

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 Secret-

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

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

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

(3) the term “United States assistance” means assistance under—

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

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

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

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section takes effect upon the date of the submission to the Congress of the report pursuant to section 406 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, that is required to be submitted by March 31, 2006.

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

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

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

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

The United Nations, at its inception, was one of the most noble undertakings in modern human history. Its vision was of world governments working in concert to ameliorate, if not eradicate, world problems. This ideal, however, has over its more recent course become a body where some member nations appear more focused on institutional anti-Americanism than addressing the growing maladies that face the world's citizens.

If the U.N. member nations insist upon open antagonism toward the United States at seemingly every turn, then the time has come to reexamine our role as their benefactor. It is counterintuitive to financially reward countries whose motivation is in opposition to American efforts. In order to correct this problem of incongruity, I propose a simple solution.

My amendment would cause the United States to end all financial assistance to those countries who vote against us more than 50 percent of the time in the United Nations. That also includes an end to training the soldiers of nations who oppose us. The ban on our funding antagonistic nations, however, would not begin until March of 2006. March 31 of 2006, the next report will come out that says how everyone voted on each position. This will give all such countries notice of the coming consequences of their action.

The rationale is simple. They are sovereign nations, they can make their own decisions, but we do not have to

pay them to hate us. Throwing money at our enemies has made them more contemptuous, not less.

I share the concerns of many Americans about the U.N., its bureaucracy and its approach to world problems. They run counter to U.S. values and interests. The U.N. is currently an inefficient bureaucratic organization badly in need of reform, and too often it has become a forum for radical anti-American rhetoric and policies that would violate many of our Nation's most cherished freedoms, laws, customs and recognized human rights.

My amendment simply stops the flow of American tax dollars to countries that claim to be our allies and who are happily taking the hard-earned tax dollars from American pockets, then using the money to spew anti-American venom all over the world.

My constituents in east Texas have told me, I have heard it around the country time and time again, they are fed up with this anti-American rhetoric coming out of the U.N. that their money is paying for. Surely we can find a better use of this money than to fund nations that oppose all we hold dear. On numerous occasions I have had citizens ask me why government is sending their money overseas to support governments and countries that are against the amendments and things for which we stand.

Some say we should be more loving and send these billions of dollars anyway. Friends, your heart may be good, but you are not using your head. I have relatives and friends that I love with all my heart. I would give my life for them, but if they are doing things to demean and destroy the very things I am fighting to preserve, I would not send them money.

Accordingly, and in conclusion, we do not have to pay these countries to hate us. We do not have to fund our opposition. If a foreign nation wants to take the tax dollars of hard-working Americans, well, then they better start helping us seek truth, justice and freedom's ways at least 50 percent of the time.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who claims time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to claim the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to control 5 minutes.

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

I do not know of anything I have done more reluctantly than object to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT's) very good amendment, not only well-intentioned, but it makes a statement that is very hard to disagree with. But I must because I can conceive of circumstances where it is in

our national interest to help support another country that does not vote with us in the U.N., but having a stable country in certain portions of the world can be in our national interest. And I would rather leave that flexibility with the State Department and with the Defense Department so that these grants that are made support our security interests and not necessarily make us feel good because we are rewarding a country that votes with us. Egypt almost never votes with us, but it is important to have the largest Muslim country, other than Indonesia, supporting the aims that we have and goals in the Middle East.

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

Mr. HYDE. Yes, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), my distinguished chairman, in opposing this amendment. I think the chairman, as always, shows great wisdom in opposing this amendment. But I am particularly thrilled that the chairman has embraced the principle of providing our Secretary of State flexibility in dealing with this issue, and I very much hope that during the course of the remaining few minutes of our debate, the chairman will see the wisdom of providing Secretary Rice with flexibility on similar issues.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has just administered the perfumed icepick.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support him in his opposition. I point out that the nation of Colombia, for whom we have provided billions of dollars in terms of dealing with the interdiction and eradication of drugs, would fall because they vote against us 90 percent of the time. I presume that most of that aid would be eliminated by this amendment.

And I would also point out for those of you who support CAFTA that at least five of the countries I have been able to determine here vote against us, so that if we extend the logic of the gentleman's argument, I would suggest that maybe during the course of that debate, when it comes to the floor, if it should come to the floor, that that should be a precondition to approval of the CAFTA trade agreement.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), this is a marvelous amendment. The spirit in which it is offered is exemplary, and it is a very difficult thing to oppose it. But I see a problem with it that needs a little work. But I congratulate him and the spirit in which his good amendment was offered, but I

hope it is not accepted in its present form.

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

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

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

In response, and of course I have nothing but utmost respect for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and it is a pleasure for me to support your amendment, and all three of the distinguished gentlemen that spoke bring up a good point. The Secretary of State does need flexibility, and that is why in this amendment I provided flexibility. If the Secretary of State certifies that there has been such a change in the regime attitudewise, personnelwise, that he or she firmly believes that the next session they will be voting with us more than half the time, then that makes an exception, and they will get funding.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I am nearly done. But that makes an exception. That gives them flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I just heard the gentleman advocating for flexibility for our Secretary of State. Does this flexibility extend to the bill as a whole, in the gentleman's view?

Mr. GOHMERT. It extends in whole if they are going to vote with us more than 50 percent of the time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109-132.

PART 2 AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2 Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 110. STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR RIGHTS.

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

United Nations to work to strengthen and expand the Social Protection sector of the International Labor Organization (ILO) in order to allow the ILO to issue more field and regional units of the ILO, to increase site inspections of working conditions, and to issue more reports on such conditions to the international community.

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

(1) Member States are broadening the scope and the instruments of social security schemes, improving and diversifying benefits, strengthening governance and management, and developing policies to combat adverse effects of social and economic insecurity.

(2) ILO constituents are targeting and taking effective action to improve the safety and health conditions at work, with special attention to the most hazardous conditions in the workplace.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSEHTINEN) each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

The Kucinich amendment would add another requirement for U.N. reform, that the International Labor Organization must be strengthened and expanded; specifically, the social protection sector. It is not the intention of this amendment to limit the U.S. contribution to the U.N. The intention of my amendment is to make it the policy of the United States at the U.N. to place the highest priority on the improvement of international labor rights. Therefore, it is necessary that this amendment has the same certification requirement for the strengthening of the International Labor Organization as the other reform criteria have. Labor rights, which are the same as human rights, should not be treated with any less importance.

The ILO does an important job, and they do it well. My amendment would urge the U.S. representative to the U.N. to use the voice, vote and influence of the United States to encourage the International Labor Organization to do even more. I believe the most important work of the ILO is in the social protection sector, which is responsible for coming up with the tools, instruments and policies to ensure that men and women have working conditions that are as safe as possible, that respect human dignity, take into account family and social values, allow for adequate compensation in the case of lost or reduced income, permit access to adequate social and medical services, and respect the right to free time and rest. In a global economic context of sweatshops, child labor, exploitative labor practices and unfettered cap-

italism, the work of the ILO social protection sector is vastly important.

The social protection sector sends on-site inspectors to investigate labor conditions around the globe. The hard evidence gathered by these inspectors is published in highly regarded in-depth reports for consumption by policymakers, decisionmakers, journalists and various labor and human rights groups throughout the international community. These reports have served as a basis for labor rights campaigns. They have served as a basis for government reforms. They have served as a basis for campaigns against unfair trade agreements with exploitative labor provisions.

The following are examples of recent reports in paper published by the ILO: Global Report 2005, a global alliance against slave labor; an economic study of the costs and benefits of eliminating child labor; a report by the Director General, A Fair Globalization, the Role of the ILO; Towards a Fair Deal for Migrant Workers in a Global Economy; Eleventh Synthesis Report on the Working Condition Situation in Cambodia's Garment Sector.

The ILO is responsible for gathering evidence for and disseminating the following facts: that there are 48,000 children working in floriculture in Cayambe and Cotopaxi in Ecuador. Conditions in Cotopaxi are worse than in Cayambe. In Cotopaxi all employees are involved in all stages of production, including fumigation, and younger children fumigate most frequently. In medical exams of 105 children between the ages of 9 and 18, 27 percent had experienced migraines, 50 percent blackouts; 32 percent experienced shaking.

It is estimated that in Brazil as many as 25,000 persons are subjected to slave labor conditions, mostly in the Amazonian States of Para and Mato Grosso.

In a number of countries free trade has replaced or undercut domestic industrial and agricultural industries displacing workers, while structural adjustment programs have restricted government spending to cushion unemployment.

□ 1215

Job creation in some countries under Structure Adjustment Programs has lagged behind the increased number of unemployed, and the net result of these job losses due to trade and structural change has been a large number of people without opportunities for decent work in their homelands.

It was estimated at the end of 1998 that some 1 billion workers, or one-third of the world's labor force, were either unemployed or underemployed.

It is essential that we know about preexisting labor and living conditions in different regions around the world as steps are taken towards a globalized economy. It is essential that the world learn about the negative consequences that accompany this economic model. The ILO is the foremost international

institution responsible for gathering information and making recommendations amid this context.

The only thing wrong with the ILO is that while its recommendations and conventions are important, they are not enforceable. Nevertheless, the ILO's work is significant, influential and does make a difference.

Mr. Chairman, we should be encouraging and expanding the important work of the ILO so that we will make better informed decisions and develop more sound policies to eradicate the worst labor abuses around the world. With the expansion of the social protection sector, more field and regional units would be established, which would allow more on-site inspections to occur and more reports to be published. A strengthened ILO would have a civilizing effect on corporate behavior.

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

As someone who appreciates the work performed by the International Labor Organization and efforts to bring about and secure labor rights for oppressed people in countries under dictatorial rule, it is with difficulty that I rise in opposition of the gentleman's amendment, but I must.

Had the amendment called on the U.S. permanent representative to the U.N. to work to strengthen the ILO, to increase site inspections, as we had wanted to do, I am confident that we would have gladly supported the gentleman's amendment.

However, this amendment before us today does not seek to reform the ILO, but seeks to use the U.N. to dictate and determine domestic policies of the U.N. member states, policies such as Social Security schemes and employee benefits; and these are issues that in the U.S., for example, we in the Congress are working on and are responsible for. We should not use legislation that seeks to reform the U.N., an international institution, as a means of influencing very specific domestic policy initiatives.

The bill before us, the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005, deals with bringing accountability to the U.N.'s budget process. It does not concern itself with dictating internal, substantive outcomes on the U.N.'s budget process.

In short, today, we are focused on reforming how the U.S., how the U.N. makes the decisions, not on what decisions it makes or what the member states make.

The gentleman from Ohio would have been, I believe, better served by offering his amendment, as others have, by it having called upon the President to direct the U.S. permanent representative to work to ensure enhanced funding for the international labor rights organization, which I believe is a worthy goal, and on that very issue, in fact, this is already being done.

The amendment suggests that the ILO is not doing enough in the social

protection sector. However, the 2006-2007 budget that was agreed to shows a significant increase in the budget for the activities of this sector.

The 2004-2005 budget for the protection sector was \$72.7 million in 2006, and the 2007 budget is \$91 million.

Overall, the International Labor Organization budget increased 12 percent from \$529 million during the 2004 and 2005 biennium to \$594 million in 2006 and 2007. That is \$297 million per year.

The amendment also requires an increase in the field presence by the ILO. However, the organization is currently undertaking a review of the field structures to determine the most effective overseas profile, and this amendment would have the effect of preempting the outcome of this study.

I have been a proud supporter of labor organizations. We want to make sure that they help the oppressed people in all of these countries and do not abuse their people. However, I do not think that this amendment, dictating what member states do with their domestic policies, would get to the heart of the gentleman's amendment.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my good friend for yielding.

I merely wish to express my support for the gentleman's amendment. I think it is worthwhile and ask my colleagues to vote for it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109-132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. PEARCE:

In section 201, add at the end the following new subsection:

(f) PROHIBITION ON CONTACT WITH MEMBER STATES SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS.—An employee from any United Nations entity, bureau, division, department, or specialized agency may not have unauthorized contact, including business contact, with a Member State that is subject to United Nations sanctions.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

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

I rise with this amendment today that would prohibit any employee of a United Nations entity, bureau, division, department, or specialized agency from having any unauthorized contact, particularly business contact, with a government that is subject to United Nations sanctions.

The purpose and ideals of the United Nations are to maintain international peace and security and to engage in collective action to preserve both.

It also is to promote friendly relations among nations founded upon the principles of human rights and self-determination.

Finally, it is to achieve multilateral cooperation on the critical global crises of our age.

I support these goals and ideals, but these purposes are being undermined and threatened by corruption and mismanagement within the U.N. today. That is why I am here today in support of this overall legislation and offering this particular amendment.

One of the most blatant examples of fraud, corruption, and abuse in the United Nations is that of the United Nations employees enriching themselves through personal deals with rogue governments.

In 1991, the United Nations placed sanctions on Iraq for Saddam Hussein's persistent noncompliance with the provisions of the cease-fire that ended the first Gulf War.

In an effort to mitigate the sanctions impact on the Iraqi population, the Oil-for-Food program was created in 1996 to allow the Iraqis to sell oil in order to pay for humanitarian goods. Under the auspices of the United Nations, the oil was to be sold with the proceeds to be deposited with the Banque National de Paris. Humanitarian goods were then to be supplied to Iraq using those funds.

However, Saddam Hussein was allowed to choose his own business partners for this program, those buyers for Iraq's oil, as well as the suppliers of humanitarian goods.

For each 180-day phase of the program, Iraq developed a list of allocations identifying companies and individuals to whom it would be willing to sell oil. Saddam personally reviewed who would receive the oil.

Mr. Hussein would then complete oil contracts based on the allocations list. As this process evolved, Saddam began to give special allocations for the benefit of particular individuals or entities that were perceived to support his brutal regime.

It is abominable for U.S. taxpayers' funds to be used to pay U.N. employees who take advantage of international sanctions and make deals to receive kickbacks.

That is exactly what happened with the U.N. Oil-for-Food program.

While visiting Iraq in the course of his official duties, director of the Oil-for-Food program, Mr. Benon Sevan, requested special allocations from the Iraq oil ministry for African Middle

East Petroleum Company to help a friend. That friend turned out to be former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros Gali's nephew.

It was later found by the Independent Inquiry Committee into the U.N. Oil-for-Food program that what Mr. Sevan sought was more than just for his friend.

Mr. Sevan was in a position of influence and could lift restrictions on various parts of the Oil-for-Food program.

So the Saddam Hussein regime granted the oil allocations to AMEP and Mr. Sevan. AMEP purchased the oil from Iraq, but then sold it to oil companies for as much as \$750,000 per transaction more than what they paid for it, all while giving the proceeds to Mr. Sevan for making the deal. Additional oil allocations granted through the years of the program as restrictions were lifted on aspects of the Oil-for-Food program.

When the program came under scrutiny, Mr. Sevan blocked the proposed audit of his office.

Because of these personal deals, Saddam was able to skirt around the restrictions of sanctions, siphoning off as much as \$10 billion in the form of illicit revenue while the Iraqi people starved.

Saddam Hussein used much of this money to purchase weapons, many of which are being used to kill Americans and Iraqis today as the Allied forces continue to fight terrorism in that country.

Actions such as Mr. Sevan's personal dealings with the sanctioned Iraqi Government undermine the United Nations' purposes.

I ask that my colleagues support this amendment that makes clear to the United Nations that the United States will not tolerate U.N. employees making deals with rogue governments subject to U.N. sanctions.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my friend and colleague.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding the time, and I want to express my enormous respect for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), my dear friend, with whom I agree on some things but not on this issue, although the majority of the bill I know is consistent with the gentleman from California's (Mr. LANTOS) and my view, although I do rise in strong support of the Lantos substitute and in opposition to the underlying bill, but it is with great respect; and I appreciate the opportunity to work with my colleague on this and many other issues.

It is no secret that the United Nations is going through a period of intense soul-searching, precipitated by increasing evidence that it has become an ineffective and unwieldy institution that long ago lost sight of its reason for being.

When the world changes, its institutions must change with it or become irrelevant, and so the U.N. has embarked on a mission to adapt to the changing times. As the Nation most involved in the founding of the U.N., the United States has an obligation to play a key role in this reform process.

Reform cannot, frankly, come quickly enough. The U.N. suffers today from a credibility gap around the world and for good reason. The Volcker Commission has exposed some uncomfortable truths about the Oil-for-Food program. The U.N. has dragged its feet in addressing some of our world's worst crises, such as the Darfur genocide, and has been impotent on human rights issues; and the record of the U.N. and many of its member states with respect to Israel has, frankly, been abominable.

In many ways, the U.N. is broken; but we must remember that it remains and must remain a central actor in global affairs. The organization has provided critical resources to nations coping with great poverty and social dislocation.

The U.N. Population Fund has reduced the number of unintended pregnancies around the world through basic family planning services.

UNICEF is the premier organization combating childhood disease in poor countries.

Agencies like the United Nations Development Program have raised living standards by improving governance, health, and education.

For millions around the world, the U.N. is not some distant bureaucracy. It is a hot meal for a hungry family. It is a doctor for a pregnant mother. It is protection for a first-time voter, and it is peace for a war-ravaged village. Indeed, even when the U.N. efforts fall short, and they often do, progress toward international cooperation is made, and recognition of common interests and values is encouraged.

As many have said, the U.N. is the kind of organization we would have to invent if it did not already exist. A strong U.N. is good for the United States and good for the world.

So enacting the Hyde bill, which is more about punishment than reform, simply does not serve, in my judgment, the best interests of this country.

In requiring a mandatory 50 percent cut in the United States dues to the U.N., unless 32 of 39 specific reforms are achieved, the Hyde bill provides no flexibility whatever to the State Department to negotiate with other U.N. member states. Rather than providing Secretary Rice a tool to encourage ongoing U.N. reform negotiations, it ties her hands.

The Lantos substitute would call for most of the same reforms as the Hyde bill, while providing the Secretary of State with room to maneuver to get real reforms passed.

