

What is the National Crime Information Center database? This is the database that every police officer in America accesses when they apprehend someone to see if the person is wanted anywhere in the country. If you had a DUI in Washington State, and you did not show up for your trial, and they catch you in Mobile, AL, and you are entered in the NCIC because of your DUI in Washington State, the officers in Mobile will hold you, and send you back to Washington State for your trial. But if you jump bail and do not show up for your immigration hearing or for your deportation proceeding, you are not treated the same way, your information is not currently being entered into the NCIC.

So I have been raising this and talking about it for quite some time now, and I have raised it with top officials in the Department of Homeland Security, and they say they are working on it and trying to enter the names faster. I know they as of December of last year they only had about 15,000 names entered into the Immigration Violators File of the NCIC which is really pathetically small. We ought to have them all of the absconder immigration violator files entered in there. This amendment would provide \$1 million to make sure those names are entered into the system.

Tomorrow we will proceed, hopefully, to call that amendment up and I will seek to have it made a part of the appropriations bill that is moving forward.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for your time tonight.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe we have, on behalf of the majority leader, Senator FRIST, some closing remarks and matters.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1382

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1382) to require the Secretary of the Interior to accept the conveyance of certain land, to be held in trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Indian tribe.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1394

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1394) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the issue of United Nations reform. This year marks the 60th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. As you know, the U.N. emerged from the ashes of the Second World War with a mandate to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of human beings.

These basic principles embodied in the U.N. charter are still significant in today's changed strategic environment. Yet, the scandals and mismanagement that has engulfed the organization threaten both its reputation and its relevance.

These scandals have resulted in a consensus that the U.N. must be reformed. Three major reports have been released in the past 7 months, including one by Secretary-General Kofi Annan, that outline the need for specific reforms to make the U.N. more efficient, more accountable, more transparent, and more effective in responding to the challenges we face today. I am pleased to see that there is agreement on this need. Yet, I remind my colleagues that when the current Secretary-General took office in January 1997, he vowed to make the hard decisions necessary to reform the institution.

But 8½ years have gone by, and he has been unwilling or unable to do so. In fact, reprehensible dealings and scandalous behavior at the U.N. has continued unabated.

Furthermore, the U.N. budget has grown by leaps and bounds. Over the past 4 years, the U.N. regular budget has increased by more than \$1.1 billion over a 2-year period—from \$2.5 billion to \$3.6 billion.

The U.S. is handed a bill from the U.N. for 22 percent of the cost, and whether or not we agree with the way the U.N. spends its money, we are expected to pay. And this does not take into account the costs of peacekeeping operations, which are expected to be over \$5 billion this year alone.

The Constitution gives to Congress the power of the purse and as such, it is our duty to monitor how the American taxpayers' money is spent. In the case of the massive waste, fraud, and abuse at the U.N., we must take action to rectify an untenable situation.

As the recent report issued by the USIP Task Force on the United Nations said, "Americans are vested in a

United Nations that embodies values of honesty, decency, and fair play."

Yet, the U.N. is hardly a model for these basic values.

The appalling kickbacks, bribes, and financial mismanagement of the Oil-for-Food program are the most obvious illustration of an insufficient oversight system within the U.N. The design of the program and the failure of the U.N. to properly monitor it allowed Saddam Hussein to pocket billions of dollars in money that was meant for the Iraqi people suffering under his brutal regime.

Sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers serving in missions around the world is an intolerable abuse of trust by those who are supposed to be contributing to a peaceful resolution to conflict situations.

Embezzlement and extravagant personal spending have been documented at U.N. programs such as UNICEF, the United Nations Development Programme, and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Countries such as Zimbabwe, Cuba, and Sudan—known violators of the basic human rights of their citizens—have been included as members of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and have used their position to manipulate its agenda to prevent resolutions that condemn their human rights records.

If the U.N. does not act boldly, and act now, it will have little credibility to serve as an organization that promotes the values in its Charter. As a European diplomat told me recently, however, the U.N. is incapable of reforming itself. It is quite good at issuing reports, having meetings, appearing contrite, and then resolutely promising to change when news reports publicize the details of the problems within the organization. But history has shown that U.S. leadership is critical to ensuring that meaningful reform is implemented at the U.N.

Last month, the House of Representatives passed comprehensive legislation that provides a framework for implementing U.N. reform. This effort was led by the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Mr. HYDE, who worked diligently to produce a responsible bill that addresses the need for serious, meaningful, and practical reform.

Today I am introducing this legislation in the Senate. I recognize that the method used in this bill to compel the U.N. to make these reforms may not be popular with some of my colleagues. But I feel that there is no other way to proceed.

This legislation requires that 50 percent of the U.S. contribution to the United Nations regular budget be withheld if specific reforms are not implemented. Before dismissing this approach, I urge my colleagues to examine the reforms mandated and the flexibility inherent in the legislation.

