

the vital work they do every day on behalf of Americans who desperately need their counsel. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring their tremendous accomplishments.

ENDING GLOBAL CORRUPTION

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Judge Mark L. Wolf in the July 23rd Washington Post. Entitled "Ending Global Corruption," the article describes the adverse effect that grand corruption by high officials has not just on matters of governance, but on the basic human rights of a nation's citizens. Judge Wolf proposes establishing an international court on corruption as a possible solution. This is a proposal that merits our close attention and investigation. We must find better means to address massive corruption, and the impunity and human rights abuses required to sustain it. I submit the article in its entirety.

ENDING GLOBAL CORRUPTION (By Mark L. Wolf)

It was hard to miss Daria at the World Forum on Governance in Prague in April. The 28-year-old lawyer and mother from Kiev was wearing a "Ukraine: [expletive] Corruption" T-shirt. Such a frank message was understandable. Indignation at "grand corruption"—the abuse of public office for personal profit by a nation's leaders—inspired Daria and many others to risk their lives in the Maidan protests that toppled President Viktor Yanukovich in February.

In too many nations, corruption is endemic at the highest levels of government. Then-U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan was correct in characterizing such behavior as an "insidious plague" in his 2003 statement upon the adoption of the U.N. Convention Against Corruption.

Corruption is extraordinarily costly, consuming more than 5 percent of the global gross domestic product. Developing regions lose more than 10 times in illicit financial flows than what they receive in foreign aid. Russia's corruption-fueled "shadow economy" makes up an estimated 44 percent of its GDP.

Corrupt governments also often provide havens for international criminals, including drug lords in Mexico and terrorists in countries such as Afghanistan and Yemen.

Nevertheless, the most serious consequence of grand corruption is that it destroys democracy and devastates the human rights that governments are constituted to protect. Countries recognized as among the world's most corrupt—including Somalia, Afghanistan, Sudan, Iraq and Syria—repeatedly violate the human rights of their citizens. The poor and powerless are victims of corrupt regimes throughout the world.

As Ukraine and Egypt exemplify, opposition to grand corruption is destabilizing many countries and, indeed, the world. International efforts to combat grand corruption have obviously been inadequate. Similar circumstances concerning the evils of genocide and other intolerable human rights abuses led to the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2002. An International Anti-Corruption Court (IACC) is now equally necessary.

Grand corruption depends on the culture of impunity that exists in many nations. An

IACC would provide an alternative and effective forum for the enforcement of the laws criminalizing grand corruption that exist in virtually every country, while giving force to the requirements of treaties such as the U.N. Convention Against Corruption and the obligations of organizations such as the World Trade Organization. Like the ICC, an IACC would operate on the principle of complementarity, meaning that only officials from those countries unable or unwilling to prosecute grand corruption properly would be subject to prosecution. This would give many nations a significant incentive to strengthen and demonstrate their capacity to combat grand corruption.

An IACC would be comparable to the approach that has served the United States well. In the United States, we do not depend on elected state prosecutors to address corruption by state and local officials because such prosecutors are often part of the political establishment they would be called upon to police and, in any event, generally lack the necessary legal authority and resources. Instead, we rely primarily on federal investigators, prosecutors and courts to deal with corrupt state and local officials.

Similarly, an IACC would employ an elite corps of investigators expert at unraveling complex financial transactions and prosecutors experienced in preparing and presenting complicated cases. It would also include experienced, impartial international judges.

The IACC's impact would be enhanced if, like federal courts in the United States, it were also empowered to hear civil fraud and corruption cases. An international "whistle-blower" statute enforceable at the IACC would increase the resources that would be devoted to combating fraud and corruption and enhance the potential for restitution for victims.

Notably, an IACC should have strong support from the United States. U.S. companies generally behave ethically and, in addition, are significantly deterred from paying bribes by the threat of prosecution for violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. They would benefit from the more level playing field an IACC would create.

Finally, an IACC would provide the potential for more effective prosecution and punishment of corrupt officials who commonly abuse human rights. Fraud, corruption and associated money laundering can often be proved based on documentary evidence, which is easier to acquire than eyewitness testimony of victims of human rights abuses, who are unlikely to have knowledge of the criminal responsibility of their nation's leaders.

