

gathered in Bloomfield Hills, MI, to pay a final tribute to one of America's most generous and outgoing public servants.

An innovative businessman, an effective Governor, a dedicated Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, a committed member of his church, a loving husband and father. George Romney was all of this and more.

But perhaps the title that Governor Romney cherished above all was the simple title of American.

During his remarkable life and career, George Romney was always fighting for his country, and for the values that make it great.

He knew that the free enterprise system was the engine that moved our economy forward, and, as a pioneering businessman, he introduced the compact car to Americans.

George Romney also believed in democracy, and he chose to leave a very lucrative career for the opportunity to make a difference for all Michigan citizens.

And some three decades before "Reinventing Government" became a national fad, George Romney fought to reduce the bureaucracy, and to see that Government remained close to the people.

George Romney also was an advocate for the uniquely American tradition of neighbor helping neighbor, and after leaving public service, he founded The National Center, which was devoted to increasing voluntarism in America, and which will stand as one of his legacies.

Another legacy is his family. Governor Romney understood that there is no institution more vital to America's survival than the family. He fought for policies that strengthened all America's families, and he took great pride in the many accomplishments of his.

I know all Senators join with me in sending our condolences, to Lenore, his wife of 64 years, and to his four children, 23 grandchildren, and 33 great-grandchildren.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as I understand it, the Senator from California wishes to speak for 10 minutes and the Senator from Rhode Island for 10 minutes.

So I ask unanimous consent that if there is no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stand in recess under the previous order after the completion of the remarks by the Senator from California, Senator BOXER, and the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the order, the Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2033

Mrs. BOXER. I am sorry that the Senator from Texas left the floor. I understand the basic premise of her amendment, which says that the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing should promote an authentic American perspective on issues of equality, peace, and development. Absolutely that is correct.

But there are a couple of things here that are just odd, which does not necessarily mean that I will not support this. But I find it odd that in a resolution coming before the Senate that the Senate has to state and go on record that there are only two genders, male and female. That is what the facts of life are. And I just find it kind of odd to have to say that there are two genders. So I was going to ask her why she feels we have to say that.

The other thing I thought was kind of unusual here is that she implies this—and I know that she could straighten it out for me—that single people are not entitled to protection by society in this country. That concerns me because what she says is to ensure that the traditional family is upheld as the fundamental unit of society upon which healthy cultures are built and, therefore, receives esteem and protection by society in the State. Of course, our families and the people in them should receive full protection of society and the country in America. But are we implying here that if we are not married, if we are single, you do not deserve to have those protections? I hope not.

So I wanted to ask her about that. But we will put that to the side. Perhaps when I get to see the Senator in the morning, she will be able to explain why we have to have the Senate vote that there are two genders.

ACTION OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was disappointed to learn that the Ethics Committee has voted 3 to 3 and is deadlocked on the issue of public hearings in the Packwood case, with three Republicans voting against public hearings and three Democrats voting in favor of public hearings.

I have stated oftentimes on this floor that if that would be the case, I was going to offer the amendment, and I stand by that. I will do that because not holding open public hearings in a case that has reached this serious a level would be the first time in history that the Senate has failed to do so.

And, Mr. President, I have just wracked my brain. What is it about this case that should give a Senator the right to have his case behind closed doors? The only thing I can come up with is the more embarrassing you

make your transgressions, the more likely you are to get to be heard behind closed doors. That is a horrible message. Or, if it involves sexual misconduct, sexual misconduct, mistreatment of women, or, if this is done by a woman toward men, misconduct of human beings because of their sexuality, that you get to have those hearings behind closed doors. What an incredible message the Republican members of the Ethics Committee have sent to the American people today. I cannot figure out any other reason.

I think it is important to note that the Senator in question got his opportunity to appear before a committee in person to talk about what he thought discrepancies might be in the case and to look at those Senators eye to eye. But the women, 17 of them in 18 different cases, do not get that chance.

I hope the American people are following this saga. It is extraordinary. The women do not have a chance to come before that committee and look in their eyes and talk about their humiliation and their pain.

I have to tell you something. When it comes to this issue, and men and women who have had this experience will tell you, you never forget it whether it was 3 days ago or 30 years ago. It is that humiliating. You remember every single detail. You remember how you felt. And it stays with you for your whole life.

These women do not have the same chance that this privileged Senator did to look in the eyes of the Ethics Committee members and tell them from their heart what transpired. I think this is wrong.

Now, on the bright side, the committee voted 6 to 0 to distribute all the documents related to the case. That is my understanding, all the depositions. That is a good sign. We can at least see what the depositions say, what the documents say, about the sexual misconduct, about the allegations of tampering with evidence, about the allegations of trying to get a spouse a job related to lower alimony payments. We will get to see the documents.

It is a good thing because I heard directly from one of my Republican colleagues that he was able to see some of the depositions, and he is not even on the committee. It is a good thing we are all getting a chance to see the documents and the depositions.

But, Mr. President, I have to tell you, this is like justice half way. You see the depositions but you do not really get to see the people, and they do not get to tell their side. That is like canceling a trial and just deciding the guilt or innocence based on paperwork. That is not justice. That is justice half way. That is one-sided justice.

I know that not all of my colleagues are very excited about the fact that I am going to be offering an amendment, but I know that each and every one of my colleagues in their heart believes, if they felt strongly about this, they would do it as well because it is about

the honor of the Senate. It is about the traditions of the Senate. It is about a signal we will send if we allow this deadlock to continue.

Mr. President, I will not take any more of the Senate's time on this matter. There will be much more to say on it. I will at this time yield my time to the Senator from Rhode Island if he wishes to take advantage of the little extra time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

IN DEFENSE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to outline some of the concerns I have about the provisions pertaining to the United Nations in the bill we have been considering, the State authorization bill.

