

package be approved without a rollcall vote. That is no way to legislate. How would I feel facing my constituents and having to say: Well, it was getting close to Christmas and Members had other things they had to do; we did pass it; I wish now we would have had a rollcall vote but I wasn't there to object?

That is no way to be accountable to the American people. Taxpayers of this country rightly expect Senators to be accountable for funds drawn out of the Federal Treasury. It is your money. How many times have we heard that? I say to those who are looking at the Senate Chamber today through those electronic lenses: It is your money. How can Members be accountable when they are scattered to the four winds across the globe? What kind of perversion of the appropriations process would result in Senators approving this monstrosity without a recorded vote?

When Members took their oath of office, they pledged, standing right there at the Presiding Officer's desk with their hands on the Bible—"so help me God," they said—that they would support and defend the Constitution. So we have a responsibility to faithfully discharge the duties of the office of U.S. Senator. We took a pledge to do that. We took an oath to do that. We took an oath before God and man to do that. Senators did not pledge to do so just when it was convenient or when the schedule permits.

The House of Representatives saw fit to return to vote on this conference report. Why then could the Senate not do the same? We all get the same pay. Senators as well as House Members are paid to work for 12 months each year, not 10 months.

Chairman STEVENS and I worked with each Senator on the Appropriations Committee to produce 13 individual appropriations bills to send to the President. I have commended—and do so again—the senior Senator from Alaska for his effort, but the process was hijacked.

By whom? Who is doing the hijacking? The Bush White House. The White House hijacked the process. The process was hijacked by the White House and the Republican leadership in both Houses. Instead of sending 13 fiscally responsible appropriations bills to the President, the Senate was asked to close its eyes, plug its ears, and be gagged in order to rubberstamp a 1,182-page conference report combining 7 appropriations bills for 11 of the 15 Departments of the Federal Government, on an unrecorded approval of a unanimous consent request. No vote to it—no rollcall vote, no vote by division, no vote viva voce, no vote by voice, with only a handful of Senators. You could count the number of Senators in this Chamber on one hand this morning. This would be legislating without accountability.

What is the use of having elections if the voters are prevented from knowing how their Senators voted on investing

\$328 billion of the people's money, your money? This is wrong. The people have a right to know how their elected representatives stand on this legislation which will affect the lives of so many.

I am saddened by the majority leader's decision to postpone a vote on this legislation until January 20. This is no way to govern. We have had since April 11 to pass these seven bills. That is no way to serve the American people.

I thank the Chair, and I thank all Senators. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE BILL EMERSON

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I want to take a moment this morning to honor a dear friend of mine and a former colleague in the other Chamber, the late Congressman Bill Emerson of Missouri. On December 13, a new bridge spanning the Mississippi River at Cape Girardeau in Missouri is being dedicated to Bill who represented the people of southern Missouri in the House of Representatives with dedication and integrity for 15 years before his untimely death in 1996.

I was privileged to meet, know, and work with Bill Emerson during my freshman year in Congress. He was an example of hard work, common sense, and the ability to put differences aside to get the job done. Bill and I shared a common constituency of rural Americans and served on the House Agriculture Committee together. Bill's spirit of uncompromising principle and his ability to lead under the most difficult circumstances are assets that I have endeavored to emulate.

Bill's commitment to his family was unparalleled. His wife Jo Ann succeeded him in his congressional seat, and he would be so proud of her today for the work she is doing. His daughters, Abby, Liz, Tory, and Katharine, were the lights of his life. I have come to know all four of them over the years, and he would, again, be so proud of them.

Jo Ann has carried on Bill's legacy of building bridges between people to promote communication, trade, and civic pride and is making a mark in her own right. This is something which I know would have brought Bill a great deal of satisfaction.

Bill Emerson's habit of bridging gaps between people is captured perfectly in the Bill Emerson Memorial Bridge. This \$120 million structure replaces the bridge that was built 76 years ago. It will tie together the two States of Missouri and Illinois and promote trade and progress. It is a fitting monument

to a man who brought credit to his family, his community, his State, his country, and the Congress of the United States.

Bill Emerson was a dear friend. I miss him every day. What a fitting tribute to a great man and a great American.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is the Senate still in morning business with a 10-minute limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as long as I must speak. I can assure the Chair it will not be over 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1997 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDING KOFI ANNAN, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, AND STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very thoughtful article written by Kofi Annan, Secretary General of the United Nations, entitled "Search For A New U.N. Role."

I commend the Secretary for his strong leadership over these years, and particularly for the courage he has shown as manifested by this op-ed piece, the courage he has shown to look to the future and to take such, what you might call, corrective measures or revisions as will further strengthen the United Nations as we, the body of nations, face a very perilous and uncertain world, a world filled with threats which really have little precedent in history and weapons that have little precedent in history.

Fifty-two years ago, this humble soul was a second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps and served under the United Nations banner in the Korean conflict in Korea. My service was—I say with deepest humility—very modest, for I have often said on this floor that such military service as I had in the closing months of World War II and in Korea was very modest compared to others, but it did much for me. I am continuously trying to pay back to the current generation, the men and women of the Armed Forces, what was done for me.

I simply cite that it was the U.N. banner under which the U.S. forces and the forces of a number of other nations, a coalition, fought those battles. This was the United Nations' first military mission, as I look back over this half century. Of course, we all recognize there has been no peace treaty. There has never been one signed. But also there has been no recourse to major military use of force on the Korea peninsula in this half century. So that mission of the United Nations, I would say, had a strong measure of success. To this day, our U.S. forces still serve in that theater under the U.N. banner to keep the peace on that peninsula.

