

gone, not as far as I would like to have gone, but a considerable distance, a significant distance in improving the intelligence community in the United States.

The intelligence community has been under considerable attack with disclosures of Aldrich Ames, with the problems in Guatemala, with many problems around the globe. And last year, at the initiative of our distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN WARNER, a commission was appointed to make recommendations on what should be done to reform the U.S. intelligence community. The commission—first headed by former Secretary of Defense Aspin, whose untimely death caused a vacancy and the need to appoint a subsequent chairman, another former Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown—came up with a comprehensive list of recommendations, and the Intelligence Committee then held extensive hearings on a subject that goes back many years.

The Intelligence Committee then submitted a program which we thought would make very major changes in the U.S. intelligence community. There was very considerable objection then raised from a number of quarters, principally by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Finally, after very extensive negotiations, not only with the Armed Services Committee but also with the Governmental Affairs Committee and, to a lesser extent, with the Rules Committee, we have hammered out the agreement which has been presented here and has been agreed to and will now go to conference.

It had been my desire that there should have been more authority in the Director of Central Intelligence on reprogramming, more authority on concurrence on the appointment of key officials because of the general responsibility of the Director of Central Intelligence, but that was not to be.

We filed our report at an early stage, but there was a reference under the rules of referral to the Armed Services Committee which took considerable time and considerable time by the Governmental Affairs Committee, and I thank Senator WARNER for not taking time in the Rules Committee.

We find ourselves, as we frequently do in the legislative process, very close to the end of the session, not with sufficient time to bring the matter to the floor and to debate the issues of reprogramming or concurrence or appointments or many other issues, so we have had to make an accommodation to have the bill handled by unanimous consent in the course of a few minutes as we have already done earlier today. Senator KERREY, my distinguished vice chairman, and I have agreed to this because, as I say, this is a significant step forward. We want to go to conference. We want to get these provisions accepted and placed into law even though a great deal more should have been done.

This bill contains very significant provisions on economic espionage, contains a very significant provision on a commission to be established to streamline the Federal Government on our handling of weapons of mass destruction. Some 96 different agencies now touch that issue. There is not centralized command. And those are very, very important matters.

An interest which I had pursued, to try to give greater authority to the Director of Central Intelligence, has come into the spotlight with the terrorist attack on Khobar Towers on June 25 of this year, and the allegation by the Secretary of Defense, in a July 9 hearing in the Senate Armed Services Committee, that there was intelligence failure, which I think was an incorrect assertion. The staff of the Intelligence Committee—and I emphasize “the staff” and not the full Intelligence Committee—but the staff prepared a report which was released last Thursday with my conclusions in my capacity as chairman of the Intelligence Committee, but again not the full committee, but my individual conclusions that there was not an intelligence failure.

Then yesterday we had the report of the Downing task force which took to task the Pentagon as well as the local field commanders. I personally visited Khobar Towers last month, and on viewing Khobar Towers and seeing a fence only 60 feet from these high-rise apartments, which house thousands of our airmen, 19 of whom were killed and hundreds of whom were injured, it was apparent to me, in the face of the many intelligence reports which had been received, that there was not an intelligence failure and that there was in fact a failure by the military, going to the Pentagon and the highest levels of the Pentagon, on failing to act to protect our airmen.

The conclusions yesterday of the Downing task force, as featured in the Associated Press reports, faulted the Pentagon, as well as the local commanders, for what had been done. I make comment of this at this time because I believe this ties into the reform of the intelligence community to have a Director of Central Intelligence who collects all of the information and could, in effect, rattle the cages, where necessary, to call attention to the top Pentagon officials, including the Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, about the need for greater protection of our forces. We have not gone that far, and we have not accomplished that. I make these comments in the context of what had occurred on June 25 and what happened just yesterday with the filing of the Downing committee report.

But I have talked to my colleagues about where we stand now, and the sentiments have been expressed that we will have a chance to further improve the intelligence community at a later date. But that remains, to some substantial extent, unfinished business, as

we have unfinished business as to how we handle not only intelligence but force protection around the United States.

