

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent I be recognized for up to 25 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BANNING JROTC

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, November 14, 2006, members of the San Francisco School Board voted 4 to 2 to eliminate over the course of 2 years the San Francisco School District's Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps. We call this JROTC. This was an arrogant, mean-spirited, absolutely foolish decision. The decision was a disservice to children of every socioeconomic and racial background, and it reveals a gangrenous, antimilitary bigotry that festers in some circles of the United States today. The vote deprives hundreds of children of a safe, extremely popular, and cost-effective program that provides structure and enjoyment to the lives of children through an emphasis on physical activity, responsibility, self-discipline, and teamwork.

The merits of the JROTC program alone compel a reversal of this decision, but it is more than that. It is only the latest antimilitary decision in the Bay City. The antimilitary counterrecruitment movement is undertaken by activists and groups who have moved beyond simple disagreement with foreign policies to the outright opposition to the military as an institution. They explicitly deprecate basic civic service and exhibit an utter lack of respect for the sacrifices of men and women which they have made in the defense of our country.

Allow me to offer a statement of one such activist before moving on, to get the sense of the nature of the movement behind the JROTC decision. This is:

When soldiers are really hurt because there are no new recruits, then we are getting somewhere.

According to the San Francisco Chronicle, when the school board announced its vote to eliminate the 90-year-old program in which 1,600 children participated, the dozens of children and their families gathered at the board meeting were absolutely stunned. Many cadets burst into tears, their faces in their hands, in silent bewilderment. "It provides me a place to go," said a fourth-year cadet, Eric Chu, as he began to cry. At the same time, the board's decision was loudly cheered by JROTC opponents and counterrecruitment activists. Former teacher Nance Manchias summarized the reason behind their jubilation by declaring, "We need to teach a curriculum of peace."

Arguments marshalled in support of this kind of antimilitary activity are not generally arguments of outright opposition to the military. Counterrecruitment activists you usually hear cloak their opposition to the military

in discussions about discrimination, about the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding homosexuals. But in this case these arguments do not apply—not to the JROTC. You don't believe me? The editorial board of the San Francisco Chronicle, which is not really a bastion of conservatism, explains. They say:

The high-flown arguments fall apart when the drill-and-discipline JROTC basics are examined.

The San Francisco Chronicle's board, writing in support of the JROTC program, continues by explaining the nature and specifics of the program:

Sorry, adults, but kids love this program as if it's family. There are 1,600 students enrolled in the classes, which fulfill physical-ed requirements. Punctuality, team work, camaraderie are the hallmarks. There, military drill competitions are as popular as football games. There are no weapons, just sticks and flags used in marching. Some ROTC members go on to serve in the military, but the vast majority don't, seeing classes as an enjoyable experience and a chance to learn new things: map-reading, leadership skills and self-discipline that goes with military-style assignments and crisp uniforms.

I am quoting from the San Francisco Chronicle's editorial board.

What were the reasons, then, for the elimination of this program? Were there safety concerns, a lack of interest in the program, budgetary issues, problems with poor management, or a troubling lack of diversity? In fact, none of these factors were at issue in the decision.

The program was popular. More than 1,600 kids were active participants in the JROTC program. Finances were not a problem. The program enjoyed a modest \$1 million budget from a school district budget of \$365 million. That is \$1 million out of \$365 million, or a cost of just under three one-thousandths of the entire budget. Was the program poorly managed? The San Francisco Chronicle answers:

No one has offered an alternative as coherent and well-run as the JROTC.

How about safety? Not a problem. There are no weapons involved. The programs are nonviolent; they are simply character-building exercises which emphasize leadership and self-discipline.

And what about the big one, diversity? For this, I repeat the words of the Chronicle reporter, Jill Tucker, in a story she wrote about the JROTC cadets at Galileo High School:

These students are 4-foot-10 to 6-foot-4, athletic and disabled, college-bound and barely graduating, gay and straight, white, black, and brown. Some leave for large homes with ocean views. Others board buses for Bayview-Hunter's Point.

Many of the students were immigrants, and one is autistic.

According to the San Francisco Chronicle:

Opponents acknowledge the program is popular and helps some students stay in school and out of trouble.