As Secretary Annan notes in his op-ed piece, the United Nations has been greatly tested in recent years. To his credit, the Secretary has been willing to face head on these challenges to the historic institution he is privileged to lead and has led with great distinction. Indeed, one of those tests was with the United States as we approached obligations which I strongly support, obligations the President has pointed out many times, obligations to bring a greater measure of freedom to the people of Iraq. But that is history. It was clearly a lesson learned by all who participated.

Last week, Secretary Annan announced he has convened a panel to take a hard look at the mission of the U.N. and what changes the U.N. should make to ensure that it can be a relevant and effective institution in the future. The panel is expected to issue a report in the fall of 2004.

I commend the Secretary for his courage in looking to the future and tasking this panel to give their views not only to him but to the entire community of nations which proudly form the United Nations. Without a doubt, the world needs a stronger United Nations, one that can address with greater decisiveness and swiftness the challenges to freedom in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 4, 2003]

SEARCH FOR A NEW U.N. ROLE

(By Kofi A. Annan)

We have come to a decisive moment in history. The great threat of nuclear confrontation between rival superpowers is now behind us. But a new and diverse constellation of threats has arisen in its place. We need to

look again at the machinery of international relations. Is it up to these new challenges? If not, how does it need to be changed?

The events of the last year have exposed deep divisions among members of the United Nations on fundamental questions of policy and principle. How can we best protect ourselves against international terrorism and halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction? When is the use of force permissible—and who should decide? Does it have to be each state for itself, or will we be safer working together? Is "preventive war" sometimes justified, or is it simply aggression under another name? And, in a world that has become "unipolar," what role should the United Nations play?

These new debates come on top of earlier ones that arose in the 1990s. Is state sovereignty an absolute and immutable principle, or does our understanding of it need to evolve? To what extent is it the international community's responsibility to prevent or resolve conflicts within states (as opposed to wars between them)—particularly when they involve genocide, "ethnic cleansing" or other extreme violations of human rights?

These questions cannot be left unanswered. Yet they are not the only questions. And for many people they may not even be the most urgent.

In fact, to many people in the world today, especially in poor countries, the risk of being attacked by terrorists or with weapons of mass destruction, or even of falling prey to genocide, must seem relatively remote compared to the so-called "soft" threats—the ever-present dangers of extreme poverty and hunger, unsafe drinking water, environmental degradation and endemic or infectious disease.

Let's not imagine that these things are unconnected with peace and security, or that we can afford to ignore them until the "hard threats" have been sorted out. We should have learned by now that a world of glaring inequality—between countries and within them—where many millions of people endure brutal oppression and extreme misery is never going to be a fully safe world, even for its most privileged inhabitants.

Today, the common ground we used to stand on no longer seems solid. In seeking new common ground for our collective efforts, we need to consider whether the United Nations itself is well suited to the challenges ahead.

During the last year, the United Nations has been held under a microscope. In an atmosphere of acrimony surrounding the crisis in Iraq, the importance and, indeed, the relevance of the institution have in some quarters been called into question. This was especially true at the time of the United States decision to go to war in Iraq without the explicit approval of the Security Council.

I know that over the years our record has been far from perfect. The Security Council has been unable to prevent horrendous atrocities—the rule of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, genocide in Rwanda. But, to paraphrase Henry Cabot Lodge, the United Nations may not have brought us to heaven but it played a vital role in saving us from hell.

Peace was brought to many lands through the U.N.—Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mozambique. We helped protect against a drift toward nuclear holocaust, including during the Cuban missile crisis. We served as a vehicle for action against North Korea, against Iraq after the invasion of Kuwait. We've brought relief to millions affected by fighting, famine and floods, and we have helped reduce child mortality and eradicate smallpox. We were critical in helping the developing world throw off the yoke of colonialism.

To my mind, recent events have only underlined the need for the United Nations. That's why I convened a panel, chaired by former Prime Minister Anand Panyarachun of Thailand, to examine the future of our organization. The panel holds its first meeting this weekend.

Its role is threefold: to analyze current and future threats to peace and security; to assess the contribution that collective action can make in meeting these threats; and to recommend the changes needed to make the United Nations a legitimate and effective instrument for a collective response. How, in particular, can the United Nations "take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace," which is one of its purposes, as defined in Article I of its charter? I hope the panel will complete its report by autumn 2004.

If it does its work well, history may yet remember the current crisis as a great opportunity that wise men and women used to strengthen the mechanisms of international cooperation and adapt them to the needs of the new century.

(The remarks of Mr. WARNER and Mr. DEWINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1993 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

THANKING STAFF

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to speak with regard to two matters of great concern to me. I recognize in all probability this will be the last day of the current session of this Congress. I simply express my warm greetings and thank-yous to my fellow colleagues in this Chamber, the staff who serve us in this Chamber, to the pages, to the guards and policemen, to those who work in the cafeterias—all of those, the greater body of infrastructure we are privileged to have in this magnificent institution known as the United States Senate.

Each year I have been privileged to be here—and I must say with some great sense of humility, I mark my 25th year in the Senate late this month. When I was sworn in, in 1978, I believe, I filled a vacancy that occurred in December, and I did it on the second or third of January. So actually my 25th anniversary occurs in the first few days of January.

It has been an enormously great, rewarding privilege for this humble soul to have served in the Senate.

I believe I have served with well over 100 Senators in addition to those I am privileged to serve with in this Congress. Again, I am always mindful of all of those who make it possible in the infrastructure and the institution of the Senate to enable me and others to serve our Nation as best we can in diverse but nevertheless constructive ways for the betterment of all mankind and, yes, America and much of the free world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.