□ 1230

It is a common-sense way to achieve the changes we all agree are needed

with the right balance of diplomacy and muscle. And while I support the goals of the chairman, I cannot endorse his means, and I urge my colleagues to support the Lantos substitute and defeat the underlying bill.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to wrap up my comments by saying that we all know what corruption looks like, smells like, and acts like. We are seeing corruption at many different levels in the U.N., and I would request that all Members support this amendment, which would limit the unauthorized contact between the United Nations employees and the nations which have been sanctioned.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109-132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

In section 601(b)(1) (relating to the withholding of United States contributions to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations), strike "50 percent" and insert "75 percent".

In section 601(b)(3), strike "11 percent" and insert "5.5 percent".

In section 601(b)(4)(B), strike "50 percent" and insert "75 percent".

In section 601(d)(2), strike "50 percent" and insert "75 percent".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a chart here which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) prepared, and I think you can see all the scandals at the United Nations. This has been shown several times. I think it is a good reminder to all of us that the U.N. is obviously in need of serious reform. I commend Chairman HYDE and his reform bill for doing just that. I think it ensures the reforms that we need.

My amendment is very simple. The main part of the Hyde bill is to withhold U.S. contributions to the regular assessed budget of the U.N. unless they make real and substantial reforms in the way they operate. So his underlying legislation calls for a 50 percent

withholding, and my amendment simply increases that to 75 percent. I think you can think over it in terms of a glass half full, half empty, his 50 percent. My amendment would make it 75 percent empty, which I think for most people is a real clear sign we should do something. So it is not just adding more teeth, it is also one of symbolism.

I think just to review, we all know the U.N. is not as effective as it could be, not to mention all these scandals. The number one scandal is the Oil-for-Food program that we are still investigating, and we still have not got to the bottom of this scandal.

I think the American people, understandably, have sort of lost faith in the United Nations. It does not seem to be fulfilling its founding mission, as long as it continues to coddle dictators and appease terrorists. There is an ever-growing list of grievances against the United Nations, and suggested reform is desperately needed. If not, we will continue to pour hundreds of millions of American taxpayers' dollars down into what I call a bottomless pit. So leveraging our dues this way is the only way we can ensure the U.N. makes the necessary change.

Now, the question would be what is the difference, as I mentioned, between 50 and 75 percent? I think in real dollars and real impact, this will be more important, to move it to 75 percent. For many of us who feel strongly about this, it gives a little more weight to it.

I would also say, Mr. Chairman, that I had a dream last night, and this dream was of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the international Relations. In this dream he was puzzling how much to withhold from the U.N. until they enact the necessary reform—so in his great wisdom. As he sat in his chair in my dream, he set in a magnificent chair, and there were clouds and harps all around him, and he was deliberating very carefully whether to do 50 percent or 75 percent. He finally decided, after much deliberation, to do 50 percent. But I could tell in this dream that in his heart of hearts he wanted to have 75 percent.

So, Mr. Chairman, the dream I had of you convinced me that I should come down to the House floor today and offer 75 percent as a humble way to extend your feelings that were in my dream.

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

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my good friend from Florida for an improved version of the underlying Hyde bill.

I refer to the Hyde bill as a guillotine on autopilot, and I think it is in the true American spirit that the gentleman now has a more effective, faster-working, more suicidal guillotine which he is offering to this body.

I do not think this proposal deserves really any serious comment. If, in fact, 38½ of the 39 Hyde commandments are

fulfilled, we should not automatically chop off 75 percent of our dues to the United Nations.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reclaim my time, because the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is very eloquent, and I would like to continue to have a little less say on my amendment. If he is accepting my amendment, I would sure appreciate his support.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is with painful reluctance that I object to my dear friend's dreams and his emanating bill. He is on the right track, God knows, but it is overkill. I think 50 percent bites just enough; 75 percent might kill the patient. And so with reluctance and admiration, and a hope that he gets a good night's sleep tonight, undisturbed by dreams, I must object to the amendment.

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

Mr. HYDE. With pleasure, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is yet another occasion that Chairman HYDE and I stand shoulder to shoulder on attempting to reform the United Nations. I strongly concur with the chairman, this is overkill. It is over-overkill.

Using the gentleman's logic, it is difficult to see why he is not proposing a 95 percent automatic dues cut-off. But maybe upon reflection he might propose that on a future occasion.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that tonight I will try to get more sleep, because I have spent so much more time dreaming, and perhaps tonight he will be in my dreams. And I will be dreaming that he wished that we would have had the amendment at 95 percent instead of the 50 percent.

My colleagues, when you come down to the House floor to vote on the amendment, I want you to vote "yes" for the Stearns amendment because in your heart of hearts, in fact in the heart of hearts of Chairman HYDE in my dream, he wanted 75 percent.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109-132.

PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 13 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 13 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. LANTOS:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "United Nations Reform and Institutional Strengthening Act of 2005".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Statement of Congress.

TITLE I—MISSION AND BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Sec. 101. United States financial contributions to the United Nations.
Sec. 102. Weighted voting.
Sec. 103. Certification requirements.
Sec. 104. Accountability.
Sec. 105. Terrorism and the United Nations.
Sec. 106. Equality at the United Nations.
Sec. 107. Reforms at the specialized agencies.
Sec. 108. Report on United Nations reform.
Sec. 109. Report on United Nations personnel.
Sec. 110. Anti-Semitism and the United Nations.
Sec. 111. United Nations cooperation relating to oil-for-food investigation.

TITLE II—HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Sec. 201. Human Rights.
Sec. 202. Economic and Social Council (ecosoc).
Sec. 203. International responsibility to protect.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Sec. 301. International atomic energy agency.
Sec. 302. Sense of Congress regarding the Nuclear Security Action Plan of the IAEA.

TITLE IV—PEACEKEEPING

Sec. 401. Sense of Congress regarding reform of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.
Sec. 402. Statement of policy relating to reform of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.
Sec. 403. Certification.
Sec. 404. United States Contributions to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.
Sec. 405. Genocide and the United Nations.
Sec. 406. Rule of construction relating to protection of United States officials and members of the Armed Forces.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Sec. 501. Positions for United States citizens at international organizations.

Sec. 502. Budget justification for regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

Sec. 503. Review and report.

Sec. 504. Government accountability office.

TITLE VI—CERTIFICATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 601. Certifications and withholding of Contributions.

Sec. 602. Diplomatic Campaign to Achieve Reform.

TITLE VII—UNITED NATIONS RENEWAL AND TOOLS TO FULLY IMPLEMENT UNITED NATIONS REFORM

Sec. 701. Synchronization of U.S. assessed Contributions to International Organizations.

Sec. 702. Increased funding for United States assessed contribution to the United Nations to support reform efforts.

Sec. 703. Buyout of United Nations personnel.

Sec. 704. United Nations democracy fund.

Sec. 705. United States personnel to international organizations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL.—The term “Economic and Social Council” means the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

(3) EMPLOYEE.—The term “employee” means an individual who is employed in the general services, professional staff, or senior management of the United Nations.

(4) GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—The term “General Assembly” means the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(5) MEMBER STATE.—The term “Member State” means a Member State of the United Nations.

(6) OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES.—The terms “Office of Internal Oversight Services” and “OIOS” mean the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of State.

(8) SECRETARY GENERAL.—The term “Secretary General” means the Secretary General of the United Nations.

(9) SECURITY COUNCIL.—The term “Security Council” means the Security Council of the United Nations.

(10) SPECIALIZED AGENCY.—The term “specialized agency” means any of the following agencies of the United Nations:

(A) The Food and Agriculture Organization, or FAO.

(B) The International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA.

(C) The International Civil Aviation Organization, or ICAO.

(D) The International Fund for Agricultural Development, or IFAD.

(E) The International Labor Organization, or ILO.

(F) The International Maritime Organization, or IMO.

(G) The International Telecommunication Union, or ITU.

(H) The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, or UNESCO.

(I) The United Nations Industrial Development Organization, or UNIDO.

(J) The Universal Postal Union, or UPU.

(K) The World Health Organization, or WHO.

(L) The World Meteorological Organization, or WMO.

(M) The World Intellectual Property Organization, or WIPO.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF CONGRESS.

Congress declares that, in light of recent history, it is incumbent upon the United Nations to enact significant reform measures if it is to restore the public trust and confidence necessary for it to achieve the laudable goals set forth in its Charter.

TITLE I—MISSION AND BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 101. UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION WITH RESPECT TO THE REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to make contributions toward the amount assessed to the United States by the United Nations for the purpose of funding the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

(b) UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—Section 11 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287e-3) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 11. UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

“(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.—

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

“(A) to pursue a streamlined, efficient, and accountable regular assessed budget of the United Nations;

“(B) to make efforts to shift funding mechanisms of some of the organizational programs of the United Nations from the regular assessed budget to voluntarily funded programs; and

“(C) to shift funding from entities whose efforts are found duplicative or unbalanced under section 106(b) of the United Nations Reform and Institutional Strengthening Act of 2005 to programs under subsection (b) of this section or other related programs.

“(2) FUTURE BIENNIALE BUDGETS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to seek to shift funding mechanisms of operational programs of the United Nations and to reduce the funding for programs specified in subsection (c) in future resolutions agreed to by the General Assembly for the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

“(b) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONAL PROGRAMS.—To the extent that any organizational programs are shifted from the regular assessed budget to voluntarily funded programs, the Secretary shall seek to use funds created by any reduction in the amount of the United States assessed contribution to the United Nations to make voluntary contributions to programs at the United Nations which—

“(1) conduct internal oversight;

“(2) promote human rights;

“(3) provide humanitarian assistance; and

“(4) are organizational programs which have been shifted from assessed to voluntary contributions.

“(c) PUBLIC INFORMATION AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY AFFAIRS AND CONFERENCE SERVICES.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to reduce by 20 percent the amount budgeted by resolution of the General Assembly for the 2008–2009 biennium compared

to the amount budgeted by resolution of General Assembly for the 2004–2005 biennial period for the following organizational programs:

“(1) Public Information.

“(2) General Assembly affairs and conference services.”

SEC. 102. WEIGHTED VOTING.

It shall be the policy of the United States to actively pursue weighted voting in the United Nations with respect to all budgetary and financial matters in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee and in the General Assembly in accordance with the level of the financial contribution of a Member State to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

SEC. 103. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

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

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conditions under this subsection are the following:

(1) NEW BUDGET PRACTICES FOR THE UNITED NATIONS.—The United Nations is implementing budget practices that—

(A) require the maintenance of a budget not in excess of the level agreed to by the General Assembly at the beginning of each United Nations budgetary biennium, unless increases are agreed to by consensus and do not exceed ten percent, or unless the Secretary of State certifies that any increase that would be inconsistent with this paragraph is important to the national interest of the United States; and

(B) require the identification of expenditures by the United Nations by functional categories such as personnel, travel, and equipment.

(2) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

(A) EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary General has used the existing authorities to take measures to ensure that program managers within the United Nations Secretariat conduct evaluations of such programs in accordance with the standardized methodology referred to in subparagraph (B) of United Nations programs approved by the General Assembly.

(B) DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA.—The Office of Internal Oversight Services has developed a standardized methodology for the evaluation of United Nations programs approved by the General Assembly, including specific criteria for determining the continuing relevance and effectiveness of the programs.

(C) REPORT.—The Secretary General is assessing budget requests and, on the basis of the evaluations of programs conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) for the relevant preceding year, reports to the General Assembly on the continuing relevance and effectiveness of such programs and identifies those that need reform or should be terminated.

(D) SUNSET OF PROGRAMS.—Consistent with the July 16, 1997, recommendations of the Secretary General regarding a sunset policy and results-based budgeting for United Nations programs, the United Nations has established and is implementing procedures to require all new programs approved by the General Assembly to have a specific sunset date or a date by which such programs should be evaluated for continuing relevance and effectiveness.

SEC. 104. ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) CERTIFICATION OF CREATION OF INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT BOARD.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the establishment of an Independent Oversight Board (IOB) have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) An IOB or an equivalent entity is established. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the IOB shall be an independent entity within the United Nations and shall not be subject to budget authority or organizational authority of any entity within the United Nations.

(2) The head of the IOB shall be a Director. The IOB shall also consist of four other board members who shall be nominated by the Secretary General and subject to Security Council approval by a majority vote. The IOB shall be responsible to the Security Council. The Director and board members shall each serve terms of six years, except that the terms of the initial board shall be staggered so that the terms of not more than two board members will expire in any one year. No board member may serve more than two terms. An IOB board member may be removed for cause by a majority vote of the Security Council. The Director shall appoint a professional staff headed by a Chief of Staff and may employ contract staff as needed.

(3) The IOB shall receive operational and budgetary funding through appropriations by the General Assembly and shall not be dependent upon any other bureau, division, or department of the United Nations for such funding.

(4) The IOB shall have the authority to evaluate all operations of the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Board of External Auditors of the United Nations. Every three months or more frequently when appropriate, the IOB shall submit, as appropriate, to the Secretary General, the Security Council, the General Assembly, or the Economic and Social Council a report on its activities, relevant observations, and recommendations relating to its audit operations, including information relating to the inventory and status of investigation by the Office of Internal Oversight Services. The IOB may direct the Office of Internal Oversight Services or the Board of External Auditors to initiate an investigation.

(5) In extraordinary circumstances, and with the concurrence of the Secretary General and Security Council by majority vote, the IOB may augment the Office of Internal Oversight Services with a special investigator and staff consisting of individuals who are not employees of the United Nations, to investigate matters involving senior officials of the United Nations when allegations of serious misconduct have been made and such a special investigation is necessary to maintain public confidence in the integrity of the investigation. A special investigation staff shall comply with all United Nations financial disclosure and conflict of interest rules, including the filing of an individual annual financial disclosure form in accordance with subsection (c).

(6) The IOB shall recommend annual budgets for the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Board of External Auditors.

(b) CERTIFICATION OF UNITED NATIONS REFORMS OF THE OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) The OIOS is designated as an independent entity within the United Nations. The OIOS shall not be subject to budget authority or organizational authority of any entity within the United Nations.

(2) The head of the OIOS shall be a Director.

(3) The OIOS shall receive operational and budgetary funding through appropriations by the General Assembly and shall not be dependent upon any other bureau, division, department, or specialized agency for such funding.

(4) All United Nations officials, including officials from any bureau, division, or department of the United Nations, may—

(A) make a recommendation to the OIOS to initiate an investigation of any aspect of the United Nations; or

(B) report to the OIOS information or allegations of misconduct or inefficiencies within the United Nations.

(5) The OIOS may, *sua sponte*, initiate and conduct an investigation of any bureau, division, department, or employee (including the Secretary General) of the United Nations or contractor or consultant for the United Nations.

(6) At least every three months and more frequently when appropriate, the OIOS or another responsible office shall submit to the IOB a report containing an inventory and status of its investigations.

(7) The OIOS shall establish or approve procedures for providing “whistle-blower” status and employment protections for all employees of the United Nations, who provide informational leads and testimony related to allegations of wrongdoing. Such procedures shall be adopted throughout the United Nations. Such status and protection may not be conferred on the Secretary General.

(8) The OIOS shall annually publish a public report determining the proper number, distribution, and expertise of auditors within the OIOS necessary to carry out present and future duties of the OIOS, including assessing the staffing requirements needed to audit United Nations contracting activities throughout the contract cycle from the bid process to contract performance.

(9) The Director of OIOS shall establish a position of Associate Director of OIOS for Specialized Agencies and Funds and Programs, who shall be responsible for supervising the OIOS liaison and oversight duties for each specialized agency and funds and programs of the United Nations. With the concurrence of the Director and the relevant specialized agency, the Associate Director may hire and appoint necessary OIOS staff, including staff serving within and located at a specialized agency and funds and programs permanently or as needed to liaison with existing audit functions with each specialized agency and funds and programs.

(10) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish a position of Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations or an equivalent position, who shall be responsible for the oversight and auditing of the field offices attached to United Nations peacekeeping operations. The Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations shall—

(A) receive informational leads and testimony from any person regarding allegations of wrongdoing by United Nations officials or peacekeeping troops or regarding inefficiencies associated with United Nations peacekeeping operations; and

(B) shall be responsible for initiating, conducting, and overseeing investigations within peacekeeping operations.

(11)(A) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish a position of Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity or an equivalent position, who shall be responsible for auditing and inspecting procurement and contracting within the United Nations. The Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity shall—

(i) receive informational leads and testimony from any person regarding allegations of wrongdoing by United Nations officials or regarding inefficiencies associated with

United Nations procurement or contracting activities; and

(ii) be responsible for initiating, conducting, and overseeing investigations of procurement and contract activities.

(B) Not later than 12 months after the establishment of the position of Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity, the Director, with the assistance of the Associate Director of OIOS for Procurement and Contract Integrity, shall undertake a review of contract procedures to ensure that practices and policies are in place to ensure that—

(i) the United Nations has ceased issuing single bid contracts, except during an emergency situation that is justified by the Under Secretary General for Management;

(ii) the United Nations has established effective controls to prevent conflicts of interest in the award of contracts; and

(iii) the United Nations has established effective procedures and policies to ensure effective and comprehensive oversight and monitoring of United Nations contract performance.

(c) CERTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS OFFICE OF ETHICS.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the establishment of a United Nations Office of Ethics or an equivalent entity (UNOE) have been established by the United Nations:

(1) A UNOE is established. The UNOE shall be an independent entity within the United Nations and shall not be subject to budget authority or organizational authority of any entity within the United Nations. The UNOE shall be responsible for establishing, managing, and enforcing a code of ethics for all employees of the United Nations. The UNOE shall be responsible for providing such employees with annual training related to such code. The head of the UNOE shall be a Director.

(2) The UNOE shall receive operational and budgetary funding through appropriations by the General Assembly and shall not be dependent upon any other bureau, division, department, or specialized agency of the United Nations for such funding.

