

HONORING THE CREW OF USS  
"LAGARTO"

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 18, 2006*

Mr. LIPINSKI Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to 86 brave men who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country and, for freedom—the crew of the submarine USS *Lagarto*—as well as their loved ones—their wives and sweethearts, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers—who have all kept them in their hearts for more than 60 years.

The story of the *Lagarto* represents the sacrifices made by sailors in the "Silent Service," the most dangerous of all the missions, as submariners suffered the highest percentage of combat deaths of any service in any branch of the armed forces during World War II.

The *Lagarto*, built in the shipyards of Manitowoc, Wisconsin, had a short but distinguished career. The submarine joined the assault on Imperial Japan in early 1945, and was credited with sinking a Japanese submarine and other enemy vessels.

However, on May 3, 1945, the *Lagarto* and its sister submarine, the USS *Baya*, were coordinating an attack on a Japanese convoy off the coast of Thailand. The Japanese escort minelayer *Hatsutaka* was able to drive off the *Baya* in the early hours of May 4. But the *Lagarto* was never heard from again. Evidence pointed to a depth charge from the *Hatsutaka* that may have sunk the *Lagarto*, and the submarine was presumed lost with all hands on board.

For the next 60 years, many of the loved ones of the *Lagarto* crew continued to wonder where their final resting place might be. Then, in the Spring of 2005, a fishing boat snagged a large object off the Thai coast. Eventually, renowned wreck diver Jamie McLeod investigated and helped confirm that the wreckage in about 180 feet of water was the *Lagarto*.

On Saturday, May 6, 2006, the crew of the *Lagarto* was honored by the Navy during a special annual USS *Lagarto* Remembrance Day Memorial Ceremony at the Wisconsin Maritime Museum in Manitowoc. This event was attended by more than 150 family members of the crew of the *Lagarto*.

As Nancy Mabin Kenney, who was a toddler when her father, Seaman 1st Class William T. Mabin, was lost on the *Lagarto*, said: "This ceremony will be our way of saying goodbye that we never had."

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me honoring the brave men of USS *Lagarto* and to express our sincere gratitude to their families and friends upon the ultimate sacrifice these sailors gave for our great nation.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON  
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR  
2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 17, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 376) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Spratt budget substitute and in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 376, the Republican budget.

Our son, daughters, and neighbors are bravely fighting wars abroad. Unfortunately, when they return home, they will find a country that has lost its way. We pay lip service to shared sacrifice, but while they risk their lives for us, Republicans in Congress are providing tax cuts for the richest 1 percent of Americans, slashing programs for working-class families and turning their backs on the middle class. The budget before us today continues these misguided policies. It does not represent the priorities of the American people, nor does it respect the values our soldiers are fighting to protect.

For too long, Republicans have racked up charges on the national credit card, while passing the bill on to future generations. Now is our chance to set this country on the proper course to ensure America's economic success and protect our grandchildren from having to pay for today's irresponsible decisions.

There is a better way. Despite the horrible fiscal outlook facing our Nation due to Republican policies, the Spratt substitute still manages to balance the budget in 6 years, cut taxes for the middle class, and provide realistic funding for education, health care, and veterans programs, all of which are short-changed by the Republicans.

The Spratt substitute has a better bottom line than the Republican budget every year. Fiscal responsibility today will lead to lower deficits, smaller interest payments, and less national debt in the future. Most significantly, after the budget is balanced, we can finally begin to pay off the trillions of dollars in debt that have accumulated since President Bush took office.

Unfortunately, the budget proposed by House Republicans does nothing to improve the quality of life in America. It would add more than \$350 billion to the national debt next year alone. Under Republican stewardship, the five years between fiscal year 2003 and 2007 will provide us with the five largest deficits in American history. This is not a legacy worth continuing. We cannot afford to borrow additional money to continue paying for failed economic policies.

Not only does the Spratt substitute match the President's request for defense spending, but it also includes additional needed funds for homeland security programs, including port security. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am concerned that the Republican budget closely mirrors the President's, which proposes to eliminate several programs important to the safety of all Americans. Programs on the chopping block include the COPS Interoperability Grant Program, the SAFER Program for firefighting equipment, the Metropolitan Medical Response System, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, and Justice Assistance Grants. In 2005, these programs provided more than \$13 million in grants to help Rhode Island's first responders keep my constituents safe. Since September 11, we have asked our police and

firefighters to do so much more, but this budget fails to provide the resources they so badly need.

