

moneys, and, frankly, this amendment, although it looks good to have it in an appropriations bill in 1995 that I hope gets signed this year for 1996, will not make a single dollar available, cannot be allocated or obligated during fiscal year 1996.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator will—

Mr. BOND. This measure does not do anything except what I think is a shell game to make it look better when, in fact, there is not a dollar that can be allocated during the coming fiscal year because of the restriction put on saying it should be restricted until September 30, 1996.

While we both share the objective of taking care of the homeless, this amendment is less than it appears. It does not accomplish anything. I, therefore, move to table it. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator withhold the tabling motion, because it is just not correct to say it cannot be allocated. It can be allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment, there is not.

Mr. BOND. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be put aside until such time as the leaders, by agreement, can establish the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. I object. Is there time remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining. The question is—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time.

Mr. SARBANES. There is time on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no debate on a motion to table.

Mr. SARBANES. Has the tabling motion been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time to be yielded, because we have a motion to table and it is not debatable.

Mr. BOND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SECRETARY CHRISTOPHER CALLS FOR U.N. REFORM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, yesterday Secretary of State Warren Christopher delivered an important address to the U.N. General Assembly. Secretary Christopher's speech, which was made at the initiation of the 50th session of the General Assembly, was remarkable not only for the milestone it commemorated, but for the forward-thinking approach it took to the issue of U.N. reform.

Recent congressional debates have demonstrated that continued U.S. support for the United Nations hinges on the issue of reform. At a time when some members of Congress are questioning the fundamental utility of U.S. participation in the United Nations, it is imperative that the U.N. perform its duties effectively and in a cost-efficient manner. As Secretary Christopher said last night,

It is time to recognize that the UN must direct its limited resources to the world's highest priorities, focusing on the tasks that it performs best. The UN's bureaucracy should be smaller, with a clear organizational structure and sharp lines of responsibility. Each program must be held to a simple standard—that is, it must make a tangible contribution to the freedom, security, and well-being of real people in the real world.

Mr. President, as one who was present at the creation of the United Nations, I have tried very hard to see the U.N. live up to its potential and have seen the good works of which it is capable. I underscore and applaud the Secretary of State's call for reform. His initiative has my full support, and I hope it will receive the support of the Congress as well. The very future of the United Nations, and the success of many of our own national security objectives, depend upon it.

Mr. President, I commend the Secretary's address to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the full text of his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
OFFICE OF THE SPOKESMAN,  
New York, NY, September 25, 1995.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF STATE WARREN CHRISTOPHER TO THE 50TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Excellencies, Distinguished Guests: It is a privilege to speak to you today on behalf of the United States. A half-century ago, the General Assembly first met in New York—across the river in a converted skating rink at Flushing Meadows. In those modest surroundings, our predecessors began to put into place an ambitious framework they hoped would keep the peace as successfully as they had prosecuted the war.

In the years since, the United Nations has helped to bring peace, prosperity and hope to countless people around the world. Technological change has brought nations closer together than the UN's founders could possibly have foreseen. The United Nations itself has been challenged in unforeseen ways. It has had to manage complex humanitarian emergencies, from civil wars to the mass movement of refugees to health epidemics. This evolution has placed great strains on the organization, and revealed the necessity for far-reaching change in how it is run.

The Clinton Administration has vigorously made the case to our Congress and our people for continued American leadership at the UN. The United States made a commitment to the UN Charter 50 years ago. We are determined to keep our commitment, including our financial obligations.

We will always remember that for millions of people around the world, the UN is far

from a faceless institution: It is, as Harry Truman once said, "a case of food or a box of school books; it is a doctor who vaccinates their children; it is an expert who shows them how to raise more rice, or more wheat." To millions more, it is the difference between peace and war.

Economic and social development, as well as protection of human rights, remain central to the UN's mission. But the UN must change to meet these needs more effectively. When money is wasted in New York, Geneva, or Vienna, and when time is lost to bureaucratic inertia, the people who pay the price are those most vulnerable to famine, disease and violence.