There are practical impediments to establishing an International Anti-Corruption Court and principled concerns to be addressed. But the status quo is intolerable. An IACC could erode the widespread culture of impunity, contribute to creating conditions conducive to the democratic election of honest officials in countries with a history of grand corruption and honor the courageous efforts of the many people, like Daria, who are exposing and opposing corruption at great personal peril.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took of-

fice, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,599,231,161,990.50. We've added \$6,972,354,113,077.42 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405, I was unable to get back in time to vote due to my daughter being very ill.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE CHICAGO DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF OLDER PERSONS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Marshall Law School in Chicago for spearheading a critical discussion about the needs and rights of older persons. Along with Roosevelt University in Chicago, John Marshall Law School has led the drafting of a model international convention to provide legal protections and guarantee human rights for older people. That model convention, the Chicago Declaration on the Rights of Older Persons, will be presented on August 1 before the 5th Session of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing at the United Nations.

According to Ralph Ruebner, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at John Marshall and a leader of the effort, "It is vital that the world's aging citizens receive comprehensive legal protections and support under international law. This proposed convention will go a long way in helping achieve this." The drafting of the document involved months of work by experts and advocates in Chicago and from around the world, including Australia, Canada, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Paraguay, and United Kingdom.

On July 10 & 11, 2014, the 21st Belle R. and Joseph H. Braun Memorial Symposium hosted by John Marshall Law School, together with East China University of Political Science and Law and Roosevelt University, brought elder law and policy experts from around the world to Chicago to discuss issues from social protection and income security to fighting elder abuse to health care and caregiving.

As co-chair of the House Democratic Caucus Seniors Task Force, I work hard every day to ensure that older Americans can remain productive, participate in their communities, and age with dignity. I also know the importance of ensuring that ageism and other forms of discrimination are addressed and that legal rights are incorporated within a comprehensive framework. The Chicago Declaration on the Rights of Older Persons embodies those concepts, and I hope that next week's

meeting in New York furthers movement toward an international convention.

To give a sense of the importance and scope of this initiative, I am including Article 1, Purpose and Core Principles, and Article 2, Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Older Persons. I encourage my colleagues to read them, learn more about the Chicago Declaration, and join in the fight to promote the rights of older Americans.

The following are excerpts from the Chicago Declaration on the Rights of Older Persons.

ARTICLE 1—PURPOSE AND CORE PRINCIPLES

(a) The purpose of this Declaration is to provide, advance, and promote a basis for the development of a convention on the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by older persons, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity.

(b) The principles recognized by this Declaration are:

1. Respect for inherent dignity;
2. Respect for individual autonomy, including the freedom to make one's own choices;
3. Respect for the independence and capabilities of older persons;
4. Respect for interdependence and caring relationships;
5. Respect for non-discrimination and equality under law;
6. Respect for family relationships and intergenerational solidarity;
7. Respect for full and effective participation and inclusion in society;
8. Respect for and recognition of older persons as part of human and cultural diversity; and
9. Respect for aging as an integral and continuous part of life.

ARTICLE 2—HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS OF OLDER PERSONS

Older persons have the following rights and nothing in this Declaration diminishes any greater rights granted to them that may be contained in local, national, regional, or international law.

(a) Equality, non-discrimination, and equal opportunity: Discrimination against older persons on the basis of age is prohibited.

(b) Quality of Life

1. Older persons have the right to the effective enjoyment of the right to life, to live with dignity in old age, and to make decisions about the quality of their lives.

2. Older persons have the right to support in making decisions regarding their present and future circumstances.

(c) Liberty

1. Older persons have a right to liberty and security of person.

2. Old age should never justify a deprivation of liberty.

3. Older persons have the right to personal mobility with the greatest possible independence.

4. Older persons have the right to liberty of movement, freedom to choose their residence, and the right to a nationality.

(d) Equality Before the Law

1. Older persons have the right to equality before the law.

2. Older persons have the right to access to justice on an equal basis with others.

3. Older persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection and equal benefits of the law.

4. Denial of legal capacity on the basis of old age is prohibited.

5. Older persons have the right to assistance and support in the exercise of their legal capacity.

(e) Health and Long Term Care

1. Older persons have the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard

of physical and mental health and long term care without discrimination on the basis of age, including access to public health, preventive medicine, palliative care, and rehabilitation.