In addition, the budget would freeze or cut all non-homeland security discretionary spending. If the Republicans have their way, 5 years from now, education and health programs will receive even less than they do today. Cuts to social programs would place a larger burden on the working class at a time when they can least afford it.

Even with all of these cuts, the Republicans still have no plan to balance the budget. Instead, they want to give away the savings to the wealthy by making permanent tax cuts on investment income. As a recent New York Times article indicated, "Americans with annual incomes of \$1 million or more, about one-tenth of 1 percent of all taxpayers, reaped 43 percent of all the savings on investment taxes in 2003." At the same time, those earning less than \$50,000 saved an average of only \$10 on the same capital gains and dividend tax cuts. The wealthiest Americans are doing fine on their own, and we should not be borrowing money to give them more special favors.

Deficit spending has stymied job growth and is plaguing our economy. No Rhode Islander would write a check without sufficient funds to cover it. Neither should the government. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Spratt budget substitute and opposing the underlying Republican plan.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

HON. RANDY NEUGEBAUER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 18, 2006*

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances beyond my control, I missed Roll Call Vote 153 on Wednesday, May 17, 2006. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." This was a vote to order the previous question on H. Res. 817, a rule providing for further consideration of the budget resolution.

THE AMBASSADORS' REVIEW OF  
THE COUNCIL OF AMERICAN AM-  
BASSADORS

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 18, 2006*

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement by Joseph Verner Reed, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations.

## VIEWPOINTS: UNITED NATIONS

Secretary-General Kofi A. Annan will step down from his position as Secretary-General when his second five-year term ends on December 31.

The search for a successor to Secretary-General Annan promises to create differences within the U.N. Security Council. Russia and China back the customary procedure of rotating the post among the world's regions, while the U.S. and Britain are questioning the need to do so.

Since the United Nations was established in October 1945, the post of Secretary-General has been held by Trygve Lie of Norway

(1946-1953); Dag Hammarskjöld of Sweden (1953-1961); U Thant of Burma (1961-1971); Kurt Waldheim of Austria (1972-1981); Javier Perez de Cuellar of Peru (1982-1991); and Boutros Boutros-Ghali of Egypt (1992-1996). Kofi A. Annan, who is from Ghana, has served since January 1997.

The list of candidates widely discussed in the international press include: Aleksander Kwasniewski, former Polish president; Vaira Vike-Freiberga, Latvian president; Kemal Dervis, Turkey, currently head of the U.N. Development Program; Surakiart Sathirathai, Thailand's deputy prime minister; Shashi Tharoor, India, U.N. under-secretary-general for Communications and Public Information and an award-winning journalist/novelist; Ban Ki Moon, South Korea's foreign minister; Jose Ramos-Horta, foreign minister of East Timor and a 1996 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate; Jayantha Dhanapala, Sri Lanka, served as U.N. undersecretary-general for disarmament and as ambassador to the United States; Goh Chok Tong, former prime minister of Singapore; and Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein, Jordanian ambassador to the U.N. The list is not exhaustive and the selection of a dark-horse candidate cannot be discounted.

The BBC (February 14) reported, "Analysts say there is much support for an Asian leader among U.N. member states, in line with an informal tradition that rotates the role on a geographical basis. But Washington's U.N. Ambassador John R. Bolton said last month that Kofi Annan's successor should be selected on merit alone."

There have been calls for a Woman as Secretary-General. Woman's groups have begun lobbying for a woman to succeed Secretary-General Annan. Their campaign has taken on new urgency with the recent announcement that Secretary-General Annan's deputy, Louise Frechette, appointed in 1998 partly because she was a woman, will leave in April to return to her native Canada.

As the campaigns move forward it is to be noted that there are no established qualifications for the post, no search committees, no interviews, no background checks, no campaign rules and no forums for showcasing aspirants and their ideas.

