for the next stage in his life, I am certain that my colleagues will join me in wishing Major O'Dell, his wife Julia and their daughters Sarah, Amanda, and Katherine all the best.

IN HONOR OF THE POLISH VETERANS COMMITTEE OF CLEVELAND

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the Polish Veterans Committee of Cleveland, Ohio, as they commemorate the 85th Anniversary of The Battle of the Vistula River.

The people and leaders of Poland, determined to protect their newly reacquired independence, were poised and committed to defend their borders from foreign invaders. The invasion of Poland was a key component in Soviet leader Vladimir Lenin's strategy of forcing the spread of communism throughout central and western Europe. On August 13, 1920, the Soviet Red Army descended just outside the Polish capital of Warsaw. The Battle of Warsaw had begun, and raged on for the next fifteen days. Polish forces, commanded by Jozef Pilsudski, counter-attacked from the south, forcing Russian troops to withdraw east.

This unexpected Polish victory, known as ''The Miracle at the Vistula'' severely crippled the Soviet army. Both Polish and Soviet forces sustained tens of thousands of casualties, and thousands more were injured or missing. The Polish triumph stunned political leaders around the world, as most expected the Red Army to secure a swift collapse of Warsaw, and a complete communist takeover of Poland.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in tribute of the Polish Veterans Committee, as they honor the sacrifice, courage and heart of Polish veterans who bravely defended their homeland during the Battle of the Vistula River, 85 years ago. The Miracle at the Vistula continues to serve as a striking reminder that humankind's fundamental quest for freedom and justice is far stronger than a formidable army. The Miracle at the Vistula reflects our modern day hope of liberty, peace and justice rising for all veterans and civilians, in Cleveland, Ohio, in Warsaw, Poland, and throughout the world.

A TRIBUTE TO DOUGLAS P. DEVORE

HON. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude for the exceptional services which Encinitas Union School District Superintendent Douglas P. DeVore has performed for the students of San Diego City Schools and for our great Nation. Superintendent DeVore's leadership, commitment to excellence and vision for the future has inspired students in San Diego for the past 11 years. For the past 36 years, Dr. DeVore has dedicated his life to public education and I believe it is only fitting that he be recognized by this body.

Superintendent DeVore began his career as a middle school science and math teacher in Santa Barbara, California. Dr. DeVore moved on to high school and became the Science Department Chair in the Fullerton High School District, where he also served as the football coach. Superintendent DeVore's commitment to education next took him to the Placentia Yorba Linda School District where he entered school administration as an Assistant Principal. It was not long before Dr. DeVore became Principal DeVore in the Centralia School District. In 1993, Superintendent DeVore completed his doctorate and in 1994 he made the move to Encinitas Union School District where he was selected as Assistant Superintendent of Administrative Services. In 1997, Dr. DeVore became Superintendent.

Under Superintendent DeVore's leadership, the Encinitas Union School District has gained statewide recognition for excellence. With his dedication and inspiration, every school in the District became a California Distinguished School and two became National Blue Ribbon Schools. The ninth school in the District, El Camino Creek, was built under Dr. DeVore's supervision. Over the past 11 years, Superintendent DeVore guided the District in formulating an Asset Management Plan to safeguard District assets and ensure the District's vision for the future as well as the modernization of all schools in the district. He also worked on the development of a District Facilities Master Plan to ensure equity among all schools. Superintendent DeVore served as President of the Association of Low Wealth Schools, Board Member of the Classroom of the Future Foundation and sat on the Board of Governors for the North Coastal Consortium for Special Education.

Superintendent DeVore has continually gone above and beyond the responsibilities of his office. He has served as a teacher, a leader and an inspiration to all who know him. Dr. DeVore has taken the Encinitas Union School District into the 21st Century in terms of technology and student progress and provided a great example for its future leaders. One of his favorite sayings is ''all about the relationships.'' I agree. In fact, that is what I will miss the most . . . the great relationship we shared. Doug's straightforward manner has always been helpful to me and I will never forget that. Dr. DeVore will retire as District Superintendent on July 30, 2005. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing him the very best success as he starts a new chapter in his life.

CONGRATULATING JEFFREY REISENAUER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jeffrey Reisenauer on his receipt of the Congressional Award Gold Medal. As you know, this distinction is the highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions, and Mr. Reisenauer is a well-deserving recipient of this award.

Through hard work and commitment, Jeffrey has become a leader in his community. Mr. Reisenauer, 19 years old, acknowledges the significant effect that the Boy Scouts has had on his life. Jeffrey has stated, ''The skills and

values you learn can bring lifelong benefit[s].'' Jeffrey has certainly amassed a number of such skills, as a high school varsity athlete, and captain of his high school ice hockey team. He has also passed the benefit of his skills and work ethic along to younger athletes, by coaching youth roller hockey teams, and by assisting with player development clinics.

Mr. Reisenauer has demonstrated his ability to tackle life's challenges by training for, and embarking on a 16-day backpacking trek through the southwestern United States. This experience, at the Boy Scout High Adventure Ranch in Cimarron, New Mexico, was best summed up by Mr. Reisenauer in his own words. ''You learn to go beyond what you think are your physical and mental limits. It was the most challenging and rewarding experience of my life.''

By applying the principles of dedication, hard work, and commitment, Jeffrey Reisenauer has become a shining example for others to follow. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Jeffrey Reisenauer on his accomplishments and on his receipt of the Congressional Award Gold Medal.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE ARC OF HILO AND LANAKILA

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Arc of Hilo and Lanakila for their hard work and dedication in improving the quality of life for people with developmental or other disabilities in Hawaii. I also want to pay tribute to the many achievements and contributions of Michael Gleason, the Arc of Hilo's executive director, and Marian Tsuji, President/CEO of Lanakila. The Arc of Hilo and Lanakila are a Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program (often referred to as JWOD), which provides job skills and training to those who are blind or who have other severe disabilities so they may earn good wages and benefits and gain a greater independence and the quality of life. Overall, the JWOD program empowers people with disabilities who traditionally face an unemployment rate of 70 percent and rely heavily on social support programs such as welfare and Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

The Arc of Hilo's mission is to improve the quality of life for people with developmental and other disabilities in Hawaii through educational, recreational, vocational, and skill training as well as employment and residential opportunities. Lanakila's mission is to offer programs and services for adults with cognitive, physical, social or age-related challenges that build and support higher levels of independence and an improved quality of life. By employing people who are blind or who have other severe disabilities, the Arc of Hilo and Lanakila are able to increase independence and self-esteem by helping these individuals enjoy full participation in their communities and market their JWOD skills to other public/private sector employers.

Demonstrating an excellent federal-private sector partnership, NISH, NIB, and local nonprofits such as the Arc of Hilo and Lanakila enhance the opportunities for economic and personal independence of people who are blind or who have other severe disabilities, primarily through creating, sustaining, and improving employment. Through the JWOD program, the Arc of Hilo provides employment opportunities and training for 60 people with visual and other severe disabilities enabling them to lead more productive and meaningful lives, support their families, and gain important work experience.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the important contributions of the Arc of Hilo and Lanakila in the great aloha state of Hawaii. I commend all persons who are committed to and work towards enhancing employment opportunities for people with visual and other severe disabilities.

IN HONOR OF JACK KASHUBECK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Mr. Jack Kashubeck, U.S. Veteran, internationally known author, poet, artist and lecturer, whose inspiring work rises beyond the borders of Cleveland, bridging our community with the great poets, writers and artists throughout the world.

His extensive body of work reflects a personal passage of exploration, a journey of experience, as he explores the cultures, history and people of distant lands. Mr. Kashubeck's introspective and poignant observations serve to highlight the human spirit, revealing the common elements of humanity that connect every one of us.

From Egypt, to South America, to Cleveland, Mr. Kashubeck's poetry and prose reflects upon the confining boundaries and soaring possibilities dually inherent within the human condition, offering us an introspective look back, and a hopeful vision rising on the horizon.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Jack Kashubeck, whose evolving life's work reflects the core of our existence—the tragedy and the triumph. The heart and soul of any society is held aloft by the artists who flourish within it, and the poetic works of Jack Kashubeck, words that pierce the darkness and carry critical social issues into the rational light of day, serve to elevate the Cleveland community, and far beyond.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF DIANE FURNAS FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize Diane Furnas' retirement as Chair of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU). Since her election in 2003 as the first female Chair of the NAFCU Board, Ms. Furnas has been a leader in the credit union community both nationally and within the great state of Texas.

For the past two years, Ms. Furnas has been balancing her time as NAFCU Chair and President/CEO of Southwest Airlines Federal Credit Union, headquartered in my District. At her credit union, Ms. Furnas has fostered several savings programs targeted to today's youth at her credit union by teaching the importance of saving through targeted programs ranging from kindergarten through college. She has promoted financial education programs and has armed her members with protecting themselves against identity theft.

Throughout her tenure as Chair of the NAFCU Board of Directors, Ms. Furnas worked tirelessly to enhance the federal credit union charter by working with Congress for regulatory relief legislation for credit unions. As Chair, she has also helped maintain NAFCU's status as a leading credit union trade association. She was first elected to the NAFCU Board in 1998, the same year she received NAFCU's prestigious ''Professional of the Year'' award. Ms. Furnas is also the silver award recipient in the 2005 Society of National Association Publications Excel Awards for a column published in The Federal Credit Union magazine.

I rise today to congratulate Ms. Diane Furnas on all of her fine work throughout her illustrious tenure as Chair of NAFCU. With her more than 30 years' experience in the credit union community, there is no doubt in my mind that our good friends at NAFCU will feel a great void once Ms. Furnas steps down. Ms. Furnas deserves our heartfelt thanks for her years of dedicated service and our best wishes for the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, due to attendance at my daughter's school graduation on June 15, 2005, I was regrettably absent during the following votes.

Please add to the official record how I would have voted on the following rollcall votes: rollcall No. 254—''nay,'' rollcall No. 255—''yea,'' rollcall No. 256—''nay,'' rollcall No. 257—''yea,'' rollcall No. 258—''nay.''

THE LONG TERM CARE SUPPORT AND INCENTIVE ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an important issue facing our community: the affordability of long-term care. People today are living longer and healthier lives than ever before.

When the Declaration of Independence was signed, the average life expectancy was 23. In the United States today, life expectancy is 83 years.

While this increased life expectancy is allowing us to live fuller lives, it is also presenting us with serious financial challenges. It is estimated that more than 40 percent of those who turn 65 will spend some time in a nursing home. Long-term care is expensive. On average, a year's nursing home charges can range from $60,000 to $70,000.

My own family had to make difficult emotional and financial decisions when my father needed care. My dad was a pediatrician, and always lived a full life. When he needed care, my sisters and I struggled to find the perfect place for him to live.

We wanted to make sure he was happy and received high quality medical care. We searched for months to find the right place for our dad and we learned very quickly how expensive long-term care is.

My experience with my dad renewed my commitment to improve our long-term care system. I took on this mission in Congress and I am pleased today to reintroduce the Long Term Care Support and Incentive Act. This much needed legislation will make a real difference for San Diegans caring for older family members.

First, the bill will give a $4,000 tax credit for seniors with long-term care needs and their caregivers. We know how many sacrifices families make to take care of their loved ones. They miss work, or in some cases are forced to give up their jobs. They pay for expensive medical supplies and equipment, and bare the burden of enormous medical bills. This tax credit will help ease their financial burden.

The second section of my legislation will establish a tax deduction for long-term care insurance premiums. As the long-term care needs in our community increase, we must face the reality that many seniors do not have family or friends to take care of them full time.

This is particularly important to women. Women live longer than men. Often times, women are the primary caregivers for their husbands. After their husbands pass away, there is often no one around to take care of them.

Long-Term Care Insurance can help fill this gap, but premiums can be expensive. My legislation will make long-term care insurance more affordable by allowing individuals over 65 to deduct 75 percent of the cost of their premiums and individuals under 65 to deduct 50 percent of the cost of their premiums.

In addition, I have included several important consumer protections in the bill to ensure that people are purchasing responsible insurance plans that will adequately meet their long-term care needs.

The bill requires plans to include: Mandatory Inflation Protection, A Lifetime Deductible Requirement that ensures policy holders must only pay their deductible one time in their lifetime, Mandatory Interchangeablity so that individuals can determine where their benefits are spent, A Care Coordination program that ensures seniors receive assistance in planning and securing the services they need.

By encouraging people to plan ahead for the future and purchase Long-Term Care Insurance, we can ensure that seniors live dignified and independent lives. I urge all of my colleagues in Congress to work with me to pass it quickly into law.

BOEING-AIRBUS WTO DISPUTE

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today concerning the recent dispute between Airbus and Boeing, which has developed into a clash between the European Union and the United States.

The dispute is long and complicated and both sides are convinced they are right. Nevertheless, one incontrovertible fact remains: the EC/EU have given Airbus massive subsidies over the past three decades, which Airbus used to buy market share and skew competition against U.S. companies, mainly Boeing.

The 1992 US–EC Agreement outlined the maximum amount of governmental support and subsidies a state could provide in aircraft production, while calling for progressively reducing subsidies. Further, Airbus agreed to provide a considerable amount of transparency in their business dealings, a standard they continue to ignore when it is not completely advantageous to them. The 1992 agreement presented Airbus with the best option, but they failed to abide by its terms. As a result, the U.S. terminated the 1992 agreement in October, 2004 and, looked to the WTO as the/international body to address this trade matter.

The EU continues to provide Airbus with massive subsidies, which undermine the ability of Boeing to compete on a level field. If the EU continues to write off billions of euros in Airbus debt, how can Boeing fairly compete?

Despite Europe's repeated flaunting of the terms of the 1992 agreement, the US pressed the EU to commit itself to fairer trade policies. As we all know, the EU refused to back down and continued their hard line stance regarding aircraft subsidies.

Reluctantly, the U.S. government filed papers with the WTO so that a panel of judges could hear the complaint, a step our government does not take lightly. We would prefer to arrive at a private understanding with the EU, one that does not resort to this WTO panel. However, the ED's insistence on continuing to provide massive subsidies and refusing to reach a compromise, have forced us to act.

I fully support the US government and Boeing in their dispute with the EU and Airbus. I believe that the EU must cease providing massive subsidies, which undermine competition and unfairly undercut Boeing. American workers can compete with anyone in the world. I'm only asking that this Congress and the Administration do everything possible to make sure that the competition is fair and equal for both sides.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS HOMEOWNERSHIP ACT OF 2005

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Congressman WALLY HERGER, introduced today, the American Veterans Homeownership Act of 2005, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

As you know, under current law, the States of Alaska, California, Oregon, Texas and my home state of Wisconsin, have the authority to issue tax-exempt bonds, which are called Qualified Veterans Mortgage Bonds (QVMBs). The proceeds of these bonds are used to finance mortgage loans to veterans who served on active duty before 1977 and who applied for the financing before the date of 30 years after the last date of which the veteran left active service.

As a result of the limits under current law, veterans of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, Kosovo, Bosnia, Haiti, Somalia and the 1991 Persian Gulf War are not eligible for these mortgage loans that are financed by QVMBs. In addition, the QVMB program has, in effect, ended or is ending in the five affected States due to the current 3D-year time limitation.

My legislation, the American Veterans Homeownership Act of 2005, would allow all veterans in these five States to be eligible for QVMB-financed mortgage loans by repealing the requirement that veterans receiving loans financed by QVMBs must have served before 1977 and would provide new State limits for these bonds. These veterans deserve the homeownership opportunities this program provides. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting these veterans and cosponsor this important legislation.