2. Older persons have the right to the benefits of scientific progress and health and long term care related research.

3. Older persons have the right to self-determination in health and long term care related matters and to make such decisions based on informed consent.

4. Older persons have the right to dignity, privacy, and autonomy in making health and long term care related decisions.

5. Older persons have the right to express their wishes and preferences regarding future health and long term care related decisions and to have those expressions respected.

6. Older persons have the right to assistance and support in receiving, understanding, and processing information in making informed health and long term care related decisions.

(f) Adequate Standard of Living: Older persons have the right to an adequate standard of living, including the right to food, water, clothing, and housing, and to improve their living conditions without discrimination on the basis of age.

(g) Housing

1. Older persons have the right to adequate housing.

2. Older persons have the right to choose on an equal basis with others their place of residence, the persons with whom they may live, and they are not obliged to live in any particular living arrangement.

3. Older persons have the right to security of tenure free from disproportionate interference.

(h) Living Independently and Being Included in the Community

1. Older persons have the right to live independently and to make choices to facilitate their full inclusion and participation in the community.

2. Older persons have the right to access and choose a range of in-home formal or informal care and other community support services. This includes personal assistance necessary to support independent living and inclusion in the community and to prevent isolation or segregation from the community.

3. Older persons have the right to community services and facilities that are responsive to their needs.

4. Older persons have the right to participate fully in all aspects of life, including equal access to the physical environment, transportation, information, communications, technology, and other facilities and services open to the public.

(i) Education: Older persons have the right to education, training, and life-long learning without discrimination.

(j) Work and Employment

1. Older persons have the right to work, including the right to participate in a workforce that is open, inclusive, and accessible to persons of all ages.

2. Mandatory retirement based on age is prohibited.

(k) Land and Other Property

1. Older persons have the following rights without discrimination on the basis of age or gender: to use, own, transfer, inherit, and participate in the redistribution of land and other property.

2. Older persons have the right to exercise self-determination with respect to their property and the right not to be arbitrarily or unlawfully deprived of their property.

(l) Freedom from Torture or Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment: Older persons have the right to be free from torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

(m) Freedom from Exploitation, Concealment, Violence, Abuse, and Neglect

1. Older persons have a right to be free from all forms of exploitation, concealment, violence, abuse, and neglect.

2. Older persons have the right to recovery and reintegration when exploitation, concealment, violence, abuse, or neglect is committed against them.

3. Older persons have the right to recovery and reintegration in an environment that fosters dignity, health, well-being, self-respect, and autonomy, and is sensitive to self-identification and personhood.

4. Older persons have the right to be free from medical abuse, including nonconsensual treatment, medication, experimentation, and hospitalization.

5. Older persons may not be denied medical treatment or have medical treatment limited on the basis of age.

(n) Freedom of Expression and Access to Information: Older persons have the right to freedom of expression and opinion, including, the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas on an equal basis with others and through all forms of communication of their choice.

(o) Freedom of Association: Older persons have the right to freedom of association and to create their own associations.

(p) Respect for Privacy: Older persons have the right to privacy, in all aspects of their lives, including, in their home, family life, communications, intimacy, health, and financial matters.

(q) Social Protection: Older persons have the right to social protection, including income security, without discrimination on the basis of age or gender.

(r) Participation in Social, Political, and Cultural Life

1. Older persons have the right to participate in cultural life, recreation, leisure, and sport.

2. Older persons have the right to exercise political rights, including the right to vote, stand for office, and participate in the political process.

(s) Right to Assistance: Older persons have the right to assistance in exercising the rights in this Declaration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2014

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast roll call votes on the afternoon of July 23, 2014. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall 442, Ordering the Previous Question during consideration of H. Res. 680, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 443, on H. Res. 680, the rule to consider H.R. 3393, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 444, on the Kilmer of Washington Part B Amendment "no." 2 to H.R. 4984, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 445, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 4984, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 446, on passing H.R. 4984, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 447, on passing H.R. 5111, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 448, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 3393, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 449, on passing H.R. 3393, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 450, on the Motion to Instruct Conferees on considering H.R. 3230, I would have voted "yes."