If history is a guide, it is likely that none of the discussed candidates will emerge the winner and that the person who does is not being publicly discussed.

Wang Guangya, China's Ambassador (the PRC holding a Permanent seat on the Security Council) at a recent reception said China would support only candidates from Asia, a polite way of saying the PRC would threaten to veto candidates from elsewhere.

The current Chief of Staff for the Secretary-General is Mark Malloch Brown, recently Head of the UNDP (United Nations Development Program). He will take the post of Deputy Secretary-General in April.

Meanwhile, the Secretary General has presented a far-reaching report with proposals for an overhaul ranging from setting up a 2,500-strong core of mobile peacekeeping professionals to multimillion-dollar investments in training and technology.

His far-reaching report "Investing in the United Nations: For a Stronger Organization Worldwide," focuses on ensuring efficiency and accountability in a way that reflects the fact that more than 70 per cent of the \$10 billion annual budget now relates to peacekeeping and other field operations, up from around 50 per cent of a \$4.5 billion budget ten years ago.

"Our current rules and regulations were designed for an essentially static Secretariat, whose main function was to service conferences and meetings of Member States, and whose staff worked mainly at Headquarters," the Secretary-General said as he

presented the report in the General Assembly Hall. "Today thanks to the mandates that Member States have given us, we are engaged directly in many parts of the world, working on the ground to improve the lives of people who need help."

In the 16 years since the cold war ended, the Organization has taken on more than twice as many new peacekeeping missions as in the previous 44 years and spending on peacekeeping has quadrupled. Over half of its 30,000 civilian staff now serve in the field—not only in peacekeeping, but also in humanitarian relief, criminal justice, human rights monitoring, supporting national elections, and in the battle against drugs and crime.

The Secretary-General's comprehensive reform blueprint was called for in the Outcome Document adopted by national leaders at last September's World Summit in New York. It builds on a package of reforms Mr. Annan launched last year to enhance ethics and accountability and address weaknesses exposed by the Independent Inquiry on the Oil-for-Food Programme as well as evidence of sexual exploitation in certain peacekeeping operations.

In the report, the Secretary-General urges Member States to seize the moment for change. "This is an opportunity, which may not occur again until another generation has passed, to transform the United Nations by aligning it with, and equipping it for, the substantive challenges it faces in the twenty-first century," he writes. "It is a chance to give Member States the tools they need to provide strategic direction and hold the Secretariat fully accountable for its performance."

While the report identifies a number of areas of potential cost savings and efficiencies, the primary financial message is that it is time to reverse years of underinvestment in people, systems and information technology to address operational deficiencies and ensure that the UN can reach the level of effectiveness expected by Member States.

The Secretary-General said that although the UN had made a number of major organizational changes in recent years to keep up with the increasing expectations of Member States, these efforts had only addressed the symptoms, not the causes, of the Organization's shortcomings. "It is now time to reach for deeper, more fundamental change," he said.

Along these lines, the proposals encompass a revamped version of how to recruit, contract, train, assign and compensate staff, with an emphasis on bringing conditions for field-based personnel up to par with those at other UN agencies operating in the field. This will include proposals for converting 2,500 existing short-term peacekeeping positions into a new flexible and mobile core of dedicated specialists who can be deployed rapidly in urgent peacekeeping and special political missions.

"Increasingly complex mandates require staff with different skills," the Secretary-General told the Assembly. "We need to be able to recruit and retain leaders, managers and personnel capable of handling large multidisciplinary operations, with increasingly high budgets. 'As things stand,' he added, 'many of our staff, especially the field staff who serve with great idealism and integrity, often in situations of hardship and danger are demoralized and demotivated by lack of opportunities for promotion, and by the frustrations of dealing with a bureaucracy that can seem both excessive and remote.'"

The report calls for consolidating reporting to address logjams associated with the current system, where over 100 senior UN officials are directly answerable to the Secretary-General. It also proposes the formal

delegation of responsibility for management policies and overall operational matters to a redefined post of Deputy Secretary-General to help free the Secretary-General to focus on political and policy issues.

The report also proposes significant investment to overhaul the Organization's information and communications infrastructure by replacing current antiquated, fragmented technology systems with an integrated global platform that should be led by a dedicated Chief Information Technology Officer.