Titles II and III of the bill, in my opinion, amount collectively to an assault on U.S. participation in the U.N. system. I know that some Americans have questioned the effectiveness of the United Nations in certain peacekeeping operations, such as those in Somalia and Bosnia, and that there are lingering concerns about the ability of the United States to expend resources on foreign affairs in general.

That being said, I think it is fair to say there is evidence that a majority of Americans support U.S. participation in the U.N. system—particularly when it comes to U.N. peacekeeping. To paraphrase former Secretary of State James Baker, U.N. peacekeeping is a pretty good bargain. For every dollar the United States spends on U.N. peacekeeping, we save many more by preventing conflicts in which we would otherwise become involved unilaterally.

I am therefore distraught and distressed by this bill's obvious anti-U.N. course. If adopted in its present form, this bill could well establish the foundation for an eventual U.S. withdrawal from the U.N. system. I think that would be a disastrous outcome, and one to which the American public would strenuously object. As Secretary of State Christopher noted in a recent letter to me, "* * * turning our back on the U.N. would increase the economic, political, and military burden on the American people."

There are a number of troublesome sections in this bill relating to the United Nations. Section 201 authorizes a reduction of more than \$157 million from the President's request for the U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations and related agencies. From there, the fiscal year 1997-99 recommendations are straightlined—frozen, to be precise—at the fiscal year 1996 levels.

That is a mistake. If we enact this provision, the Congress will force the United States to default on treaty obli-

gations and fall further into arrears on our payments to the United Nations. I remember how hard I tried to work with the Bush administration to bring the United States back from its dead-beat status at the United Nations; what a shame it would be for us to fall behind once more.

Section 203, in a misguided effort to save the United States money at the United Nations, calls for the U.N. General Assembly to reformulate the percentages of assessed contributions, and to base those percentages upon each nation's share of the world's total gross national product. If we were to follow these guidelines, however, the U.S. share of total assessed contributions to the United Nations would easily exceed our current mandated ceiling of 25 percent. In other words, we would achieve the exact opposite of what this section probably intends.

Section 205 is probably the most problematic of all the U.N. provisions. This section would have the United States withhold 50 percent of its assessed peacekeeping dues and 20 percent of its regular contributions, and would bar payment of all voluntary peacekeeping contributions, unless the President were able to certify certain conditions with regard to the U.N. inspector general's office.

While U.N. reform is a good idea, this provision sets unworkable standards for an effective U.N. inspector general. In other words, the President would never be able to certify the conditions set forth in this legislation, nor in many cases would he want such conditions to arise. In my opinion, by setting such impossible certification requirements, this section is but a thinly veiled attempt to cut off enormous percentages of U.S. funding for the United Nations. It ought to be modified or, better yet, deleted.

There are other sections that also should be revised. I know that Senator KERRY and I have had discussions with our Republican counterparts to express concerns about section 206, a so-called whistle-blower provision; section 212, which increases advance notification requirement for U.N. Security Council votes; section 217, which creates exceptions for U.S. enforcement of U.N. sanctions regimes; section 220, which redefines the U.S. concept of a peacekeeping operation; and finally, sections 313, 316, and 317, which would prohibit certain U.S. contributions to the ILO and other international organizations.

Having returned just a short time ago from the 50th anniversary celebration of the foundation of the United Nations, I am convinced more than ever of the usefulness and necessity of U.S. participation in the United Nations. It is often repeated—and with good reason—that if the United Nations did not exist, then the world would need to invent it. I think it is high time that the Congress recognized the good and positive value we get for spending at the United Nations, and

make the correct decision to reject the troublesome provisions in this bill.

Mr. President, on July 28, former Deputy Secretary of State John C. Whitehead, who is now Chair of the U.N. Association, wrote to me to outline the Association's assessment of the U.S. stake in the United Nations. It is an important statement and offers a clear and concise argument for continued U.S. participation in the United Nations.

Secretary Whitehead's letter prompted me to recall my own personal involvement with the United Nations having been present at its creation. To be precise, I was an Assistant Secretary of Committee III—the Enforcement Arrangements Committee—and worked specifically on what became articles 43, 44, and 45 of the charter. These articles are as relevant now as they were 50 years ago.

To my mind, the charter has been more than mere words and paper, more than a blueprint of an organizational structure. To me, the charter is a vibrant and dynamic force, willed into being by the collective hopes and dreams of the participants in the San Francisco conference. Although experience has proven that the charter has not always lived up to such high expectations, the last 50 years have proven that collective security is a pretty sound concept for relations between states. It therefore pains me to see this debate in Congress over the future of U.S. participation in the U.N. system.

If the United States abandons the United Nations, the United Nations could well meet the same fate as the League of Nations. I think our interest lies in remaining solidly behind the United Nations. The U.S. failure to support the League of Nations is precisely why the League failed. We should not let the same thing happen to the United Nations. In the coming years, I can easily foresee that the United States will need the United Nations to intervene in areas of conflict or to tackle issues such as the international environment, world hunger, and refugee crises.

It is unfair and shortsighted to judge the United Nations solely on its success or failure in dealing with an intractable, longstanding ethnic conflict such as that in the former Yugoslavia. Rather, we should look at its 50 year's worth of experience in promoting collective security, humanitarian assistance and international cooperation in the environment and other areas.

The record, I would argue, has been good, and with a little work, the future holds real promise. My hope is that 50 years from now, when the United Nations celebrates its 100 year anniversary, our children will look back and remember this time as the turning point.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Whitehead's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: