

people who know those languages at a professional or technical level is even harder.

"Many of our assignments are highly technical and they [native speakers] simply do not have vocabulary to move between the two languages. That's where our challenges lie," said Brenda Sprague, the director of Office of Language Services at the State Department.

Not all candidates who meet the grade want to work for, say, the Foreign Service and be posted far from their families, said Nancy Serpa, former director of the Human Resources for Recruitment, Examination and Employment at the State Department.

"The Foreign Service is not a career for everyone, and finding people who want to spend their career overseas away from their family is very difficult to begin with, even though we have a lot of people who take the Foreign Service test," Serpa said.

National Security Agency managers find that many candidates are reluctant to move even to the agency's Maryland headquarters.

"We may be successful in attracting people to the type of work we do and the opportunities and possibilities we have available, but we're not always successful in encouraging them to move to Columbia or Baltimore," said John Taflan, NSA human resources director.

Getting new employees a security clearance is another hurdle.

"We require, for all our full-time positions and even some of our contract positions, that people have the ability to obtain a security clearance, and that's become extremely difficult for those who are naturalized American citizens," Sprague said. "That limits your pool to a large extent."

Hiring binge.

Despite the recruiting challenges, agencies have been hiring.

Since 9/11, the FBI has hired nearly 1,000 linguists and plans to hire 274 more next fiscal year. Currently it has nearly 1,400 contract and full-time linguists who speak 100 languages. Ninety-five of those linguists are native speakers of their languages. The bureau increased its linguists by 69 percent and the number of those in critical languages, such as Arabic, increasing by 200 percent.

The State Department this year is hiring nearly 400 Foreign Service generalists, many of whom will get training to speak another language. It's also hiring translators and interpreters. Many of those new hires will staff new embassies in Baghdad, Iraq, and Kabul, Afghanistan; and a new liaison office in Tripoli, Libya. Currently the department has about 7,000 employees speaking 60 languages working in the United States and at 265 posts abroad.

Likewise, the National Security Agency is aggressively recruiting: Currently at 35,000 employees, the agency plans to hire 1,500 people every year until 2010, and many will become language analysts. It offers sign-up bonuses of up to 20 percent of a person's salary for those who speak critical languages. NSA also hires 50 to 200 bilinguals a year whom it then trains to speak a third language.

More training.

The shortage of linguists prompted the Defense Department to overhaul its language program. The department in April unveiled a plan, called the Defense Language Transformation Roadmap, to build up its foreign language skills. It includes directing money to colleges and universities to teach languages. Also, the department plans to invest \$45 million more than current levels—\$195 million in fiscal 2006—in its Defense Language Institute. The department also will build a database of active-duty personnel, civilians, reservists and retirees who speak foreign languages.

"9/11 really changed our whole orientation to understand that this is a major issue that's going to be with us for a long time," said Gail McGinn, Defense deputy undersecretary for plans. "It's going to take a long time to solve it."

Today, Defense has nearly 84,000 military linguists who speak about 250 languages and dialects—up from 72,000 in 2000. The military services plan to train about 2,300 linguists this year. The Air Force is the most active and plans to train 1,500 military linguists this year.

Agencies that cannot hire or train enough people with foreign language skills borrow them from other agencies or contract for them.

Congress in 2003 also created the National Virtual Translation Center, an interagency clearinghouse that lets agencies share translators with each other or to seek the services of translators in the private sector and academia. The center also performs translation work for intelligence agencies.

Federal contracting for people with language skills has taken off since 9/11. But as demand has shot up, so have labor rates.

Before 9/11, a linguist speaking Arabic might get paid \$15 or \$20 an hour. Now, rates are about double that. And for those with security clearances and expertise, rates are up to between \$70 and \$80 an hour. A contract linguist working in Iraq now can make \$150,000 a year, Hendzel said.

Not all agencies are willing to pay so much, he said. Some want to settle for \$20 an hour and hire someone who can speak a foreign language but may not be certified or have experience or expertise in a particular field. By doing that, Hendzel said agencies risk getting poor-quality work that could undermine their missions.

"Mistranslation or distortion are as dangerous as a lack of translation," he said.

Mr. AKAKA. We all understand the importance of language education and cultural understanding in this country; we just need to figure out how we make it happen. I am confident the National Foreign Language Coordination Council will provide the needed leadership and coordination to reach our goal.