It is time to recognize that the UN must direct its limited resources to the world's highest priorities, focusing on the tasks that it performs best. The UN's bureaucracy should be smaller, with a clear organizational structure and sharp lines of responsibility. Each program must be held to a simple standard—that is, it must make a tangible contribution to the freedom, security, and well-being of real people in the real world.

In the last two years, under the leadership of Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali, the groundwork for substantial change has been laid. The UN has an office with the functions of an inspector general, and a mandate to crack down on waste and fraud. Under-Secretary-General Joe Connor has embarked on an aggressive campaign to improve the UN's management culture, and we fully support his work. The UN Secretariat has moved in the right direction by submitting a budget that begins to restrain spending.

Now the momentum for reform must accelerate. Let me propose a concrete agenda:

First, we must end UN programs that have achieved their purpose, and consolidate programs that overlap, especially in the economic and social agencies. The UN has more than a dozen organizations responsible for development, emergency response, and statistical reporting. We should consider establishing a single agency for each of these functions. We should downsize the UN's regional economic commissions. We should ensure that the functions of the UN Conference on Trade and Development do not duplicate the new WTO. And we should adopt a moratorium on big UN conferences once the present series is completed, concentrating instead on meeting the commitments of those we have held.

Second, we need to streamline the UN Secretariat to make it more efficient, accountable and transparent. Each part of the UN system should be subject to the scrutiny of an inspector general. The UN must not tolerate ethical or financial abuses and its managers should be appointed and promoted on the basis of merit.

Third, we should rigorously scrutinize proposals for new and extended peacekeeping missions, and we should improve the UN's ability to respond rapidly when new missions are approved. We must agree on an equitable scale of peacekeeping assessments that reflects today's economic realities. And we should have a unified budget for peacekeeping operations.

Finally, we must maintain the effectiveness of the Security Council. Germany and Japan should become permanent members. We should ensure that all the world's regions are fairly represented, without making the Council unwieldy.

We welcome the formation of the high-level group on reform, initiated under the leadership of outgoing General Assembly President Essy. Our goal must be that a practical blueprint for UN reform will be adopted before the General Assembly's 50th Session finishes work next fall. The way forward is clear: We have already seen countless

studies and reports. The time has come to act on the best proposals.

As you know, in my country there have been serious efforts to curtail our support for the United Nations. The Clinton Administration believes it would be reckless to turn away from an organization that helps mobilize the support of other nations for goals that are consistent with American and global interests. But to sustain support for the UN among the American people and the people of other nations, it is not enough that we defend the institution. The best argument against retreat is further reform. Tangible progress will help us win the battle for UN support that we are waging in the United States.

The United Nations must emerge from the reform process better able to meet its fundamental goals, including the preservation of peace and security. From Korea, to the Persian Gulf, to Haiti, the UN has provided a mandate to its members as they carried out this responsibility. The UN's own blue helmets have helped nations create the basic conditions of peace in some of the most difficult situations imaginable, even though they have not always fully achieved their intended purpose.

Recently, a young Haitian father was asked what peacekeeping forces had achieved in his country. "We walk freely," he answered. "We sleep quietly. There are no men who come for us in the night." In Haiti, as for example in Cambodia, Mozambique and El Salvador, the UN has shown that peacekeeping, for all of its limitations, has been an enormously useful instrument.

Our region where UN forces and the international community have played a critical role is the Middle East. Another historic milestone will be marked this Thursday in Washington when Israel and the Palestinians sign their agreement to implement phase two of the Declaration of Principles. That agreement will bring to life a goal first set in the Camp David accords—that is, to protect Israel's security and to give Palestinians throughout the West Bank control over their daily lives. The international community and the UN must continue to support this process politically and economically.