Separately, the report identifies significant opportunities to realize cost savings and efficiency gains, recommending that the Secretariat explore options for alternative service delivery, including the potential for relocating core functions from Headquarters to lower cost duty stations and possible outsourcing of less central functions such as printing.

One area where investment could yield substantial savings is procurement, where the report outlines change that would improve transparency and realize up to \$400 million.

A number of the proposals fall under the direct authority of the Secretary-General, who said he intends to immediately carry them out. But most of the fundamental changes, particularly with regard to budget and personnel issues, require approval from Member States.

To help ensure momentum for this agenda through the end of his term and to help equip his successor to follow through, the Secretary-General also proposes creating a Change Management Office that would seek to work closely with Member States to drive the implementation of the reforms.

In the report, Mr. Annan cautions against complacency, stressing that the proposals must mark the beginning of a process that will be carried over the next several years. "One of the weaknesses of the old culture is precisely the view that a report or a vote in itself represents change," he notes. "In practice, reports and votes enable and authorize change, but change itself is the long march that follows."

Last week the international community took an important step forward in the fight for global human rights by way of the General Assembly voting to adopt a new Human Rights Council.

The new Human Rights Council represents a significant improvement over the old, discredited Human Rights Commission because it includes a number of new provisions and characteristics that will significantly strengthen the UN's human rights machinery and prevent human rights violators from participating in the Council.

The President of the General Assembly, Jan Eliasson, has done a masterful job of diplomacy, as demonstrated by the broad support that exists among governments and non-governmental organizations.

His proposal was made considerably stronger through pledges by a large number of countries.

These recent pledges will help ensure that countries with dubious human rights records will not be elected to the new Council and that countries under Security Council sanctions are prevented from participating in the Council.

The new commitments significantly enhance the proposal and set the stage for additional efforts to strengthen the new body as it is formed and made operational.

Countries committed to human rights must know that leadership and diplomacy can continue to improve the Council as it gets up and running and into the future.

While this unfortunate that the United States found itself virtually alone in New York and was unable to join consensus, it is

a positive sign that the United States did not abandon the Council altogether.

Result of the GA resolution on Human Rights Council: 170 in favour; 44 against (U.S., Israel, Marshall Islands, Palau); and 3 abstained (Venezuela, Iran, Belarus).

Building on these principles, the U.S. should participate actively in the next phase of the Council, exercising leadership and summoning enlightened diplomacy to advance the Council and the cause of human rights.

The creation of this new Council—which was mandated by world leaders in last September's summit at the UN—also fuels the momentum in the ongoing reform process at the UN.

The Secretary-General attended the World Economic Forum in January of this year and addressed the Plenary Session:

“A NEW MINDSET FOR THE UNITED NATIONS”

“Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear friends:

“Some of you may remember me coming to Davos nine years ago, as a freshly minted Secretary-General.

“Since then I have attended all but three of your annual meetings—including the memorable one in 2002 when you came to show confidence in New York, after the attack on the World Trade Center.

“So I did not hesitate one minute, Klaus, before accepting your kind invitation to come here once more, at the beginning of my last year in office. And I was also very happy to accept the title you suggested for this session—a new mindset for the United Nations”.

“Why? because it expresses something I have striven to achieve throughout these nine years, and something in which Davos itself has played a part.

“In 1999, when I came here and called for a ‘global compact’ between the United Nations and the private sector, many of my colleagues in the Secretariat—and many representatives of member States—would hardly have been more shocked if I had proposed a compact with the Devil.

“It is the mindset that I have been seeking to change throughout my time in office—the mindset that sees international relations as nothing more than relations between States, and the United Nations as little more than a trade union for governments.

“My objective has been to persuade both the member States and my colleagues in the Secretariat that the United Nations needs to engage not only with governments but with people. Only if it does that, I believe, can it fulfill its vocation and be of use to humanity in the 21st century.

“That’s why, in the year 2000, I used the first words of the UN Charter, ‘We the Peoples’ as the title of my report setting out the agenda for the Millennium Summit, at which political leaders from all over the world came together to assess the challenges of a new century, and adopted a collective response, known as the ‘Millennium Declaration.’