THE WOMEN'S OBSTETRICIAN AND GYNECOLOGIST MEDICAL ACCESS NOW ACT (THE WOMAN ACT)

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing the Women's Obstetrician and Gynecologist Medical Access Now Act, the WOMAN Act. This bill will ensure that every woman has direct access to her ob-gyn.

I believe women should not need a permission slip to receive ob-gyn care. Unfortunately, that is the reality faced by many women when they need to see their doctor. Numerous managed care plans require women to visit their primary care physicians before seeking the health care services they need from the providers they want. Denying direct access, or forcing women to jump through numerous bureaucratic hoops to see their ob-gyn is not acceptable treatment.

The WOMAN Act recognizes women have different medical needs than men and the significant role ob-gyns play in women's health. Women who see an ob-gyn on a regular basis are more likely to receive important screening services such as pelvic exams, as well as counseling on critical reproductive health issues. My legislation removes the barriers complicating women's access to their doctors. Women will no longer have to contend with the gatekeeper system that can prevent or delay appropriate care.

It is easy to understand what a difference direct ob-gyn access makes in women's health care. Imagine, for a moment, a woman in San

Diego who works 45 hours a week and has limited sick and vacation time. Now, imagine she has an urgent medical problem requiring an ob-gyn visit. On Monday, she calls from work to make an appointment with her primary care physician. If she is lucky, she gets an appointment for the following morning. She takes time off Tuesday to go see her doctor. Her primary care doctor agrees she should be seen by her ob-gyn and gives her a referral. Tuesday afternoon she returns to work and calls her ob-gyn for an appointment. The doctor is in surgery on Wednesday, but they offer her an appointment on Friday morning. On Friday she takes another morning off from work and finally, after almost a week, gets the care she needs. The unnecessary referral process resulted in her taking an extra morning off work and delayed her proper medical care by 5 days. The patient, employer, primary care physician, and health plan provider would have saved money and time if the patient had been able to go directly to her ob-gyn.

The public overwhelmingly supports direct access to ob-gyn care. A survey conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University found that 82 percent support direct access legislation and 63 percent would support it even if their health insurance costs increased.

While serving in the California State Assembly, I heard from many women who experienced the same problems I have outlined today. After meeting with women, obstetricians and gynecologists, health plan representatives, and providers in the State of California, I wrote the state law allowing women direct access to their ob-gyn. That law was a good first step; however, it still does not cover women enrolled in self-insured, federally regulated health plans. This means that even if a woman lives in a state with direct access protections, like California, she may not be able to see her ob-gyn without a referral if she is covered by a federally regulated ERISA health plan.

I believe the time has come to make direct access to an ob-gyn a national standard.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues to pass this critical legislation into law.

WOMEN OF BURMA DAY

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, June 19 marks the 60th birthday of Burma's Democracy Leader Aung San Suu Kyi. She has been held under house arrest since May 30, 2003—this is the third time since 1988 that the regime has confined Suu Kyi to house arrest for political reasons—after narrowly escaping an assassination attempt by Burma's ruling military regime in May of 2003. June 19 also marks the Women of Burma Day. In recognition of this day I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the courageous and honorable efforts made by Suu Kyi and other Burmese women who continue to struggle for democracy, human rights, and an end to brutal dictatorship in Burma.

Today, Burmese women are a driving force in the fight for freedom and democracy in Burma. They inspire us all in their courage to carry out non-violent activities, challenging the military regime's repressive and violent rule. Burmese women are struggling to save a homeland that continues to deteriorate under military dictatorship.

The military regime's response to non-violent political protestors has been abominable. Since winning the popular election by a landslide in 1988, supporters of democracy in Burma have been killed, arrested, imprisoned, and tortured by the thousands. Fearing certain imprisonment and death, many of these democracy supporters have fled the country.

I would like to honor ten Burmese women who have dedicated their lives to improving the health, welfare, and future of Burma's people. With unwavering commitment, these women have sought to address critical issues affecting the people of Burma. These honorees have been involved in a diverse range of activities in the arena of social welfare and democracy and human rights. Eight of the honorees, Daw Aye Aye Mar, Daw Hla Hla Moe, Ma Mi Suu Pwint, Ma Nilar Thein, Ma Su Su Nway, Ma Than Than Htay, Ma Tin Tin Myint and Ma Zinmar Aung have endeavored to continue the ongoing struggle for freedom, human rights, and democracy in Burma. Two of the honorees, Dr. Myint Myint Khin and Ma Than Myint Aung, are deeply involved in organizing and engaging in social welfare and education programs. Demonstrating a unifying commitment to the people of their country, these extraordinary women have pursued their life's work with courage and perseverance. In the course of their lives, many have served, or continue to serve, lengthy jail sentences dealt by Burma's repressive military regime. I request that we honor and show solidarity with Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and all of ''2005 Profiles in Courage'' honorees. We should celebrate their achievements, and honor their personal sacrifice and vision for the future of Burma.

Democracy will come to Burma soon. I believe that one day, the people of Burma will have a chance to openly honor these women and I am very sure that they will do so with great happiness. For the time being, they need our help, and we need to assist them consistently and strongly so that they will attain the goal to which they have been aspiring for so long.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF PANCAKES ON THE PLAZA

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of Pancakes on the Plaza, an annual fundraising event hosted by the United Way of Santa Fe County in my home state of New Mexico. Pancakes on the Plaza not only raises money but brings people together as New Mexicans from all walks of life volunteer side-by-side to make a difference in Santa Fe County.

Each July 4 on the historic Santa Fe Plaza, hundreds of volunteers prepare and serve pancakes to thousands of attendees whose contributions to United Way directly benefit residents of Santa Fe County.

Pancakes on the Plaza has been held in Santa Fe each Fourth of July since 1975, building on traditional annual festivities that date back to the 1920's. The Santa Fe Plaza is an appropriate location for this event as it has historically been a multi-cultural gathering place highlighting the unique diversity within the Northern New Mexico community. Pancakes on the Plaza is a celebration of the American spirit of generosity, volunteerism and community-building that raises money to help foster independence for underserved individuals and families of Santa Fe County.

To pull off an event of this scale takes an enormous amount of collaboration: Three 15 by 60 foot tents for cooking and serving pancakes; twelve pancakes cooks per tent, flipping cakes on 12 stoves per tent; two batter transporters per tent, per shift; two tent captains per tent, per shift; six Army Reservists taking batter from refrigerated trucks to cook tents; twelve batter mixers; two ham and vegetarian sausage cooks per tent, per shift; four fruit, butter and syrup servers per tent, per shift; four beverage servers per tent, per shift to pour milk, juice and coffee; two milk and juice runners per tent, per shift to rush cold beverages from the trucks to the tents; three refrigerated truck workers per shift to relay ham, vegetarian sausage, juice, milk, butter and batter transporters; two ticket takers per tent, per shift; six stage crewmembers; twelve Girl Scouts to keep the Plaza and table neat and clean; eighteen crew members to set up and break down tents and stoves.

And, of course, a massive amount of goods comes together to serve 10,000 breakfasts: 2,500 pounds of pancake batter; 4,000 pints of milk (regular and chocolate); 300 gallons of fresh-squeezed juice; 100 pounds of locally-roasted gourmet coffee; 600 pounds of fruit; 300 pounds of butter; 3,000 pieces of vegetarian sausages; 1,000 pounds of ham; 14,000 place settings; 12,000 cups; 20,000 packets of sugar and artificial sweetener; 20,000 packets of syrup.

The United Way of Santa Fe County fulfills the mission of ''creating lasting change in chronic community conditions'' with events such as Pancakes on the Plaza which fund specific programs that target health, learning and self-sufficiency. Yet Pancakes on the Plaza is more than just a fundraiser, this event also features the diverse music, art and crafts unique to Northern New Mexico with many activities for children and families. Locals and visitors alike enjoy the annual July 4th United Way of Santa Fe County Pancakes on the Plaza.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that I have participated in Pancakes on the Plaza for several years now. This United Way event raises much needed money for social programs while building community, enhancing lives and creating opportunities in Santa Fe County. Northern New Mexico is a place rich in history and steeped in tradition and I am fortunate to be a part of such wonderful programs as Pancakes on the Plaza.

SECOND OPINION COVERAGE ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Second Opinion

Coverage Act—legislation that will ensure the accessibility and coverage of medical second opinions.

Imagine that your doctor tells you that you must undergo radical surgery that may threaten the use of a limb or leave you with a serious chronic condition. Understandably, you would request a second opinion from another physician. Most health care groups see the value in such requests and provide patients with a second opinion. Besides giving patients much needed peace of mind, second opinions can benefit health plans by reducing the number of invasive procedures and result in better patient care through increased dialogue about treatment options.

However, when I was a member of the California State Assembly, I heard from a number of patients who experienced a glitch in their health care coverage. They noticed the absence of a clear process for obtaining medical second opinions. These patients, many struggling with challenging health conditions, had difficulties obtaining second opinions through their health plans.

After meeting with patients, physicians and health groups, I authored a law in California that guarantees coverage of second opinions. Patients, meeting any one of several qualifying conditions, are entitled to a timely second opinion by a ''qualified health care professional,'' within 72 hours in cases of serious or imminent health threat. When another expert is not available within the provider group or network, the organization will pay for an appropriately qualified doctor outside of the plan. Patients are responsible for the costs of applicable co-payments.

The law in California was a good first step. Unfortunately, this legislation does not cover the more than 4 million Californians enrolled in self-insured, federally regulated health plans. Nationwide, this translates into almost 51 million persons without guaranteed access to second opinions. This means that one in four insured families are not protected by California's own second opinion law! I believe the time has come to make access to second opinions a national standard.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues to pass this critical legislation into law.

ON THE OCCASION OF FATHER'S DAY: A SALUTE TO RALPH R. SALIMPOUR, MD, DCH, FAAP

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 2005

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, ''Blessed indeed is the man who hears gentle voices call him father!'' The name Ralph Salimpour has become synonymous with charity and commitment in the greater Los Angeles area. Indeed, Ralph Salimpour is blessed for selflessly giving him energy and his love, and dedicating his left to those most in need.

Dr. Ralph R. Salimpour is the senior attending physician of the highly acclaimed Salimpour Pediatric Medical Group in Los Angeles. Dr. Salimpour is internationally recognized as a global expert in the fields of Tetanus, Malnutrition, and Rickets and has the largest published series on Tetanus and Rickets in the world.

Dr. Salimpour graduated from medical school at the age of 23 and has practiced medicine on 3 continents over the span of nearly 5 decades. He attended the Shiraz School of Medicine in Iran, the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of England, and Cedars-Sinai Medical Center—UCLA School of Medicine.

In Iran, Dr. Salimpour emerged as the Director of the Research Institute of Child Health where he described, for the first time, Rickets and its etiology in tropical countries. This pioneering research eventually helped to change the American Academy of Pediatrics' recommendations for Vitamin D Supplementation in breastfed babies, staving off the debilitating disease in America. His research and his leadership in the treatment of Tetanus cut the mortality rate of this horrific disease from a devastating 100 percent to half of that value, directly resulting in countless saved lives. Dr. Salimpour also tackled the issue of malnutrition in Iran, demonstrating that it resulted from poor education rather than poverty. Dr. Salimpour's scientific and clinical research propelled him to the world's medical center stage, gaining international acclaim for his pioneering research.

After the 1979 Iranian revolution, Dr. Salimpour and his family moved to the United States where Dr. Salimpour, a man nearly in the 6th decade of his life, sat for and successfully passed the rigorous series of exams enabling him to once again practice medicine, this time in America. He has been awarded the prestigious Governor's Commendation from the State of California and the Award of Excellence from California's Vaccine for Children Program. Today, Dr. Salimpour serves as Clinical Assistant Professor of Pediatrics at the UCLA School of Medicine and is a practicing pediatrician in Los Angeles.

Dr. Salimpour is also a founding Board Member of the NexCare Collaborative, which created a state-of-the-art, highly-innovative and successful call center/web site and communications program aimed at families with young children. This program has assisted more than 100,000 families and helped enroll more than 18,000 children into free or low cost health insurance programs.

Married to his wife Farah for 44 years, the 2 have raised 4 children, Pejman, Sherry, Pedram, and Nilou. Dr. and Mrs. Salimpour also have 6 grandchildren, Koby, Alexa, Branden, Gabriella, Allen, and Ariella. Dr. and Mrs. Salimpour have inspired a love of medicine and children amongst their sons. Doctors Pejman and Pedram Salimpour are practicing pediatricians and leaders in their field.

Mother Teresa once said, ''I slept and I dreamed that life is all joy. I woke and I saw that life is all service. I served and I saw that service is joy.'' Dr. Salimpour has improved the human condition by way of perseverance and leadership. He has passed on these ideals to his students as a professor of pediatrics, to his tens of thousands of patients, and to his children and grandchildren. As we approach Father's Day, I salute Dr. Salimpour for his blessings as a ''father'' to many.

IN RECOGNITION AND REMEMBRANCE OF THE LIFE OF U.S. MARINE CORPS CAPTAIN KELLY C. HINZ

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mrs. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to recognize and honor the life U.S./Marine Corps Capt. Kelly C. Hinz.

Capt. Hinz was a Marine Corps fighter pilot who died May 2, 2005, from injuries received when the F/A–18 Hornet aircraft he was piloting crashed in Iraq while flying in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Capt. Hinz was a native of Woodbury, Minn., and a 1993 graduate of St. Thomas Academy in Mendota Heights, Minn., where he was a member of the State championship downhill ski team, and where his family remained active after their sons had graduated. Capt. Hinz was also a graduate of the University of St. Thomas, in St. Paul, Minn., in the District I represent.

Capt. Hinz earned his wings as an aviator in March 2002, after which he and his wife Molly were stationed in San Diego. Capt. Hinz and his wife have one daughter, Abby.

Capt. Hinz comes from a military, and flying, family. Donald Hinz was a retired naval and commercial pilot who died in a plane crash in 2004. In his retirement, Donald Hinz had committed himself to restoring a P–51 C Mustang fighter plane in honor of the Tuskegee Airmen. His brother, Ben Hinz, is also a Marine pilot. His brother Kurt has his private pilot's license, and brother Luke will earn his this summer.

Capt. Hinz inherited a strong sense of duty to his country from his father, and reminds us of the human face of Operation Iraqi Freedom. There have been 19 members of the military from Minnesota who have died in Iraq since 2003. I honor Capt. Hinz for his courageous service to this country, and his commitment to protecting our freedom.

CONGRATULATING HORACE L. DICKERSON, JR. ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Horace L. Dickerson, Jr. for his service to the Social Security Administration and to congratulate him on his upcoming retirement. Mr. Dickerson began his career at SSA in 1971 and held several field office positions before moving to Social Security's headquarters as a Division Director, and later Director of Disability Operations.

After a stint as the Director of Social Security's Central Records Operations, Mr. Dickerson was promoted to Regional Commissioner for the Dallas Region in 1997. In that role he has ably overseen more than 4,000 employees in 151 field offices and has been responsible for SSA Teleservice Centers in Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas and part of Arizona.

Mr. Dickerson's work at the Social Security Administration has touched countless lives in these States, where one in every six residents is a Social Security beneficiary. Under his stewardship, SSA has distributed $49 billion in benefits each year and has processed, on average, 740,000 benefit claims annually.