(3) The Director of the UNOE shall, not later than six months after the date of its establishment, publish a report containing proposals for implementing a system for the filing and review of individual annual financial disclosure forms by each employee of the United Nations at the P-5 level and above and by all consultants for the United Nations compensated at any salary level. Such forms shall be made available at the request of the Director of the Office of Internal Oversight Services. Such system shall seek to identify and prevent conflicts of interest by United Nations employees and shall be comparable to the system used for such purposes by the United States Government. Such report shall also address broader reforms of the ethics program for the United Nations, including—

(A) the effect of the establishment of ethics officers throughout all organizations within the United Nations;

(B) the effect of retention by the UNOE of annual financial disclosure forms;

(C) proposals for making completed annual financial disclosure forms of each employee and consultant available to the public, on request, through the mission to the United Nations of the Member State of which the employee or consultant is a national;

(D) proposals for annual disclosure to the public of information related to the annual salaries and payments, including pension payments and buyouts, of employees of and consultants for the United Nations;

(E) proposals for annual disclosure to the public of information related to per diem rates for all bureaus, divisions, departments, or specialized agencies within the United Nations;

(F) proposals for disclosure upon request by the Ambassador of a Member State of information related to travel and per diem payments made from United Nations funds to any person; and

(G) proposals for annual disclosure to the public of information related to travel and per diem payments made from United Nations funds to any person.

(d) CERTIFICATION OF UNITED NATIONS ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the following reforms related to the establishment of the position of a Chief Operating Officer or an equivalent position have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) There is established the position of Chief Operating Officer (COO). The COO shall report to the Secretary General.

(2) The COO shall be responsible for formulating general policies and programs for the United Nations in coordination with the Secretary General and in consultation with the Security Council and the General Assembly. The COO shall be responsible for the daily administration, operation and supervision, and the direction and control of the business of the United Nations. The COO shall also perform such other duties and may exercise such other powers as from time to time may be assigned to the COO by the Secretary General.

SEC. 105. TERRORISM AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to work toward adoption by the General Assembly of—

(1) a definition of terrorism that builds upon the recommendations of the Secretary General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, and includes as an essential component of such definition any action that is intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do, or abstain from doing, any act; and

(2) a comprehensive convention on terrorism that includes the definition described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 106. EQUALITY AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) INCLUSION OF ISRAEL IN WEOG.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to expand the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) in the United Nations to include Israel as a permanent member with full rights and privileges.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and every six months thereafter for the succeeding 2-year period, the Secretary of State shall notify the appropriate congressional committees concerning the treatment of Israel in the United Nations and the expansion of WEOG to include Israel as a permanent member.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVIEW AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To avoid duplicative efforts and funding with respect to Palestinian interests and to ensure balance in the approach to Israeli-Palestinian issues, the Secretary shall conduct an audit of the functions of the entities listed in paragraph (2) and submit to the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 60 days after en-

actment of this Act, a report containing recommendations for the elimination of such entities.

(2) ENTITIES.—The entities referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The United Nations Division for Palestinian Rights.

(B) The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

(C) The United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative to the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority.

(D) The NGO Network on the Question of Palestine.

(E) The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East.

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

(G) Such other entities as the Secretary determines to constitute duplicative efforts and funding or fail to ensure balance in the approach to Israeli-Palestinian issues.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION BY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to seek the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report required under subsection (b)(1).

(2) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—Until such recommendations have been implemented, the Secretary of State is authorized to withhold from United States contributions to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations for a biennial period amounts that are proportional to the percentage of such budget that are expended for such entities.

(d) GAO AUDIT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of—

(1) the status of the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report required under subsection (b)(1); and

(2) United States action and achievements under subsection (c).

SEC. 107. REFORMS AT THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES.

(a) BUDGET REFORM.—The Secretary of State shall direct the United States representative to each specialized agency to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States ensure that each specialized agency—

(1) has developed a standardized methodology for the evaluation of the programs of the agency, including specific criteria for determining the continuing relevance and effectiveness of the programs, patterned on the work of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations under section 103;

(2) provides the results of such evaluations to the governing body of such agency; and

(3) has established and is implementing procedures to require all new programs of such agency have a specific sunset date.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Secretary of State shall direct the United States representative to each specialized agency to use the voice, vote and influence of the United States to ensure that each specialized agency—

(1) has a strengthened internal inspection capability or has agreed to allow the Office on Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations to conduct an investigation or audit of any program in such agency, including any employee or contractor of, or consultant for, such agency; and

(2) has adopted whistleblower protections patterned on the protections developed by OIOS under section 104 of this Act.

(c) ETHICS.—The Secretary shall direct the United States representative to each specialized agency to use the voice, vote and influence of the United States to ensure that each specialized agency—

(1) is using a system for the filing and review of individual annual financial disclosure forms developed by the United Nations Ethics Office established by section 104 of this Act or a system patterned after such system; and

(2) has established its own ethics office or is using the services of the United Nations Ethics Office to review and otherwise implement the ethics system described in paragraph (1).

(d) AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary is unable to certify that one or more of the policies described in this section has been implemented for any specialized agency, the Secretary is authorized to withhold up to 50 percent of the United States contribution to the regular assessed budget of such specialized agency, beginning with funds appropriated for such contribution for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 108. REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United Nations reform since 1990.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall describe—

(1) the status of the implementation of management reforms within the United Nations and its specialized agencies;

(2) the number of outputs, reports, or other items generated by General Assembly resolutions that have been eliminated;

(3) the progress of the General Assembly to modernize and streamline the committee structure and its specific recommendations on oversight and committee outputs, consistent with the March 2005 report of the Secretary General entitled "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all";

(4) the status of the review by the General Assembly of all mandates older than five years and how resources have been redirected to new challenges, consistent with the March 2005 report of the Secretary General referred to in paragraph (3); and

(5) the continued utility and relevance of the Economic and Financial Committee and the Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee, in light of the duplicative agendas of those committees and the Economic and Social Council.

(c) UPDATE.—Not later than one year after submitting the report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report updating the information included in the first report.

SEC. 109. REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(1) concerning the progress of the General Assembly to modernize human resource practices, consistent with the March 2005 report of the Secretary General entitled "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all"; and

(2) containing the information described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report shall include—

(1) a comprehensive evaluation of human resources reforms at the United Nations, including an evaluation of—

(A) tenure;

(B) performance reviews;

(C) the promotion system;

(D) a merit-based hiring system and enhanced regulations concerning termination of employment of employees; and

(E) the implementation of a code of conduct and ethics training;

(2) the implementation of a system of procedures for filing complaints and protective measures for work-place harassment, including sexual harassment;

(3) policy recommendations relating to the establishment of a rotation requirement for nonadministrative positions;

(4) policy recommendations relating to the establishment of a prohibition preventing personnel and officials assigned to the mission of a Member State to the United Nations from transferring to a position within the United Nations Secretariat that is compensated at the P-5 level or above;

(5) policy recommendations relating to a reduction in travel allowances and attendant oversight with respect to accommodations and airline flights; and

(6) an evaluation of the recommendations of the Secretary General relating to greater flexibility for the Secretary General in staffing decisions to accommodate changing priorities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 111. UNITED NATIONS COOPERATION RELATED TO OIL-FOR-FOOD INVESTIGATION.

The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to make efforts to ensure that the United Nations provides all appropriate and necessary information to the relevant law enforcement authority of a Member State relating to a prosecution initiated by such authority regarding the oil-for-food program of the United Nations and that the United Nations waives immunity regarding

any official charged with a serious criminal offense under such prosecution.

TITLE II—HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

SEC. 201. HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use its voice, vote, and influence at the United Nations to ensure that a credible and respectable Human Rights Council or other human rights body is established within the United Nations whose participating Member States uphold the values embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(b) HUMAN RIGHTS REFORMS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to seek to ensure that the following human rights reforms have been adopted by the United Nations:

(1) A Member State that fails to uphold the values embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights shall be ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body.

(2) A Member State that is subject to sanctions by the Security Council or under a Security Council-mandated investigation for human rights abuses shall be ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body.

(3) A Member State that is subject to a country specific resolution relating to human rights abuses perpetrated in that country by the government of that country that has been adopted, within the preceding 3-year period, by a United Nations or regional organization that has competence regarding such matters shall be ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body. For purposes of this paragraph, a country specific resolution shall not include consensus resolutions on advisory services.

(4) A Member State that violates the principles of a United Nations human rights body to which it aspires to join shall be ineligible for membership on such body.

(5) No human rights body has a standing agenda item that only relates to one country or one region.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the human rights reforms described under subsection (b) have been adopted by the United Nations.

(d) PREVENTION OF ABUSE OF “NO ACTION” MOTIONS.—The United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations shall work to prevent abuse of “no action” motions, particularly as such motions relate to country specific resolutions.

(e) OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS.—

(1) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to continue to strongly support the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—In accordance with section 601, a certification shall be required that certifies that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has been given greater authority in field operation activities, such as in the Darfur region of Sudan and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in furtherance of the purpose and mission of the United Nations.

SEC. 202. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (ECOSOC).

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use its voice, vote, and influence at the United Nations to—

(1) abolish secret voting in the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC);

(2) ensure that, until such time as the Commission on Human Rights of the United

Nations is abolished, only countries that are not ineligible for membership on a human rights body in accordance with paragraph (1) through (4) of section 201(b) shall be considered for membership on the Commission on Human Rights; and

(3) ensure that after candidate countries are nominated for membership on the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council conducts a recorded vote to determine such membership.

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

SEC. 203. INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The situation in Darfur, Sudan, declared to be genocide by the U.S. House of Representatives in H.Con.Res. 467 (adopted on July 27, 2004), demonstrates the need for an internationally agreed framework for effective action to prevent genocide or other crimes against humanity that threaten a large scale loss of life.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the United States and other members of the international community should endorse the Secretary General's initiative described in his report entitled “In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all” to require that—

(1) the government of every country has the responsibility to protect its civilian population from genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity; and

(2) in the case of a government that is unwilling or unable to do carry out its responsibility under paragraph (1) in the face of such gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, members of the international community must use diplomatic, humanitarian, and other necessary means to help protect civilian populations and save lives.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

SEC. 301. INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY.

(a) ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE.—

(1) OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to establish an Office of Compliance in the Secretariat of the IAEA under the direction of the Deputy Director General for Safeguards.

(B) OPERATION.—The Office of Compliance shall—

(i) function as an independent body composed of technical experts who shall work in consultation with IAEA inspectors to assess compliance by IAEA Member States and provide recommendations to the IAEA Board of Governors concerning penalties to be imposed on IAEA Member States that fail to fulfill their obligations under IAEA Board resolutions;

(ii) base its assessments and recommendations on IAEA inspection reports; and

(iii) take into consideration information provided by IAEA Board Members that are among the five nuclear weapons states as recognized by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (21 UST 483) (commonly referred to as the “Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty” or the “NPT”).

(C) STAFFING.—The Office of Compliance shall be staffed from existing personnel in the Department of Safeguards of the IAEA or the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security of the IAEA.

(D) OPERATION.—The Office of Compliance shall operate in consultation with IAEA inspectors and enforcement actions shall be

based on inspection reports, IAEA Board of Governors resolutions, Director General reports, and shall take into consideration information provided by IAEA Board Members that are among the five nuclear weapons states as recognized by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(2) SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SAFEGUARDS AND VERIFICATION.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to establish a Special Committee on Safeguards and Verification.

(B) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Special Committee shall—

(i) improve the ability of the IAEA to monitor and enforce compliance by Member States of the IAEA with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

(ii) consider which additional measures are necessary to enhance the ability of the IAEA, beyond the verification mechanisms and authorities contained in the Additional Protocol to the Safeguards Agreements between the IAEA and Member States of the IAEA, to detect with a high degree of confidence undeclared nuclear activities by a Member State.

(3) PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE IAEA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to ensure that a Member State of the IAEA that is under investigation for a breach of or noncompliance with its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations has its IAEA privileges suspended, including—

(i) limiting its ability to vote on its case; (ii) being prevented from receiving any technical assistance; and

(iii) being prevented from hosting meetings.

(B) TERMINATION OF PENALTIES.—The penalties specified under subparagraph (A) shall be terminated when the investigation is concluded and the Member State is no longer in such breach or noncompliance.

(4) PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to ensure that a Member State of the IAEA that is found to be in breach of, in noncompliance with, or has withdrawn from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty shall return to the IAEA all nuclear materials and technology received from the IAEA, any Member State of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

(b) UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—Voluntary contributions of the United States to the IAEA may only be used to fund activities relating to Nuclear Safety and Security or activities relating to Nuclear Verification.

(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to—

(A) ensure that funds for safeguards inspections are used giving first priority to address countries that are initiating or developing nuclear activities; and

(B) block the allocation of funds for any other IAEA development, environmental, or nuclear science assistance or activity to a country—

(i) the government of which the Secretary of State has determined—

(I) for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or other provision of law, is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(II) has not dismantled and surrendered its weapons of mass destruction under international verification;

(ii) that is under investigation for a breach of or noncompliance with its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; or

(iii) that is in violation of its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

(3) DETAIL OF EXPENDITURES.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to secure, as part of the regular budget presentation of the IAEA to Member States of the IAEA, a detailed breakdown by country of expenditures of the IAEA for safeguards inspections and nuclear security activities.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to block the membership on the Board of Governors of the IAEA of a Member State of the IAEA that has not signed and ratified the IAEA Additional Protocol and—

(A) is under investigation for a breach of, or noncompliance with, its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; or

(B) is in violation of its IAEA obligations or the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

(2) CRITERIA.—The United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA shall make every effort to modify the criteria for Board membership to reflect the principles described in paragraph (1).

(d) NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.—

(1) UNITED STATES ACTION.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the IAEA to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the IAEA to make every effort to ensure the adoption of a resolution by the IAEA Board of Governors that makes Iran ineligible to receive any nuclear material, technology, equipment, or assistance from any IAEA Member State and ineligible for any IAEA assistance not related to safeguards inspections or nuclear security until the IAEA Board of Governors determines that Iran—

(A) is providing full access to IAEA inspectors to its nuclear-related facilities;

(B) has fully implemented and is in compliance with the Additional Protocol; and

(C) has permanently ceased and dismantled all activities and programs related to nuclear-enrichment and reprocessing.

(2) PENALTIES.—If an IAEA Member State is determined to have violated the prohibition on assistance to Iran described in paragraph (1) before the IAEA Board of Governors determines that Iran has satisfied the conditions described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of such paragraph, such Member State shall be subject to the penalties described in section 301(a)(3), shall be ineligible to receive nuclear material, technology, equipment, or assistance from any IAEA Member State, and shall be ineligible to receive any IAEA assistance not related to safeguards inspections or nuclear security until such time as the IAEA Board of Governors makes such determination with respect to Iran.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act

and annually thereafter for the succeeding 2-year period, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this section.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ACTION PLAN OF THE IAEA.

It is the sense of Congress that the national security interests of the United States are enhanced by the Nuclear Security Action Plan of the IAEA and the Board of Governors of the IAEA should recommend, and the General Conference of the IAEA should adopt, a resolution incorporating the Nuclear Security Action Plan into the regular budget of the IAEA.

TITLE IV—PEACEKEEPING

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REFORM OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) although United Nations peacekeeping operations have contributed greatly toward the promotion of peace and stability for the past 57 years, and the majority of peacekeeping personnel who have served under the United Nations flag have done so with honor and courage, the record of United Nations peacekeeping has been severely tarnished by operational failures and unconscionable acts of misconduct; and

(2) if the reputation of and confidence in United Nations peacekeeping operations is to be restored, fundamental and far-reaching reforms, particularly in the areas of planning, management, training, conduct, and discipline, must be implemented without delay.

SEC. 402. STATEMENT OF POLICY RELATING TO REFORM OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

It shall be the policy of the United States to pursue reform of United Nations peacekeeping operations in the following areas:

(1) PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.—

(A) GLOBAL AUDIT.—As the size, cost, and number of United Nations peacekeeping operations have increased substantially over the past decade, an independent audit of each such operation, with a view toward “right-sizing” operations and ensuring that such operations are cost effective, should be conducted and its findings reported to the Security Council.

(B) REVIEW OF MANDATES AND CLOSING OPERATIONS.—In conjunction with the audit described in subparagraph (A), the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations should conduct a comprehensive review of all United Nations peacekeeping operation mandates, with a view toward identifying objectives that are practical and achievable, and report its findings to the Security Council. In particular, the review should consider the following:

(i) Activities that fall beyond the scope of traditional peacekeeping activities should be delegated to a new Peacebuilding Commission, described in paragraph (3).

(ii) Long-standing operations that are static and cannot fulfill their mandate should be downsized or closed.

(iii) If there is legitimate concern that the withdrawal from a country of an otherwise static United Nations peacekeeping operation would result in the resumption of major conflict, a burden-sharing arrangement that reduces the level of assessed contributions, similar to that currently supporting the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, should be explored and instituted.

(C) LEADERSHIP.—As peacekeeping operations become larger and increasingly complex, the Secretariat should adopt a minimum standard of qualifications for senior leaders and managers, with particular emphasis on specific skills and experience, and

current senior leaders and managers who do not meet those standards should be removed or reassigned.

(D) PRE-DEPLOYMENT TRAINING.—Pre-deployment training on interpretation of the mandate of the operation, specifically in the areas of force, civilian protection, field conditions, the Code of Conduct described in paragraph (2)(A), HIV/AIDS, gender, and human rights issues should be mandatory, and all personnel, regardless of category or rank, should be required to sign an oath that each has received and understands such training as a condition of participation in the operation.

(2) CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINE.—

(A) ADOPTION OF A UNIFORM CODE OF CONDUCT.—A single, uniform Code of Conduct that has the status of a binding rule and applies equally to all personnel serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations, regardless of category or rank, should be promulgated, adopted, and enforced.

(B) UNDERSTANDING THE CODE OF CONDUCT.—All personnel, regardless of category or rank, should receive training on the Code of Conduct prior to deployment with a peacekeeping operation, in addition to periodic follow-on training. In particular—

(i) all personnel, regardless of category or rank, should be provided with a personal copy of the Code of Conduct that has been translated into the national language of such personnel, regardless of whether such language is an official language of the United Nations;

(ii) all personnel, regardless of category or rank, should sign an oath that each has received a copy of the Code of Conduct, that each pledges to abide by the Code of Conduct, and that each understands the consequences of violating the Code of Conduct as a condition of appointment to such operation, including immediate termination of the participation of such personnel in the peacekeeping operation to which such personnel is assigned; and

(iii) peacekeeping operations should conduct educational outreach programs within communities hosting such operations, including explaining prohibited acts on the part of United Nations peacekeeping personnel and identifying the individual to whom the local population may direct complaints or file allegations of exploitation, abuse, or other acts of misconduct.