“And that was why last year, in my report called ‘In Larger Freedom’, I urged governments to accept that security and development are interdependent, and that neither can be long sustained without respect for human rights and the rule of law.

“That report was intended as the blueprint, not only for a far-reaching reform of the United Nations itself, but also for a series of decisions that would enable humanity to realize the aims of the Millennium Declaration, particularly in the light of new challenges that had arisen since.

“How far the blueprint will be translated into reality, remains to be seen. But in the meantime the United Nations has not stood

still. Far from it! This has been a decade of rapid change. Let me give you a few examples.

“When I took office there was a widespread perception, based on the tragic events in Bosnia, Somalia and Rwanda, that UN peacekeeping was a failed experiment, and that henceforth this task would have to be handled by regional organizations.

“Peacekeepers, especially in countries where conflict is still raging—where there is literally no peace to keep—continue to face immense challenges. Even so, today we have 85,000 people serving in 16 UN peacekeeping operations, spread across four continents. Most of these operations are not static observers of a truce, but active participants in the implementation of peace agreements, helping the people of war-torn countries make the transition from war to peace.

“Certainly, in many parts of the world regional organizations play an important role, and so they should. But most often they do so in partnership with the United Nations. The UN has become, in effect, the indispensable mechanism for bringing international help to countries recovering from conflict—and member States have now recognized this by agreeing to set up a Peacebuilding Commission, within the UN, to manage this highly complex process.

“The last decade has also seen growing use of United Nations economic sanctions. These are now used to influence or restrict the activity not only of recalcitrant States, but also of non-State actors, such as rebel movements or terrorist groups. At the same time, the Security Council has developed more sophisticated and humane types of sanctions, aimed at individuals rather than whole societies—travel bans, for instance, and the freezing of bank accounts.

“The same philosophy of punishing individuals rather than communities has driven the work of the UN criminal tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia—one of which was the first international court to convict people of genocide (including a former prime minister) and of rape as a war crime, while the other has become the first to indict and try a former Head of State.

“This in turn has led to further innovations, including the mixed tribunal in Sierra Leone and, of course, the International Criminal Court. The latter is not an organ of the United Nations, but the UN convened and serviced the conference, which adopted its Statute in 1998.

“Over 100 States have now ratified the Statute—which means that the Court’s jurisdiction is now recognized by well over half the UN’s membership.

“Another way the UN has changed is the increasing focus on human rights—which is reflected in the recent decision by member States to strengthen the office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. That office is now a dynamic operational entity, which deploys and supports hundreds of human rights workers around the world. And I hope that within the next week or two we may see agreement on a corresponding change at the intergovernmental level, with the establishment of a more authoritative Human Rights Council, to replace the now widely discredited Commission.

“One more example of change: the United Nations has responded to the growth of international terrorism. Even before ‘9/11’, the Security Council had imposed sanctions on Al-Qaida, and set up a special committee to monitor its activities. Immediately after the attack, the Council went much further, with its historic resolution 1373, which imposed stringent obligations on all countries, established a list of terrorist organizations and individuals, and created the Counter-Terrorism Committee to monitor member

States’ compliance and help them improve their capacity to enact and implement anti-terrorist legislation.

“In short, I believe the United Nations is proving itself an increasingly flexible instrument, to which its member States turn for a wider and wider array of functions.

“For instance, within the last five years the UN has been asked: to shepherd Afghanistan’s transition from the anarchic wasteland of the Taliban and the warlords to the nascent democracy—still struggling, but hopeful—that it is today; to help establish the Interim Government of Iraq, and to help organize the referendum and elections there—as it has supported democratic elections in half the world’s nations over the last 12 years; to verify the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon and carry out, for the first time ever, a full criminal investigation into the assassination of a former prime minister; to coordinate global relief efforts after the tsunami, and again after the earthquake in Kashmir; and to take the lead in raising global awareness, as well as funds, to protect the world’s peoples against avian flu.

“What all these activities have in common is that they involve the United Nations not simply in relations among its member States, but also in the lives of their peoples. To carry out such tasks, we must engage not only with governments but with all the new actors on the international scene.