Since becoming Regional Commissioner, Mr. Dickerson has been recognized several times for his outstanding leadership qualities. He is the two-time recipient of the Award as a Meritorious Executive in the Senior Executive Service. Mr. Dickerson has also been named a Distinguished Executive in Senior Executive Service and received the Presidential Distinguished Rank Award in 1999. Most recently, Mr. Dickerson was inducted as a Fellow into the National Academy of Public Administration, an impressive recognition from his peers of Mr. Dickerson's many accomplishments.

For his service to my constituents, the State of Texas and the country, I offer Mr. Dickerson my most sincere congratulations and wish him the best of luck in his well-deserved retirement.

HONORING RICHARD GALLO

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Richard Gallo, owner and president of Gallo Office Products in Indiana, Pennsylvania, who has been named a NFIB Small Business Champion Award Winner for 2005. The NFIB Small-Business Champion award program identifies a smallbusiness activist in each of the 50 States who have distinguished themselves through their involvement and participation in NFIB programs and activities.

Within months of starting his own business in 1992, Richard Gallo joined NFIB and has worked ever since to support Main Street small businesses. As an elected official, candidate for State office, civic leader, and NFIB member, Richard has been a tireless advocate for his community and a supporter for the free enterprise system.

As a committed member for over thirteen years, Richard Gallo is currently serving his second term on the NFIB/Pennsylvania Leadership Council as a vice president. Prior to his election as a LC vice president, Richard served as chairman of the Area Action Council—Pennsylvania's first AAC.

On top of his local NFIB leadership, Rich has supported the NFIB Young Entrepreneur Foundation Scholarship program, which encourages entrepreneurship in young Americans. Rich has testified before both Congress and the Pennsylvania State legislature. In 1999, Rich testified before the U.S. House Committee on Small Business concerning small-business health plans (formerly known as AHPs). In 2000, he testified before the Pennsylvania House Select Committee on Pharmaceuticals, and in 2004 Richard testified before the Pennsylvania House State Government Committee on Contract Bundling. Rich has represented NFIB at several Presidential events and has also worked actively to help the sales team to recruit new NFIB members, including attending drive-a-longs with sales representatives. In addition to his extensive activities with NFIB, Richard is a long time community activist. Richard recently retired as Indiana Borough Council vice president and has run three times for the state legislature. In 1994, Richard was named Indiana County's Republican Man of the Year, and he also served as the State Board Vice Chairman of the Yokefellowship Prison Ministry. He is a past president of the Indiana Lions Club, a board member of a local YMCA, an Indiana Midday Rotary Club member, and a member of the Indiana County Chamber of Commerce.

Richard Gallo's contribution to America's small businesses, NFIB, and his surrounding community is truly invaluable. I am proud of his efforts to strengthen the economy and the engine of our economy, small business.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation, which expands stem cell research and ensures that the Federal Government can implement ethical guidelines. This bill will provide hope and opportunity for millions of Americans suffering from chronic and life threatening health conditions. This legislation will also ensure that the Federal Government can implement ethical guidelines over this research.

On August 9, 2001, President Bush announced that for the first time, Federal funds would be used to support research on human embryonic stem cells, but funding was to be limited to ''existing stem cell lines where the life and death decision has already been made.'' Prior to this decision, no Federal funds had been used to support research on stem cells derived from either embryos or fetal tissue. Previous experiments involving stem cells were conducted privately, with no ovesight or public input.

I believe that the expansion of funding to stem cell research is an effective way of moving this science forward. Stem cells offer remarkable potential contributions to medical science and improve the lives of millions of people who suffer from incurable diseases such as juvenile diabetes, Alzheimers's, Parkinson's, AIDS, and spinal cord injuries. It may also help us to understand abnormal cell growth that occurs in cancer and birth defects and change the way we develop drugs and test them for safety and potential efficacy.

Former First Lady Nancy Reagan and 69 percent of Americans are in favor of the expansion of stem cell research. This effort is supported by over 200 patient groups, universities, and scientific societies, and has been endorsed by more than 75 national and local newspapers and eighty Nobel Laureates.

It is imperative that we support efforts to improve the quality of life. I am pleased that we have the opportunity to move this important bill forward today, and it is my hope that the Senate will do the same. Unfortunately, the President has indicated that he will veto efforts to expand stem cell research—even H.R. 810 which only proposes to allow stem cell research on discarded embryos with the donor's consent. In this case, the President is clearly choosing radical ideology over American lives.

THANKING MRS. ROSE AVALOS FOR HER SERVICE TO THE ALDINE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the work and dedication that Mrs. Rose Avalos, Principal of MacArthur High School, has done in the Aldine Independent School District and North Houston community for the last 33 years. She has led MacArthur High School to become a leader in academic achievement regardless of the socio-economic status of its students.

Mrs. Avalos's strong family upbringing enabled her to commit herself to others in educating the children of her own community. She is a role model for all of Aldine ISD as she was one of the first graduates of MacArthur High School in 1968. After graduating from Sam Houston State University, she went on to become a teacher in Aldine ISD and her success as a teacher led to her promotion as Principal of MacArthur High School in 1994.

Through her leadership, student test scores rose consistently and her commitment to educating all students was evident to everyone in the community when the school reached exemplary status in 2001–02. She gained the respect of her teachers, counselors, coaches, and support and administrative staff by setting high goals for the school and achieving them.

Mrs. Avalos will be greatly missed and thanks to her success, the next principal has a steady foundation to build upon. Again, we applaud the efforts of Mrs. Avalos and wish her well in her future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO WALTER J. ZABLE ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to a leading San Diego citizen who, on this day, is celebrating his 90th birthday. Walter J. Zable, the founder of Cubic Corporation, has served as the chairman, president and CEO of the corporation for five decades.

Walt Zable formed Cubic in 1951 with just one product and plenty of grit and determination. Today, Cubic Corporation is a $722 million company that employs 1,200 in the San Diego area and nearly 6,000 employees worldwide.

Prior to forming Cubic in 1951, Mr. Zable was project supervisor in charge of electronics for the Atlas and Terrier missiles, and the microwave and antenna development sections at General Dynamics Convair. His background includes engineering and management posts

with Sperry Gyroscope Company, where he directed development of fire control, guidance, communications, and command and control systems. He also held key technical, scientific and administrative positions with Federal Telecommunications Laboratories of ITT, Flight Research Company, and Newport News Shipyard and Drydock Company.

Before launching his engineering career, Mr. Zable was a professional football player for the Richmond Arrows and the New York Giants. He went on to receive numerous sports honors, including the 1962 SPORTS ILLUSTRATED Silver Anniversary All-American Team and induction into William and Mary's Hall of Fame in 1969. In 1971, he established the Walter J. Zable/San Diego Chapter of the National Football Foundation and College Hall of Fame (NFFCHF) to help preserve the genuine sportsmanship and integrity exhibited in high school and college football.

He credits the Boston school system for his success in business, because "if it weren't for athletics during the depression years, it would have been difficult to go to college," said Mr. Zable, who received a full football scholarship from the College of William and Mary. Today, he's still dedicated to helping other young student-athletes realize their dreams and reach their full academic and athletic potential through the NFFCHF local chapter, which is among more than 100 chapters in the country.

Recognized as Cubic's largest and most visible community relations project, the Walter J. Zable/San Diego Chapter has helped further the careers of the hundreds of honorees, including sports giants such as former San Diego Charger Junior Seau and Mark Malone, a sports broadcaster and former Pittsburgh Stealers quarterback. In 1987, the NCAA acknowledged his contribution to athletics by naming Walter Zable a winner of the Teddy Roosevelt Award, its most prestigious honor. Other winners of this award have included President George Bush, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Senator Leverett Saltonstall.

In addition to his work in helping young student-athletes, Walter Zable and his company give generously to charitable causes, most of them benefiting children. He has also set up a $10 million endowment that will become effective for the College of William and Mary upon the deaths of Walter and his wife, Betty.

Walter Zable is a humble man who eschews the limelight and would rather see the focus be on his company and its hardworking employees. However, I think even he would be willing to make an exception for this special recognition for reaching his 90th birthday. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Walter J. Zable on attaining this significant milestone and wish him many more years in the company of his loving wife and family.

H.R. 1279, THE GANG DETERRENCE AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment with H.R. 1279, the Gang Deterrence and Community Protection Act.

The Gang Deterrence and Community Protection Act will neither deter youth from entering gangs nor add protections to our community. This legislation increases the use of the death penalty, creates new mandatory minimum sentences, and subjects more juveniles to trial as adults. I believe strongly that criminals must be punished and that we need to do more to deter our youth from entering gangs. However, research shows that these measures do not have their intended effect of reducing crime, have been misapplied based on race, are not the assistance requested by law enforcement, and do not address the reasons given by youth for their participation in gangs. In fact, this bill does nothing to address the real problems facing our youth or the needs of local law enforcement working with youth on a daily basis.

This year, in order to make room for tax cuts for the wealthy, the President and House Republicans have chosen to cut the very programs that provide hope and opportunity for youth. In his Fiscal Year 2006 budget, the President proposed eliminating funding for Safe and Drug Free Schools and freezing funding for after school programs. He also proposed eliminating funding for TRIO programs, which offer the opportunity for disadvantaged students to access higher education and for many job training programs currently serving youth in our communities.

Republicans have also chosen to cut funding for local law enforcement by eliminating funding for the COPS program and Byrne grant dollars which are vital to ensuring our peace officers have the training and manpower they need to keep our communities safe. In addition, Republican Leadership has failed to keep promises to fund juvenile justice programs that promote prevention and early intervention.

Investments in our youth and in local law enforcement will reduce crime and improve the safety of our neighborhoods. Law enforcement needs adequate equipment, training, and personnel. In order to succeed, children need recreational opportunities, a quality education, and role models to provide a positive example. Families need to have safe housing, access to health care, and the opportunities for good-paying jobs. Our priority should be investing in families—not prisons. For these reasons, I opposed H.R. 1279.

FREEDOM FOR ALFREDO MANUEL PULIDO LÓPEZ

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Alfredo Manuel Pulido López, a political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Pulido López is a dentist, an independent journalist and a member of the Christian Liberation Movement. He believes in writing and speaking the truth about the nightmare that is the Castro regime. As a dentist, trained in protecting and nurturing human life, he could not tolerate the tyrant's incessant abuse of Cuban people. He understood the human condition and he knew that freedom is infinitely superior to the ills of tyranny and repression.

On March 18, 2003, as part of the dictator's condemnable crackdown on peaceful pro-democracy activists, Mr. Pulido López was arrested because of his belief in liberty over repression. In a sham trial, he was sentenced to 14 years in the inhuman, totalitarian gulag.

Mr. Pulido López' wife, Rebeca Rodriguez, described the abhorrent treatment of her husband in a phone call with Reporters Without Borders. She said:

> My husband has 11 ailments, seven of them chronic. They include high blood pressure, liver problems, malnutrition and migraines aggravated by cervical osteoporosis. He has permanent bronchitis which affects his breathing and gastric problems that are the cause of rectal bleeding. I don't know all of the problems. The prison officials know. But my husband has not been hospitalized since August 2004. He is in a critical condition and that's the price paid by all those who have wanted to defend human rights in Cuba.

Reporters Without Borders also reports that Mr. Pulido López he has been placed in solitary confinement. According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2004, he has been "held in 'punishment cells,' which usually were located in the basement of a prison, with continuous semi dark conditions, no available water, and a hole for a toilet." This is in addition to the grotesque depravity of the gulag that also includes beatings, isolation, denial of medical treatment to detainees and other forms of condemnable abuse.

Mr. Pulido López is a brilliant example of the heroism of the Cuban people. No matter how horrifically brutal the consequences of a dignified struggle for liberty, the totalitarian dungeons are full of men and women of all backgrounds and ages who represent the best of the Cuban nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must speak out and act against this abominable disregard for human rights, human dignity, and human freedom just 90 miles from our shore. My Colleagues, we must demand the immediate and unconditional release of Alfredo Manuel Pulido López and every political prisoner in totalitarian Cuba.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on June 16, 2005 during rollcall vote No. 268. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H.R. 2862, the FY06 Science, State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill.

COMMENDING COAST GUARD AUXILIARY FLOTILLA 11–08 D1NR AT AIR STATION CAPE COD

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 11–08 D1NR for their distinguished service at Air Station Cape Cod. As a

former member of the Coast Guard Reserve, and as Co-Chair of the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus, I know full well the vital role that Auxillarists carry out. They are an integral and valued part of the Coast Guard family.

I commend to my colleagues the following article from The Navigator, which showcases the dedicated efforts of Auxillarists like the men at Air Station Cape Cod.

[From the Navigator, Spring 2005]

VALUED SERVICE

CAPE COD.—Members of Auxiliary Flotilla 11–08 D1NR just surpassed the one year milestone in their volunteer service to Coast Guard Air Station Cape Cod.

A dedicated team of seven Auxilarists has been providing an extremely valuable service in the Aviation Engineering Department of Air Station Cape Cod since November 2003.

By performing administrative tasks, which require meticulous attention to detail and frequent repetition, they freed up over 300 work hours that would have otherwise been a burden on the over tasked active duty workforce.

Aircraft maintenance technicians, who also serve as flight crewmembers, are frequently task-saturated with flying duties related to search and rescue, law enforcement, and Homeland Security missions.

When they are not flying, the active duty workforce is fully employed with HU–25 and HH–60 maintenance responsibilities. The regular presence of trained volunteers to assume critically important administrative functions has had an extremely positive effect on aircraft and crew readiness postures.

Working together in cohesive teams, Auxiliary volunteers dedicate as much as 15 hours per week to administrative tasks related to aircraft maintenance.

One of the first and most successful projects this team took on was the monthly audit of the aircraft maintenance logbooks for the eight aircraft assigned to Air Station Cape Cod.

Working teams of two, these Auxiliarists compared the computer printed configuration reports of all installed components to the detailed component history reports. Ensuring that the lists of installed components matched the component history reports was an arduous task requiring great attention to detail.

An accurately performed logbook audit required that each component be cross checked for the proper serial number and part number against two computer generated reports for all major airframe and engine instillations. With over 240 such components per aircraft, this monthly review normally consumes eight to ten man hours per month.

Another vital maintenance support role that the Auxiliary recently performed was a comprehensive audit of the technical publications library.

Semi-annual audits of the technical publications library are required to ensure that vital technical publications are updated with the latest revisions. Not only did the dedicated Auxiliary team complete the audit, they also performed several page changes to aircraft technical manuals that are used by technicians on a regular basis.

The Auxiliary team drew from their diverse work experience to develop processes that increased the efficiency of each hour dedicated to administrative actions. In the classic case of working smarter to avoid the need to work harder, they created a photographic archive of all tools requiring calibration and cataloged them in an easy to use binder. This made tracking tool locations and calibration intervals much easier.

With aircraft tools and avionics test sets distributed among five different shops and two separate hangars, the Auxiliary team had a daunting task ahead of them.

Fortunately, their previous work experience lent itself well to the arduous task and they made great progress. One of their first initiatives was to catalog each tool according to its location and function in a binder complete with digital photographs which they took themselves. This greatly eased the burden of sorting through the Precision Measurement Equipment Lab (PMEL) report which lists the items that were due for calibration.

By relieving active duty members of certain administrative functions, the Auxiliary team has significantly enhanced productivity and morale. Auxiliary members committed over 400 hours in direct support of aviation maintenance activities. Representing a significant departure from the traditional uses of Auxiliary members at air stations, the innovative management practices of this Auxiliary team made it possible for active duty members to be relieved of support roles and assigned to maintenance or flight related tasks.