(C) MONITORING MECHANISMS.—Dedicated monitoring mechanisms, such as the personnel conduct units deployed to support United Nations peacekeeping operations in Haiti, Liberia, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, should be present in each operation to monitor compliance with the Code of Conduct, and—

(i) should report simultaneously to the Head of Mission, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and the Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations (established under section 104(b)(9)); and

(ii) should be tasked with designing and implementing mission-specific measures to prevent misconduct, conduct follow-on training for personnel, coordinate community outreach programs, and assist in investigations, as OIOS determines necessary and appropriate.

(D) INVESTIGATIONS.—A permanent, professional, and independent investigative body should be established and introduced into United Nations peacekeeping operations. In particular—

(i) the investigative body should include professionals with experience in investigating sex crimes, as well as experts who can provide guidance on standards of proof and evidentiary requirements necessary for any subsequent legal action;

(ii) provisions should be included in a Model Memorandum of Understanding that obligate each Member State that contributes troops to a peacekeeping operation to designate a military prosecutor who will participate in any investigation into an allegation of misconduct brought against an individual of that Member State, so that evidence is collected and preserved in a manner consistent with the military law of that Member State;

(iii) the investigative body should be regionally based to ensure rapid deployment and should be equipped with modern forensics equipment for the purpose of positively identifying perpetrators and, where necessary, for determining paternity; and

(iv) the investigative body should report directly to the Associate Director of OIOS for Peacekeeping Operations, while providing copies of any reports to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Head of Mission, and the Member State concerned.

(E) FOLLOW-UP.—A dedicated unit, similar to the personnel conduct units, staffed and funded through existing resources, should be established within the headquarters of the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and tasked with—

(i) promulgating measures to prevent misconduct;

(ii) coordinating allegations of misconduct, and reports received by field personnel; and

(iii) gathering follow-up information on completed investigations, particularly by focusing on disciplinary actions against the individual concerned taken by the United Nations or by the Member State that is contributing troops to which the individual belongs, and sharing that information with the Security Council, the Head of Mission, and the community hosting the peacekeeping operation.

(F) FINANCIAL LIABILITY AND VICTIMS ASSISTANCE.—Although peacekeeping operations should provide immediate medical assistance to victims of sexual abuse or exploitation, the responsibility for providing longer-term treatment, care, or restitution lies solely with the individual found guilty of the misconduct. In particular, the following reforms should be implemented:

(i) The United Nations should not assume responsibility for providing long-term treatment or compensation by creating a “Victims Trust Fund”, or any other such similar fund, financed through assessed contributions to United Nations peacekeeping operations, thereby shielding individuals from personal liability and reinforcing an atmosphere of impunity.

(ii) If an individual responsible for misconduct has been repatriated, reassigned, redeployed, or is otherwise unable to provide assistance, responsibility for providing assistance to a victim should be assigned to the Member State that contributed the troops to which the individual belonged or to the manager concerned.

(iii) In the case of misconduct by a member of a military contingent, appropriate funds should be withheld from the troop-contributing country concerned.

(iv) In the case of misconduct by a civilian employee or contractor of the United Nations, appropriate wages should be garnished from such individual or fines should be imposed against such individual, consistent with existing United Nations Staff Rules.

(G) MANAGERS AND COMMANDERS.—The manner in which managers and commanders handle cases of misconduct by those serving under them should be included in their individual performance evaluations, so that managers and commanders who take decisive action to deter and address misconduct are rewarded, while those who create a permissive environment or impede investiga-

tions are penalized or relieved of duty, as appropriate.

(H) DATA BASE.—A centralized data base should be created and maintained within the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations to track cases of misconduct, including the outcome of investigations and subsequent prosecutions, to ensure that personnel who have engaged in misconduct or other criminal activities, regardless of category or rank, are permanently barred from participation in future peacekeeping operations.

(I) WELFARE.—Peacekeeping operations should assume responsibility for maintaining a minimum standard of welfare for mission personnel to ameliorate conditions of service, while adjustments are made to the discretionary welfare payments currently provided to Member States that contribute troops to offset the cost of operation-provided recreational facilities.

(3) PEACEBUILDING COMMISSION.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Consistent with the recommendations of the Report of the Secretary General’s High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, the United Nations should establish a Peacebuilding Commission, supported by a Peacebuilding Support Office, to marshal the efforts of the United Nations, international financial institutions, donors, and non-governmental organizations to assist countries in transition from war to peace.

(B) STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission should—

(i) be a subsidiary body of the United Nations Security Council, limited in size to ensure efficiency;

(ii) include members of the United Nations Security Council, major donors, and Member States that contribute troops, appropriate United Nations organizations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund; and

(iii) invite the President of ECOSOC, regional actors, Member States that contribute troops, regional development banks, and other concerned parties that are not already members, as determined appropriate, to consult or participate in meetings as observers.

(C) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Commission should seek to ease the demands currently placed upon the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to undertake tasks that fall beyond the scope of traditional peacekeeping, by—

(i) developing and integrating country-specific and system-wide conflict prevention, post-conflict reconstruction, and long-term development policies and strategies; and

(ii) serving as the key coordinating body for the design and implementation of military, humanitarian, and civil administration aspects of complex missions.

(D) RESOURCES.—The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission and the related Peacebuilding Support Office should be staffed with existing resources.

SEC. 403. CERTIFICATION.

(a) NEW OR EXPANDED PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS CONTINGENT UPON PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS REFORMS.—

(1) NO NEW OR EXPANDED PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—Beginning on January 1, 2007, and until the Secretary certifies that the requirements described in paragraph (2) have been satisfied, the President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to oppose the creation of new, or expansion of existing, United Nations peacekeeping operations unless the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such creation or expansion is in

the national interest of the United States, and includes with the certification a written justification therefor.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS REFORMS.—The certification referred to in paragraph (1) is a certification made by the Secretary to the appropriate congressional committees that the following reforms, or an equivalent set of reforms, related to peacekeeping operations have been adopted by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations or the General Assembly, as appropriate:

(A) A single, uniform Code of Conduct that has the status of a binding rule and applies equally to all personnel serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations, regardless of category or rank, has been adopted by the General Assembly and mechanisms have been established for training such personnel concerning the requirements of the Code and enforcement of the Code.

(B) All personnel, regardless of category or rank, serving in a peacekeeping operation have been trained concerning the requirements of the Code of Conduct and each has been given a personal copy of the Code, translated into the national language of such personnel.

(C) All personnel, regardless of category or rank, are required to sign an oath that each has received a copy of the Code of Conduct, that each pledges to abide by the Code, and that each understands the consequences of violating the Code as a condition of the appointment to such operation, including the immediate termination of the participation of such personnel in the peacekeeping operation to which such personnel is assigned.

(D) All peacekeeping operations have designed and implemented educational outreach programs that reach local communities where peacekeeping personnel of such operations are based for a significant period of time, explaining prohibited acts on the part of United Nations peacekeeping personnel and identifying the individual to whom the local population may direct complaints or file allegations of exploitation, abuse, or other acts of misconduct.

(E) A centralized data base has been created and is being maintained in the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations that tracks cases of misconduct, including the outcomes of investigations and subsequent prosecutions, to ensure that personnel, regardless of category or rank, who have engaged in misconduct or other criminal activities are permanently barred from participation in future peacekeeping operations.

(F) A Model Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations and each Member State that contributes troops to a peacekeeping operation has been adopted by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations that specifically obligates each such Member State to—

(i) designate a competent legal authority, preferably a prosecutor with expertise in the area of sexual exploitation and abuse, to participate in any investigation into an allegation of misconduct brought against an individual of the Member State;

(ii) refer to its competent national or military authority for possible prosecution, if warranted, any investigation of a violation of the Code of Conduct or other criminal activity by an individual of the Member State;

(iii) report to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations on the outcome of any such investigation;

(iv) undertake to conduct on-site court martial proceedings relating to allegations of misconduct alleged against an individual of the Member State;

(v) assume responsibility for the provision of appropriate assistance to a victim of mis-

conduct committed by an individual of the Member State; and

(vi) establish a professional and independent investigative and audit function within the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the OIOS to monitor United Nations peacekeeping operations.

SEC. 404. UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) 25 PERCENT LIMITATION.—Section 404(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 287e note; Public Law 103-236) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2006 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated for ‘Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities’ for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 shall not be available for the payment of the United States assessed contribution for a United Nations peacekeeping operation in an amount which is greater than 27.1 percent of the total of all assessed contributions for that operation.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect and apply beginning on October 1, 2005.

SEC. 405. GENOCIDE AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

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

(1) suspend the membership of a Member State in the United Nations if genocide, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity are determined to be occurring in such Member State, regardless of whether such acts are being committed by the government of such Member State or by a third party;

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

(3) deploy a United Nations peacekeeping operation or authorize and support the deployment of a peacekeeping operation from an international organization to the Member State with a mandate to stop such acts;

(4) deploy monitors from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the area where such acts are occurring in the Member State; and

(5) authorize the establishment of an international commission of inquiry into such acts.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Unless the Secretary certifies that the mechanisms described in subsection (a) have been adopted and implemented, the Secretary is authorized to withhold up to ten percent of United States contributions to the peacekeeping budget of the United Nations.

SEC. 406. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES OFFICIALS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Nothing in this title shall be construed as superseding the Uniform Code of Military Justice or operating to effect the surrender of United States officials or members of the Armed Forces to a foreign country or international tribunal for prosecutions arising from peacekeeping operations or other similar United Nations related activity.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SEC. 501. POSITIONS FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

The Secretary of State shall make every effort to recruit United States citizens for positions within international organizations.

SEC. 502. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION FOR REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) DETAILED ITEMIZATION.—The annual congressional budget justification shall include a detailed itemized request in support of the assessed contribution of the United States to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

(b) CONTENTS OF DETAILED ITEMIZATION.—The detailed itemization required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) contain information relating to the amounts requested in support of each of the various sections and titles of the regular assessed budget of the United Nations; and

(2) compare the amounts requested for the current year with the actual or estimated amounts contributed by the United States in previous fiscal years for the same sections and titles.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS AND NOTIFICATION.—If the United Nations proposes an adjustment to its regular assessed budget, the Secretary of State shall, at the time such adjustment is presented to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions of the United Nations (ACABQ), notify and consult with the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 503. REVIEW AND REPORT.

Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall conduct a review of programs of the United Nations that are funded through assessed contributions and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing—

(1) the findings of such review; and

(2) recommendations relating to—

(A) the continuation of such programs; and
(B) which of such programs should be voluntarily funded.

SEC. 504. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS REFORMS.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and 12 months thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the status of the 1997, 2002, and 2005 management reforms initiated by the Secretary General and on the reforms mandated by this Act.

(b) REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF STATE CERTIFICATIONS.—Not later than six months after each certification is submitted by the Secretary of State to the appropriate congressional committees under this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each such certification. The Secretary shall provide the Comptroller General with any information required by the Comptroller General to submit any such report.

TITLE VI—CERTIFICATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 601. CERTIFICATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The certifications required under sections 103, 104(a) through 104(d), 110, 201(c), 201(e), and 202 of this Act are certifications submitted to the appropriate congressional committees by the Secretary of State that the requirements of each such section have been satisfied with respect to reform of the United Nations.

(b) ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION MECHANISM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event that the Secretary is unable to make any certification described in subsection (a), the Secretary may nonetheless satisfy the requirements referred to in such certification by certifying that—

(A) the United Nations has implemented reforms that are either substantially similar

to or accomplish the same purposes as the requirements referred to in any such certification; or

(B) in the case of the policies described in subsections (a) and (c) of section 11 the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (as amended by section 101 of this Act) or the requirements of sections 201(c) and 202(b) of this Act, substantial progress has been made in implementing such policies or requirements.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this subsection, reforms are “substantially similar to or accomplish the same purposes as” if the reforms are—

(A) formally adopted by the organ or committee of the United Nations that has authority to take such action or are issued by the Secretariat or the appropriate entity or committee in written form; and

(B) are not identical to the measures required by a particular certification but in the judgment of the Secretary will have the same or nearly the same effect as such measures.

(3) WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION AND CONSULTATION.—

(A) WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days before submitting an alternate certification in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written justification explaining in detail the basis for such alternate certification.

(B) CONSULTATION.—After the Secretary has submitted the written justification under subparagraph (A), but not later than 15 days before the Secretary exercises the alternate certification mechanism described in clause (i), the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees regarding such exercise.

(C) WITHHOLDING OF UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO REGULAR ASSESSED BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS.—If the Secretary is unable to make one or more of the certifications described in subsection (a) or (b), the Secretary is authorized to withhold from expenditure until such time as the Secretary deems appropriate up to 50 percent of the contribution of the United States to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations for a biennial period, beginning with funds appropriated for the United States Assessed contribution for fiscal year 2008.

(D) CONSULTATION ON PROGRESS OF REFORMS.—Beginning six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every three months thereafter until all the certifications under subsection (a) and (b) are made, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees regarding the progress in adoption and implementation of the reforms described in this Act.

(E) DURATION OF FUNDS.—

(1) ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE U.N.—Any amounts of funds appropriated for the United States assessed contribution to the United Nations that are withheld under subsection (c) are authorized to remain available until expended in fiscal years after the fiscal year in which all certifications are made under subsections (a) and (b).

(2) ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS TO SPECIALIZED AGENCIES.—Any amounts of funds appropriated for the United States assessed contribution to a specialized agency that are withheld under section 107(d) are authorized to remain available until expended in fiscal years after the fiscal year in which the Secretary makes the certification with respect to the policy or policies described in section 107 by reason of which the funds were withheld.

(F) BIENNIAL REVIEWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct biennial reviews, beginning two years after the date on which the Secretary sub-

mits the last of the certifications under subsections (a) and (b), to determine if the United Nations continues to remain in compliance with all such certifications. Not later than 30 days after the completion of each such review, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the findings of each such review.

(2) ACTION.—If during the course of any such review the Secretary determines that the United Nations has failed to remain in compliance with a certification that was submitted in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to exercise the authority described in subsection (c) with respect to the biennial period immediately following such review and subsequent biennial periods until such time as all certifications under subsection (a) or (b) have been submitted.

SEC. 602. DIPLOMATIC CAMPAIGN TO ACHIEVE REFORM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in order to achieve the reforms required by this Act, the President must undertake an extensive diplomatic campaign, in combination with like-minded countries at the United Nations to achieve those reforms, including acting through the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use its voice, vote and influence at the United Nations and direct diplomatic intervention at the highest levels of government in Member States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Sixty days before exercising the authority to withhold funds under section 601(c), the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees and submit a report on how the exercise of such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(c) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of efforts by the United States to achieve the reforms required by this Act to date;

(2) an analysis of why reforms sought by the United States have not been achieved; and

(3) an explanation of how United States policy will be furthered by conditioning or withholding funds for assessed contributions to the United Nations, as well as an analysis of how withholding such funds are expected to affect programs, operations, staff, and reforms of the United Nations and United States interests.

TITLE VII—UNITED NATIONS RENEWAL AND TOOLS TO FULLY IMPLEMENT UNITED NATIONS REFORM

SEC. 701. SYNCHRONIZATION OF U.S. ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the early 1980s, the United States Government began to pay United States assessments to certain international organizations in the last quarter of the calendar year in which they were due. This practice allowed the United States to pay its annual assessment to the United Nations and other international organizations with the next fiscal year's appropriations, taking advantage of the fact that international organizations operate on calendar years. It also allowed the United States to reduce budgetary outlays, making the United States budget deficit appear smaller.

(2) The United States, which is assessed 22 percent of the United Nations regular budget, now pays its dues at least 10 months late, and often later depending on when the relevant appropriation is enacted.

(3) This practice causes the United Nations to operate throughout much of the year

without a significant portion of its operating budget. By midyear, the budget is usually depleted, forcing the United Nations to borrow from its peacekeeping budget, since the organization is prohibited from borrowing externally. As a result, countries that contribute to United Nations peacekeeping missions are not reimbursed on a timely basis.

(4) For years, continuing this practice is inconsistent with the purposes of this Act to encourage the United Nations to engage in sound, fiscally responsible budgetary practices.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Beginning in the fiscal year in which all certifications under subsection (a) and (b) of section 601 have been made, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated to a process to synchronize the payment of its assessments to the United Nations and other international organizations over a multiyear period so that the United States can resume paying its dues to such international organizations at the beginning of each calendar year:

(1) For the fiscal year after all such certifications have been made, \$150,000,000.

(2) For the second year after all such certifications have been made, \$150,000,000.

(3) For the third year after all such certifications have been made, \$150,000,000.

SEC. 702. INCREASED FUNDING FOR UNITED STATES ASSESSED CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS TO SUPPORT REFORM EFFORTS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should support an increase in the 2006-2007 United Nations biennium budget and future United Nations budgets to support the creation of new offices or institutions and the strengthening of existing offices in order to fully implement the reforms required by this Act.

SEC. 703. BUYOUT OF UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should support an increase in the appropriate United Nations biennium budget to fund a buyout of United Nations personnel to the extent that the buyout is a targeted buyout of personnel that do not have the skills necessary for the United Nations in the 21st century.

SEC. 704. UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND.

There is authorized for fiscal year 2006 for a voluntary contribution to the United Nations International Democracy Fund \$10,000,000.