First, the reforms. Title I requires management and budgetary reforms to create a more streamlined, efficient,

and effective organization. It shifts funding mechanisms for 18 programs of the U.N. from the regular assessed budget to voluntarily funded programs in an effort to make these programs more accountable to those who fund them. It calls for budgetary practices that would allow us to measure the effectiveness and relevance of programs. And it creates an Independent Oversight Board, an Office of Ethics, and a Chief Operating Officer to increase the accountability of the U.N.

This Title also addresses the shameful anti-Semitism inherent in U.N. structures by calling for Israel to have a permanent seat in one of the regional groups, with all the accompanying rights and privileges. And it requires the State Department to review U.N. agencies that focus exclusively on the Palestinian agenda.

Title II deals with the human rights mandate of the U.N. It establishes basic criteria that member states must meet to be eligible to serve on U.N. human rights bodies and requires the U.N. entity that selects members on these bodies to abide by these criteria.

Title III mandates reforms of the International Atomic Energy Agency so that it can better focus on the key issues of nuclear safety and security, and nuclear verification activities.

Title IV calls for a review of U.N. peacekeeping operations and requires that the U.S. deny support for new or expanded missions until procedures are in place to prevent further sexual exploitation by U.N. peacekeepers.

These measures, including adopting a Code of Conduct for all personnel participating in these operations, and establishing a data base so that past abusers are not able to participate in future operations, have been specifically endorsed by the Secretary General's special advisor on sexual exploitation and abuse and should be in place by this summer. Yet it is incumbent upon us to ensure that they are not stalled by member states that don't see this tragic situation as a serious problem.

Title V puts forward ways to improve budget practices by requiring more details about the U.N. budget, including proposed increases, to be presented to Congress.

And finally Title VI provides the leverage.

If I could come up with a better way, I would pursue it wholeheartedly. But even the strongest supporters of the U.S.-U.N. relationship acknowledge that the only way the U.N. pays attention to calls for reform is when its budget is threatened. Experience has shown that the U.N. will institute needed improvements only when Congress threatens to withhold U.S. funding.

This is not meant to be draconian. These reforms, if implemented, will increase the credibility, the legitimacy, and the effectiveness of the U.N.

In fact, I want to underscore the importance I place on a United Nations

that can fulfill its core objective—to serve as an institution that supports the preservation of international peace and security. I feel this objective is at risk.

Finally, it is important to highlight the flexibility that is built into this legislation. It allows the administration 2 years to work with the U.N. to make these necessary reforms before the withholding provision is triggered. Even after 2 years, it does not insist that every one of the reforms be implemented, but allows an additional year for the U.N. to complete the job. If the U.N. adopts measures that achieve the same purpose as those outlined in this bill, it allows the full U.S. contribution to be expended. And if the U.N. chooses not to implement these needed reforms, the legislation authorizes the contributions that are withheld from expenditure to remain available until the U.N. acts.

In 1949, Dean Acheson said that the United States must work actively to make the United Nations an effective instrument of international cooperation. There is, and always will be, a role for America in ensuring that the U.N. lives up to the ideals of its charter. By pushing for these critical reforms, I believe that we can forge the U.N. into the effective instrument of international cooperation that we all hope it can be.

It is my belief that this legislation is the instrument to get the job done—to make the U.N. the organization that its founders envisioned 60 years ago.

I yield the floor.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES EXPORT REFORM ACT of 2005

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1395 introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1395) to amend the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to provide authority for the Attorney General to authorize the export of controlled substances from the United States to another country for subsequent export from that country to a second country, if certain conditions and safeguards are satisfied.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1395) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REEXPORTATION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Controlled Substances Export Reform Act of 2005".

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 1003 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 953) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) Notwithstanding subsections (a)(4) and (c)(3), the Attorney General may authorize any controlled substance that is in schedule I or II, or is a narcotic drug in schedule III or IV, to be exported from the United States to a country for subsequent export from that country to another country, if each of the following conditions is met:

"(1) Both the country to which the controlled substance is exported from the United States (referred to in this subsection as the 'first country') and the country to which the controlled substance is exported from the first country (referred to in this subsection as the 'second country') are parties to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1954, and the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971.

"(2) The first country and the second country have each instituted and maintain, in conformity with such Conventions, a system of controls of imports of controlled substances which the Attorney General deems adequate.

"(3) With respect to the first country, the controlled substance is consigned to a holder of such permits or licenses as may be required under the laws of such country, and a permit or license to import the controlled substance has been issued by the country.

"(4) With respect to the second country, substantial evidence is furnished to the Attorney General by the person who will export the controlled substance from the United States that—

"(A) the controlled substance is to be consigned to a holder of such permits or licenses as may be required under the laws of such country, and a permit or license to import the controlled substance is to be issued by the country; and

"(B) the controlled substance is to be applied exclusively to medical, scientific, or other legitimate uses within the country.

"(5) The controlled substance will not be exported from the second country.

"(6) Within 30 days after the controlled substance is exported from the first country to the second country, the person who exported the controlled substance from the United States delivers to the Attorney General documentation certifying that such export from the first country has occurred.

"(7) A permit to export the controlled substance from the United States has been issued by the Attorney General."

GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT OF 1998

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 173 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 173) expressing support for the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 as the blueprint for lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.