This was only possible because the highly talented Auxiliary team gained the skill and ability to act autonomously within the scope of their responsibilities after receiving initial training and guidance from active duty members.

The Auxiliary members also represent a degree of continuity that, as a result of frequent job rotations within the enlisted workforce, has historically resulted in frequent learning curves. Realizing the impact of their commitment, technicians on the hangar deck accept the Auxiliary members as part of the team that makes Air Station Cape Cod one of the best units in the Coast Guard.

INTRODUCTION OF NATIVE AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to introduce legislation to provide assistance to Native American entrepreneurs throughout the country. This bill authorizes grants that Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs) can apply for to provide assistance with outreach, development, and enhancement on Indian lands of small business startups and expansions that are owned by Indian tribe members, Alaska Natives, or Native Hawaiians.

I introduced this legislation during the 107th and 108th Congresses and it passed the House overwhelmingly both times but it did not pass the Senate. I am pleased to reintroduce this legislation today and wish to thank Small Business Committee Chairman MANZULLO, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, as well as Representatives OBERSTAR, CASE, GRIJALVA, ABERCROMBIE, MCDERMOTT, REYES, HONDA, HASTINGS, PALLONE, YOUNG, TOWNS, MATHESON, HERSETH, CUBIN, MCCOLLUM, and MORAN for their support.

While economic data shows much uncertainty for our national economy, the effects from our struggling economy are desperate on our Native American lands. The unemployment rate is over 10 times the national average on Native American lands and Native Americans and Native Alaskans have almost double the poverty rate than the national average.

There is, however, a bright spot. Small business creation has drastically increased on tribal lands, which has lead to job growth in these areas. In fact, in recent decades, Native American business growth and gross receipts have dwarfed overall small business growth rates and total gross receipts. You can see why there is a reason to be optimistic. As we all know, small businesses are the fuel for the engine of economic growth. That is why it is so imperative that we take steps to help ensure that small business development reaches the places in this country where economic prosperity has yet to be realized.

My bill ensures that Native Americans, Native Alaskans and Native Hawaiians seeking to create, develop and expand small businesses, have full access to the counseling and technical assistance available through the SBA's SBDC program. The business development tools offered by the SBDCs can assist Native Americans with the information and opportunity to build sustainable businesses in their communities.

Additionally, this legislation requires a state receiving a small business development center program grant to request the advice of the governing bodies of Indian tribes, corporations organized pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and other Alaska Native entities, and Native Hawaiian organizations, as appropriate, on how best to provide assistance to such members, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians and where to locate satellite centers to provide—such assistance. This ensures assistance from the SBDC that is culturally sensitive and appropriate.

It is clear we can do more to aid Native American entrepreneurs. Not enough has been done to assist Native Americans in building their businesses, which in turn helps benefit their communities. I hope to change that with my proposal.

I look forward to passage of this bill, and to the day it is signed into law.

ON THE PASSING OF MS. BRENDA PILLORS, CHIEF OF STAFF TO REP. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to send my deepest condolences and prayers to the family, friends and colleagues of my good friend Brenda Pillors, especially to her partner Mr. Marwan Burgan and my good friend and colleague Congressman ED TOWNS from New York.

I first met Brenda at the very beginning of her congressional career over 25 years ago when I was a congressional staffer to my predecessor Representative Ronald V. Dellums and she was a Congressional Black Caucus fellow. Her legacy of service to this institution, the CBC, and the 10th Congressional District of New York is one of the most memorable careers during a truly historic era. Serving as legislative assistant and eventually as legislative director, Brenda was instrumental

when former Representatives Shirley Chisholm and Walter Fauntroy traveled to visit Haitian refugees in detention camps. My recollections of their great work continue to inspire my activism for rights of Haitians.

As one of the last two Chisholm staff still working on the Hill, Brenda played a leadership role, in coordinating the Congressional Black Caucus memorial service that Congressman TOWNS and I organized earlier this year. Brenda and I sat next to each other during Shirley Chisholm's funeral in Florida, and I will always remember those moments, sharing our grief and our memories of Chisholm's legacy. Looking back at that time, I never imagined that we would be mourning another great woman only six months later.

Brenda Pillors was solid as a rock. Humble, caring, wise and considerate, the knowledge, presence and spirit of Brenda will be missed by all. And her respect, her dignity, and her beauty will be remembered by many. My thoughts and prayers are with all who knew and loved her.

PATIENT NAVIGATOR, OUTREACH, AND CHRONIC DISEASE PREVENTION ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2005

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I'd like to begin by commending the distinguished Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful for your leadership on and commitment to moving this important legislation forward.

I'd also like to extend a special thanks to my friend and colleague, Mr. BOB MENENDEZ. He has been a great partner over the last few years as we've worked on this initiative together.

We represent different parts of the country and belong to different political parties, but we have put any differences aside and have joined together for a great purpose here today.

We join together because we understand that cancer, diabetes and other chronic diseases can affect anyone in any part of the country, of any race, of any income level.

Because even with the tremendous advancements we have made in prevention, diagnosis and treatment of illnesses, we understand that in far too many communities across this country, navigating the health care system can be a significant barrier to gaining access to quality and affordable health care services.

I also want to highlight the American Cancer Society, the National Association of Community Health Centers, the National Rural Health Association, and other organizations for their tireless efforts to educate our colleagues about this important issue and advocate for this legislation.

Madam Speaker, today Congress is taking a significant step forward to insure that our friends and neighbors across America have the tools and resources they need to make good decisions about their health and the health of their children.

I am grateful to have had the opportunity to meet two gentlemen who pioneered the concept that this legislation is based on—the "patient navigator" concept.

Dr. Harold Freeman and Dr. Elmer Huerta are two of the most humble, kind gentlemen I have had the good fortune of getting to know. Let me tell you a little about what they do.

First, they recognized from their own work as doctors in underserved communities that navigating the health care system can be an insurmountable barrier for many people, especially when they are poor, under-insured, or uninsured. All we have to do is step out of our homes and into our communities to find families and individuals who struggle to find and access the health care services they need—both preventive services and treatment.

Enter Dr. Freeman and Dr. Huerta's patient navigator concept. Patient navigators are the angels who guide individuals through the health care system. This is truly one of the most creative and innovative ways to address the health care needs of these individuals who may otherwise avoid seeing a doctor when they're healthy and getting the treatment they need when they're sick.

Whether based at hospitals, community health centers, or cancer centers, these programs literally put in place patient navigators to help individuals find their way through the often complex health care system.

These navigators, like Leka Murdock who I met during my visit to the Ralph Lauren Cancer Center in Harlem, assist people who come through their doors with obtaining coverage through Medicaid or other sources, obtain cancer screenings or counseling about disease prevention, or make referrals for treatment or clinical trial options should an abnormality be detected.

For people who may otherwise not know how or be able to access health care services, patient navigator programs offer them the tools and resources they need to make good decisions about their health and the health of their children. They help break through the red tape that often prevents them from even getting the information they need to find a doctor or get treated.

I know that walking into a facility that is even associated with cancer is a daunting challenge in and of itself. To see the words cancer screening or chemotherapy this way is just terrifying. But the fact of the matter is, we still live in a world where people suffer from cancer. And while we are waging the war on cancer, but we have not yet won.

So until that day comes, we must commit to offering our family members, friends, and neighbors, both young and old, insured and un-insured, the best care in the best facilities we can create. Dr. Freeman's Ralph Lauren Cancer Center and a similar program right here in D.C. at the Washington Hospital Center run by Dr. Huerta are model programs that should be commended and emulated.

That's why Congressman MENENDEZ and I partnered together to introduce, garner support for, and move forward this legislation that will create innovative demonstrations projects in communities across the country based on the patient navigator concept.

This bill will link sustained health promotion outreach efforts with patient navigation programs. Specifically, the bill will make funds available to community health centers, cancer centers, rural and frontier serving medical facilities, and other eligible entities to increase and promote chronic disease prevention screening, outreach and public health education, as well as provide patient navigators to help patients overcome barriers and complexities around the health care system.

It is my hope that this legislation will serve as a springboard for launching many more patient navigator programs, like those of Dr. Freeman and Dr. Huerta. These extraordinary programs are making a real difference in the lives of people who suffer from cancer and other diseases.

People who may not otherwise even know they're sick.

Or if they do, people who may not do what is necessary to get proper treatment and care.

These are the people we need to reach and this bill is a healthy start.

By furthering this collaboration between the private and public sectors, we will maximize our resources and close in on that day when cancer and other chronic diseases no longer threaten the lives of our loved ones.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL IMAGEN AWARDS

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud the efforts of the Imagen Foundation. Today, the Imagen Foundation will host its Twentieth Annual Imagen Awards and will bestow special achievement awards to a distinguished group of Latino talent for their outstanding contributions to the entertainment industry.

For the past twenty years, the Imagen Foundation has raised awareness, increased knowledge and encouraged positive portrayal of Latinos and the Latino culture in the media. Under the strong leadership of its founder and president, Helen Hernandez, the Imagen Foundation has fostered countless career opportunities to inspiring Latino actors, writers, and producers.

It is with great pride that I highlight two distinguished individuals who will be recipients of Imagen's special awards tonight. Nina Tassler will be the recipient of Imagen's 2005 Career Achievement Award. As the first Latino to head a major television network, CBS, Nina Tassler has built a remarkable career. She oversees the network's entertainment programming and uses her heritage as a tool to help her be more proactive in showcasing diverse talent. Jose Rivera, a prominent Latino writer, will receive the Norman Lear Writer's Award. He is the author of the Oscar-nominated screenplay, "The Motorcycle Diaries," and a two-time Obie Award-winning playwright whose works have been translated into seven languages.

Through groups such as the Imagen Foundation and people like Helen Hernandez, more doors are opening for Latinos in the entertainment industry. Although we have seen significant progress, there is still much to be done and we need to continue to work together. I was proud to join the Imagen Foundation in hosting a workshop in my district to inform talented Latinos about the entertainment industry and how to break into it. With institutions such

as the Imagen Foundation, who are committed to fighting prejudices and committed to bringing diversity and cultural sensitivity to television and society, I look forward to the accomplishments that are yet to come.

The Imagen Foundation has been an amazing force working to develop, showcase and honor the talent in the Latino community. It is my privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Imagen Foundation.

FATHER'S DAY 2005

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate one of the proudest institutions of human society—the father. This Sunday, many in our country will turn those individuals who often go underappreciated throughout our lives. As a father myself, I know the joys and wonders of being a father and I applaud those fathers that stand up for and behind their children throughout their lives.

Dads are an important aspect of many of our lives. They, like mothers, dedicate their lives to the rearing of their kids. They sacrifice and suffer for the betterment of the family. They fret and worry constantly over the safety and future of their loved ones. Fathers nevertheless play an important role in the lives of the community, intentionally or not. They are an integral part of the national fabric that weaves and connects us to one another and to our collective futures.

Fathers on Father's Day seldom get to the attention and praise that mothers do on Mother's Day. We get interesting ties, not fresh roses. Greeting cards on Father's Days are rarely as lovely and thoughtful. The importance of fathers, like mothers, however is not reflected in the gifts and praises lauded on us. The importance is seen at birthdays and holidays, graduations and weddings. Our biggest accomplishments are turning our little boys into men and our girls into women. That is where our praise comes from.

Nonetheless, I want to acknowledge the fathers of this country today. I want to thank them for spending time with their families, providing the necessities of life to their children, caring and supporting their wives, and being role models for and leaders of their communities. I want to recognize the hard work and sacrifice that they endure for their loved ones and the advice and wisdom they give to guide the family. I applaud their daily efforts, sympathize with their trials and tribulations, and encourage them to persevere through difficult moments. The rewards far outweigh the sacrifices.

I especially want to thank the fathers that are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan today. Their service to this nation means they will not able to hold their kids and their wives on this Father's Day. I also want to thank the fathers of our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan. They too will be unable to hold their kids and their wives because of their service to this country. I have spoken before about my admiration and love for our military forces. The sacrifices they endure for our freedom and safety must be appreciated and we must continue to recognize and honor these men and women on Father's Day and every day.

HONORING JIGGS MANN, RANCHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, our nation includes many traditions and cultures which have influenced our history and our national character. In my area, none is stronger than ranching.

Cowboy Roundup, USA, is an organization dedicated to preserving the Ranching Heritage of Amarillo and the Texas Panhandle. It works to educate the public, ''in the spirit of our ranching ancestry and the lifestyle of the great American Cowboy.''

Each year at the Ranch Rodeo in Amarillo, Texas, which this organization sponsors, an individual is named as ''Rancher of the Year,'' to recognize a lifetime of accomplishment. This year's recipient is W.C. ''Jiggs'' Mann, from my home county, Donley County, Texas.

In thinking about ranchers, the stereotype characters from movies, books, songs, and stories will come to mind for many people. But I think that they would be more impressed to meet the real thing. Jiggs Mann is the real thing.

Jiggs began working on the JA ranch as a schoolboy during the summers of World War II. He rode with the chuck wagon all summer as it moved from pasture to pasture on Texas' second largest ranch, sleeping on the ground and eating by campfire. After returning from serving his country in Korea in 1953, Jiggs went to work at the JA again and served as foreman of the ranch from 1959 until 1969. He leased part of the ranch, running his own cattle, and now runs cattle on his own property in Donley County.

More than his decades of experience with land and cattle, Jiggs Mann was honored because of his character and integrity and because he is a shining example of what a rancher is and should be.

A rancher, like others who make their living off of the land, is a risk taker. His whole year's work can be wiped out by weather, disease, or a tumble in the market.

A rancher is independent and does not look for—or feel entitled to—a hand-out from government or anyone else, but he will drop whatever he is doing, even at considerable sacrifice, to help out a neighbor.

He is honest and straight talking; he has no need to beat-around-the-bush. Mother Nature and the demands of making a living off the land do not allow it for one thing, but more importantly, he comes from a background where a man's word is still his honor. He tells it as he sees it. The strength of what he says is found not so much in the words used but in his integrity.

He works hard—incredibly hard—from sun up until sun down and understands the value of a job well done, whether measured by the depth of his corner post or the number of hay bales stacked in the field. While some of the tools he uses have changed over the years, like steel post drivers or pick-ups with round bale haulers mounted on the back, others have not changed at all, like a good horse. He realizes that some things, however simple they may seem on the surface, will forever stand the test of time, and it is in those things that he puts his faith.

A rancher has to respect nature and all of God's creation or he will not last long. From taking care of the land, which may have been in the family for generations, to helping a cow give birth, or nursing a new calf with a bottle, he understands the give and take that this life demands and the sacrifices necessary to maintain those things we cherish most, our families and our heritage.

These are some of the qualities which this award recognizes. Jiggs Mann is not the only person I know with these qualities, but he is the ''best of the breed.'' It is appropriate to honor him, and through him, this important part of our national character.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM MICHAEL FINE

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bill Fine, who is leaving his position as President and General Manager of Baltimore's WBAL–TV to return to Boston, where he will become Executive Vice President and General Manager, and, in 2006, President of WCVB, a station where he worked as Sales Manager before coming to Baltimore.

Baltimore's loss will be Boston's gain, as Bill has been a pillar of our community. He has selflessly volunteered his time and energy to numerous charitable causes, including the Chesapeake Region 2012 Olympic Coalition and the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. Through these efforts, Bill has established himself as a true civic leader.

At WBAL, he transformed the station into ''the leader in nighttime news'' in Baltimore. Under his leadership, WBAL won the Peabody Award in 2004, the most prestigious award in broadcasting, for its reporting on Chesapeake Bay pollution. WBAL was also named as one of the ''Ten Stations That Do It Right'' by MediaWeek Magazine in 2001.

Bill's accomplishments have been recognized by his peers as well. Baltimore Magazine named him Baltimore's ''Best CEO'' in 2000 and he was selected as one of the ''25 Leaders We Most Admire'' by Baltimore Smart CEO Magazine in 2005. Bill Fine was also awarded the American Advertising Federation's ''Silver Medal Award'' in 2004, in recognition of his ''Outstanding Contributions to Advertising.''

I hope my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in saluting Bill Fine's exemplary record of leadership and service to the Baltimore community. We will miss his presence in our city and we wish him all the best in Boston.

COMMENDING THE ESTABLISHMENT IN COLLEGE POINT, NEW YORK, OF THE FIRST KINDERGARTEN IN THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 47, commending the establishment of the first kindergarten in the United States, in College Point, N.Y.

This legislation praises Conrad Poppenhusen, the Poppenhusen Institute, and the citizens of College Point, New York, for establishing the first early childhood education institution open to the public, in 1854.

This resolution rightly expresses the sense of Congress that the government should recognize the importance of childhood education, and the social and academic enrichment provided to students through free and public kindergartens throughout the Nation.

Studies commissioned by the Department of Education consistently demonstrate that children who attend kindergarten exhibit higher levels of mathematics and reading skills than those who do not.

Children enrolled in kindergarten have consistently and more rapidly acquired skills necessary for success in an academic environment. Additionally, students enrolled in early childhood education are exposed at an early age to students of different racial, cultural, economic, and religious backgrounds, providing valuable learning experiences and aiding in the social development of our Nation's youth.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude by again expressing my support for this legislation and encouraging my colleagues to support it. The time has come for our government to recognize and honor the establishment of our Nation's kindergartens, the very institutions that equip our children with the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in school and life while also providing a diverse environment in which to learn and grow.

CONGRATULATING CITY OF COCONUT CREEK

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the City of Coconut Creek for its designation as a ''community wildlife habitat'' by the National Wildlife Federation. Coconut Creek becomes the first city in Florida and the eleventh city in the Nation to receive this environmental recognition.

In order to receive such a designation, criteria set by the National Wildlife Federation mandates that applicants must have a number of homes declared as back yard wildlife habitats while establishing habitats at schools and residential complexes. In addition, applicants must also create educational programs about various wildlife within the city.

Facing these various guidelines, residents of Coconut Creek met the challenge by planting trees and various gardens around the city. City Manager John Kelly stated, ''They tackled the project and took it as their own. And it's been a wonderful instrument for getting the word out about the environment in our schools.''

Mr. Speaker, Coconut Creek, located in Broward County, was incorporated in 1967. Today, with a population of 48,000, the city takes great pride in promoting itself as an environmentally friendly community. In fact, Coconut Creek is considered the Butterfly Capital of the World.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent the city of Coconut Creek and its residents in the House of Representatives. I congratulate Mayor Gerber, the City Commission and the residents of Coconut Creek on being designated a ''community wildlife habitat.''

IN HONOR OF REESE EDWARD PHILLIPS

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Reese Edward Phillips of Milford, Delaware. Known to his family and friends as ''Pappy,'' Mr. Phillips was born in Zion Grove, Pennsylvania on May 5th, 1916.

Mr. Phillips was a deeply patriotic man who went to great lengths to defend our freedom. A proud veteran of the United States Air Force, his 32-year career in the military spanned both World War II and the Korean War. Although he retired from the service in 1972, Mr. Phillips would continue his unwavering devotion to our Nation's veterans for the rest of his life.

Mr. Phillips was instrumental in the planning and development of countless projects for Delaware's veterans, including the Delaware Veterans Cemeteries located in Bear and Millsboro, the state's first veterans home, and the establishment of the Governor's Veterans Advisory Council, known today as the Delaware Commission of Veterans Affairs. Mr. Phillips would serve with distinction on the Commission from its creation until his recent passing, a period that included tenure as Chairman from 1991–1992.

In addition to these projects, Mr. Phillips was actively involved in other community organizations, including membership in the Walter L. Fox Post #2 in Dover, the Disabled American Veterans Department of Delaware, and the Calvary United Methodist Church in Milford.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, Reese Edward Phillips was a persistent man whose community involvement greatly benefited the entire state of Delaware. Those of us with the good fortune to know Mr. Phillips were touched by his kindness and caring. While he is greatly missed by his family and friends, ''Pappy'' will always be remembered for the work he has done on behalf of the veterans of our great Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I underwent corrective hernia surgery on June 13, and I was unable to record my vote during the consideration of legislation earlier this week, including the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill for Science, State, Commerce and Justice.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall votes Nos. 241, 242, 244, 246, 248, 252, 254, 255, 256, 258, 261, 264, 268, 270, 271, and 272.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall votes Nos. 243, 245, 247, 249, 250, 251, 253, 257, 259, 260, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 269, and 273.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPIATIONS ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in reluctant support of this bill.

It needs to be passed, and I will vote for it, but in my opinion it falls short of what is needed to adequately fund a number of important purposes.

As Ranking Member of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science, I am pleased that the bill includes $16.5 billion for NASA funding. NASA's working in human space exploration, space and earth science, and aeronautics plays an important role in advancing our knowledge, expanding our economy and inspiring Americans both young and old. I believe NASA performs important research which allows us to better understand our climate, the creation of our planet and the universe beyond.

I am encouraged that the Committee did not cut NASA's aeronautics budget by $54 million as the President had requested. Progress in aeronautics is crucial to the health of the Nation's air transportation industry, which in turn is crucial both to the continued strength of our domestic economy and to our international competitiveness. Aeronautics research and development can enable advances in the capability of our Nation's air transportation system to handle the enormous increases in air travel projected over the next 20 years. Aeronautics R&D can enable more environmentally compatible commercial aircraft, with significantly lower noise, emissions, and energy consumption compared to aircraft in commercial service today.

I am also pleased that the Committee includes $40 million more than the President's

request for earth science programs. These programs have taken a significant cut in recent years even though they have delivered important scientific data.

I am a strong supporter of the servicing of the Hubble Space Telescope and am happy to see that this bill expresses support for a fourth servicing mission to Hubble. However, I had hoped the bill would provide more detailed guidance regarding the amount of funds to be used for the Hubble servicing mission. I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure that a Hubble servicing mission takes place and that it is provided with necessary funding.

This bill also provides significant funding for the President's exploration initiative. I support the President's Vision for Space Exploration and believe human space exploration is a worthwhile undertaking. However, NASA's exploration plans are currently in flux. NASA Administrator Michael Griffin has expressed a desire to accelerate the development of the Crew Exploration Vehicle, and Project Prometheus is being restructured. These are just a few examples of the possible changes to the Exploration program at NASA. So in light of the relatively immature state of the Exploration program, I believe we need to proceed cautiously and thoughtfully while ensuring that the demands of the exploration mission do not take away from other core missions.

We are currently faced with a tight budget, and I realize we need to make very difficult decisions about the Federal budget. However, I am concerned that we are not investing enough in science and research and development, which has the effect of strengthening and expanding our economy.

I am also pleased that the bill includes $106 million for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP). MEP serves small and medium sized manufacturing companies nationally to enhance their ability to compete globally. Every Federal dollar appropriated for MEP leverages $2 in state and private-sector funding, which means that a small federal investment of $106 million translates into billions of dollars in benefits for the economy in terms of jobs created and retained, investment, and sales. The appropriators' acknowledgment of MEP's importance is welcome—especially as manufacturers continue to experience tough economic times.

And, because of its importance for my own Congressional District, I am glad to note that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) budget includes $45 million for construction and specifically $9.4 million for the completion of the Boulder Central Utility Plant. NIST's Boulder laboratories were built in the 1950s and are in critical need of modernization to ensure the continuation of world-class research.

However, my support for the bill is reluctant for the reasons I have expressed year after year—namely, that it provides inadequate funding for the Department of Commerce laboratories in my district in Colorado—NIST and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

The NOAA budget took a cut of 13 percent over the FY05 level and has been the target to draw from for other programs in the bill during debate on the floor. The office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR), which funds the important work being conducted in the labs in my district, is funded at $326 million in the bill—down from $337 million in FY05. NOAA performs vital research in climate change, cooperates with NASA on Earth observations, monitors our oceans and provides Americans with important weather forecasting that affects one-third of all industries in our country. A 13-percent cut to this agency means not only cuts to important research but also to Americans jobs. If we do not support and protect this research and these jobs, we cannot continue to be a leader in oceanic and atmospheric research.

NIST also fared poorly in this bill—receiving a cut of $150 million from the FY05 budget. I am specifically concerned that the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) received no funding. While I believe this is an important and worthy program, if this body intends to eliminate its funding, at a minimum we need to provide close-out costs associated with its termination. The Views and Estimates of the FY06 budget signed by Democratic and Republican members of the House Science Committee identified at least $33 million in close-out costs which will have to be absorbed by NIST labs, resulting in cuts to research programs.

The Small Business Administration also has not fared well. I am disappointed by the anemic investment made by the Bush Administration and Congress in our Nation's small businesses. Although small businesses are the top job creator in this country, the Small Business Administration (SBA) budget is one of the hardest hit in the bill. While the bill improves upon the budget request by reinstating the microloan program and 7a loan program, more needs to be done. We must not turn our back on America's economic future.

My reactions are also mixed regarding the Justice Department portion of the bill.

For example, I was glad to see that under the bill as it came to the floor the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) would have received an increase of $54 million over the FY05 budget. I was supportive of this increase because I think it is important that we provide states with this reimbursement. However, I could not support the Dreier amendment that took funds out of the already dramatically cut NOAA budget to further fund SCAAP. Year after year, NOAA programs have faced budgetary cuts, which translate into degraded ability to perform its world-class research, and a loss of American jobs.

I voted for some amendments intended to improve the bill. Some were adopted, including the Baird amendment to increase funding for the COPS program, but others were not.

In particular, I am very glad that the House approved the amendment to limit the use of Section 215 of the ''Patriot Act'' to obtain information from libraries and bookstores. I hope that the approval of this amendment demonstrates that the Congress will take a similarly thoughtful approach when we consider whether to extend or revise that Act.

However, I was disappointed by the rejection of the amendment to bar prosecution on Federal drug charges of people using marijuana for medical purposes in ways permitted by the laws of Colorado or any other state that permits such use.

I am not a doctor or a lawyer. My support for the amendment was not based on a judgment about the medical value of marijuana or a disagreement with the Supreme Court's decision upholding the constitutionality of the Controlled Substances Act as applied to its use pursuant to a state medical-marijuana law. Instead, it was based on my respect and support for the people of Colorado who voted to allow medical use of marijuana in our state. I think that the Federal government ought to share that respect and not seek to overrule that decision. That would have been the effect of the amendment, which is why I voted for it.

Finally, I am not encouraged by funding levels in the bill for State Department activities.

The State Department as a whole is funded 10 percent less than in FY 2005. Funding for peacekeeping missions is decreased from this year's levels when we take supplemental funds into account, making it harder for the international community to support activities that are ongoing in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Liberia, West Africa, East Timor, Cambodia, Western Sahara, Kosovo and Bosnia. Funding for education and cultural exchange programs is higher than last year but less than the request, which is disappointing at a time when our investment in the non-military sources of foreign policy is more important than ever. Even more disappointing at a time when the President is speaking out about the importance of U.S. democratization efforts is the 15 percent cut to National Endowment for Democracy programs.

In summary, this bill is not all that it should be—but it is not so bad that it should be rejected. I will vote for it and hope that it will improve as the legislative process continues.

COMMENDING ED MESSER FOR EXEMPLARY COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the exemplary public service of Ed Messer, a resident of the Chautauqua County Town of Carroll, upon the occasion of the celebration of his years of dedicated community involvement.

As a young man Ed demonstrated his strength, courage and devotion to his country as a member of the United States Marine League.

Ed's patriotism continues to be evident today, as he devotes his time as an avid member and past Commander of the Frewsburg American Legion and the Chautauqua County American Legion.

Mr. Messer became active in the Town of Carroll Democratic Committee in mid 1970's. During that time he served as the election machine custodian for the Town of Carroll for many years.

Presently Ed serves as the Chairman of the Town of Carroll's Democratic Committee. His success in that role is apparent in the fact that currently, except for town justices, every office in the Town of Carroll including the County Legislator position is held by Democrats.

I ask that we pause to consider the contributions Mr. Ed Messer has made, not just to the Democratic Party in general, but to the people of his community, his county and to western New York as well. Chautauqua County is a better place because of Ed Messer's commitment to public service, and I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to have an opportunity to honor him today.

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN STEVEN C. MILLER, USN

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Captain Steven C. Miller, United States Navy, for his twenty-six years of active duty service to our country. He is the Commanding Officer of the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Corona, California and will retire on June 17, 2005.

Captain Miller graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1979. After being commissioned as an officer he embarked on an extraordinary active duty career as a Surface Warfare Officer. He has deployed throughout the world in support of America's global naval presence and power projection. Captain Miller has served as a Surface Warfare Officer on destroyers, frigates and cruisers. He was the Executive Officer of the USS *Ticonderoga* (CG 47) when she went to war in support of Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm in 1990 and 1991. Captain Miller was hand picked to be the first Commanding Officer of the USS *Stethem* (DDG 63) when she entered service in 1995. Under his leadership, the crew of the *Stethem* earned the coveted Battle ''E'' award for combat readiness in the first year of the ship's service.

Besides being a true warrior at sea, Captain Miller has had a distinguished career ashore. He has served in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations as the Executive Secretary for Joint Chiefs of Staff Affairs and as the Flag Secretary for the Commander Naval Surface Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet. Following his command tour on the USS *Stethem,* Captain Miller shaped the future of the Navy's surface combat force while working on the program start of the DD(X). This new destroyer program will lead the Navy into the twenty-first century. Captain Miller has earned a Master's Degree in National Security Strategy at the Naval War College and qualified as a U.S. Navy Acquisition Professional.

I first met Captain Miller when he assumed command of the Naval Surface Warfare Center in my district. NSWC, Corona provides independent assessment and testing and evaluation to the fleet on weapons systems and operations and provides quality control for the tools our Navy uses to fight the Global War on Terrorism. I have come to know him as a strong leader who accomplishes the mission and takes care of his people.

Captain Steve Miller has done much to preserve our way of life. Our country, our Navy and my community have benefited from his selfless service. He is a fantastic example for today's young people who want to serve their country and for those who dream of attending one of our service academies. He has earned my many thanks. I wish him well in his retirement from the Navy and all his future endeavors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MOORE HIGH SCHOOL AND TOTTENVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. VITO FOSSELLA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the stellar baseball seasons of Moore High School and Tottenville High School. Both of these schools recently completed their seasons with respective City Championships.

Andrew Costello, a Tottenville senior, couldn't have scripted a better ending to his already impressive high school career. The right-hander fired a complete-game three hitter to give the Pirates their third Public School Athletic League city championship in six years. The Pirates finished their season with a 23–1 record, including a 6–0 record in the playoffs.