But this is a significant step forward. This is the very best we could do. Those who do not know the interworkings of the Senate might be interested to know that any one Senator can tie up this bill. A number of Senators interposed objections, which we had to work through laboriously to get this bill to the stage where it is now where it has been passed.

I thank my distinguished colleague, Senator KERREY from Nebraska, who has done an extraordinary job in many things over many years, but especially on the Senate Intelligence Committee. As we have worked together, we have had some tough times, especially as the election grows nearer. We have kept the Intelligence Committee working on a bipartisan, nonpartisan basis. I think it is indispensable on a committee of this sort that the chairman and the vice chairman and really members on both sides of the aisle work very closely to keep partisan politics out of it. Senator KERREY and I have worked laboriously at that and I think we have succeeded, notwithstanding the fact that we face some very, very difficult issues and continue to face difficult issues as we work to complete quite a number of projects which yet remain undone.

I would like to single out for special praise—this is always a delicate matter—some key staffers, Charles Battaglia, who is the staff director, and Chris Straub, who is the staff director for the Democrats, the minority staff director, for the extraordinary work which they have done on the nights, Saturdays, Sundays, you name it; and for general counsel, Suzanne Spaulding, and for Ed Levine, who has been a powerhouse in drafting very complex reports. I thank the Chair, and I note the presence of my colleague, Senator PELL. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. I thank my colleague and friend for yielding at this time.

IT IS TIME TO DEBUNK THE DANGEROUS MYTHS ABOUT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today the U.N. General Assembly will convene its 51st session. This occasion has particular meaning for me because 51 years ago I had the honor of serving on the International Secretariat of the San Francisco Conference that drew up the United Nations' charter. In 1970, I was privileged to serve as a Representative of the United States to the 25th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. This year I have been honored again with my nomination by President Clinton and confirmation by my Senate colleagues to be a representative of the United States to the 51st session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Having been present at the United Nations' creation and observed its work over the last 50 years, I strongly believe in the need for such a body and in the principles upon which it was founded. While I have applauded and participated in efforts to amend and improve the organization, I would argue that these last 51 years have witnessed an impressive record of achievement. Though it has not always lived up to all the expectations of its founders, the United Nations has irrevocably changed the world in which we live. Despite the obstacles posed by the politics of the cold war, I can think of numerous examples where the United Nations succeeded in promoting international peace and security—in Namibia, El Salvador, Cambodia, and countless other countries. Whether brokering peaceful settlements to violent conflicts, halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons, protecting the international environment, or immunizing children from disease, the United Nations has made the world a safer place. Clearly, if the United Nations did not exist today, we would have to invent it.

I am therefore troubled by the increasingly violent attacks on this important institution—in Congress, the press, and other public fora. These attacks seem symptomatic of a broader and dangerous tendency to seek to retreat from our international commitments and obligations. Revolutionary changes in communications, transportation, capital flows, and the nature of warfare have irreversibly linked our fate with that of the rest of the world. Today, there is no ocean wide enough—nor border fence we could build that would be high enough—to keep out an often turbulent world.

Rather than abandoning our role as part of the international community, we should endeavor to expand and improve cooperation with those states that share our values in order to address our common problems. The United Nations offers a valuable forum for such cooperation.

With this in mind, I would like to use this opportunity to address three of the more dangerous myths that have been propagated recently regarding the United Nations:

The first of these myths is that the United Nations somehow threatens American sovereignty. Critics of the United Nations have often depicted the organization as a nascent world government eager to supplant the nation-state. In fact, the United Nations more accurately resembles an unruly debating club, where members control and vote on its activities. Moreover, the United Nations charter clearly states that resolutions of the General Assembly are non-binding on member states. In similar fashion, United Nations conventions only apply to nations that elect to ratify them. The one United Nations body in which decisions could be binding upon member-states is the Security Council, where the United

States and other permanent members enjoy veto power. Because of these institutional checks, the United Nations usually must struggle to achieve enough of a consensus to make action possible. In no way could one mistake this organization for an out-of-control bureaucracy trampling upon the prerogatives of nation-states.