U.N. REFORM

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss Coleman-Lugar bill that will effect meaningful and reasonable reform of the United Nations. But before I delve into the issues of U.N. reform, I must take a moment to thank my colleague Senator LUGAR for his leadership. As the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR has been at the forefront of these issues for years—working to pass bipartisan, consensus legislation touching a wide range of international matters. In short, Senator LUGAR's leadership on the issue of U.N. reform has been crucial.

Sixteen months ago, as the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I initiated a bipartisan, comprehensive investigation into the massive international fraud that flourished under the United Nations Oil for Food Program. You will recall this program was created to help protect the poor of Iraq from the impact of international sanctions. Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein manipulated the pro-

gram—siphoning off billions of dollars in under-the-table payments—and used that money to strengthen his murderous regime at home and reward friends abroad. As Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice testified at her confirmation hearing, Saddam Hussein was "playing the international community like a violin." It could not have been more wrong: evil prospered while the poor starved; the program designed to control and oust the oppressor actually helped him stay in power and bolster his arsenal.

Over the course of our 16-month investigation, the subcommittee has held three hearings and released three reports on the oil-for-food scandal. At those hearings and in our reports, we exposed how Saddam abused the program—we documented how the Hussein regime rewarded political allies by granting lucrative oil allocations to foreign officials, such as Russian politician Vladimir Zhirinovskiy and the Russian Presidential Council; we presented evidence of how Saddam made money on the oil deals by demanding under-the-table surcharge payments, and how he generated illegal kickbacks on humanitarian contracts.

All of Saddam's abuses occurred under the supposedly vigilant eye of the U.N. How could that happen? Well, over the course of our investigation, an avalanche of evidence has emerged demonstrating that the U.N. terribly mismanaged the Oil for Food Program. That evidence revealed mismanagement ranging from outright corruption to sloppy administration. For instance:

Our subcommittee uncovered evidence that Kofi Annan's handpicked executive director of the Oil for Food Program, a man named Benon Sevan, appears to have received lucrative oil allocations from Saddam.

Our subcommittee discovered evidence that a U.N. oil inspector received a large bribe to help Saddam cheat on two oil deals.

Fifty-eight reports written by the U.N.'s own internal auditors revealed rampant mismanagement by the U.N., describing a program rife with sloppy stewardship and riddled with "overcharges," "double charge[s]" and other "unjustified" waste of more than \$100 million.

The U.N.'s investigators, headed by Paul Volcker, determined that the U.N.'s process for awarding three multimillion-dollar contracts in the program was "tainted."

The U.N.'s investigators also found that Kofi Annan failed to adequately investigate or remedy a serious conflict of interest—namely, that the U.N. had awarded a massive contract to the company that employed Annan's son.

Perhaps most disturbing, however, was that Kofi Annan's chief of staff ordered the destruction of 3 years' worth of documents. That order was given the day after the U.N. decided to investigate the Oil for Food Program.

Such gross mismanagement and corruption in the Oil for Food Program

raise serious questions about the U.N.'s ability to administer crucial programs in the future. American taxpayers pay roughly 22 percent of the U.N.'s operating costs. They need assurances that their tax dollars are well spent. This is especially true in light of the fact that the U.N. is playing an increasingly larger role in world affairs.

As a result, we must bring about meaningful and reasonable reform of the U.N. Such reforms must include three elements. First is the concept of "transparency." As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis famously stated, "Sunlight is the most powerful of all disinfectants." Today, the U.N.'s operations are shrouded in mystery—not a single ray of sunlight disinfects the internal machinations of the U.N. The U.N. should be transparent to its member states, and use those rays of sunlight to prevent another episode of massive mismanagement.

Another necessary element for U.N. reform is "accountability." Specifically, U.N. officials responsible for the operation and management of programs, such as sanctions regimes and humanitarian efforts, must be held accountable for their performance. Such accountability should apply to all U.N. officials from the highest to the lowest.

The third element necessary for U.N. reform is effective internal oversight. Simply put, the U.N.'s internal auditor—the Office of Internal Oversight Services, OIOS, needs drastic improvement. The OIOS is woefully underfunded and lacks true independence. With respect to funding, the OIOS receives \$24 million per budget—a paltry pittance when compared to the \$162 million allocated to U.N.'s press office. Without an effective and independent auditor, the U.N.'s operations will continue to be plagued with misconduct and mismanagement.

Those crucial elements are the cornerstones of the proposed Coleman-Lugar bill, the United Nations, Management, Personnel, and Policy Reform Act of 2005. The bill presents a well-balanced and constructive U.N. reform initiative that addresses: (1) a variety of U.N. management weaknesses identified by the subcommittee, a lack of transparency, oversight, accountability, and effective budgetary and personnel systems, and (2) a series of U.N. policy issues that need reform, including peacekeeping and human rights. The legislation strikes an appropriate balance between important goals: effecting crucial U.N. reforms, preserving U.N. administrative discretion, and ensuring limited U.S. government monitoring and oversight.

