

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 sup-

port 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 findings 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 tyr-

annies, 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, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Leb-

anon, 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 Secre-

tariat 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