Without a doubt, the UN has never undertaken a mission more difficult than the one in the former Yugoslavia. The limitations of that mission are well known. But we must also recognize that it has provided relief for hundreds of thousands of people and saved thousands of lives. Today, with diplomacy backed by force, the United States and the international community are moving forward on a track that is producing genuinely hopeful results. The United Nations and NATO are working together effectively to bring peace to the region. On September 8 in Geneva, the parties to the conflict accepted the fundamental goal the Security Council has often expressed—namely, the continuation of Bosnia-Herzegovina as a single state within its current internationally recognized borders. When I meet with the foreign ministers of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia later today, I will urge them to maintain momentum toward peace and to establish constitutional structures for Bosnia.

The framers of the UN Charter created this institution to meet threats to peace and security posed by aggression and armed conflict. These threats are still very much with us. But the world also faces a set of new security challenges, including proliferation, terrorism, international crime and narcotics, as well as the far-reaching consequences of damage to the environment. These have assumed a new and dangerous scope in a more interdependent world. As President Clinton said in San Francisco in June, the "new forces of integration carry within them the seeds of disintegration and destruction."

While new technologies have brought us closer together, they have also made it easier for terrorists, drug dealers, and other international criminals to acquire weapons of mass destruction, to set up cocaine cartels, and to hide their ill-gotten gains. The collapse of communism has shattered dictatorships. But it has also left the political and legal institutions of newly liberated nations even more vulnerable to those who seek to subvert them.

Although these threats are sometimes sponsored by states, they increasingly follow no flag. Each of us must vigorously fight these enemies on our own. But we will never be truly secure until we effectively fight them together. That is the new security challenge for the global community. It must be the new security mission of the UN.

There is no area where the UN can make a more significant contribution than in non-proliferation. Fifty years ago, the United States was the only country capable of making a nuclear bomb. Today, many countries have the technology that would enable them to turn a fist-sized chunk of plutonium into a bomb as small as a suitcase. That is one reason why more than 170 countries agreed to extend for all time the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty last May, at the conference chaired here by Ambassador Dhanapala. We must build on that achievement.

First, we should have a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty ready for signature by the time we meet here next year. As President Clinton announced last month, the United States is committed to a true zero-yield test ban. We urge other nations to join us in that commitment.

Second, we should immediately start negotiations on a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty. Those who have been most vocal in calling for nuclear disarmament should recognize that it is essential to ban future production of fissile material for nuclear weapons.

Third, we should push forward with the historic reductions of the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the countries of the former Soviet Union. I call on the U.S. Senate, as well as the Russian Duma, to approve the START II Treaty so that we can lock in deep cuts in our strategic nuclear arsenals. In addition, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin are working together to ensure the safety, transparency and irreversibility of nuclear arms reductions.

As part of this process, President Yeltsin will host a Nuclear Safety and Security Summit in Moscow next spring. The Summit should have an ambitious agenda, including a declaration of principles on nuclear reactor safety. We look to the summit to address the worldwide problem of nuclear waste management, including ocean dumping. The Summit should also promote a plan of action to Safeguard nuclear materials. That plan should include new measures to prevent criminals and terrorists from acquiring nuclear material for use in weapons.

Finally, we should push for the earliest possible entry-into-force of the Chemical Weapons Convention. President Clinton has urged the U.S. Senate to act promptly on its ratification, and to stop holding it and the START II treaty hostage to unrelated issues. The world has witnessed the effect of poison gas too many times in this century—on European battlefields during World War I, in Ethiopia and Manchuria during the 1930s, and against Iranian soldiers and innocent Kurdish civilians in the 1980s. The Chemical Weapons Convention will make every nation safer, and we need it now.

The UN is also playing an invaluable role in focusing attention on pressing regional proliferation problems. In Iraq UNSCOM and its chairman Rolf Ekeus continue to uncover horrific details about Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

Under Saddam Hussein, Iraq developed a deadly biological weapons capacity hidden from view. It was conducting research to turn some of the most toxic substances known to man into weapons of war. We know Saddam succeeded in putting anthrax and botulism in bombs and missile warheads. In December 1990, he deployed these with every intent to using them against the international coalition and innocent civilians. He was dissuaded only by the steadfast determination of the United States and the international community.