A second myth about the United Nations is that it does not serve American interests. In the most extreme version of this myth, critics imagine that the United States always fares worse when it acts multilaterally, than when it goes it alone. In fact, given that many of today's most pressing problems—be it crime, disease, environmental degradation, terrorism, or currency crises—transcend national boundaries, there is much to be gained from forging common solutions to common problems.

The end of the artificial divisions of the cold war has presented the United States with an extraordinary opportunity to use the United Nations to advance its foreign policy goals. In the last U.N. session, members of the General Assembly voted with the United States 88.2 percent of the time; 91 percent of Security Council resolutions were adopted unanimously. The United Nations has enabled the United States to avoid unilateral responsibility for costly and entangling activities in regions of critical importance, even as it yields to the United States a position of tremendous authority. To paraphrase former Secretary of State James Baker, U.N. peacekeeping is a pretty good bargain. For every dollar the United States spends on peacekeeping, it saves many more dollars by preventing conflicts in which it might otherwise have to become involved.

From a cost-benefit perspective, U.S. contributions to the United Nations and its agencies have been a very worthwhile investment. In addition to the American lives and dollars saved by U.N. peacekeeping missions, other U.N. agencies have worked to prevent disaster and death and to promote health and security both here in the United States and abroad. In 1977, the World Health Organization [WHO] averted an estimated 2 million deaths per year by eradicating smallpox. Today, WHO's children immunization program saves an estimated 3 million lives every year. In 1992, during a severe drought in Africa, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Food Programme saved an estimated 20 million people from starvation. And in this last week, the U.N. General Assembly overwhelmingly adopted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which will contribute to the security and well-being of generations of peoples to come.

Which brings me to the third myth: that U.S. participation in the United Nations is ruinously expensive. In fact, in fiscal year 1996, the United States' assessed and voluntary contributions to the U.N. system totaled \$1.51 billion.

That includes \$304 million for the U.N. general budget, \$359 million for peacekeeping operations, \$7 million for war crimes tribunals, \$337 million in assessments to the United Nations' specialized agencies, and \$501 million in voluntary contributions to programs such as UNICEF and other programs that the United States has treaty obligations to support. This total American contribution represented less than half of 1 percent of the current defense budget; that allotted for peacekeeping less than the annual budget of the New York City police force.

On a per capita basis, the annual U.S. contribution to the U.N. regular budget breaks down to slightly more than \$1 per American. This is considerably less than what most other people in the world pay. For example, the per capita contribution of the U.N.'s newest member state, Palau, is over \$6 per person. Clearly, the American taxpayer is getting a good deal for his money.

Of course there is certainly room for further economies. Like many large organizations, the United Nations could be leaner, more efficient, and more responsive. But rather than eviscerating one of the key institutional underpinnings of the present international order by starving it of funds, we should work patiently but determinedly with like-minded states and with the U.N. Secretariat to reform and to improve it. I am heartened by the consensus among such strong advocates for U.N. reform as former Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick and former Assistant Secretary of State John Bolton that the U.S. benefits greatly from its membership in the United Nations. I also agree with them that a U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations would be contrary to our national interests.

How we go about the task of reforming the United Nations will say a lot about the prospects for American leadership in the twenty-first century. As after World War II, the United States faces a decisive challenge: whether to maintain the mantle of international leadership and stay engaged in the creation of a new international order, or to seek to retreat into isolationism. The latter course is an even more dangerous option today than it would have been 51 years ago. Only through international engagement and assertive leadership can America hope to prosper and safeguard its security in the next century. The United Nations can serve as an important vehicle for advancing these vital national interests.

THE RIGHT TO SAY NO

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to make a short statement on my strong disappointment that the energy and water conference report does not include the Senate-passed amendment giving the States and the cities the right to say no to the importation of out-of-State garbage.

I must say, and I think you remember, Mr. President, this is not a new