So, again, why eliminate a school program in which students simply re-

ceive phys-ed and elective credits required for graduation? Sandra Schwartz of the American Friends Service Committee, an organization dedicated to active opposition to the JROTC program, explains:

We don't want the military ruining our civilian institutions. In a healthy democracy, you contain the military. You must contain the military.

So we have an answer to the question as to why this program was eliminated. It wasn't because of any practical consideration such as cost, interest, or safety, nor was it opposition to a specific policy of the Government. It was opposition to the military as an institution.

But the JROTC decision in San Francisco should come as no surprise. It comes on the heels of two other antimilitary decisions in the Bay City which have taken place over the past year or so. Last year, San Francisco city supervisors refused to allow a ship to dock in the city's port. The ship was a historic World War II battleship, the USS *Iowa*. Just as in the JROTC decision, there were no practical considerations which necessitated refusal of the USS *Iowa*. Supervisor Chris Daly explained the reason for his vote:

I am not proud of the history of the United States of America since the 1940s.

The decision was intended to be an insult to our Armed Forces.

Also, last year, San Francisco passed measure 1, dubbed "College, Not Combat," which was a symbolic measure to ban all military recruiters in the city's public schools. "College, Not Combat" was the first local success of the counterrecruitment movement. Examples of other counterrecruitment slogans include "Don't die for recruiter's lies," and my personal favorite, "An army of none."

This decision enjoyed the support of many extreme antiwar groups, including ANSWER, Not In Our Name, Ralph Nader's Green Party, American Friends Service Committee, Code Pink, Cindy Sheehan, and the International Socialist Organization.

These decisions to denigrate the Armed Forces are the latest tactics of the antiwar counterrecruitment movement. But, again, make no mistake about the basis or the purpose of this movement. Ignore all the rhetoric about discrimination in the Armed Forces and "don't ask, don't tell." Forget about arguments that this is simply opposition to the Iraq war, to George Bush, or to some other specific policy.

The counterrecruitment movement opposes the military as an institution. Counterrecruitment activists and measure 1 supporter April Owens admit the purpose of her movement, and she is speaking in behalf of measure 1:

When soldiers are really hurting because there are no new recruits, then we are getting somewhere.

Speaker PELOSI is on record as saying that she was not behind measure 1 100 percent. I think the American people would be interested to know what percentage of her support the measure is enjoying. But at least some political leaders in San Francisco are speaking out about these topics and decisions and this type of attitude toward the American soldiers.

Regarding the school board decision—and this took a lot of courage for him to do it, I might add—San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom said:

This move sends the wrong message. It's important for the city not to be identified with disrespecting the sacrifices of men and women in uniform.

Yes, it is—especially now. Do we really need to remind people that men and women are fighting and dying because they heeded the call of their country? Do we need to remind people that families are grieving?

One wonders whether these activists understand that the only reason they have the freedoms to dedicate their time and energy to opposing the U.S. Armed Forces is because of the very existence of the U.S. Armed Forces. One wonders whether they have ever realized that the Armed Forces have dedicated far more of their time and efforts to establishing and ensuring the continuation of peace rather than launching wars. And when wars are fought, they are done so at the behest of democratically elected civilian leaders.

If they have a problem with any specific policy, they should take it up with the civilians who made the policy, not the soldiers doing their duty and carrying out that policy in the service of their country.

They certainly should not take their frustrations out on schoolchildren who enjoy a structured, character-building, afterschool program such as the JROTC program. But they believe the program exists to trick youngsters into joining the military. School board member Dan Kelly says the JROTC is “basically a branding program, or a recruiting program for the military.” Well, Mr. Kelly, if that is the case, that the JROTC is a recruiting vehicle, then the JROTC should enjoy the same protections military recruiters receive. This is what I am getting to now.

San Francisco's measure 1, which tells all military recruiters to stay away from schools, was only symbolic for a reason. San Francisco banned military recruiters in their schools for over a decade, until the No Child Left Behind Act was passed into law in 2001. Under provisions of No Child Left Behind, schools can only prevent military recruitment if they are willing to forgo their Federal funding. Unfortunately, the JROTC is not currently included in the recruiting program under the act. However, as board member Dan Kelly admits, the JROTC program was banned simply because it was perceived as a recruiting program.