SEC. 705. UNITED STATES PERSONNEL TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

The President is authorized to detail any United States Government officer or employee to the United Nations on a non-reimbursable basis for up to three years to assist in the implementation of the reforms described in this Act, including providing for any necessary housing, education, cost-of-living allowances, or other allowances authorized under the Foreign Service Act of 1945.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me thank all Members of the House for a singularly civilized, substantive, and I believe informative debate. I particularly want to thank my dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, with whom I have

had the privilege of serving now for some 25 years, and with whom I have had the privilege of sharing the leadership of the Committee on International Relations for the past 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan substitute offered by me and my distinguished Republican colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), is a rational and logical proposal to promote U.N. reform while giving the Secretary of State sufficient flexibility to do her job. With our substitute amendment, we align ourselves strongly on U.N. reform issues with our Nation's foreign policy leadership, including Secretary of State Rice and eight former U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, including a former distinguished Republican Senator, John Danforth, and the revered Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick.

We are fighting to ensure that the United States is better armed to propose serious U.N. reform and not forced to cut off funds to the United Nations in an arbitrary manner that is counter-productive to our national interest.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment addresses four primary deficiencies, fatal deficiencies, in the Hyde bill. First, our substitute does not sever the link between achieving U.N. reform benchmarks and the possibility of withholding half of our U.N. dues, which is the Hyde proposal. Rather, though the benchmarks are the same as in the underlying bill, the Lantos-Shays amendment would give Secretary Rice the authority to withhold up to 50 percent of our U.N. dues, not mandate such a cut.

This is the fundamental distinction between the Hyde and the Lantos bills, and I want to reiterate it so every Member of the House will be clear on what they are voting on. The Hyde bill is a guillotine on autopilot, while our bill gives desperately needed discretion to Secretary of State Rice.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the Hyde bill would prohibit the United States from supporting any new U.N. peacekeeping mission unless a far-reaching set of peacekeeping reforms is adopted. My substitute keeps these reforms, but provides Secretary Rice with a waiver in the event that a new mission is required, such as preventing genocide.

I want to repeat this, too, Mr. Chairman. The Hyde bill would prevent a U.N. peacekeeping mission to prevent genocide in an automatic, rigid, non-negotiable and arbitrary fashion. The Lantos-Shays substitute provides our Secretary of State the authority to waive that restriction.

Our substitute also ensures that we do not withhold funds from the United Nations when it is separate specialized agencies, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization or others, which have failed to make necessary reforms. It is a non sequitur, it is fundamentally flawed logic to hold the U.N. accountable for shortcomings of organizations that the United Nations does not control. It boggles the mind that we would penalize the U.N. for the

failure of an agency that the U.N. does not control instituting necessary reforms.

Our amendment also incorporates a number of the amendments that have been adopted in this 2-day debate on anti-Semitism, the Oil-for-Food scandal, nonproliferation and others.

Mr. Chairman, there are touches of a Greek tragedy as we move towards the vote. Many of my Republican friends would like to vote for the Lantos substitute because they recognize the wisdom of flexibility to be given to our Secretary of State. I find myself in the delicious but unaccustomed position of having the support of the White House, the Secretary of State of a Republican administration, eight former Ambassadors to the United Nations, a united front on the Democratic side, and a handful of bold Republicans who are prepared to break party discipline and vote for what is in our national interest.

□ 1245

Newt Gingrich, who has been referred to repeatedly, clearly does not favor the rigid and automatic requirement in the chairman's bill. He favors our initiative, as do I.

I stand shoulder to shoulder with the chairman in calling for these reforms, but my alternative offers the Secretary of State desperately needed flexibility that she wants and needs.

There is an additional item that we should recognize. This is a very fast-moving world. A year ago there were Syrian troops in Lebanon. A year ago many developments globally were not even on the horizon. Why should we freeze ourselves into autopilot for a 4-year period when none of us are clairvoyant, none of us can predict what conditions our Secretary of State and our country will confront in 2007 or 2008 or 2009.

I have the highest respect for the chairman. We have worked together on countless issues. We have brought most pieces of legislation to this House on a bipartisan basis. In a sense, this too is a bipartisan piece of legislation in terms of its substance. Where we part company is in making the legislation, in terms of the chairman's preference calling for automatic 50 percent reductions in U.N. dues if everything is not done perfectly.

I have used the phrase 39 amendments or commandments. We have adopted a few more. We are now up to 46 commandments. So if 45½ commandments are fully complied with, do we really want to cut our contribution to this international organization which we so desperately need all across the globe? Do we really want to cut our contributions by 50 percent, giving the President, the Secretary of State and this body no flexibility? I do not think so.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized.

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

First, I want to say to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) what an absolute pleasure it is working with him. He brings to these very critical issues intellect, dignity, and a fierce patriotism. I have been very proud and pleased to have had this association.

One of the most interesting aspects of today's debate is the fact that we have focused very little on what the U.N. needs to do, and we spent most of our time on how we should ensure these reforms are actually implemented. We have heard from our opponents quote after quote from informed and not-so-informed sources that withholding dues is absolutely the death knell of the U.N. They are victimized by effective reform.

Well, how our opponents can make this charge and then support the Lantos substitute suggests a conflicted state of mind. It is clear that the Lantos substitute is nearly identical to our bill except for the powers given to Secretary Rice. I assert she does have flexibility under our bill as well. She can waive the withholding, decide what level of withholding, if any, is appropriate under the Lantos bill. He cedes to her total control over the purse strings. But every Member voting for the Lantos bill, and God bless them, every one of them is voting to withhold dues. I tip my hat to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for achieving consensus in his party for securing unanimity among his flock on the conclusion that the U.N. will not reform unless dues are withheld. That is a signature achievement. Of course the Democrats withhold dues in a fashion different than we do. We legislate them. We say we have had enough waivers, enough resolutions, enough statements; it is time we have some teeth in reform.

It is not impossible to achieve this notwithstanding the naysayers. There are 2 years before the certifications even kick in, 2 years for the U.N. to get its act together; and then you can do 32 of the 39 reforms, still be certified, and no funds are withheld and still you have another year to accomplish the remaining reforms. So both measures have nearly identical reforms and both measures withhold dues. Only it is the Secretary of State who has the authority in their substitute, and we legislate it.

What does history show? History shows when Congress stands tough, when it says if you do not reform, we are not going to pay, then change occurs.

Does anyone remember Kassebaum-Solomon? The amendment eventually led to the implementation of consensus-based budgeting, a reform that no one said could be achieved.

Does anyone remember UNESCO? We withdrew in protest. We stopped paying

our assessed dues. Let me repeat that: we stopped paying our assessed dues. Reforms of that agency were made and we rejoined.

Does anyone remember the genesis of the Office of Internal Oversight Services? In the mid-1990s, the U.S. threatened to withhold funding, and lo and behold the U.N. created an oversight function.

Even with Helms-Biden, Congress leveraged the fact that in order for us to pay arrears, the U.N. had to undertake certain reforms. All of these requirements were legislated and directed actions which resulted in reforms that were actually implemented.

Look, if we want to reform the United Nations, we have to legislate the reforms and have some teeth in the sanctions if they fail to. The U.N. will go sailing its merry way on if it reforms. If it does not reform, there is a penalty.

The eight ambassadors that wrote this letter prove our point. There is a mind-set in the upper realms of diplomacy that worships at the theater of the U.N. and could not possibly bring itself to withholding dues, so I do not think it will work. I implore Members to put some teeth in the sanctions.

Simon Bolivar, the great South American patriot, had a phrase for political futility. He said it was plowing in the sea. I suggest when it comes to sanctions against the U.N. for failing to reform, if Members leave it to the discretion of the State Department, we are plowing in the sea.

Mr. Chairman, let us begin real reform of the U.N., a monumental task, a long road ahead. Let us begin it here and now, June 17, right in this room; and let us begin it with your vote.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee of Asia and Pacific Affairs.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, let me say I may consider the Lantos-Shays alternative imperfect, but it represents a credible political balancing and is clearly preferable to the underlying bill.

But listening to the debate over the past 2 days, I sense a lack of perspective not only for treaty obligations but for the U.N. itself.

Corruption exists in all societies. It is rife, indeed endemic, in some. At the U.N., it is isolated; it is not endemic. I have known hundreds and hundreds of people who have worked for the U.N. itself or U.N. agencies. They are honorable, decent people doing a decent job. It is true that a few thousand dollars here and a few thousand dollars there pretty soon adds up to a loss of confidence in institutions of governance, and we have that problem at the U.N. Hence, we cannot ignore scandal, but scandal does not define the United Nations; it defines a problem that must be dealt with there and elsewhere.

We should do this, but we should do this with the understanding that the world would be a far worse place without the U.N. and that the activities and actions of its various organizations and agencies have made this a better world society. So improvement, not destruction, is the goal.

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

I would like to state improvement is our goal, too. A healthy U.N., rather than a vast, sprawling, bureaucratic cesspool which is where it is headed. Everyone agrees to that.

Now this notion that we are obliged by the treaty to pay our dues and that it would be an international default if we did not, that was argued before back in the 1980s. Contributions to the U.N. are made subject to authorization and appropriation of the U.S. Congress. We have a duty to the taxpayer first to ensure that there is good stewardship of their dollars. We have to hold the U.N. accountable.

All countries benefit from an efficient, transparent, and accountable U.N. It is not only in our interest. We have not signed away part of our sovereignty. We are paying big dues: \$442 million a year just on the dues part. Peacekeeping is another \$1 billion. To say we do not have an obligation to make the providers that we purchase with our dues perform honorably and efficiently does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Lantos-Shays substitute and to direct Members' attention to a serious flaw in the peacekeeping section, which I respectfully submit are reasons enough to vote against the substitute.

The substitute amendment gives the U.N. until 2007 to complete even the most basic tasks. This is completely unnecessary, and I submit only encourages some states who view rape and exploitation of young women and children by U.N. peacekeepers as a mere public relations problem and thus an opportunity to dig in their heels and stall the reform process.

□ 1300

Prince Zeid has told some of us, I met with him last week, that sustained pressure is needed to get results. We have been here before. In 2002, we knew about the exploitation of children by U.N. personnel in the Congo. I have already chaired two hearings on it myself in my subcommittee. Yes, the U.N. is moving in the right direction, but there needs to be considerable pressure brought to bear to make this happen.

What is perhaps most troubling about the substitute is that it authorizes an up to 10 percent withholding of U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping. I want to be clear on this point. The Hyde bill supports full funding of all existing missions, while the substitute authorizes up to a 10

percent cutoff of our assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping. The withholding is linked to a certification requirement which is, plain and simple, bad policy. The intent is good. I have no doubt about that. But it is flawed.

The substitute requires the Secretary of State to certify that the U.S. permanent rep at the U.N. has made every effort to ensure the formal adoption and implementation of mechanisms to suspend the membership of a member state if genocide, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity are determined to be occurring in that member state regardless of whether the acts are being committed by the government or by a third party. "Third party" is the problem. There are countries like the Congo, and we have also seen it in Uganda, where there are "third-party" groups of terrorists and killers and maimers who the government would like to see done away with and are actively cooperating with the international community and the U.N. itself to try to mitigate this terrible problem.

Under this language, which is very different than the language that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) offered, we would be in a strange and, I think, even bizarre situation where even where there has been an effort made by the state, there could be an explosion and a cutoff of peacekeeping money, 10 percent assessed contribution cutoff. It would be wrong for a state to lose their membership when there was no omission, no commission on their part with regards to crimes against humanity and that is where the Fortenberry amendment got it right.

I think we can all agree that genocidal governments do not deserve to have an equal voice at the U.N. with other peacekeeping and peace-loving nations. But we should not punish those governments which are fighting against those who would commit such heinous acts. I think that language is, as I said, egregiously flawed. The Hyde amendment does get it right.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lantos substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the substitute legislation offered by the ranking member of the House International Relations Committee, Mr. TOM LANTOS.

As a former U.S. Ambassador, I know and appreciate that the United Nations serves a most useful purpose. It is the only international body that allows those countries that support the United States and those that do not to sit down in peaceful dialogue to address issues of concern and to work together. To maintain the opportunity to resolve our differences, we must not cut the funds we provide to the United Nations.

Mr. LANTOS' bill supports the necessary reforms we all recognize are needed for the

United Nations but does so without malice. Like H.R. 2745, the substitute supports the goal of reforming budgeting procedures, but it eliminates the devastating automatic withholding of 50 percent of the dues we owe to the United Nations. We should not tie the hands of our Secretary of State nor should we give those who do not support the United States, an issue in which to embarrass us. The substitute gives the Secretary of State the authority to make the cut but does not mandate such cuts. A more preferable position.

The substitute also keeps the peacekeeping reforms of H.R. 2745 but does not mandate the vetoing of any new or expanded U.N. peacekeeping operation that does not serve our national interest. Again, the flexibility contained in the substitute is preferable to H.R. 2745.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is the world leader and we should be a leader in all areas including serving as a model country in its relationships to the world community. This means pushing for reforms in the United Nations when such reforms are necessary but it also means being a good citizen and doing our part to fulfill our responsibilities and to be a good world citizen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Lantos substitute.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great respect for both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) in this. While we can all agree that our country, as the biggest contributor to the U.N., must help the organization become more efficient and effective, the Lantos-Shays substitute finds a compromise that I think reflects where the majority of Americans come down on this issue. The Gingrich-Mitchell task force takes serious issue with much of the damaging policies that have occurred at the U.N., but it refrains from calling for mandatory withholding of dues. President Bush has also signaled his opposition to many of these provisions, which may hinder our Ambassador's dealings with the organization.

Under the Lantos-Shays substitute, we can send the same message to the international community without undermining our efforts to promote democracy and protect those in need.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lantos/Shays substitute. Chairman HYDE has been an indispensable Member of this body for many years, and I commend you for bringing this important debate before us.

While I strongly agree with Chairman HYDE, that serious and fundamental problems exist at the United Nations, I prefer the President's approach of continuing to pursue negotiations for reform through diplomatic means.

Regardless of preference for this bill, we can all agree that the U.N. and the international community should hear our outrage for the mismanagement of what is meant to be an example of unity and peace. I commend the Chairman and the full committee for trying to improve the accountability of those at the U.N. and hope this debate will trigger reforms in the functioning of this embattled, yet well-meaning organization.

The Lantos-Shays substitute reflects the significant reforms outlined in the Chairman's bill. However, it makes an all important distinction in rightly leaving the Secretary of State with the discretion to decide when, and if, the ultimatums are a hindrance to our national interests. Alternatively, automatically withholding funds may derail our international and global commitments and could have a devastating impact on poor nations around the world.

While we can all agree that our country, as the biggest contributor to the U.N., must help the organization become more efficient and effective, the Lantos-Shays substitute finds a compromise that I think reflects where the majority of Americans come down on this issue. The Gingrich-Mitchell task force takes serious issue with much of the damaging policies that have occurred at the U.N., but it refrains from calling for mandatory withholding of dues. President Bush has also signaled his opposition to many of these provisions, which may hinder our Ambassador's dealings with the organization.

Under the Lantos-Shays substitute, we can send the same message to the international community without undermining our efforts to promote democracy and protect those in need.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank our great esteemed chairman, Chairman HYDE, for yielding me this time.

By limiting instruments of persuasion to an authorization by the Secretary of State to withhold U.S. dues, this substitute would all but guarantee that few of these reforms would actually be implemented. Much of the world, including many at the U.N., would be excused if they saw any threats as a mere bluff. The historical record tells us very accurately that any level of success can only be done if we use our leverage. If we adopt the Lantos-Shays substitute amendment, we will not have that leverage.

My colleagues maintain that our legislation does not afford sufficient flexibility. Yet a fair reading of this text reveals that that is just not the case. First, the certifications for action are not required until the year 2007. Secondly, this legislation allows the Secretary of State to certify U.N. reforms that are substantially similar to, or accomplish the same goals and the same objectives as, the Hyde U.N. Reform Act. That is plenty of flexibility, Mr. Chairman.

If the U.N. does on its own institute these reforms, then we have no problems. The withholding provisions in the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act will only be triggered and implemented if the U.N. does not reform itself. The onus is on the U.N. to fulfill its stated commitment to reform.

The Constitution gives to Congress the responsibility for determining how the public's money will be spent. The Lantos substitute proposes to surrender that obligation, that principal source of congressional authority, to an unelected official of the executive

branch who has not been entrusted with it by the Constitution. However burdensome that task is, Mr. Chairman, it is ours to carry out.

Reforming the U.N. is about lives. It is not just about policies. Let us carry out our obligation to the taxpayers by rejecting the Lantos substitute and by affirming the Hyde bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, it is time that we make real reforms at the United Nations that address the real problems, but I believe that the Hyde bill simply sets the United Nations up to fail by creating a series of requirements that will be almost impossible to meet. One might even argue that this is the actual goal of some U.N. critics. The United Nations is governed by 191 countries, including Syria, Iran, and North Korea, who would have to approve the majority of these changes. This seems highly unlikely as structured by the bill. Right now this bill is medicine which may kill the patient rather than cure a specific disease.

The Hyde bill ties the hands of the Secretary of State with a mandatory 50 percent withholding, even if the U.N. improves significantly. That is like kicking a child out of school who has moved from an F to a B because they did not get an A. The bill also keeps the U.S. from supporting any new peacekeeping missions until far-reaching reforms have been implemented, even in cases like a Sudan and when innocent civilians are at risk. We do not know when and where U.N. peacekeepers will be needed next, but we do know that we cannot risk the lives of innocent people or risk American interests around the world. We simply cannot create legislation which hurts our own security interests and our national interest while we are at war.

This is a time, when our own human and financial resources are stretched thin, for the United States to get the world to act with us rather than destroy the institution which unites the world.

I am concerned that the bill condemns us to lose only American lives, shed only American blood and spend only American capital instead of having the world share this responsibility with us. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hyde bill and to vote for the Lantos-Shays substitute that does the reforms we want, but gives the Secretary of State the flexibility to do the peacekeeping and to achieve the reforms we all want to see.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this has been a fine debate today, and

I believe that both sides have handled it very responsibly, but let us take a look at what the real issue is.

There is broad agreement on both sides as to the need for reform in the United Nations. This is not in contention. There is even broad agreement of what changes need to be made, what are the issues at the United Nations, a lack of accountability and some of these monstrous atrocities that we have seen, and the inefficiency and corruption that we have seen at the U.N. There is agreement on the problem.