Costello put his three-pitch arsenal of fastballs, curve balls, and sliders to work against what some considered the city's most talented hitting order and could have hardly been much better. He allowed one earned run, walked one, and struck out seven. He retired the first nine batters that he faced took a no-hitter into the fifth.

Moore Catholic High School, just as Tottenville had, rode the strong arm of their starting pitcher, Nick Doscher. He pitched five of scoreless baseball and even helped his own cause from behind the plate by homering off the left field foul pole.

Moore High School, winners of their second Catholic High School Athletic Association championship, battled adversity through the early stages of the game by failing to score twice with the bases loaded.

Doscher, selected by the Kansas City Royals in the Major League Baseball Amateur Draft overmatched his opponents over the final five innings of play; only allowing one hit and recording seven strikeouts, at one point, retiring twelve in a row.

On behalf of family, friends, fans, and the entire 13th Congressional District of Staten Island and Brooklyn New York, I would like to again congratulate both Tottenville and Moore Catholic High Schools for their outstanding seasons. Each player, coach, and fan should be very proud of their efforts. I commend them for their drive, desire, and sportsmanship that they revealed throughout the season.

REGARDING THE INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2939, THE OCEANS CONSERVATION, EDUCATION, AND NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday represented a giant step forward towards the protection and sustainable management of this nation's largest public trust: our oceans. I introduced OCEANS 21, a comprehensive oceans policy bill that answers the calls of the Pew Oceans Commission and the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, along with other bipartisan co-chairs of the House Oceans Caucus, Curt Weldon of Pennsylvania, Tom Allen of Maine, and Jim Saxton of New Jersey.

Our bill offers a comprehensive legislative solution to crises documented in both of the Oceans Commissions reports by establishing a strong National Oceans Policy that protects, maintains, and restores the health of marine ecosystems. This National Oceans Policy will secure, for present and future generations, the full range of benefits of healthy marine ecosystems—a responsibility that I take quite seriously in my job of representing California's central coast, home to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

The importance of this policy cannot be overstated, as we all depend on our oceans and coasts, from the person who lives off the water to the person who visits the ocean once in a lifetime. The oceans provide food, jobs, vacation spots, as well as opportunities for scientific inquiry, including medical discovery, and personal reflection. Despite our inability to measure the many non-market values associated with our oceans and coasts, we are able to quantify some of the benefits they provide. For example, the ocean economy—the portion of the economy that relies directly on ocean attributes—contributes well over $100 billion to American prosperity. About one tenth of the nation's annual gross domestic product (GDP) is generated in nearshore areas, the relatively narrow strip of land immediately adjacent to the coast. If that area is expanded to include coastal watershed counties, representing about one quarter of the nation's land area, the contribution increases to about half of the nation's GDP. This is a huge economic contribution to our gross domestic product; a contribution that must be protected so the returns keep coming.

Oceans-2I was introduced in the 108th Congress to begin a national dialogue on our coasts and oceans. Since that time, the co-chairs of the House Oceans Caucus have revised the bill based on input from the oceans and fishing communities. This effort reflects continued forward momentum toward the goal of healthy marine ecosystems for present and future generations of Americans. The most substantive changes to the bill from the 108th Congress are to the regional governance and trust fund provisions. The bill would establish Regional Ocean Partnerships that facilitate communication among federal, state, and local management entities. The Oceans and Great Lakes Conservation Trust Fund no longer relies on monies from outer continental shelf activities and instead draws from general revenues.

One of the most common concerns about the 108th Congress bill was that the structure of Regional Governance added an ineffective layer of bureaucracy without helping ecosystem-based management efforts. The integration of ecosystem-based management into current ocean and coastal management regimes must occur incrementally. Regional Ocean Partnerships are a first step toward deliberate and strategic planning for the long term health of our marine ecosystems. The revised language removes regulatory mandates from the Partnership's purview and concentrates instead on planning, removing the extra layer of bureaucracy. Currently, there is no organized forum for communication between federal and state entities responsible for management of coastal and ocean resources.

The successful co-management of the oceans relies on frequent and effective communication.

Fisheries are not only affected by the number of fish we take out of the sea but are also affected by pollution, invasive species, degradation of nursery areas, and other ocean uses. Fishermen have not been able to adequately address or voice their concerns about non-fishing issues that affect their resource. Oceans 21 will give fishing a loud voice by including the executive director of each Regional Fishery Management Council on the corresponding Regional Ocean Partnership. Fishermen need the ability to be effective ocean stewards.

I urge all of my colleagues to dedicate themselves to shaping a better future for our oceans by supporting the House Oceans Caucus Founder's ocean policy bill. Our bill will not only bring U.S. ocean policy into the 21st century, it will set the tone for a future in which our oceans remain vital components of our economy, our communities, and our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a quote from the U.S. Commission Report that encapsulates my thoughts on the urgency of considering OCEANS 21 this session: ''The responsibility of our generation is to reclaim and renew the oceans for ourselves, for our children, and—if we do the job right—for those whose footprints will mark the sands of beaches from Maine to Hawaii long after ours have washed away.''

NAMING THE FEDERAL BUILDING AT 333 MT. ELLIOTT STREET IN DETROIT, MICHIGAN AS THE ''ROSA PARKS FEDERAL BUILDING''

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that would name the Federal Building at 333 Mt. Elliott Street in Detroit, Michigan after Rosa Parks.

Rosa Parks was a seamstress and the secretary of the local NAACP. Mrs. Parks refused to give up her seat on a Montgomery, Alabama bus in December 1955. She was arrested and fined for violating a city ordinance. Her defiance began a movement that ended legal segregation in America and made her an inspiration to people everywhere.

The bus incident led to the formation of the Montgomery Association. The Association called for a boycott against the city-owned bus company. Black people citywide boycotted of the bus system for more than a year. As a result of the boycott and the actions of Rosa Parks, the Supreme Court eventually outlawed racial segregation on public transportation.

Rosa Parks was born Rosa Louise McCauley in Tuskegee, Alabama on February 4, 1913. In 1957, Mrs. Parks and her husband Raymond moved to Detroit. She continued her seamstress career and later served on the staff of Congressman John Conyers. After the death of her husband, she founded the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development. The Institute sponsors leadership programs for youth, including an annual summer program for teenagers called Pathways to Freedom.

Rosa Parks' work helped change history. Her contributions to the Civil Rights Movement brought this country a step closer to equality. Her devotion to the Civil Rights Movement and the city of Detroit will always be remembered.

I believe people who make meaningful contributions to society should be recognized and honored. Naming the Federal Building at 333 Mt. Elliott Street at E. Jefferson after Mrs. Rosa Parks will remind everyone who drives by or visits the building of the contribution she made for Civil Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in honoring the ''Mother of the Civil Rights Movement,'' Mrs. Rosa Parks, by becoming a cosponsor of my legislation to name the Federal Building at 333 Mt. Elliott Street at E. Jefferson in Detroit, Michigan after Rosa Parks. The building will serve as a reminder of her strong sacrifice and unwavering commitment to her community and America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 2005, I inadvertently voted in the affirmative on rollcall No. 234 on H.R. 2744. It was my intention to be recorded as ''no'' on this measure and I offer this clarification for the RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND MONSIGNOR JOSEPH J. GRANATO—GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to offer heartfelt congratulations to Monsignor Joseph J. Granato as he celebrates 50 years in the priesthood. Father Joe, as he is affectionately known was ordained on June 4, 1955, at St. Lucy's Parish in Newark, New Jersey.

As a youngster in his First Ward neighborhood of Newark, Father Joe embraced the Catholic traditions that were intricately woven into the lives of his family and friends. His Catholic school education began at Sacred Heart Cathedral Grammar School and included Our Lady of Good Counsel High School and Seton Hall University. He attended Darlington Seminary where he studied diligently and paid close attention to his prayers of obligation. Although Father Joe yearned for his mom's cooking and the camaraderie of his old neighborhood while in the Seminary, he was appreciative of the jovial exchanges he shared with his fellow seminarians.

Father Joe's religious assignment to St. Lucy's Parish has been a true blessing to him and his congregation. In addition to being close to his own home, Father Joe flourished under the guidance of Father Ruggiero until his death in 1966. Father Joe took responsibility for the CYO, Drum Corps, Children of Mary, Altar Boys, sick calls, First Friday calls and confessions. He was subsequently appointed Administrator in 1971 and in 1977; he was assigned by Archbishop Peter Gerety as the Pastor of his beloved St. Lucy's. On July 16, 1979, Father Joseph J. Granato was awarded the honor of being named Monsignor by His Holiness, John Paul II, which the humble Father Joe attributed to the virtue of the people of St. Lucy's rather than himself. Father Joe has worked hard to transform the neighborhood around St. Lucy's. His leadership along with the cooperation of the city, state and federal government has resulted in the removal of the old abandoned high-rise apartments which have been replaced with new beautiful townhouses.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Monsignor Joseph J. Granato has served his church and the community well over the past 50 years. He has received several awards including the first Msgr. Joseph Granato Italian Culture Award from Seton Hall University and an induction into the Our Lady of Good Counsel Hall of Fame. St. Lucy's Parish is thriving under his guidance and leadership. I know my colleagues join me in wishing Father Joe a very happy 50th anniversary.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF JOHN KACZOROWSKI, PRESIDENT OF THE BUFFALO AFL-CIO

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of Buffalo's wonderful American Federation of Labor–Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO) President, John Kaczorowski.

After nine years of stalwart service as Buffalo's AFO–CIO president, Mr. Kaczorowski chaired his final meeting on February 8, 2005. He has previously served at the Erie County Medical Center and the Erie County Industrial Development Agency. In a previous career, Mr. Kaczorowski was both an autoworker and a union chief for General Motors Corporation, Tonawanda engine plant.

John Kaczorowski has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life for the working men and women of Western New York. His contingent of 75,000 affiliated union workers is among the largest of AFL–CIO members in any congressional district nationwide and he has vigorously campaigned on their behalf. He has organized numerous boycotts and protests, deftly handling both picket lines and conference rooms. This past December Mr. Kaczorowski made national news headlines by organizing a campaign with M-ONE Financial Services to send AT&T phone cards to U.S. troops overseas. He serves on numerous boards, including the Coalition for Economic Justice and the Workforce Development Center.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally proud to call John Kaczorowski my confidant and friend. He is the consummate campaigner—he has the know-how, gravitas and experience to get the job done. His tireless work in my race for U.S. House of Representatives last year was immeasurable. Although he may no longer be Buffalo's labor president, I am fortunate that he will remain a resident of the 27th Congressional District. Once again, I would like to

thank this outstanding gentleman for his munificent service to our community. I wish him well with all his future ventures.

IN MEMORY OF SERGEANT KENNETH J. SCHALL

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen hero—Sergeant Kenneth J. Schall of El Mirage, Arizona.

On May 22, 2005, we tragically lost this soldier of freedom when his military vehicle was involved in an accident. Kenneth was nobly serving his country in Yusafiyah, Iraq as a vital and supportive member of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

At the young age of 22, Kenneth has marked history as a true American hero. He sacrificed his life to protect the citizens of this great Nation and the cause of human freedom. Today, we deeply honor his memory with our profound gratitude and extend our most loving condolences to his family and parents, Mr. and Mrs. John and Terri Schall.

JUNETEENTH, 2005

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, it has been 140 years now since the United States finally severed its ties with the ancient inhumanity of slavery.

At the end of a great civil war—a war fought over slavery and won to eradicate the ''curious institution''—600,000 Americans were dead, but 4 million were freed.

The last of those 4 million were freed 140 years ago Sunday, June 19th, 1865, in Galveston, Texas—by a man named Gordon Granger.

On his arrival in Galveston, Major General Granger of the United States Army, issued General Order Number Three to the people of Texas, informing them of the end of the war and the emancipation of slaves.

As he read the words of President Lincoln's self-consciously legalistic Emancipation Proclamation, the world changed in front of him:

''This [order] involves an absolute equality of rights and rights of property between former masters and slaves, and the connection heretofore existing between them becomes that between employer and free laborer.''

The United States, the first nation in history ''conceived in liberty and founded on the proposition that all men are created equal,'' was, at long last, fulfilling that conception and proposition for the millions of African-Americans whose freedom had theretofore been denied.

Juneteenth, then, is not merely a celebration for African-Americans, or for Texans—it is a celebration for all men in all times.

It should instead be a celebration of humanity itself, and of the human race's universal yearning to be free.

How many Americans—black and white—joined in arms decades after emancipation, to pass along the gift of human freedom to the continent of Europe in World War II?

How many more risked and gave their lives together in the Cold War against communist aggression?

How many more today are serving together to bring a new emancipation to the people of Afghanistan and Iraq, who for too long have suffered under slave-like conditions at the hands of their oppressors?

The answer? As many as it takes.

Americans of all races today are joined in our hope for the freedom of all mankind, and will stand united against any enemy who would deny any people their human rights.

Juneteenth, then, is a reminder not simply of the great freedom won 140 years ago, but of the great freedom to be secured in the coming years, around the world.

COMMEMORATION OF JUNETEENTH DAY

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to celebrate the 140th Anniversary of Juneteenth Day. Today we remember the events of June 19, 1865, when Major General Gordon Granger led his Union troops through Galveston, Texas, to spread the news of the Emancipation Proclamation. This was more than two years after President Lincoln issued this directive. Initially celebrated by African Americans who had been slaves in the southwest, Juneteenth Day officially commemorates the ending of slavery in the United States.

This important anniversary represents how far we have come as a nation. With an emphasis on freedom, education, and achievement, Juneteenth Day recognizes the ending of one of the most sinister periods in our Nation's history and the beginning of a new era of liberty, not just for the slaves that were freed, but for all Americans.

Today, a growing number of Americans celebrate Juneteenth Day. People of all faiths, races, and creeds from cities and towns across our country are gathering together to both rejoice in the progress this Nation has made and reflect upon how much work there is still to be done. We celebrate this day by spending time with our close friends and family, enjoying ourselves and listening to others.

In my own district in the State of Maryland, Juneteenth Day is being observed at Fort McHenry. In addition, on June 22nd, the members of the Boys and Girls Club of Central Maryland will re-enact the events of that historic day.

By celebrating this holiday, we recognize the progress that this Nation has made in advancing the fundamental values to which we, as a country hold true—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in celebrating this monumental day. Juneteenth Day has become part of the fabric of this Nation's history, and deserves to be acknowledged and celebrated.

OUTSTANDING HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS, FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the following high school students from the First Congressional District of New Mexico have been awarded the Congressional Certificate of Merit. These are exceptional students that serve the community and participate actively in school and civic activities. It is my pleasure to be able to recognize these outstanding students for their accomplishments. Their parents, their teachers, their classmates, the people of New Mexico, and I are proud of them.

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AWARD WINNERS 2005

Juanita Martizes, Albuquerque High School; Laura Rogers, Cibola High School; Britten Smith, Highland High School; Gary R. Stinnet, La Cueva High School; Robert Cordwell, Rio Grande High School; Cameron Banes, Creative Education Preparatory Institute; David Gullet, Temple Baptist Academy; Adam Geoffry Cowan, Calvary Christian Academy; and Leanne Raskob, St. Pius X High School.

Merethy Billian, Cornerstone Christian School; Jordan Spence, Evangel Christian Academy; Markenzi Williamson, Hope Christian Schools; Aaron Smith, Menaul High School; Emily Wildsmith, Southwest Secondary Learning Center; Nicholas Trumbley, Albuquerque Evening School; Karl Nieman, Career Enriched Center; Takesha Haynes, New Future High School; and Suzia Vanswol, East Mountain High School.