In light of what Ambassador Ekeus has uncovered, we can only conclude that for the last four and a half years Saddam Hussein has lied about the full scope of Iraq's weapons programs. There should be no easing of the sanctions regime until the Iraqi government complies with all the demands of the Security Council and demonstrates that it has changed its ways.

The UN should also promote responsibility and restraint in the transfer of conventional weapons. Last year at the General Assembly, President Clinton proposed, and the Assembly approved, the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines. On my recent trip to Cambodia, I saw the terrible damage these hidden killers can do. This year, we will again call on other countries to join us in ending the export of landmines.

Two years ago, President Clinton called on the international community to devise a true international system that governs transfers of conventional weapons and sensitive dual-use technologies. I am pleased that the Russian Federation has joined with the United States and 26 other countries to agree on common principles to control the build-up of dangerous conventional arms. We hope to activate this global regime, called the New Forum, by the end of this year.

The proliferation of weapons has added a disturbing dimension to another threat we all face: international terrorism. Indeed, this year's sarin gas attack in Tokyo is a grim warning of what can happen when terrorists acquire weapons of mass destruction.

More nations are joining the fight against those individuals and groups who attack civilians for political ends. The United Nations has supported this effort in important ways. The UN Security Council recognized the importance of countering state-sponsored terrorism by imposing sanctions against Libya for the bombing of Pan Am 103 and UTA 772.

Terrorists should be treated as criminals and there must be no place where they can hide from the consequences of their acts. States that sponsor terrorists should feel the full weight of sanctions that can be imposed by the international community. Let us not deceive ourselves: Every dollar that goes into the government coffers of a state sponsor of terrorism such as Iran helps pay for a terrorist's bullets or bombs. Iran's role as the foremost state sponsor of terrorism makes its secret quest for weapons of mass destruction even more alarming. We must stand together to prevent Iran from acquiring such threatening capabilities.

The United States has taken a leading role in meeting the international terrorist threat. We have intensified our sanctions against Iran. Last January, President Clinton also issued an Executive Order prohibiting financial transactions with terrorist groups and individuals who threaten the Middle East peace process. We are urging our Congress to tighten our immigration and criminal laws to keep terrorists on the run or put them behind bars.

The United States strongly supports the counter-terrorism measures the G-7 and Russia announced at the Halifax Summit, and

we expect the P-8 Ministerial Meeting on Terrorism in Ottawa to produce a concrete action plan to implement these measures.

Other kinds of international crime also threaten the safety of our citizens and the fabric of our societies. And globalization brings new and frightening dimensions to crime. The threat of crime is a particular menace to young democracies. It weakens confidence in institutions, preys on the most vulnerable, and undermines free market reform.

Of course, every country must take its own measures to combat these threats. The Clinton Administration is now completing a review of our approach to transnational crime that will lead to a stronger, more coordinated attack on this problem.

To help other states deal with criminal threats, the United States and Hungary have created the International Law Enforcement Academy in Budapest to train police officers and law enforcement officials from Central Europe and the states of the former Soviet Union. We are providing similar help bilaterally and through the UN Drug Control Program to countries whose laws are challenged by drug cartels.

A particularly insidious form of crime and corruption is money laundering. All nations should implement recommendations by the OECD to attack money laundering. The nations of this hemisphere should also advance the anti-money laundering initiative introduced at last December's Summit of the Americas. Together, we must squeeze the dirty money out of our global financial system.

Through the UN's conventions on drugs and crime, the international community has set strong standards that we must now enforce. We call on UN member states who have not already joined the 1988 UN Drug Convention to do so. Those countries who have approved the convention should move quickly to implement its key provisions.