The fundamental difference between the sides of this debate is whether or not there should be consequences if the United Nations does not reform. What is going on? The American people understand that in order to get an organization like the United Nations to reform, there must be consequences. Do we think the United Nations, this entrenched bureaucracy, will just say, Oh, we're enlightened by the wonderful debate that we've heard, you've appealed to our heart, that they are going to make the changes that are necessary to prevent corruption in their organization that they have lived with for years because we have touched their hearts, we have reached their intellect? No. We have got to make sure that there are consequences if they do not reform, or they will not pay any attention to us.

You remember the old show *Truth Or Consequences*? Unless we provide consequences for activities and actions that are wrong, we are not going to get any truth. There will be no truth unless they have consequences for telling us lies. For years we have lived with the lie that the United Nations is somewhat above corruption, that the United Nations represents the best of humankind. It will only represent the best of humankind and reach these higher standards if we say to them, if you are not living up to these standards, there is a price to pay.

The American people deserve to get their money's worth. We deserve to try to put pressure on the United Nations to live up to its standards. If we just give them a free pass, whether or not they reform or not, there will be no reform at the United Nations, and all of this will have gone for nothing.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield the balance of my time to my distinguished Republican co-author, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I love HENRY HYDE. I have awesome respect for TOM LANTOS. I thank the gentleman from California for supporting the President in the war against Iraq and to go into Afghanistan. I thank him for being such a clear thinker along with the gentleman from Illinois on so many issues.

We are not part of the Kyoto agreement. We are not part of the land mine

agreement. We are not part of other treaties. We are not part of the ICC, the International Criminal Court. I understand those things. We are in a war in Afghanistan, a war in Iraq, and we are telling the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, Forget it. We don't care what you think. We're going ahead. Mandatory, nuclear option. It is going to happen even if the U.N. does most of what we ask. Even if they do 80 percent of what we ask, it is still going to happen. Mandatory.

I cannot believe when our men and women are fighting in Iraq that we would move forward with legislation like this when we need to draw countries together. The problem is not all the reforms can physically happen, and some of them will not happen, and some in the U.N. might not even want them to happen. They are eager to have us withhold funds. They are eager to have more people hate the United States.

The United States, the President, the Secretary of State, they are working so hard, and they are making progress. We have a new manager, Chris Burnham, who is the Under Secretary running the whole management of the U.N. We are making progress.

Go with the Hyde bill, but with the flexibility to let our President and our Secretary of State have the ability to work with these countries to move them along and see progress.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his long-standing leadership on issues related to the United Nations and human freedom. No one has greater respect for him in this body than I do. But in this case, Mr. Chairman, I think and I believe that the Lantos substitute just falls a little short.

Six decades ago, the United Nations was formed to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

These words, from the preamble of the United Nations' historic Charter, today hover over that institution not as a symbol of its founding mission, but as a reminder of its abject failure.

□ 1315

Far from saving future generations from the scourge of war, the United Nations' history of hand-wringing, appeasement, and moral equivalence has exacerbated the scourge of war.

Far from reaffirming faith and fundamental rights and the dignity of the

human person, the United Nations has overseen the degradation of human rights even of vulnerable human beings in its own care through routine abuses of power, corruption, and even horrific sexual exploitation of peoples at the hands of U.N. peacekeepers.

Far from reaffirming faith in the equal rights of nations large and small, the U.N. has instead adopted an institutional posture favoring belligerent tyrannies at the expense of freedom-loving democracies, standing with Palestinian terrorists against Israeli families, standing with Saddam Hussein against the civilized world, and too often standing with anyone against the United States of America.

Far from promoting justice and respect for international law, the United Nations has become one of the world's greatest apologists for tyranny and terror where justice is merely one point of view; a place where Sudan and Syria and Castro's Cuba are given a soap-box on which to lecture the free world on human rights; a place where international lawyers scheme to haul American soldiers before a rogue court, irrespective of constitutional rights; a place where an international humanitarian mission to feed and heal the Iraqi people resulted in \$10 billion in siphoned bribes and kickbacks.

And far from promoting social progress and the better standards of life in larger freedom, the United Nations has become a hindrance to both progress and freedom. Just ask the besieged citizens of Israel whose every gesture of goodwill has been returned by violence from their enemies and condemnation from the U.N.

Diplomatic pretenses aside, Mr. Chairman, corruption has infected the United Nations. And yet given its organizational structure, how could it be otherwise? There is no independent financial oversight. There are no standards of transparency. Most U.N. divisions are exempt from democratic accountability. And most U.N. leaders are protected from the law by diplomatic immunity.

The rampant corruption that today infects the United Nations is not a function of its personnel. Not really. It is a function of its structure. That is what we get, Mr. Chairman, from an organization driven by consensus instead of principle. And as long as tyrants and terrorists get as much say in policymaking as democratically elected leaders, the U.N. will continue to betray its charter and betray the billions of people on this planet who look to it for hope.

This substitute essentially agrees with that conclusion. It just does not do enough about it. But what more do we need to hear, Mr. Chairman? The U.N.'s corruption is so breathtaking in its scope as to be almost universal: peacekeepers raping women that they are sent to protect; sexual exploitation of children at the hands of their humanitarian relief workers; institutional anti-Semitism so brazen that

Yasser Arafat was considered a moderate; \$10 billion, \$10 billion, stolen from sick and starving children in Iraq; bribery, embezzlement, misappropriation of funds, and conflicts of interests so extensive that the financial management of many of the U.N. agencies resembles that of a second-rate kleptocracy.

What further evidence could we possibly need?

The pervasive corruption at the U.N. is not a problem; it is a crisis. No one denies this. And in response to the overwhelming evidencing, the Democrat substitute says the reforms in the underlying bill should happen. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough to say that these reforms should happen. They must happen. And they must happen right now. We should not be asking the U.N.'s leaders to make these reforms. We need to tell them. The philosophy of flexibility and appeasement create loopholes that diplomats drive huge trucks through. And if they were serious about giving the administration flexibility, why did they not give it to the President instead of the Secretary of State? The President leads foreign policy in this country, not the Secretary of State.

The American people are today underwriting rampant corruption, 22 percent of it to be precise, and it needs to stop. Today the Congress must take this stand and clearly voice not simply our frustration but our expectation of concrete reform. We must act, Mr. Chairman. And as he has so many times in his decades with us, the gentleman from Illinois has shown us the way.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has brought before this House a comprehensive, almost exhaustive, package of reform that, if enacted, will finally bring the United Nations under some semblance of control. If and when these reforms are enacted, Mr. Chairman, the world will be safer and stronger. The American people will be assured their money is being well spent, and the United Nations charter to prevent wars, protect human rights, and advance the cause of human freedom will be reaffirmed.

And every man, woman, and child on this planet will owe a great debt of gratitude to HENRY J. HYDE.

I just ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the Democratic substitute. Vote "yes" on the Hyde reform bill, and let us put the United Nations back on track to fulfill its promise to the human race.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, this is an instance in which both the proponents and opponents of the Lantos substitute share the same goal: reforming the United Nations. We differ over the best means to accomplish that goal, and that disagreement is fundamental.

The committee bill embodies a go-it-alone, take-it-or-leave-it approach to dealing with the United Nations that is entirely inconsistent with the tenets of an international organization founded on the belief that nations should be respectful of each other's views.

With the United States having so recently suffered the debacle of dealing with U.N. members in an imperious way before the invasion of Iraq, and then being surprised by the U.N.'s reluctance to join us on the course we had pre-determined, one would think that the Republican majority in the House would have learned a lesson about the kind of approach likely to produce international cooperation. This bill is evidence that they have not.

The committee bill mandates the withholding of dues if certain reforms are not implemented, dictates the scope of the reforms, and provides precious little time to have them agreed to and put in place. The bill creates a system designed to fail, and then imposes draconian consequences for the failure. Not only have eight former U.S. ambassadors to the U.N. come out strongly in opposition to the bill, but Secretary of State Rice has been noticeably silent about it.

The Lantos substitute fashions a better way to achieve needed reform at the U.N. without imperiling American interests in peacekeeping and other activities. That way is to provide the secretary of state with the maximum flexibility to employ diplomacy to expand the number of countries sharing our views on reform so that a broad-based mandate for reform is produced. By holding out the possibility that U.S. dues would be withheld if reform is not achieved, but not making withholding mandatory, the substitute creates the conditions for diplomacy to work effectively.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the interest that the United States has in a strong and effective United Nations, and to weigh carefully whether the steps we take in this bill will strengthen that institution or weaken it. Reform is the right way to go and the right way to achieve it is to adopt the Lantos substitute. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, the U.N. soon to celebrate its 60th anniversary, is chartered to promote universal human rights, justice and social progress. These are perfect ideals that the global community must strive to put into action, but that does not mean the U.N. is a perfect organization. Recent scandals and the lack of transparency within the U.N. undermine the essential role the U.N. plays in world affairs. Reform is an urgent priority but the cure for fixing these problems should not be worse than the disease.

H.R. 2745 will hamstring the U.S.'s ability to create positive reform within the U.N., tarnish the image of the U.S. abroad when public opinion of the U.S., particularly in the Arab countries where it is at an all time low, and defeat the Administration's public diplomacy efforts before Karen Hughes even assumes her new responsibilities in September. Additionally, H.R. 2745 would halt funding for any new or expanded peacekeeping missions. Unilaterally preventing the U.S. from supporting new peacekeeping missions puts an untold number of lives at risk and additionally, could endanger U.S. national security interests. In fact many of the peacekeeping reforms contained in the Hyde bill are endorsed by the U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and in most cases are already underway, to address recent concerns raised about sexual exploitation and abuse in peacekeeping missions.

Moreover, H.R. 2745 does not enjoy the full support of the administration. According to R. Nicholas Burns, under secretary of state for political affairs, "We have serious concerns

with the bill. We are the founder of the U.N. We're the host country of the U.N. We're the leading contributor to the U.N. We don't want to put ourselves in a position where the United States is withholding 50 percent of the American contributions to the U.N. system."

Congress must provide the State Department with the tools and flexibility to push for positive changes within the U.N. The Lantos/Shays substitute would provide the authority, but not mandate, the Secretary of State to withhold dues from the U.N. if reform measures aren't implemented in a timely manner. The United States, as the world leader, must take an active, positive role in helping reform the U.N. The Lantos/Shays substitute is the step in the right direction for U.S. reform efforts and I will vote in favor of this substitute and against the U.N. Reform Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes prevailed to have it.

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

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

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 1 printed in subpart D by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), amendment No. 2 printed in subpart D by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), amendment No. 1 printed in subpart E by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), amendment No. 5 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), amendment No. 9 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), amendment No. 12 printed in part 2 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and amendment No. 13 in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in subpart D of part 1 of House Report No. 109-132 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 32, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—373

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Hyde	Moran (KS)	Reichert	Stearns	PART 1, SUBPART D AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED
Ackerman	Davis (KY)	Inglis (SC)	Moran (VA)	Renzi	Strickland	BY MR. FORTENBERRY
Aderholt	Davis (TN)	Inslee	Murphy	Reynolds	Stupak	The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending
Akin	Davis, Jo Ann	Israel	Musgrave	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan	business is the demand for a recorded
Alexander	Deal (GA)	Istook	Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Sweeney	vote on the amendment offered by the
Allen	DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Rogers (MI)	Tancredo	gentleman from Nebraska (Mr.
Baca	DeGette	(TX)	Napolitano	Rohrabacher	Tanner	FORTENBERRY) on which further pro-
Bachus	DeLauro	Jefferson	Neal (MA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher	ceedings were postponed and on which
Baker	DeLay	Jenkins	Neugebauer	Ross	Taylor (NC)	the ayes prevailed by voice vote.
Baldwin	Dent	Jindal	Ney	Rothman	Terry	
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (CT)	Northup	Royal-Ballard	Thomas	The Clerk will redesignate the
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)	Norwood	Royce	Thompson (CA)	amendment.
Bartlett (MD)	Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Ruppersberger	Thornberry	The Clerk redesignated the amend-
Barton (TX)	Dingell	Jones (NC)	Osborne	Sabo	Tiabert	ment.
Bass	Doggett	Kaptur	Otter	Salazar	Tiberi	RECORDED VOTE
Bean	Doolittle	Keller	Owens	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney	The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded
Beauprez	Doyle	Kelly	Oxley	T.	Towns	vote has been demanded.
Becerra	Drake	Kennedy (MN)	Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner	A recorded vote was ordered.
Berkley	Dreier	Kennedy (RI)	Istook	Pastor	Udall (CO)	The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be
Berman	Duncan	Kildee	Jackson-Lee	Pearce	Sánchez, Linda	a 5-minute vote.
Berry	Edwards	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pence	Saxton	Udall (NM)	The vote was taken by electronic de-
Biggert	Ehlers	Kind	Peterson (MN)	Schiff	Upton	vice, and there were—ayes 375, noes 29,
Bilirakis	Emanuel	King (IA)	Peterson (PA)	Schwartz	Van Hollen	not voting 29, as follows:
Bishop (NY)	Emerson	King (NY)	Pitts	Schwartz (PA)	Walden (OR)	[Roll No. 275]
Bishop (UT)	Engel	Kingston	Platts	Schwarz (MI)	Wamp	AYES—375
Blackburn	English (PA)	Kirk	Poe	Sanders	Wasserman	
Blunt	Eshoo	Kline	Rehberg	Shimkus	Schultz	
Boehlert	Etheridge	Knollenberg		Shuster	Watt	
Bonilla	Evans	Kolbe		Sensenbrenner	Shadegg	
Bonner	Everett	Kuhl (NY)		Platts	Weiner	
Boozman	Farr	LaHood		Shaw	Weldon (FL)	
Boren	Fattah	Langevin		Shays	Weldon (PA)	
Boswell	Feeley	Lantos		Sherman	Weller	
Boucher	Ferguson	Larsen (WA)		Sherwood	Westmoreland	
Boustany	Filner	Latham		Porter	Wexler	
Boyd	Fitzpatrick (PA)	LaTourette		Shimkus	Whitfield	
Bradley (NH)	Flake	Leach		Price (GA)	Wicker	
Brady (PA)	Foley	Levin		Price (NC)	Wilson (NM)	
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Lewis (CA)		Pryce (OH)	Wilson (SC)	
Brown (OH)	Ford	Lewis (KY)		Putnam	Smith (NJ)	
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Linder		Rahall	Smith (TX)	
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Lipinski		Ramstad	Wolf	
Ginny	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo		Sodrel	Wu	
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe		Souder	Wynn	
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Lowey		Young (AK)	Young (FL)	
Butterfield	Gallegly	Lucas		Young (PA)	Young (WA)	
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel				
Calvert	Gerlach	E.				
Camp	Gibbons	Lynch				
Cannon	Gilchrest	Mack				
Cantor	Gohmert	Maloney				
Capito	Gonzalez	Manzullo				
Capps	Goode	Marchant				
Cardin	Goodlatte	Marshall				
Cardoza	Gordon	Matheson				
Carnahan	Granger	Matsui				
Carson	Green (WI)	McCarthy				
Carter	Green, Gene	McCaull (TX)				
Case	Gutknecht	McCollum (MN)				
Castle	Hall	McCotter				
Chabot	Harman	McCrary				
Chandler	Harris	McHenry				
Chocola	Hart	McHugh				
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre				
Cleaver	Hayes	McKeon				
Coble	Hayworth	McKinney				
Cole (OK)	Hefley	McMorris				
Conaway	Hensarling	McNulty				
Cooper	Herger	Meehan				
Costa	Herseth	Meek (FL)				
Costello	Higgins	Melancon				
Cox	Hinchey	Menendez				
Cramer	Hinojosa	Mica				
Crenshaw	Hobson	Michaud				
Crowley	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)				
Cubin	Holden	Miller (MI)				
Culberson	Holt	Miller (NC)				
Cummings	Honda	Miller, Gary				
Cunningham	Hostettler	Miller, George				
Davis (AL)	Hoyer	Mollohan				
Davis (CA)	Hulshof	Moore (KS)				
Davis (FL)	Hunter	Moore (WI)				

NOES—32

NOT VOTING—28

□ 1346

Messrs. SERRANO, GRIJALVA, RANGEL, and AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LEWIS of California, SPRATT, WELDON of Florida, NADER, and RAHALL changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 274, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would advise Members of its intention to run this next series of votes as 5-minute votes.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 375, noes 29, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—375

Abercrombie	Conaway	Goodlatte
Ackerman	Cooper	Gordon
Aderholt	Costa	Granger
Akin	Akin	Costello
Alexander	Costello	Green (WI)
Allen	Cox	Green, Al
Baca	Cramer	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Gutknecht
Barrett (SC)	Crowley	Hall
Barrow	Cubin	Harman
Bartlett (MD)	Baldwin	Culberson
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Harris
Bass	Cummings	Hart
Bean	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Beauprez	Davis (AL)	Hayes
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hayworth
Berkley	Davis (FL)	Hefley
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hensarling
Berry	Davis (PA)	Herseth
Biggert	Davis (TX)	Hinchey
Bilirakis	Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hobson
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Hoekstra
Boyd	DeLay	Holden
Bradley (NH)	DeLay	Jones (SC)
Brady (PA)	DeLay	Krenzschaw
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Gutknecht
Brown (OH)	Dent	Hall
Brown (SC)	Dent	Honda
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hostettler
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Burgess	Dicks	Hulshof
Burton (IN)	Dicks	Hunter
Butterfield	Doolittle	Hyde
Buyer	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Calvert	Dole	Doyle
Camp	Dole	Drake
Cannon	Dole	Green (SC)
Cantor	Dole	Drake
Capito	Dole	Green, Al
Capps	Dole	DeFazio
Cardin	Dole	DeGette
Cardoza	Dole	DeLay
Carnahan	Dole	Emmanuel
Carson	Dole	Emerson
Carter	Dole	Engel
Case	Dole	Brady (TX)
Castle	Dole	Brady (PA)
Chabot	Dole	Brady (IL)
Chandler	Dole	Brady (PA)
Chocola	Dole	Brady (TX)
Clay	Dole	Brady (PA)
Cleaver	Dole	Brady (TX)
Coble	Dole	Brady (PA)
Cole (OK)	Dole	Brady (TX)
Conaway	Dole	Brady (PA)
Cooper	Dole	Brady (TX)
Costa	Dole	Brady (PA)
Costello	Dole	Brady (TX)
Cox	Dole	Brady (PA)
Cramer	Dole	Brady (TX)
Crenshaw	Dole	Brady (PA)
Crowley	Dole	Brady (TX)
Cubin	Dole	Brady (PA)
Culberson	Dole	Brady (TX)
Cummings	Dole	Brady (PA)
Cunningham	Dole	Brady (TX)
Davis (AL)	Dole	Brady (PA)
Davis (CA)	Dole	Brady (TX)
Davis (FL)	Dole	Brady (PA)