Jane Yein Song, Sandia High School; Erika Anaya, Moriarty High School; Samuez Luban, Charter Vocational High School; Danielle Treadgill, Bernalillo High School; Jessica R. Siegel, Sandia Preparatory High School; Ruth Ann Huning, Los Lunas High School; Kenneth David Rael, Sierra Alternative High School; Marie Jiron, Career Academy; Maggie Elizabeth Crank, Albuquerque Academy; and Orlando Pacheco Los, Puentes Charter School.

HOW MUCH TO FEED A DRAGON

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you an article written by Scott Lilly, the former Democratic Staff Director to my distinguished colleague and Ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations, David Obey. Scott, a longtime friend and valued resource to Members and staff on both sides of the aisle, left Capitol Hill last year after 32 years of distinguished service. His departure was and continues to be deeply felt by many of us, but as the article below reveals, Scott remains a tremendous resource for this institution as we work to deal with serious policy issues that impact our constituents, our communities and our nation.

In this article, How Much to Feed a Dragon, Mr. Lilly discusses the extremely important issue of the threat of China to the United States as an economic and world power. As Scott articulates so well, the time to act

against China and its currency undervaluation is now I urge my colleagues in the House to heed the warnings detailed in this article and to stop the rhetoric. We must act immediately and decisively to address the serious risk China poses to the American way of life—our nation's future depends on it.

HOW MUCH TO FEED A DRAGON

A few weeks ago the Bush administration took action to cap the growth of Chinese textile imports to no more than 7.5 percent a year, professing grave concern for what is left of America's textile industry. The controversy generated by that move largely obscured a far more profound decision by the administration only a week earlier. In a formal report to Congress, Treasury Secretary John Snow refused to designate China as a currency manipulator despite massive evidence of China's continuous intervention in global currency markets-keeping the yuan at levels far below what most economists believe is its true value. Snow stated that Chinese officials ''have repeatedly vowed'' to move toward ''a more flexible'' currency. When they will move or how far they will move is an issue that Snow will apparently continue to leave to the discretion of China's central planners.

While this issue sounds arcane, it may also rate as one of the most important economic issues of this generation. The intense manipulation of the Chinese yuan impacts greatly on numerous problems facing American households, ranging from high gas prices to weak job growth and stagnant wages. It has materially contributed to the problem of our growing foreign debt, the weakness of the dollar and a potential worldwide currency crisis that could lead to global depression. In addition, it has serious implications for the balance of global power in the decades ahead.

How has China impacted U.S. gasoline prices? World demand for energy grew by more than 3.4 percent last year-the largest yearly increase since the gas lines of the 1970s and more than twice the average yearly growth over the past two decades. Furthermore, it is clear that the big players in world energy markets see this spike in demand as anything but temporary. They are not only buying up oil futures and the shares of companies that own and sell oil but companies that explore and drill for oil as well.

The reason for this rapid growth in oil demand is attributable to one single fact: Oil consumption in China is growing at astronomical rates. During 2004 Chinese consumption of oil averaged more than one million barrels a day above the previous year, an increase of 19.3 percent, or eight times faster than the growth of energy consumption in the rest of the world. Without China, the global growth in oil consumption during 2004 would have been just 2.2 percent—a rate that the normal expansion of world oil exploration and production can accommodate without significant upward pressure on oil prices. Even in per capita terms, China's oil consumption is growing three times faster than the rest of the world.

Why is China guzzling so much petroleum? China's skyrocketing demand for energy is largely a function of the nation's skyrocketing rate of economic growth. For several years China has been growing at a rate of more than 9 percent per annum even after accounting for inflation. Some experts expect growth in the 8 to 10 percent range for the indefinite future. This rate of growth drove China last year to consume 40 percent of the globe's increased demand for crude oil in 2004—more than the rest of the developing world combined.

How can China maintain such a rapid pace of growth? The answer to that is also relatively simple. According to a report released in Beijing last month by the State Information Center, foreign trade is the major driving force of China's economy. In particular, China's net exports, or trade surplus with the rest of the world, are credited with bringing strong growth to the nation. The report discloses that Chinese exports totaled $156 billion in the first quarter of 2005 while imports totaled only $143 billion. More than 60 percent of Chinese surplus came at the expense of the United States. Last year, the U.S; bilateral trade deficit with China exceeded $162 billion, while the rest of the world actually ran a trade surplus with China. As a result, it is almost entirely the Chinese trade surplus with the United States that is providing the country with this extraordinary pace of expansion.

What makes China so competitive with U.S. and other foreign producers? It is important to remember that China is not a market economy. Prices in a particular sector can easily be manipulated by central economic planners. This goes for all inputs: labor, land, capital and energy. If China wants to compete and be the low price producer for a particular product, no other producers functioning in a market economy with fixed prices can match the price at which China will be able to sell.

But even more important has been China's manipulation of its currency, the yuan. The central government has gone to extraordinary lengths to cap the value of the yuan to no more than 8.3 to the dollar. As Secretary Snow points out, leaders in Beijing have talked at great lengths about future plans to allow the yuan to trade more freely on world currency markets.

But they have taken no such action and the rapid export-led growth of the Chinese economy would drop back to more normal levels if they did. Since rapid growth is seen by the leadership in Beijing as central to the nation's economic, political and geopolitical goals, it is hard to imagine that significant change will occur without strong external pressure. Since the United States alone represents nearly all of China's net trade surplus, the lever to force revaluation of the yuan is almost entirely in the hands of the United States.

Isn't China's growth good for the world? It depends on what part of the world you are talking about. Oil producing countries are having a bonanza. Saudi Arabia, a country in danger of not being able to make payments on its foreign debts just a few years ago, is now raking in revenues at a rate that dwarfs even the oil price boom of the 1970s.

Oil executives in this country are also prospering. The 3 million shares of Exxon Mobil held by Board Chairman and CEO Lee R. Raymond are now worth about $170 million, up more than $62 million or about 59 percent from the level such shares would have sold for only 18 months ago. Raymond is only one of thousands of oil company executives enjoying the new prosperity that China's demand for petroleum has created for the industry.

There are also other domestic winners in the unbalanced trade relationship between the U.S. and China—at least over the short term. Companies ranging from Mattel to Boeing have increasingly moved production operations from the U.S. to China in recent years. They reap two benefits in such transactions. First, the lower wages paid in the Chinese factories provide savings that go largely to the bottom line on corporate balance sheets. Chinese workers make about one-twentieth of what U.S. workers make.

But secondly, the mere threat of moving more production to China keeps downward pressure on wages paid to U.S. workers. Since 2001, the hourly output of U.S. workers has increased by more than 16 percent, but the average wage production and non-supervisory worker wage remained virtually flat after adjusting for inflation. Corporate profits, on the other hand, have jumped by about 58 percent since the beginning of 2001 despite slower than normal economic growth. Not since the 1920s have workers' wages fallen so far behind their increases in productivity and at no time in the post-World War II era have corporate profits accounted for such a large portion of the growth in national output.

So while American corporations have at least thus far been winners in U.S. acceptance of China's trade and currency policies, U.S. workers have been major losers. Not only have wages been stagnant, but so have the number of jobs. The number of Americans with manufacturing jobs has dropped by 2.8 million, or 16 percent, since January of 2001. At the same time, the U.S. population has continued to grow. About 12 million more individuals are now being supported with paychecks that are no bigger in either size or number.

Whether or not U.S. corporations—outside the oil patch—will be long-term winners in this arrangement is a matter of increasing concern on Wall Street. Many on the street are expressing concerns that U.S. corporate profits cannot grow over the long term if American families have less and less income with which to make purchases. Since production and non-supervisory workers make up about 80 percent of the total workforce, the long-term health of the U.S. consumer is inextricably linked to the earning power of the U.S. worker.

There are also losers in other countries around the world. Underdeveloped countries with large pools of low-wage and underutilized labor are among those who suffer the most. Their dreams of development have been stymied by China's export gluttony and they have not only lost out in the struggle to attract industry and earn hard currency, but they now live in a world where the winner has driven the cost of energy they need for their own development to prices they can no longer afford.

But there are implications to our unbalanced trading relationship with China that may be grimmer than the impact it is having on the U.S. and world economy. Those implications involve China's geopolitical ambitions, which are clearly less benign than proponents of unbridled U.S.-Chinese trade would want us to believe.

While the CIA may have overestimated Iraq's military capabilities, it has consistently underestimated (at least until recently) the pace of Chinese military modernization. China has taken the politically painful steps of slimming down its uniform forces to levels compatible with high-tech, modern, Western military doctrine. It has invested heavily in the development of highly capable fighter planes, air-to-air missiles, radars, landing craft and other military resources needed to confront U.S. forces in the Formosa Straits and eventually in other parts of Asia.

China now has hundreds of nuclear weapons which are both strategic and tactical in type. It maintains at least twenty intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of hitting targets in the western United States and is believed to have recently recommissioned a submarine capable of launching nuclear missiles from waters off U.S. coasts. China is working on the DR–41 missile, believed to have greater range, accuracy and a shorter launch time than existing Chinese ICBMs. They are believed to be working on between four to six new submarines capable of launching nuclear armed missiles.

As Thomas Kane wrote last year in Parameters, a publication of the U.S. Army War

College, ''Nuclear weapons allow the People's Republic of China to take diplomatic and military positions with a much greater level of confidence.''

China's booming economy also has geopolitical implications beyond the mere contribution it makes to military modernization. If China's economy continues to experience real growth in the 9 percent range, it could surpass the United States as the world's largest economy within a single decade, even if GDP growth in the United States remains relaively strong. As the magnitude of China's economy grows, so will its geopolitical will. One does not need to go to Asia to find examples. Brazil has become a major source for Chinese raw materials and in turn China is discussing financing the construction of a long sought after road from the Amazon basin across the Andes to ports on the Pacific. Korea is becoming something of a ''Silicon Valley'' for Chinese industry, and even old adversaries such as India and Japan have to rethink how to accommodate the new reality that a rapidly growing China presents.

Some of these changes are inevitable. China needs to grow and will grow almost regardless of U.S. policy. But does China have the political maturity to absorb such a rapid increase in economic, political and military power and use it wisely? Its record on human rights, democratic reform and the treatment of its own citizens should raise serious doubts. We should want a growing economy and rising prosperity for the world's most populous nation, but we should question whether the current torrential rate of growth—growth driven almost entirely by huge net export surpluses with the United States—is a positive for the economic well-being of our own citizens or the prospects for world peace over the coming decades.

COMMENDING JAKE DILLENBURG FOR EXEMPLARY COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the exemplary public service of Jake Dillenburg, a resident of the Town of Arkwright in Chautauqua County, upon the occasion of his recognition as the 2005 Chautauqua County Democrat of the Year.

Jake's dedication to public service has been manifest, and his commitment to the residents of Chautauqua County has been outstanding.

Jake's served as an appointed member of New York State Assemblyman Rolland Kidder staff from 1976 until 1982.

During that time Jake continued to work very hard for his constituents back home. In 1975, Jake was elected to the Forestville Village Board of Trustees where he served until 1977 when he was elected Mayor.

In 1980, Jake began a four term streak as a member of the Chautauqua County Legislature. During his time as a Legislator, Jake's leadership and consensus building skills led him to be chosen by his colleagues to be both the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader.

The year 1992 ushered in six terms as the Arkwright Town Supervisor where there is no doubt that he did all he could to better the community.

Over 20 years later, Jake decided to hang up his hat as an elected official and in 1998 he began a five-year duty as the Clerk of the Chautauqua County Legislature; a responsibility, he was well suited to fill following his years of experience in the Legislature.

In addition to all of these outstanding achievements in public service, Jake still gave his all and served as the Town of Arkwright's Democratic Chair for 27 years.

Mr. Dillenburg deserves recognition and congratulations for the vast contributions he has made over the last three decades, not just to the Democratic Party in general, but to the people of his community, his county and to all of West em New York. Chautauqua County is a better place because of Jake Dillenburg's commitment to public service, and I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to have an opportunity to honor him today.

RECOGNIZING THE 94TH BIRTHDAY OF PAOLI TROOP 1 OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Paoli Troop 1 of the Boy Scouts of America on its 94th birthday.

In 1911 at the Good Samaritan Church in Paoli, Pennsylvania, Paoli Troop 1 was established. Its name was derived from it being the first Boy Scout Troop in the Paoli area. The Reverend Horace A. Walton was the Troop's first Scoutmaster and he established two patrols within the Troop called the Wolves and the Lions. As the group grew in membership, three additional patrols were created. The Colour Patrol guarded and carried the Troop colors. Thereafter the Eagle Patrol was established and, most recently, the Fox Patrol was added in 2003.

At the outset, Paoli Troop 1 had significant challenges. They were poorly equipped in both uniform and camping gear. During World War I, Troop activity diminished due to the lack of available young men. Following the War, Colonel Clifton Lisle became Scoutmaster and the Charter was resurrected under a ''Group of Citizens'' as sponsor. In 1924, the Troop moved to Wayne, PA.

Tradition has always been the foundation of Paoli Troop 1. Adherence to the Scout Law and Scout Oath constitute the bedrock principles of the Troop, but other traditions play an important role in the Troop's daily life, such as giving a sailor hat as a memento of the first summer trip. The Troop also adheres to the tradition of military dress (the wool shirt and military press) as started by Colonel Lisle. For 20 years, Richard T. ''Dick'' Bensing led the Troop until his retirement in 2004. Today, Scoutmaster Mike Manotta heads the Troop.

Paoli Troop 1's approaching 94th birthday is a wonderful achievement. With a rich, long history, the Troop has maintained its core purpose of promoting, maintaining, and carrying out the principles of the Boy Scouts of America and to work for the best interests of its members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Paoli Troop 1 on its 94th birthday. The Troop's efforts to create a positive environment to shape our youth into exemplary role models and citizens is a marvelous contribution to our state and nation and we commemorate them for this.

HONORING THE CAREER OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD V. REYNOLDS

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lieutenant General Richard V. Reynolds. Lieutenant General Reynolds is retiring as the Vice Commander of Air Force Materiel Command after thirty-three years of faithful and distinguished service to our country.

In addition to being an effective Air Force officer, Lieutenant General Reynolds has been a positive contributor to the Wright Patterson Air Force Base community for the past eleven years. I met Lieutenant General Reynolds when I began to serve areas surrounding the base after the re-districting of 2002. I have always appreciated his candor, professionalism, and accessibility. In addition, I appreciated his willingness to educate my staff about both the Air Force and Wright Patterson at our 2003 staff retreat.

I am also greatly impressed by Lieutenant General Reynolds' dedication to our country and his commitment to advancing the competitive edge of the United States Air Force. He has a distinguished service record and has worked with some of the best aircraft and service technologies in our military. His service to both the Air Force and our country will be greatly missed.

To you Dick, I thank you for your service to our country, and I wish you and your family best wishes in your future endeavors. Congratulations for a successful and dedicated career.

DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS LEADER AUNG SAN SUU KYI HONORED

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 2005

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday the world will celebrate the 60th birthday of Nobel Laureate and Burmese democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi. It's usually not polite to discuss a lady's age—but in this case, I'm sure that this feisty fighter known by her supporters simply as ''the Lady'' will forgive us, because this occasion provides an opportunity to highlight the horrendous human rights situation in Burma.