“That includes the private sector, but it also includes parliamentarians; voluntary, non-profit organizations; philanthropic foundations; the global media; celebrities from the worlds of sport and entertainment; and in some cases labour unions, mayors and local administrators. And it includes less benign actors such as terrorists, warlords, and traffickers in drugs, illicit weapons or—worst of all—the lives and bodies of human beings.

“That is why I have repeatedly urged all the organs of the United Nations to be more open to civil society, so that their decisions can fully reflect the contribution made by groups and individuals who devote themselves to studying specific problems, or working in specific areas.

“It is also why I myself have cultivated contacts with scholars, with parliamentarians, with practitioners of all sorts, and with young people—seeking to learn from their views and also encouraging them, whatever sector they work in, to use their talents for the public good and to keep the global horizon in view.

“It is one of the reasons why I have worked constantly to make our Organization more transparent and comprehensible to the public, and thereby more genuinely accountable.

“And, of course, it is why I launched the Global Compact, to which the international business community—including some of you in this audience—has responded with such enthusiasm that it is now the world’s leading corporate citizenship initiative, involving more than 2,400 companies, in nearly 90 countries.

“This new mindset must also extend to the domain of international peace and security—so that we think of security not only in conventional terms, focusing on prevention of war between States, but also as including the protection of the world’s peoples, against threats which, to many of them today, seem more immediate and more real.

“One of those threats is the threat of genocide and other crimes against humanity. I called the General Assembly’s attention to this in 1999, warning that such mass atrocities can never be treated as a purely domestic affair. Being rightly called crimes against humanity, they demand a collective response from humanity, which should be organized and legitimized by the United Nations.

"More recently, the High-Level Panel that I appointed in 2003 has identified a broad range of threats, including: poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation; conflict within States, as well as between them; the spread of nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons; terrorism; and transnational organized crime.

"My 'Larger Freedom' report built on this re-definition of global security, drawing it together with the detailed recommendations of the Millennium Project for achieving the Millennium Development Goals by 2015—which in itself would rescue many millions of people from the threats of poverty and disease.

"But my report also included a third dimension: human rights and the rule of law. Without these, any society, however well-armed, will remain insecure; and its development, however dynamic, will remain precarious.

"Member States took the report as their starting-point in negotiating the outcome of last September's world summit. I won't say that that document fulfills all my hopes. But it does contain many important decisions—from the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission and Human Rights Council, through the commitments to advance the Millennium Development Goals, to the acceptance, by all States individually and collectively, of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

"Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

"The United Nations cannot stand still, because the threats to humanity do not stand still. Every day the world presents new challenges, which the founders of the UN 60 years ago could never have anticipated. Whether it is a looming crisis over Iran and its compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, continuing atrocities in Darfur, or the threat of an avian flu pandemic, people all over the world look to the United Nations to play a role in making peace, protecting civilians, improving livelihoods, promoting human rights and upholding international law. I have worked long and hard to transform the United Nations so that when called upon, as we are every day, we will deliver what is asked of us—effectively, efficiently and equitably. That is the true objective of the changes I have sought to bring about, and it will be the true measure of my success or failure.

"And my successor—since I understand several members of this panel may be interested in the position—need not worry. Changing the mindset of the United Nations, so that it can both reflect and influence the temper of the times, is a never-ending challenge. There will be plenty more work to do in the years and decades to come."

I have worked for three Secretary Generals and been at post for some 20 years. I am honored to have worked for the House of Peace. As we approach the new era of a new Secretary-General I say it is time for renewal.

**TRIBUTE TO ROBERT F. CARROLL  
CHAIRMAN, APLASTIC ANEMIA &  
MDS INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION**

**HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 18, 2006*

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to inform the House of the passing of Robert F.

Carroll, a constituent of mine from Wolcott, Connecticut. I ask that you join me in paying tribute to this great man, who served both as the Chairman of the Board of the Aplastic Anemia & MDS International Foundation and the Assistant Executive Director for the Connecticut Association of Schools in Cheshire, CT.