Report 109-132 offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—405

Abercrombie	Costello	Grijalva
Ackerman	Cox	Gutierrez
Aderholt	Cramer	Gutknecht
Akin	Crenshaw	Hall
Alexander	Crowley	Harman
Allen	Cubin	Harris
Baca	Culberson	Hart
Bachus	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Baker	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Baldwin	Davis (AL)	Hayes
Barrett (SC)	Davis (CA)	Hayworth
Barrow	Davis (FL)	Hefley
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (IL)	Hensarling
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Herger
Bass	Davis (TN)	Herseth
Bean	Davis, Jo Ann	Higgins
Beauprez	Deal (GA)	Hinchey
Becerra	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Berkley	DeGette	Hobson
Berman	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Berry	DeLauro	Holden
Biggert	DeLay	Holt
Bilirakis	Dent	Honda
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hostettler
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Blackburn	Dicks	Hulshof
Blunt	Dingell	Hunter
Boehlert	Doggett	Hyde
Bonilla	Doolittle	Ingelis (SC)
Bonner	Doyle	Insllee
Boozman	Drake	Israel
Boren	Dreier	Istook
Boswell	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boustany	Ehlers	Jindal
Boyd	Emanuel	Jefferson
Bradley (NH)	Emerson	Jenkins
Brady (PA)	Engel	Ortiz
Brady (TX)	English (PA)	Johnson (CT)
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Johnson (IL)
Brown (SC)	Etheridge	Johnson, Sam
Brown-Waite,	Evans	Jones (NC)
Ginny	Everett	Jones (OH)
Burgess	Farr	Kanjorski
Burton (IN)	Fattah	Kaptur
Butterfield	Feeney	Keller
Buyer	Ferguson	Kelly
Calvert	Filner	Kennedy (MN)
Camp	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kennedy (RI)
Cannon	Flake	Kildee
Cantor	Foley	Kilpatrick (MI)
Capito	Forbes	Kind
Capps	Ford	King (IA)
Capuano	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Cardin	Fossella	Kingston
Cardoza	Foxx	Kirk
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Kline
Carson	Franks (AZ)	Knollenberg
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Case	Gallegly	Kucinich
Castle	Garrett (NJ)	Kuhl (NY)
Chabot	Gerlach	LaHood
Chandler	Gibbons	Langevin
Chocola	Gilchrest	Lantos
Clay	Gohmert	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Goode	Latham
Coble	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Cole (OK)	Gordon	Leach
Conaway	Granger	Lee
Conyers	Green (WI)	Levin
Cooper	Green, Al	Lewis (CA)
Costa	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)

Lewis (KY)	Osborne	Shays
Linder	Otter	Sherman
Lipinski	Owens	Sherwood
LoBiondo	Oxley	Shimkus
Lofgren, Zoe	Pallone	Shuster
Lowey	Pascarel	Simpson
Lucas	Pastor	Slaughter
Lungren, Daniel E.	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lynch	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Mack	Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)
Maloney	Peterson (PA)	Snyder
Manzullo	Petri	Sodrel
Marchant	Pickering	Solis
Markey	Pitts	Souder
Marshall	Platts	Spratt
Matheson	Poe	Stearns
Matsui	Pombo	Strickland
McCarthy	Pomeroy	Stupak
McCaul (TX)	Porter	Sullivan
McCollum (MN)	Price (GA)	Sweeney
McCotter	Price (NC)	Tancredo
McCryer	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
McGovern	Putnam	Tauscher
McHenry	Radanovich	Taylor (MS)
McHugh	Rahall	Taylor (NC)
McIntyre	Ramstad	Terry
McKeon	Rangel	Thomas
McMorris	Regula	Thompson (CA)
McNulty	Rehberg	Thompson (MS)
Meehan	Reichert	Thornberry
Meek (FL)	Renzi	Tiaho
Meeks (NY)	Reynolds	Tiberi
Melancon	Rogers (AL)	Tierney
Menendez	Rogers (KY)	Towns
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Michaud	Rohrabacher	Udall (CO)
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Udall (NM)
Miller (MI)	Ross	Upton
Miller (NC)	Rothman	Van Hollen
Miller, Gary	Royal-Allard	Visclosky
Miller, George	Royce	Walden (OR)
Mollohan	Ruppertsberger	Wamp
Moore (KS)	Rush	Wasserman
Moore (WI)	Schultz	Blackburn
Moran (KS)	Ryan (OH)	Blunt
Moran (VA)	Ryan (WI)	Frank (MA)
Ryun (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Boehlert
Murphy	Sabo	Watson
Neugebauer	Salazar	Bonilla
Ney	Schiff	Frelinghuysen
Nadal	Sánchez, Linda T.	McIntyre
Nadler	Sánchez, Loretta	McHugh
Napolitano	Sanders	Boehner
Neal (MA)	Saxton	Bradley (NH)
Nussle	Scalise	Goodlatte
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Brown (SC)
Ortiz	Shadegg	Granger
Ortiz	Shaw	Brown-Waite, Green (WI)
Paul	Young (AK)	Green, Gene
Paul	Young (FL)	Moore (KS)
NOT VOTING—26	NOT VOTING—26	NOT VOTING—26
Andrews	Gillmor	Pelosi
Baird	Gingrey	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	Graves	Sessions
Brown, Corrine	Hooley	Simmons
Brown, Tom	Boehner	Skelton
Bono	Johnson, E. B.	Stark
McDermott	Hooley	Conaway
Millender	McDermott	Velázquez
McDonald	Waxman	Costa

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1407

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART 2 AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR.

PENCE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in Part 2 of House Report 109-132 offered

by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 126, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—281

Abercrombie	Edwards	Linder
Aderholt	Ehlers	Lipinski
Akin	Emanuel	LoBiondo
Alexander	Emerson	Lowey
Bachus	Engel	Lucas
Barrett (SC)	English (PA)	Lungren, Daniel
Barrow	Etheridge	Mack
Bartlett (MD)	Everett	Lynch
Barton (TX)	Feeney	Matheson
Bass	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bean	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Manzullo
Beauprez	Flake	Marchant
Becerra	Foley	Matheson
Berkley	Forbes	Matsui
Berman	Ford	McCarthy
Berry	Ferguson	Maloney
Biggert	Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)
Bilirakis	Fossella	McCotter
Bishop (NY)	Fox	McCrary
Bishop (UT)	Frank (MA)	McHenry
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	McHugh
Blunt	Barrow	Mica
Boehlert	Bartlett (MD)	Miller (FL)
Bonilla	Berkley	Miller (MI)
Bonner	Barton (TX)	Miller, Gary
Boozman	Bonner	Morris
Boren	Bishop (UT)	Morris
Brown (KS)	Boozman	Murphy
Brown (WI)	Blackburn	Musgrave
Brown (WI)	Blunt	Melancon
Brown (WI)	Frank (MA)	Menendez
Brown (WI)	Boehlert	Mica
Brown (WI)	Boyd	Miller (FL)
Brown (WI)	Bradley (NH)	Miller (FL)
Brown (WI)	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Brown (WI)	Brown (SC)	Granger
Brown (WI)	Brady (TX)	Brown (WI)
Brown (WI)	Brown (WI)	Green (WI)
Brown (WI)	Calvert	Green, Gene
Brown (WI)	Capito	Moore (KS)
Brown (WI)	Cardin	Napolitano
Brown (WI)	Cardoza	Neugebauer
Brown (WI)	Carroll	Nunes
Brown (WI)	Carnahan	Nussle
Brown (WI)	Carter	Osborne
Brown (WI)	Castile	Pomero
Brown (WI)	Chabot	Oxley
Brown (WI)	Chandler	Pearce
Brown (WI)	Coble	Pence
Brown (WI)	Conaway	Peterson (MN)
Brown (WI)	Costa	Peterson (PA)
Brown (WI)	DeLay	Petri
Brown (WI)	Dent	Pickering
Brown (WI)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Platts
Brown (WI)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Pomero
Brown (WI)	Doolittle	Reichert
Brown (WI)	Doyle	Rogers (AL)
Brown (WI)	Drake	Rogers (KY)
Brown (WI)	Dreier	Rogers (MI)
Brown (WI)	Duncan	Rohrabacher
Brown (WI)	Ehlers	Ros-Lehtinen

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 306, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—100

Aderholt	Gibbons	Musgrave
Akin	Gohmert	Myrick
Alexander	Goode	Neugebauer
Bachus	Green (WI)	Ney
Baker	Green, Gene	Norwood
Barrett (SC)	Hayes	Otter
Bartlett (MD)	Hayworth	Paul
Barton (TX)	Hefley	Petri
Beauprez	Herger	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hostettler	Pombo
Blackburn	Hulshof	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hunter	Radanovich
Boustany	Istook	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Jenkins	Renzi
Burgess	Jindal	Rogers (AL)
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Royce
Cannon	Keller	Ryun (KS)
Carter	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kingston	Shuster
Coble	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lynch	Tancredo
Doolittle	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
Drake	Marchant	Terry
Duncan	McCaull (TX)	Tiahrt
Emerson	McCrery	Tiberi
Feeney	McHenry	Wamp
Foley	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Foxx	Miller (MI)	
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)

NOES—306

Abercrombie	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Ackerman	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Allen	Costa	Gallely
Baca	Costello	Gerlach
Baldwin	Cox	Gilchrest
Barrow	Cramer	Gonzalez
Bass	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bean	Crowley	Gordon
Becerra	Cubin	Granger
Berkley	Culberson	Green, Al
Berman	Cummings	Grijalva
Berry	Cunningham	Gutierrez
Bilirakis	Davis (AL)	Gutknecht
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hall
Blunt	Davis (FL)	Harman
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Harris
Bonilla	Davis (KY)	Hart
Bonner	Davis (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Boren	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Boswell	DeGette	Hensarling
Boucher	Delahunt	Herseth
Boyd	DeLauro	Higgins
Bradley (NH)	DeLay	Hinchey
Brady (PA)	Dent	Hinojosa
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Hoekstra
Brown-Waite,	Dingell	Holden
Ginny	Doggett	Holt
Butterfield	Doyle	Honda
Calvert	Dreier	Hoyer
Camp	Edwards	Hyde
Cantor	Ehlers	Inglis (SC)
Capito	Emanuel	Insllee
Capps	Engel	Israel
Capuano	English (PA)	Jackson (IL)
Cardin	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Cardoza	Etheridge	(TX)
Carnahan	Evans	Jefferson
Carson	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Case	Farr	Johnson (IL)
Castle	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Chandler	Ferguson	Kanjorski
Chocola	Filner	Kaptur
Clay	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kelly
Cleaver	Flake	Kennedy (MN)
Clyburn	Ford	Kildee
Cole (OK)	Fortenberry	Kilpatrick (MI)
Conaway	Fossella	Kind

King (NY)

Napolitano

Scott (VA)

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.		
A recorded vote was ordered.		
The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.		
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 306, not voting 27, as follows:		
[Roll No. 280]		
AYES—100		
Aderholt	Gibbons	Musgrave
Akin	Gohmert	Myrick
Alexander	Goode	Neugebauer
Bachus	Green (WI)	Ney
Baker	Green, Gene	Norwood
Barrett (SC)	Hayes	Otter
Bartlett (MD)	Hayworth	Paul
Barton (TX)	Hefley	Petri
Beauprez	Herger	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hostettler	Pombo
Blackburn	Hulshof	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Boustany	Istook	Radanovich
Brown (SC)	Jenkins	Rehberg
Burgess	Jindal	Renzi
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Cannon	Keller	Royce
Carter	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)
Chabot	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Souder
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lynch	Sullivan
Doolittle	Manzullo	Tancredo
Drake	Marchant	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	McCaull (TX)	Terry
Emerson	McCrary	Tiaht
Feeley	McHenry	Tiberi
Foley	McKeon	Wamp
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	
NOES—306		
Abercrombie	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Ackerman	Cooper	Frelighuysen
Allen	Costa	Galleghy
Baca	Costello	Gerlach
Baldwin	Cox	Gilchrest
Barrow	Cramer	Gonzalez
Bass	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bean	Crowley	Gordon
Becerra	Cubin	Granger
Berkley	Culberson	Green, Al
Berman	Cummings	Grijalva
Berry	Cunningham	Gutierrez
Bilirakis	Davis (AL)	Gutknecht
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hall
Blunt	Davis (FL)	Harman
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Harris
Bonilla	Davis (KY)	Hart
Bonner	Davis (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Boren	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Boswell	DeGette	Hensarling
Boucher	DeLahunt	Herseth
Boyd	DeLauro	Higgins
Bradley (NH)	DeLay	Hinchey
Brady (PA)	Dent	Hinojosa
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Hoekstra
Brown-Waite,	Dingell	Holden
Ginny	Doggett	Holt
Butterfield	Doyle	Honda
Calvert	Dreier	Hoyer
Camp	Edwards	Hyde
Cantor	Ehlers	Inglis (SC)
Capito	Emanuel	Inslee
Capps	Engel	Israel
Capuano	English (PA)	Jackson (IL)
Cardin	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Cardoza	Etheridge	(TX)
Carnahan	Evans	Jefferson
Carson	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Case	Farr	Johnson (IL)
Castle	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Chandler	Ferguson	Kanjorski
Chocola	Filner	Kaptur
Clay	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kelly
Cleaver	Flake	Kennedy (MN)
Clyburn	Ford	Kildee
Cole (OK)	Fortenberry	Kilpatrick (MI)
Conaway	Fossella	Kind

Kirk	Neal (MA)	Serrano
Kline	Northup	Shadegg
Knollenberg	Nunes	Shaw
Colbe	Nussle	Shays
Kucinich	Oberstar	Sherman
Kuhl (NY)	Obey	Sherwood
LaHood	Olver	Shimkus
Langevin	Ortiz	Simpson
Lantos	Osborne	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Owens	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Latham	Pallone	Smith (WA)
LaTourette	Pascarella	Snyder
Leach	Pastor	Sodrel
Lee	Payne	Solis
Levin	Pearce	Spratt
Lewis (CA)	Pence	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Lipinski	Peterson (PA)	Sweeney
LoBiondo	Pickering	Tanner
Lofgren, Zoe	Pitts	Tauscher
Lowey	Poe	Taylor (NC)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Pomeroy	Thomas
Mack	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Maloney	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Markey	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
Marshall	Putnam	Tierney
Matheson	Rahall	Towns
Matsui	Ramstad	Turner
McCarthy	Rangel	Udall (CO)
McCullum (MN)	Regula	Udall (NM)
McCotter	Reichert	Upton
McGovern	Reynolds	Van Hollen
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Velázquez
McIntyre	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky
McKinney	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden (OR)
McMorris	Ross	Wasserman
McNulty	Rothman	Schultz
Meehan	Royer-Allard	Waters
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger	Watson
Meeks (NY)	Rush	Watt
Melancon	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
Menendez	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (PA)
Mica	Sabo	Weller
Michaud	Salazar	Wexler
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Whitfield
Miller, George	T.	Wicker
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (NM)
Moore (KS)	Sanders	
Moore (WI)	Saxton	Wolf
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Murphy	Schiff	Wu
Murtha	Schwartz (PA)	Wynn
Nadler	Schwartz (MI)	Young (AK)
	Scott (GA)	Young (FL)
NOT VOTING—27		
Andrews	Gillmor	Pelosi
Baird	Gingrey	Reyes
Biggert	Graves	Sessions
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Simmons
Blumenauer	Issa	Skelton
Boehner	Johnson, E. B.	Stark
Bono	Kennedy (RI)	Walsh
Brown, Corrine	McDermott	Waxman
Cuellar	Millender-	
Davis, Tom	McDonald	
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN		
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are minutes remaining in this vote.		
□ 1427		
So the amendment was rejected.		
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		
PART 2, AMENDMENT NO. 13 IN THE NATURE OF SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS		
The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.		
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.		
The Clerk redesignated the amendment in the nature of a substitute.		