Today Aung San Suu Kyi is under strict house arrest. Isolated from her family, her colleagues, and the Burmese people who so strongly support her. Sadly, this is not a new state of affairs. Suu Kyi has spent nine of the past 16 years either behind bars or under house arrest.

We must remember that Aung San Suu Kyi is not simply another democracy campaigner toiling away in a totalitarian nation—her party actually won elections in 1990, only to find the halls of power to be locked when she tried to assume the role she had won by right.

Aung San Suu Kyi is an inspiring figure. She could have left Burma countless times to rejoin her family, but she refused. Suu Kyi

would not abandon her people to the ruthless Burmese military goons, nor her hope that Burma would someday be a strong, democratic nation that respected human rights.

Sadly, house imprisonment has been the least of Aung San Suu Kyi's worries. Two years ago, the Burmese government tried to kill her in an ambush of her convoy in rural Burma. Burma's ruling thugs simply couldn't stand the fact that she remained enormously popular despite years of imprisonment, and was being greeted by throngs of supporters everywhere she went.

We in Congress have not forgotten the cause of human rights in Burma, Mr. Speaker. Next week, it is my hope that the House will move forward with H.J. Res. 52, my legislation to renew import sanctions against Burma for an additional year. Only when the Burmese thugocracy feels the economic pinch of their sick rule will change finally come.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I will be pleased to deliver 6,000 birthday cards to Aung San Suu Kyi via the Burmese Embassy. I have no illusion that they will be delivered, or even that word of this deed will be delivered to her. But these good wishes from people across America show that the world has not forgotten Aung San Suu Kyi, nor the cause for which she fights. One day, Aung San Suu Kyi will finally be sworn in as the democratically elected leader of Burma, and it will be my great honor to attend her inauguration.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, June 20, 2005.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 2957–2982; 2 private bills, H.R. 2983-2984; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 181; and H. Res. 328-329 were introduced. **Pages H4721–22**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4722–23**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bonner to act as speaker pro tempore. **Page H4657**

Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005: The House passed H.R. 2745, to reform the United Nations, by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 282. The bill was also considered yesterday, June 16. **Pages H4658–H4706**

Adopted the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations, now printed in the bill. **Page H4705**

Accepted:

Barton amendment (No. 2 printed in subpart E of part 1 of H. Rept. 109–132) that directs the Independent Oversight Board to review the Final Report of the Independent Inquiry Committee into the U.N. Oil-for-Food Program; **Pages H4667–69**

Wilson amendment (No. 2 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that adds the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories to the list of entities which the Department of State is directed to review and report on in order to avoid duplicative efforts and funding; **Pages H4672–74**

King of Iowa amendment (No. 3 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that prohibits the Secretary of State from making contributions to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East in an amount greater than the highest contribution to U.N.RWA made by an Arab country; **Pages H4674–75**

McCotter amendment (No. 4 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that calls on U.S. Permanent Representatives to ensure full implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1559; **Page H4675**

Ros-Lehtinen amendment (No. 6 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that calls for the establishment of a democracy fund to assist countries that respect and uphold human rights (agreed to extend the time for debate); **Pages H4675–78**

Garrett amendment (No. 7 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that discourages the State Department from increasing the size of the U.N. Security Council if such an increase would diminish the U.S.'s influence on the Council; **Page H4678**

Garrett amendment (No. 8 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that directs the U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N. to make every effort to enforce zero nominal growth in all assessed dues to the regular budget of the U.N.; **Page H4679**

Pearce amendment (No. 11 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that prohibits an employee from any U.N. entity, bureau, division, department, or specialized agency from having unauthorized contact, including business contact, with a Member State that is subject to U.N. sanctions; **Pages H4682–83**

Royce amendment (No. 1 printed in subpart D of part 1 of H. Rept. 109–132) that adds an additional

paragraph to the list of reforms in section 201(b) regarding human rights reforms (by a recorded vote of 373 ayes to 32 noes, Roll No. 274); **Pages H4661–62, H4697–98**

Fortenberry amendment (No. 2 printed in subpart D of part 1 of H. Rept. 109–132) that directs the U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N. to use the voice, vote, and influence of the U.S. to make every effort to ensure the adoption and implementation of mechanisms regarding Member States engaged or complicit in acts of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity (by a recorded vote of 375 ayes to 29 noes, Roll No. 275); **Pages H4662–65, H4698–99**

Flake amendment (No. 1 printed in subpart E of part 1 of H. Rept. 109–132) that creates a certification of U.N. cooperation that requires the U.N. to release documents that concern the Oil-for-Food Program; and to waive the immunity of U.N. officials from the judicial process in the U.S. for civil or criminal acts that transpired in the U.S. and in connection with the Oil-for-Food Program (by a recorded vote of 366 ayes to 38 noes, Roll No. 276); **Pages H4665–67, H4699**

Chabot amendment (No. 1 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that directs the U.S. ambassador to the U.N. to oppose anti-Semitic statements and anti-Israel resolutions in the U.N. (by a recorded vote of 405 ayes to 2 noes, Roll No. 277); and **Pages H4669–71, H4699–H4700**

Pence amendment (No. 5 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that requires that there be no more than five times difference in the levels of assessment among the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council (agreed that the amendment be considered out of the order specified in the rule) (by a recorded vote of 281 ayes to 126 noes, Roll No. 278). **Pages H4671–72, H4700–01**

Rejected:

Kucinich amendment (No. 10 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that sought to add ''strengthening of international labor laws'' as another U.N. reform; **Pages H4681–82**

Gohmert amendment (No. 9 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that sought to prohibit U.S. assistance to a country that opposed the position of the U.S. in the U.N. (by a recorded vote of 108 ayes to 297 noes, Roll No. 279); **Pages H4679–81, H4701**

Stearns amendment (No. 12 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that sought to change the amount of regular U.S. dues withheld from 50% to 75% (by a recorded vote of 100 ayes to 306 noes, Roll No. 280); and **Pages H4683–84, H4701–02**

Lantos amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 13 printed in part 2 of H. Rept. 109–132) that sought to make a number of changes to the bill (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 281). **Pages H4684–97, H4702–03**

H. Res. 319, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to yesterday, June 16.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, June 20 for Morning Hour debate. **Page H4707**

Private Calendar: Agreed to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday, June 21. **Page H4707**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, June 22. **Page H4707**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified the Congress of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the large accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 109–35). **Page H4708**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Nine recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4698, H4698–99, H4699, H4700, H4700–01, H4701, H4702, H4702–03, H4705. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 20 through June 25, 2005

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at 2 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 6, Energy Policy Act. Also, at 5 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of John Robert Bolton, of Maryland, to be U.S. Representative to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the U.S. Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations, and at 6 p.m., Senate will consider and agree to the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination was not agreed to, agree to the motion to reconsider, and then proceed to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

On *Tuesday*, Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 6, Energy Policy Act. During the balance of

the week, Senate expects to complete action on H.R. 6, Energy Policy Act, and will consider any other cleared legislative and executive business, including appropriation bills, when available.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: June 22, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Richard A. Raymond, of Nebraska, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Food Safety, 10 a.m., SR–328A.

June 22, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999, 10:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: June 21, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up H.R. 2862, making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, 2 p.m., S–128, Capitol.

June 21, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up H.R. 2744, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, 3 p.m., SD–192.

June 23, Full Committee, business meeting to mark up H.R. 2744, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Legislative Branch, 2 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Armed Services: June 21, to hold a closed briefing on the nature of the evolving Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) threat and the Department of Defense's approach to addressing this threat, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: June 21, to hold hearings to examine regulatory relief proposals, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 21, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine the Coast Guard's revised deepwater implementation plan, 10 a.m., SR–253.

June 22, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine telecom mergers, 10 a.m., SR–253.

June 22, Subcommittee on Aviation, to hold hearings to examine financial stability of airlines, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

June 23, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: June 22, to hold an oversight hearing to examine grants management within the Environmental Protection Agency, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: June 23, to hold hearings to examine United States-China economic relations, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 21, to hold hearings to examine the United States policy toward Russia, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

June 21, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Larry Miles Dinger, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Fiji Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, Tuvalu, and the Republic of Kiribati; Joseph A. Mussomeli, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Cambodia; and Emil A. Skodon, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Brunei Darussalam, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

June 22, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the nominations of Ronald E. Neumann, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; Gregory L. Schulte, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador; Michael E. Hess, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development; and Dina Habib Powell, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs), Time to be announced, S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: June 23, to meet to discuss the Family Medical Leave Act, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: June 21, to hold hearings to examine issues relating to juvenile diabetes, focusing on the personal toll on families, financial costs to the Federal health care system, and research progress toward a cure, 10 a.m., SH–216.

June 22, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–562.

June 23, Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold oversight hearings to examine disparities in Federal HIV/AIDS CARE programs, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

Committee on Indian Affairs: June 22, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the In Re Tribal Lobbying Matters, Et Al, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 23, Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights, to hold hearings to examine the consequences of Roe V. Wade and Doe V. Bolton, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: June 21, to hold hearings to examine the issue of voter verification in the Federal elections process, 10 a.m., SR–301.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: June 23, to hold hearings to examine pending veterans benefits related legislation, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: June 22, to hold a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

June 23, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, June 22, hearing to Review the Centennial of the USDA Forest, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, June 22, Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, on U.S. Coast Guard, Deepwater Program, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Science, The Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, on United Nations Task Force, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, June 21, hearing to review Marine Corps force protection, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

June 22, hearing on Afghanistan: Operations and Reconstruction, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, June 22, hearing on Budgeting in the Congress, Reflections on How the Budget Process Functions, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, June 22, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, to mark up H.R. 2830, Pension Protection Act of 2005, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, June 21, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''The United Nations Oil-For-Food Program: A Review of the 661 Sanctions Committee,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Medicaid Prescription Drugs: Examining Options for Payment Reform,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 23, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Reauthorization of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, June 22, Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology, hearing entitled ''Combating Trafficking in Persons: An International Perspective,'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 23, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''Banking on Retirement Security: A Guaranteed Rate of Return,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, June 21, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing entitled ''Authorizing the President's Vision: Making Permanent The Faith-Based and Community Initiative—H.R. 1054, Tools for Community Initiatives Act,'' 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations hearing entitled ''The Development Fund for Iraq: U.S. Management of Iraq Oil Proceeds and Compliance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1483,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 22, full Committee, hearing entitled ''Wasted Space, Wasted Dollars: The Need for Federal Real Property Management Reform,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability, to consider pending business; followed by a hearing entitled ''The Evolution of Federal Financial Management—A Review of the Need to Consolidate, Simplify, and Streamline,'' 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, June 21, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment, hearing entitled ''Using Open-Source Information Effectively,'' 10 a.m., room to be announced.

June 21, Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack and the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology, joint hearing entitled ''Detecting Nuclear Weapons and Radiological Materials: How Effective Is Available Technology?'' 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure, Protection, and Cybersecurity, hearing entitled ''Ensuring the Security of America's Borders through the Use of Biometric Passports and Other Identity Documents,'' 11 a.m., room to be announced.

June 23, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight, joint hearing entitled ''The National Training Program: Is Anti-Terrorism Training for First Responders Efficient and Effective,'' 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, June 20, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, hearing on Human Rights in Vietnam, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia, hearing on Democracy in the Middle East: Toward an Inter-Arab Democratic Charter, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 22, full Committee, hearing on Sudan: Consolidating Peace While Confronting Genocide, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, hearing on The EU Constitution and U.S.-EU Relations: The Recent Referenda in France and the Netherlands and the U.S.-EU Summit, 2:15 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, June 21, Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing on Copyright Office Views on Music Licensing Reform, 10 a.m., and to hold a hearing on H.R. 1229, Federal Consent Decree Fairness Act, 5:15 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, oversight hearing on the Lack of Worksite Enforcement and Employer Sanctions, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, June 22, Subcommittee on Water and Power, oversight hearing entitled ''Environmental Regulations and Water Supply Reliability,'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 23, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing entitled ''The Vast North American Resource Potential of Oil Shale, Oil Sands, and Heavy Oils,'' Part 1, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

June 23, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 518, Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Improvement Act of 2005; and

H.R. 2693, Great Ape Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2005, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, June 20, to consider the following: H.J. Res. 10, Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; and H.R. 2475, Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

June 21, to consider the Legislative Branch Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2006, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, June 21, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight, hearing on Veteran's Access to Capital, 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

June 21, Subcommittee on Workforce, Empowerment, and Government Programs, hearing entitled ''Union Salting—Organizing Against Small Business, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 21, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, oversight hearing on Deepwater Implementation, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 21, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, oversight hearing on The Judiciary's Ability to Pay for Current and Future Space Needs, 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 22, Subcommittee on Aviation, oversight hearing on Airline Pensions: Avoiding Further Collapse, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, June 23, to mark up H.R. 1220, Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2005, 9:30 a.m., followed by an oversight hearing to examine the budget modeling and methodologies used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to develop and forecast veterans' health care cost and utilization projections for future years, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, June 21 and 23, Subcommittee on Social Security, to continue hearings on Protecting and Strengthening Social Security, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

June 23, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing to review the Tax Deduction for Facade Easements, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, June 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 6, Energy Policy Act. Also, at 5 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of John Robert Bolton, of Maryland, to be U.S. Representative to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the U.S. Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations, and at 6 p.m., Senate will consider and agree to the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination was not agreed to, agree to the motion to reconsider, and then proceed to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, June 20

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Consideration of H.R. 2863, Department of Defense Appropriations Act for FY 2006 (open rule, one hour of general debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abercrombie, Neil, Hawaii, E1264
Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1258
Baca, Joe, Calif., E1255
Boehner, John A., Ohio, E1279
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1275
Cardin, Benjamin L., Md., E1272, E1277
Castle, Michael N., Del., E1257, E1273
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E1265, E1266
Cunningham, Randy ''Duke'', Calif., E1263
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E1264, E1265, E1266
Delahunt, William D., Mass., E1269, E1276
DeLay, Tom, Tex., E1277
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E1269
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1263
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1260, E1275
Filner, Bob, Calif., E1259
Fortuño, Luis, Puerto Rico, E1259
Fossella, Vito, N.Y., E1254, E1275
Franks, Trent, Ariz., E1277
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1256
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1264
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E1279
Green, Gene, Tex., E1267, E1268
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1262, E1273
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1255, E1274, E1276, E1279
Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E1258
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E1268
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E1261
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1264
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E1255
Kilpatrick, Carolyn C., Mich., E1276
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1259, E1260, E1261, E1262, E1263, E1264
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E1279
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1269, E1270
LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E1257
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1268
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1258
Millender-McDonald, Juanita, Calif., E1253, E1254
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1261
Moran, James P., Va., E1258
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1261
Northup, Anne M., Ky., E1259
Oberstar, James L., Minn., E1273
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1256
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1257
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E1276
Pryce, Deborah, Ohio, E1271
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1272
Ryan, Paul, Wisc., E1265
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1277
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1267
Scott, David, Ga., E1254
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr., Fla., E1273
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1268
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E1258, E1263
Solis, Hilda L., Calif., E1271
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1259, E1260
Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E1272
Udall, Mark, Colo., E1273
Udall, Tom, N.M., E1266, E1270
Walden, Greg, Ore., E1256
Weiner, Anthony D., N.Y., E1262
Weller, Jerry, Ill., E1257
Wilson, Heather, N.M., E1277
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1253, E1254

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.