In April 1991, at age 57, Bob was diagnosed with myelodysplastic syndromes (MDS), a serious and non-contagious rare bone marrow failure disease. Bob was told he had MDS after having gone to his doctor for a routine check-up required by the school district for which he worked. He was given two to four years to live. He had always told his wife, Marie, that he would not want to know if he had a life-threatening disease. But courageously Bob transformed his fear of dying to a fear of dying without giving back. From at month in 1991 until today, Bob set about to make a difference for individuals and families suffering from bone marrow diseases.

In early 1992, Bob and his wife were searching the Internet and came across the Aplastic Anemia & MDS International Foundation. He contacted the executive director immediately and, as a result, was given everything he needed to educate himself about the disease, clinical trials, and support networks of other patients. He soon became active and a member of the board. Four years later, he became President of the Foundation, the first patient President in the history of the organization. He believed in the same goals as the Foundation, which is to keep patients attitudes positive. He refused to let his life change because of his MDS. He did not retire, and instead continued with his career in education and the many projects that kept him active and busy.

For 15 years, Bob advocated tirelessly for the tens of thousands of individuals diagnosed with bone marrow diseases (about 35,000 new cases are diagnosed annually). He also became involved in the recovery efforts in Sri Lanka after the devastating tsunami of 2004, traveling to that country and raising money in the U.S. for recovery efforts. And through his service with the Connecticut Association of Schools, Bob worked strenuously to improve the quality of education in our school systems.

Bob was able to live with MDS thanks to the hundreds of transfusions he received over a period of 15 years. Unfortunately, though, there is no cure for MDS. The extreme low blood counts that are caused by MDS ultimately took their toll on Bob's long-term health. Bob passed away yesterday in Connecticut.

Bob would not want us to remember him as a victim of a rare disease, but rather as one who experienced a new challenge that gave greater purpose to his life. He often referred to MDS as his "gift" because it taught him that relationships with others are what are important in life. Let us honor this spirit today by paying the highest tribute to this great American and tireless advocate for those suffering from rare diseases.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO COACH  
TREY GIBSON AND THE LOUISIANA  
TECH UNIVERSITY DEBATE TEAM**

**HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 18, 2006*

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Louisiana Tech University Debate Team for its continued success this academic year. Just last month, the debate team regained its national championship status and the team is poised to continue its success next season.

The team's success is not accidental; the foundation of this team's success was established by hard work, determination, dedication and experience. At the helm of the Louisiana Tech Debate Team is Trey Gibson, a Louisiana native who came to Louisiana Tech in 2000. This year's team includes: Levy Leatherman, John Emory, Bill Willis, Kris Lucas, John McCorkle, Michelli McKnight, Matt LaCaze, Baileigh McClaran, Henry Shuler, Courtney McGuffee, Rachel Taylor, Kyle O'Neal, Taryn Branson, Kacey Richard, Nick Cordaro, Richie Robinson, Christina Linza and Reece Lewis.

Gibson works tirelessly to promote this program and uses his talent, energy and drive toward developing articulate students. Long after these students graduate, Gibson's lessons and dedication will continue to surface as his students succeed in business and public service professions. By winning the national championship, the Louisiana Tech Debate Team also earned the prestigious Protogoras Cup. It is also important to note that this year's team faced the trials and tribulations that Hurricanes Katrina and Rita brought to our state. Most north Louisiana institutions of higher learning had to carry the burdens of finding space for our south Louisiana students from other universities, and all state universities had to address budget cuts. Through all of this, the team continued on its successful journey.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to know that the academic honors these students have achieved will truly pay off for our nation. This type of training will enhance and strengthen each student's educational experience. I am thankful for professors like Trey Gibson, who exude energy and determination in the classroom. The fruits of his labor are evident in his team's storied success.

**BILL IN SUPPORT OF RELIEF TO  
MENNONITE MUTUAL AID**

**HON. MARK E. SOUDER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 18, 2006*

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill that would offer relief to Mennonite Mutual Aid, a organization affiliated with the Mennonite church based in Indiana that provides individuals with socially-conscious investment and retirement options.

For more than 40 years Mennonite Mutual Aid has been offering defined benefits to its customers in the form of annuities paid directly from its 401(a) defined contribution church retirement plan, a process known as "self-