RECORDED VOTE

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 216, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—190

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Nadler
Ackerman	Gordon	Napolitano
Allen	Green, Al	Neal (MA)
Baca	Green, Gene	Oberstar
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Obey
Barrow	Harman	Olver
Bass	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Bean	Herseth	Owens
Becerra	Higgins	Pallone
Berkley	Hinchey	Pascrell
Berman	Hinojosa	Payne
Berry	Holden	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Price (NC)
Boehlert	Honda	Rahall
Boren	Hoyer	Rangel
Boswell	Inglis (SC)	Ross
Boucher	Inslee	Rothman
Boyd	Israel	Royal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Butterfield	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Jefferson	Sabo
Capuano	Johnson (CT)	Salazar
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kanjorski	T.
Carnahan	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson	Kildee	

Case	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanders
Castle	Kind	Schakowsky
Chandler	Kucinich	Schiff
Clay	LaHood	Schwartz (PA)
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Shays
Costa	Leach	Sherman
Costello	Lee	Slaughter
Cramer	Levin	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Cummings	Lipinski	Solis
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Spratt
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Strickland
Davis (FL)	Lynch	Stupak
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Tanner
Davis (TN)	Markley	Tauscher
DeFazio	Marshall	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	Matsui	Tierney
DeLauro	McCarthy	Towns
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Udall (CO)
Dingell	McGovern	Udall (NM)
Doggett	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Doyle	McNulty	Velázquez
Edwards	Meehan	Visclosky
Ehlers	Meek (FL)	Wasserman
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Schultz
Engel	Melancon	Waters
Eshoo	Menendez	Watson
Etheridge	Michaud	Watt
Evans	Miller (NC)	Weiner
Farr	Miller, George	Wexler
Fattah	Mollohan	Woolsey
Filner	Moore (KS)	Wu
Ford	Moore (WI)	Wynn
Frank (MA)	Morean (VA)	

NOES 816

NOES—210	
Aderholt	Boustany
Akin	Bradley (NH)
Alexander	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Brown (SC)
Baker	Brown-Waite,
Barrett (SC)	Ginny
Bartlett (MD)	Burgess
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)
Beauprez	Buyer
Biggert	Calvert
Bilirakis	Camp
Bishop (UT)	Cannon
Blackburn	Cantor
Blunt	Capito
Bonilla	Carter
Bonner	Chabot
Boozman	Chocola
	Coble
	Cole (OK)
	Conaway
	Cox
	Crenshaw
	Cubin
	Culberson
	Cunningham
	Davis (KY)
	Davis, Jo Ann
	Deal (GA)
	DeLay
	Dent
	Diaz-Balart, L.
	Diaz-Balart, M.
	Doolittle
	Drake

Dreier	Kline	Putnam
Duncan	Knollenberg	Radanovich
Emerson	Kolbe	Ramstad
English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)	Regula
Everett	Latham	Rehberg
Feeley	LaTourette	Reichert
Ferguson	Lewis (CA)	Renzi
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (KY)	Reynolds
Flake	Linder	Rogers (AL)
Foley	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
Forbes	Lucas	Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Rohrabacher
Fossella	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Foxx	Mack	Royce
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Ryun (KS)
Gallegly	McCaul (TX)	Saxton
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Schwarz (MI)
Gerlach	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Gibbons	McHenry	Shadegg
Gilchrest	McHugh	Shaw
Gohmert	McKeon	Sherwood
Goode	McKinney	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McMorris	Shuster
Granger	Mica	Simpson
Green (WI)	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Grijalva	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Gutknecht	Miller, Gary	Sodrel
Hall	Moran (KS)	Souder
Harris	Murphy	Stearns
Hart	Murtha	Sullivan
Hastings (WA)	Musgrave	Sweeney
Hayes	Myrick	Tancredo
Hayworth	Neugebauer	Taylor (MS)
Hefley	Ney	Taylor (NC)
Hensarling	Northup	Terry
Herger	Norwood	Thomas
Hobson	Nunes	Thornberry
Hoekstra	Nussle	Tiahrt
Hostettler	Osborne	Tiberi
Hulshof	Otter	Turner
Hunter	Oxley	Upton
Hyde	Pastor	Walden (OR)
Istoek	Paul	Wamp
Jenkins	Pearce	Weldon (FL)
Jindal	Pence	Weldon (PA)
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Westmoreland
Jones (NC)	Pickering	Whitfield
Keller	Pitts	Wicker
Kelly	Platts	Wilson (NM)
Kennedy (MN)	Poe	Wilson (SC)
King (IA)	Pombo	Wolf
King (NY)	Porter	Young (AK)
Kingston	Price (GA)	Young (FL)
Kirk	Pryce (OH)	

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews	Gingrey	Peterson (MN)
Baird	Graves	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Sessions
Blumenauer	Issa	Simmons
Boehner	Johnson, E. B.	Skelton
Bono	Kennedy (RI)	Stark
Brown, Corrine	McDermott	Walsh
Cuellar	Millender-	Waxman
Davis, Tom	McDonald	
Gillmor	Pelosi	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1434

Mr. BOEHLERT changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2745. There is a need for reform at the United Nations. No one disagrees with that, but the legislation before the House is an extreme and deeply flawed bill that would actually set back our efforts to

strengthen and improve this important institution.

The problem with the amendment is its complete lack of flexibility. It requires the United States to withhold 50 percent of our dues if 32 of 39 specific goals are not met by 2007. Furthermore, 14 of those goals are mandatory, and if a single one is not met, our dues are withheld. Such a rigid approach weakens the Bush Administration's hand in negotiating the changes that we all agree are necessary there.

I want to quote from a June 14 letter to Speaker HASTERT and Leader PELOSI from eight former U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations. These ambassadors served in Republican and Democratic administrations alike, range broadly in their political persuasions, and include President Bush's most recent Ambassador to the U.N., John Danforth, as well as Madeleine Albright, Richard Holbrooke, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Donald McHenry, Thomas Pickering, Bill Richardson and Andrew Young.

In their letter, they write that "withholding U.S. dues to the U.N. threatens to undermine our leadership and effectiveness at the U.N. and the reform effort itself—as well as the U.N.'s ability to take on responsibilities critical to protecting our national security. . . . Reforming the United Nations is the right goal. Withholding our dues to the U.N. is the wrong methodology."

These distinguished former ambassadors go on to assert that, "Withholding U.S. dues to the United Nations may sound like smart policy but would be counterproductive at this time. . . . It would create resentment, build animosity and actually strengthen opponents of reform."

For these reasons, I will vote for the substitute offered by Ranking Member LANTOS. The Lantos substitute would give Secretary of State Rice the tools and flexibility needed to bring about reform at the United Nations.

Let me conclude by saying that the bill before the House is a perfect example of how the priorities of the Majority are out of step with the needs of the country. It is simply amazing that the House is debating this bill—a bill that the President would almost certainly veto if it ever reached him—when there are so many more important and unmet needs that the House has yet to address and could effectively address.

Millions of manufacturing jobs have left the United States over the last four years, and more jobs are leaving every day. The cost of gasoline remains near record highs, yet we still have no strategy to deal with it. Over 40 million Americans have no health insurance, and the cost of health insurance for all Americans continues to rise. These are the issues that the American people need us to address.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this flawed and unbalanced bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the United Nations Reform Act of 2005 as it is currently constituted. This legislation sends the signal to the world that our Nation has a disdain for the United Nations and I for one cannot support that idea.

There are many instances in which the U.N. has been instrumental in furthering U.S. foreign policy objectives. In the past year alone, the U.N. helped organize parliamentary elections in Iraq, reconstruction efforts following the Indian Ocean tsunami, and helped mediate the withdrawal of Syrian armed forces

from Lebanon. A reformed U.N. could be even more complementary to U.S. interests abroad, but only if the U.S. does not alienate other Member States and create animosity in the process. The inflexibility of the Hyde legislation would create resentment among Member States, and the automatic withholding of dues would cripple the institution.

Hyde's unilateral approach to U.N. reform promises to thwart the growing international consensus for reform, which will be addressed by at least 174 nations at the September Summit in New York. We need a more flexible approach which does not dictate unrealistic deadlines for changes or threaten automatic withholding of dues, will achieve U.S. goals without causing widespread resentment among Member States whose support we depend on.

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

Not only does the Hyde bill take a wrong approach to peacekeeping, but it will also create great problems with the budget at the United Nations. The Hyde bill claims to "pursue a streamlined, efficient, and accountable regular assessed budget of the United Nations," yet in reality the approach taken by the bill will wreak havoc on the U.N. budget process and will result in the automatic withholding of U.S. financial obligations to the U.N. regular budget. This flawed bill attempts to shift funding for 18 specific programs from assessed contributions to voluntary contributions. To achieve these goals, the bill mandates the withholding of up to \$100 million in U.S. dues to the U.N. regular budget. While this idea may have merit, the U.S. should work with its allies to advance it through the Budget Committee at the U.N. instead of starting from the point of withholding dues, which should be our Nation's last resort. Furthermore, the Hyde

proposal links 50 percent of U.N. dues to a list of 39 conditions, not only at the U.N. Secretariat, but also at various U.N. specialized agencies over which the U.N. has no direct control. All of this will create a new U.S. debt at the U.N., since many of the conditions are so rigid and specific that they are not achievable. In the end, all that any of this will do is create resentment towards the United States in the international community. As the Washington Post editorialized, "This is like using a sledgehammer to drive a nail into an antique table: Even if you're aiming at the right nail, you're going to cause damage."

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

Clearly, too many of the provisions of the Hyde U.N. reform bill will only cause resentment against the United States in the international community. Achieving reform by consensus in a body with 191 members is difficult, but this is not in itself a reason to bypass the consensus building process. The more Member States that are engaged in achieving reform, the more legitimate and effective the changes will be. The U.S. should lead the way by actively promoting a tough reform agenda and retaining the threat of withholding dues as a last resort. Reform should not, however, be a crusade led by the U.S. against the institution and its Member States. Unfortunately, this bill on U.N. reform will not lead to reform, but only to the weakening of the United Nations. With great respect for Chairman HYDE and his intent I regretfully will have to oppose H.R. 2745.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot vote for this bill.

I am not opposed to the ostensible purpose of the bill—in fact, I share the view that the United Nations needs to be improved so it can better carry out its indispensable role.

The U.N. is a critically important body that has taken on many of the world's problems and solved them—problems such as poverty, disease, and international disputes. And the U.S. has benefited from U.N. actions. Just recently, the U.N. helped with elections in Afghanistan and Iraq and helped negotiate the withdrawal of Syrian forces from Lebanon.

But it has serious problems, as exemplified by the oil-for-food scandal and offenses committed by U.N. peacekeeping forces.

So, I support U.N. reform—but I cannot support the approach the bill takes toward achieving that objective.

The bill would require the Secretary of State to push for reforms at the U.N. in the areas of budgeting, oversight and accountability, peacekeeping, and human rights. That is something that needs to be done. But if the Secretary of State cannot certify that the reforms have been achieved, starting in 2007, the Secretary would be required to withhold 50 percent of the U.S. assessed contributions to

the U.N.'s regular budget. The assessed U.S. contributions are estimated at \$362 million for 2005, and \$439 million for 2006.

I think such a punitive and unilateral approach to reform will not work. I think its primary result would be to further isolate the United States while at the same time actually undermining ongoing efforts at reform and potentially jeopardizing the U.N.'s ability to focus on global threats and work toward greater global stability.

The substitute proposed by Representatives LANTOS and SHAYS would have been a better approach, and I regret that it was not adopted.

As it stands, the bill is problematic on a number of fronts. First, it would mandate withholding of dues from programs that do not get moved from the U.N.'s assessed budget to a system of voluntary contribution, a goal unlikely to be achieved.

Also, it would require the United States to veto Security Council resolutions establishing any new U.N. peacekeeping missions—including involvement in a crisis like the one taking place in Darfur—until the peacekeeping reforms called for by the bill have been completed. This is like forbidding firemen to respond to a blaze because we are unhappy about the way the department is organized and financed. I cannot support that.

The bill would cut U.S. contributions to U.N. conferences and public information programs by 20 percent unless the overall budgets for these programs are cut by 20 percent, and if the 20 percent target is not met by 2008, the bill would mandate the withholding of 50 percent of U.S. contributions. It also would require that 50 percent of annual dues be withheld even if just one of 14 mandatory benchmarks were not met. These go beyond stern—they are petulant. Their predictable result is not reform, but failure.

In short, the bill as it stands would simultaneously demand reform and make it impossible to achieve.

The substitute offered by Representatives LANTOS and SHAYS would have used carrots as well as sticks and would have given much greater flexibility to the Secretary of State.

The substitute included benchmarks very much like those in the base bill, but it gave flexibility to the Secretary of State to mandate the 50 percent cuts to our U.N. dues. Similarly, the substitute did not link the change from "assessed" to "voluntary" contributions to withholding a portion of our dues, and it would have allowed the Secretary of State to waive the peacekeeping reform requirements if it is determined that a new mission is in the U.S. national interest.

The substitute also included incentives by supporting an effort to pay our dues on time, an increased U.N. budget for the large number of new offices that will be needed to implement the reforms, a well structured buyout of unneeded U.N. personnel, and a contribution to the U.N. Democracy Fund.

The difference between the bill now before us and the Lantos-Shays substitute is that while the substitute was realistic in the way it set out a path toward reform, the majority's bill if fully implemented would effectively destroy the chances of achieving an effective and improved U.N.

Instead of adopting such an approach, the United States should engage the U.N. member countries in the process of reform and provide the U.N. with the resources necessary to

accomplish reforms, rather than alienate the global community by threatening to withhold dues.

The Bush Administration itself is opposed to this legislation as it stands. I do not often agree with them, but I do in this instance and I therefore must vote against the bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2745, the Henry Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005.

H.R. 2745 is a common sense piece of legislation that would mandate timely change to a United Nations suffering from scandal, mismanagement and abuse. Specifically, it would withhold 50 percent of regular assessed budget contributions unless the U.N. enacts 39 specific budgetary, accountability, and human rights-related reforms necessary to providing needed transparency to the world body.

The need for this legislation could not be more evident. Over the past few years we have witnessed a United Nations mired in scandal. The U.N. Oil-for-Food program was a glaring failure that served only to benefit a tyrant and keep the Iraqi people in a state of despondency and despair. As a result, the Oil-for-Food program has become the biggest scandal in the history of the U.N. and one of the greatest financial scandals of modern times.

Scandals involving U.N. peacekeeping operations have also escalated. In Congo and Bosnia, U.N. peacekeepers were accused of widespread sexual exploitation and rape of refugees, betraying the trust of the very people they were there to protect. In Sierra Leone, peacekeepers were accused of systematically raping women. These actions are reprehensible in any society and unbecoming to an organization whose founding charter is dedicated to the promotion and respect for human rights and maintaining international peace and security.

In recent years, the U.N. has also abdicated their role as a protector of human rights. This legislation rightfully prevents some of the world's premier human rights abusers such as Cuba, Sudan and Libya from having a seat on the U.N. Commission of Human Rights.

Without H.R. 2745, we will be sending American taxpayer dollars to support an international organization that currently embraces mediocrity, corruption and waste as the status quo. The United Nations Reform Act will go a long way to employ proper checks and balances to an organization that I believe has lost control of both its purpose and mission, and no longer adequately represents the United States' interests, nor the interests of democracies around the world.

It is time for these common sense reforms. The American people who pay 22 percent of the U.N. dues demand that their tax dollars go to an organization that is transparent, and accountable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Mr. HYDE for his distinguished service in the House of Representatives and to support his work to bring accountability and transparency to the United Nations.

Throughout his career, Mr. HYDE has been a promoter and a defender of conservative issues, including the rights of the unborn and the need for a strong national defense.

While many of my colleagues are committed and dedicated to these issues, my friend from

Illinois has truly led by example in how he has advocated for conservative policies and championed family values.

He is well known for his consistency and tenacity in his beliefs, yet he is well-respected within the House by Members of both sides of the aisle. He has strongly disagreed with Members about issues that evoke emotional responses, yet he has maintained his dignity and gentlemanly conduct.

Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Mr. HYDE for his work to increase the credibility of the United Nations and to wish him well in his retirement. Unfortunately, I was committed to attend an event in my district, and I was unable to vote for the final passage of the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005. I would like the official record to reflect I support this important legislation.

HENRY, thank you for your service and best wishes to you and your family.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2745) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 319, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 184, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—221

Aderholt	Blunt	Cantor	Kelly	Porter	Menendez	Rangel	Spratt
Akin	Bonilla	Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Price (GA)	Michaud	Reichert	Strickland
Alexander	Bonner	Carter	King (IA)	Pryce (OH)	Miller (NC)	Ross	Stupak
Bachus	Boozman	Chabot	King (NY)	Putnam	Miller, George	Rothman	Tauscher
Baker	Boustany	Chocola	Kingston	Radanovich	Moore (KS)	Royal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Barrett (SC)	Bradley (NH)	Coble	Kirk	Ramstad	Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Barrow	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)	Kline	Regula	Nolan (VA)	Rush	Tierney
Bartlett (MD)	Brown (SC)	Conaway	Knollenberg	Rehberg	Murtha	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Barton (TX)	Brown-Waite,	Costello	Kolbe	Renzi	Nadler	Sabo	Udall (CO)
Bass	Ginny	Cox	Kuhl (NY)	Reynolds	Napolitano	Salazar	Udall (NM)
Beauprez	Burgess	Crenshaw	LaHood	Rogers (AL)	Neal (MA)	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Berkley	Burton (IN)	Cubin	Latham	Rogers (KY)	Oberstar	T.	Velázquez
Biggert	Buyer	Culberson	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)	Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher	Olver	Sanders	Wasserman
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Ortiz	Schakowsky	Schultz
Blackburn	Cannon	Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Royce	Owens	Pallone	Waters
			LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)	Pascarella	Scott (GA)	Watson
			Lucas	Ryun (KS)	Pastor	Scott (VA)	Watt
			Lungren, Daniel E.	Saxton	Paul	Serrano	Weiner
			Mack	Schwarz (MI)	Payne	Shays	Wexler
			Manzullo	Sensenbrenner	Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Woolsey
			Marchant	Shadegg	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)	Wu
			Marshall	Shaw	Price (NC)	Snyder	Wynn
			McCaull (TX)	Sherwood	Rahall	Solis	

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews	Gingrey	Reyes
Baird	Graves	Sessions
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Simmons
Blumenauer	Issa	Skelton
Boehner	Johnson, E. B.	Slaughter
Bono	Kennedy (RI)	Stark
Brown, Corrine	McDermott	Tanner
Cuellar	Millender-	Walsh
Davis, Tom	McDonald	Waxman
Gillmor	Pelosi	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1451

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 17, 2005, I was not in Washington, DC, for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2745, the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005.

Regarding the amendments, I would have voted in favor of the Royce, Fortenberry, Flake and Chabot/Lantos amendments, and I would have voted against the Pence, Gohmert, Stearns and Lantos/Shays amendments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to official business that has great importance to residents of the 30th Congressional District of Texas, I was not present on June 17, 2005.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 274, On Agreeing to the Royce of California Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 275, On Agreeing to the Fortenberry of Nebraska Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 276, On Agreeing to the Flake of Arizona Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 277, On Agreeing to the Chabot of Ohio Amendment (House Resolution 2745), had I been present, I would have voted "aye."