Our proposed legislation underscores that an effective United Nations is in the interest of the United States and that the United States must lead the United Nations toward greater relevance and capability. The bill also emphasizes that the U.S. push for further reform will require bipartisanship and the joint involvement of the executive and legislative branches so that

the U.S. presents a unified position toward the United Nations. The proposed legislation exhorts the U.S. to use its voice, vote, and funding in the U.N. to accomplish U.N. management, personnel, and policy reforms. It requires the President to submit an annual report on U.N. reform to "appropriate congressional committees." It also authorizes the President to withhold 50 percent of U.S. contributions to U.N. if he determines that the U.N. is not making sufficient progress in implementing reforms described in the act.

While the proposed legislation acknowledges that the U.N. has initiated some reforms, it also recognizes that the U.N. has failed to make many necessary changes. The bill cites past GAO reports on U.N. reforms and recent U.N. reports, including the High-Level Panel Report and the Secretary-General's Report, on the need to expedite existing reforms and implement new urgently-needed reforms. It emphasizes that the U.N. must transform itself to meet current and future challenges and undertake institutional reforms that ensure the effectiveness, integrity, transparency, and accountability of the United Nations system.

The proposed legislation recognizes the important findings of the subcommittee in its Oil for Food Program investigation identifying key internal management weaknesses that led to mismanagement, fraud, and abuse of the program. It also cites the June 2005 Gingrich/Mitchell U.N. Reform Report. The majority of the U.N. management, personnel, budget, and policy issues addressed in the proposed legislation are consistent with many recommendations of the subcommittee and the recent Gingrich/Mitchell report.

The management section of the proposed legislation stems from the many U.N. management weaknesses revealed in the subcommittee's oil-for-food investigation. The section strengthens the power of the Secretary-General to replace top officials in the U.N. Secretariat and recruit only the highest quality individuals, placing emphasis on professional excellence over geographic diversity. It calls for an updated assessment of the U.N. procurement system and the establishment of a new and improved procurement process that embodies the standards currently present in the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, which prohibit officials from making or receiving payments, gifts, or exchanging other promises to secure an improper benefit.

In short, this legislation will help transform the United Nations into a modern and dynamic institution capable of responding to the many complex and varied challenges confronting it. The reforms embodied in this legislation provide the United Nations the opportunity to embrace change and regain its role as a critical institution in today's rapidly changing international environment. This legislation will force the United Nations to be a better

managed, transparent, and accountable organization. This legislation will prevent reoccurrences of scandals like the Oil for Food scandal, peacekeeping abuses, and other managerial failures.

I must reiterate the importance of a robust and effective U.N. for the future of U.S. relations with the international community. The U.N., when properly led and properly managed, can play an important role in promoting global peace and stability. Real reform, and not mere rhetoric, is the proper course of action to ensure an effective U.N.—the mission of the U.N. is simply too important to look the other way.

As I conclude my remarks, I would like to reiterate my thanks to Chairman LUGAR for his leadership on the issue of U.N. reform and for the opportunity to work with him to tackle this important issue.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF KENNETH W. MONTFORT COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

● Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Kenneth W. Montfort College of Business at the University of Northern Colorado on receiving the 2004 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, the Nation's highest honor for quality and performance excellence.

The Kenneth W. Monfort College of Business at the University of Northern Colorado is the sole business school to receive the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award from the National Institute of Standards and Technology. This award recognizes the outstanding performance and accomplishments of American businesses, schools, and health care organizations that surpass standards of excellence and ethics.

Monfort College of Business offers the only program of its kind in the Rocky Mountain region focused exclusively on undergraduate business education and internationally accredited in business administration and accounting. Monfort is one of five undergraduate-only programs in the United States to hold such accreditations. Students at Monfort score in the top 5 percent on nationwide standardized exit exams and earn a degree in business administration with an emphasis in accounting, computer information systems, finance, general business, management, or marketing. An interdisciplinary degree is also available in nonprofit management. Monfort's student-centered approach is exemplified by its three-dimensional learning strategy: High-Touch, small class sizes taught on an interactive basis, Wide-Tech, exposure to a wide array of business technologies, and Professional Depth, instruction from seasoned professors, including highly placed executives.

Understanding the importance of a well-rounded college education is important if we are to produce the next