Let's make that perception a reality. Let's amend the appropriate laws and give the JROTC the same protection that military recruiters enjoy. The program, as I have illustrated, is clearly a valued program in many communities. It deserves our support. The JROTC program in San Francisco, as well as those in communities all across the nation, deserve our support. Sadly, they need our protection, too.

At this time I would like to announce that I will soon be introducing legislation to afford the same protection to the JROTC programs as the other military recruiters enjoy. I look forward to bipartisan support of that program.

U.N. GLOBAL TAXES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, last session of the Congress, I introduced a bill, along with 30 other Senators, to prevent the imposition of global taxes on the United States. The bill would withhold 20 percent of our contributions to the United Nations' budget should the organization continue in advancing its global tax goals.

There are a lot of things they do. I know this body is divided in support of the United Nations. I, frankly, don't see a lot of good that they do. In fact, many of the things I find offensive all get started in the United Nations. But the fact is, there is an effort to get out from under any type of supervision from any of the member states of the United Nations.

The current efforts of the United Nations—and we are talking about organizations which are trying to replace the dues system so that we can no longer threaten to withhold 20 percent of our dues and come up with some type of a global tax independent funding system so they don't have to answer to anyone. The current efforts of the United Nations and other international organizations to develop, advocate, endorse, promote, and publicize proposals to raise revenue by instituting international taxes are unacceptable.

Last year, United Nations Ambassador John Bolton summarized the U.S. position in stating that although the U.S. fully supports increased development assistance, “the U.S. does not accept global aid targets or global taxes.”

My bill is the latest development in a decade-long struggle against the desire of the United Nations to implement a global tax regime.

First, to articulate openly the U.N.'s movement toward global taxes was none other than Boutros-Boutros Ghali, and that was in 1996 in a speech he made at Oxford University in which he hopefully embraced the consent of global taxes and authoritarian world government. The then-Secretary General expressed the U.N.'s desire not to “be under the daily financial will of member states.” Now, what he is talking about is the United States.

This statement warranted and resulted in congressional action, and I

cosponsored Senator DOLE's bill at that time—this is 1996—to prevent U.N. global taxes, which passed both Houses of Congress and became law.

Our efforts were met with continued resistance and arrogance on the part of the United Nations. In that same year, the concept of global taxes was fully debated. That was after we passed our legislation.

A little later, the U.N. Development Programme Research Project resulted in a push for the Tobin Tax, which is a tax on international monetary transactions to go directly to the United Nations. This tax would net trillions of dollars annually.

The 2001 Zedillo report concluded that “there is a genuine need to establish, by international consensus, stable and contractual new sources of multilateral finance”—world taxes.

Over the next few years, the U.N. pushed for a tax on international arms sales and military expenditures, taxes on international airline tickets, taxes on international trade through an ocean freight tax, a global environmental levy, and all other types of global taxes.

The list goes on and on, but here are just the most recent examples of this movement: A 2004 United Nations University study on global taxation; the U.N.'s 2005 book called “New Sources of Development Finance” edited by A.B. Atkinson; a September 2005, United Nations “Millennium Development Goals” meeting addresses international airline ticket tax; Peter Wahl of the German organization, WEED, says international currency transactions taxes are “ready,”; and International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which is an affiliation of the AFL-CIO, supports international taxes. The Clinton, Ford, and Gates Foundations participated in U.N. conferences pushing global taxes. George Soros's Open Society Institute and Oxfam America met at the “New Rules for Global Finance Coalition.”

The U.N. is fascinated with these global tax schemes. It would be an unprecedented accumulation of power for the United Nations. We cannot concede any ground on this issue. Conceding on even one of these initiatives will only embolden the United Nations to go for more.

The same rules that apply to bureaucracies in the United States—gradual accumulation of more and more power and resources and coercive ability—apply to the United Nations in an even more dramatic manner. The IRS is a model of confidence, moderation, and responsibility when compared to the United Nations.

Unfortunately, the United Nations enjoys support from another international bureaucracy which has endorsed global tax efforts. It is the Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In addition to its support of U.N. global tax schemes, the OECD, which receives 25 percent of its budget from the United