We are increasingly aware that damage to the environment and unsustainable population growth threaten the security of our nations and the well-being of our peoples. Their harmful effects are evident in famines, infant mortality rates, refugee crises, and ozone depletion. In places like Rwanda and Somalia, they contribute to civil wars and emergencies that can only be resolved by costly international intervention. We must carry out the commitments we made at last year's Cairo Conference, and the Rio Conference three years ago.

Never have our problems been more complex. It has never been more evident that these problems affect all nations, developed and developing, alike. Only by working together can we effectively deal with the new threats we all face.

That is why, on this 50th anniversary year, we must shape the UN's agenda as if we were creating the institution anew. Just as the UN's founders devised a new framework to deter aggression and armed conflict, the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, must now assign the same priority to combating the threat posed by proliferation, terrorism, international crime, narcotics, and environmental pollution. We should dedicate our efforts in the UN and elsewhere to turning our global consensus against these threats into concrete action. We must renew and reform the United Nations not for its sake, but for our own.

Thank you very much.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

# DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2782

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my previous tabling motion be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I simply want to address the argument by my colleague that passing this amendment will not serve a purpose. The amendment will, in effect, enable HUD to implement a formula approach with respect to the homeless problems in the coming year. HUD could structure the formula approach so that State and local governments, the homeless assistance providers, the church groups, and the community groups could come in and anticipate their expected level of funding off a \$1.1 billion figure. The Appropriations Committee itself has said they have to have more than \$1 billion in order to make the formula approach work.

They are going to negotiate regulations. That will take a good part of the fiscal year. The end result of all of this is a greater commitment to dealing with the homeless.

I concede that we are taking money from the section 8 program. I think in the order of priorities, addressing the homeless ought to come ahead of that.

Then people say, well, the following fiscal year the amount needed for section 8 is going to double from \$4 billion to \$8 billion. If it is that order of magnitude you will need an entirely new solution. You will not solve it by this \$360 million here that is being held in the reserve.

This money, though, could make an enormous difference with respect to addressing the homeless problem.

Therefore, I very strongly renew my support of the amendment.

Mr. BOND. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me just conclude this discussion by saying that under the system that has been suggested by my colleague from Maryland, which is an effort to solve the homeless problem, we are still in a budgetary quandary. We have not solved the budgetary problem.

The Budget Committee will score the outlays during the year in which they occur no matter when they have been allocated. If, when the budget author-

ity has been granted, if we move the funds to fiscal year 1997, as the amendment by my friend from Maryland would do, we will have that many fewer dollars to spend, that many fewer dollars in outlays to spend during fiscal year 1997.

That is why I say that we have asked HUD to enter into negotiated rule-making to try to get these funds out to deal with not only the funds we have appropriated in this bill but the funds, \$297 million, made available in the rescission bill for the coming year, and utilize those funds to deal with the homeless problem.

That is why again I regretfully say that moving money from one pocket to another does not overcome the appropriations and budgetary problems, and does not move us any further towards the goal of serving the homeless and those who need section 8 public housing assistance.

Mr. President, is all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2783

(Purpose: To require EPA to give priority to small businesses in its "green programs" and to require EPA to perform a study to determine the feasibility of making these programs self-sufficient)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. LEAHY, PROPOSES AN AMENDMENT NUMBERED 2783.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 151, line 11, insert:

## SEC. . ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND ENERGY SUPPLY PROGRAMS.

(a) PRIORITY FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.—During fiscal year 1996 the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall give priority in providing assistance in its Energy Efficiency and Energy Supply programs to organizations that are recognized as small business concerns under section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)).

(b) STUDY.—The Administrator shall perform a study to determine the feasibility of establishing fees to recover all reasonable costs incurred by EPA for assistance rendered businesses in its Energy Efficiency and Energy Supply program. The study shall include, among other things, an evaluation of making the Energy Efficiency and Energy Supply Program self-sustaining, the value of the assistance rendered to businesses, providing exemptions for small businesses, and making the fees payable directly to a fund that would be available for use by EPA as needed for this program. The Administrator shall report to Congress by March 15, 1996 on