PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2863, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 315 on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 200, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Bono
Cuellar
Davis, Tom
English (PA)
Granger
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Oberstar
Sessions
Thomas

□ 1612

Ms. HARMAN changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2745, HENRY J. HYDE UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 319 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 319

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2745) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

(e)(1) Consideration of amendments printed in subpart A of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of accountability of the United Nations and shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

(2) Consideration of amendments printed in subpart B of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of United Nations peacekeeping operations and shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

(3) Consideration of amendments printed in subpart C of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall

be confined to the subject of the International Atomic Energy Agency and shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

(4) Consideration of amendments printed in subpart D of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of human rights and shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

(5) Consideration of amendments printed in subpart E of part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of the Oil-for-Food Program and shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on International Relations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of or germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

This resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill H.R. 2745, the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005, and provides a structured rule for consideration of 28 different amendments, including an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the minority.

The rule provides for the offering of the 28 specified amendments according to subject areas as designated in the text of the resolution, and with a cumulative total of an hour and 40 minutes of general debate to be divided equally by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 2745, the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005. Madam Speaker, with 28 amendments in order, to poorly paraphrase Winston Churchill, never will so much be said by so many about so little, in this case, just a single subject act.

It is fitting, though, Madam Speaker, that this bill be named after our esteemed colleague to my right, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), who has served and is serving with such distinction and integrity and has been a stalwart in these halls for the past 30 years. He is to be commended for putting together a well-thought-out, comprehensive measure aimed at helping to bring about real and needed reforms within the United Nations.

I commend also the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, as well for the long-standing cooperation and dedication to bipartisanship in the area of U.S. policy and diplomacy which is evident in many important aspects of this legislation.

In fact, Madam Speaker, when these two distinguished gentlemen were testifying before the Committee on Rules on this bill, I was struck by the fact that the House, and indeed the entire Nation, is the beneficiary of decades' worth of their collective wisdom and firsthand experience.

We spent the last few weeks discussing DOD authorization and appropriations, Interior, State and Justice appropriations, and these acts have a wide range of topics and generated a multitude of amendments. This specific act has generated 28 potential amendments on a single topic, and, Madam Speaker, I know my colleagues are going to love listening to all 28 of those amendments, but let that not overshadow the reality of this bill.

This bill is unusual in the bipartisan unity of the content. When it comes to the issue of United Nations reform, I was also impressed that both gentlemen, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Ranking Member LANTOS), seemed to be of one mind when it relates to the necessity for reforms in the wake of continued scandals within various United Nations functions.

There was also a unique, bipartisan unity in supporting the need for a penalty to follow failure of reform. There is a small disagreement on who should trigger that penalty, which differences I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will bring forward, but there can be no doubt as to the underlying need of this penalty phase. That is telling.

To put it in a nutshell, Madam Speaker, this legislation is long overdue. It would require 39 very specific reforms within the areas of U.N. budgeting, oversight, accountability, and human rights. It provides clarity and a reasonable timetable under which the U.N. must act. With the U.S. footing the largest share of dues of any Nation, a share consistent with our voice, this act should provide some real teeth and real incentives to get the job done. To not require such withholdings would only create a paper tiger.

As an old teacher, I learned that I never made a threat that I was not willing to carry out. If students ever thought I was not seriously going to follow through on my disciplinary commitments, I would lose all credibility and lose both the respect and the cooperation of the kids. It would create an atmosphere of weakness and chaos. No learning would take place. Such an atmosphere of distrust cannot be part of our foreign policy. We have seen that too often, and such a potential cannot be ignored.

There are indeed precedents for what we are trying to do both in the 1980s and 1990s when actions by Congress ensured change within the United Nations.

It is regrettable, Madam Speaker, that this bill is even necessary. It is regrettable that the United Nations would not undertake to clean up its own act in the wake of the oil-for-food scandal, irregularities in the accounting and uses of its funds, misconduct by entrenched U.N. bureaucrats, and the deplorable state of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

We all witnessed the appalling lack of resolve and consistency in the U.N. when it failed to live up to and enforce the 17 different resolutions condemning Saddam Hussein's murderous regime.

When I am at home in my district, some of my constituents will say to me that we ought to pull out of the United Nations entirely. It is hard to argue with many of them who say that the U.N. is merely a haven for corruption, waste and, frankly, anti-Americanism. We must do all we can to try and rectify all these problems, and to not act would indeed be irresponsible.

This act sends an unmistakably clear message that specific reforms must be enacted or face real consequences. If these reforms are not enacted, the future looks bleak and will only increase the calls to replace the United Nations with a more updated handling of international disputes.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, this rule is a good and fair rule. It made every single amendment in order, all 28, which were filed before the Committee on Rules. In short, the only complaint that one may have with this rule is that is may be somewhat parsimonious in its general debate, and we will provide in those 28 amendments a

long and wide-ranging debate of all of these important issues.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes, and I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the time.

Let me quote, this would undermine American credibility at the United Nations. It would undermine our effectiveness. Those are the words of the distinguished Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns, who said of the bill that we are considering, it will call into question our reliability as the founder and host Nation and leading contributor to the United Nations and would also harm our image worldwide.

My colleague from Utah pointed to the bipartisanship. I gather that he would agree that it is bipartisan when Nicholas Burns and ALCEE HASTINGS and other Democrats and this administration join in opposing this measure.

In my opinion, this bill takes a shortsighted approach to reforming the United Nations. There are decent, necessary and desirable provisions in this legislation, but, Madam Speaker, this bill takes well-thought-out ideas and pushes them far into the realm of demagoguery, demonstrating a contempt for the United Nations that is entirely unfounded.

The United Nations Reform Act is yet another example of the majority's willingness to bulldoze over dissension and force its will upon those who would otherwise disagree. The draconian requirements of the underlying legislation will affect everything from the promotion of human rights in the organization to the inclusion of mandatory sunset provisions for all new U.N. programs.

The most shortsighted of the bill's provisions would require a mandatory withholding of peacekeeping funds unless the requirements in this legislation are met.

Madam Speaker, simply put, prohibiting the Secretary of State from exercising discretion regarding the withholding of funds to the United Nations is counterproductive. The Secretary herself told a group here in the Capitol day before yesterday that the Bush administration is not supporting the mandatory withholdings contained in this bill. It seems clear that if even this administration, which has never been reluctant to withhold criticism of the U.N., is against this provision, then it must be bad.

It has become a cliche when Members of the House speak repeatedly about winning the hearts and minds of the world; yet our constant use of gun-barrel diplomacy continues to fail. Do my colleagues really believe that withholding millions of dollars from the United Nations will encourage the member nations to go along with what we are trying to do today?

Adlai Stevenson, that great champion of world diplomacy, said, ''The whole basis of the United Nations is the right of all nations, great or small, to have weight, to have a vote, to be attended to.'' Now, more than 40 years later, the underlying legislation seeks to eliminate the right of any country besides our own to chart the future of the United Nations.

The only way for us to reform the U.N. is to work within it rather than threatening to take our ball and go home. We will not be successful by withholding the funds that are needed to do the job.

Thanks to the Bush administration, the United States' international reputation as a peace-loving Nation is in tatters. Now my friends on the other side want to pass a bill which will withhold peacekeeping funds while conflicts rage around this world unchecked? This is irresponsible, immoral and a foreign policy disaster.

Everyone in this body realizes that the United Nations is not a perfect organization, but on balance, the United Nations has been and will continue to be good for America on a range of global issues.

Let us not forget the thousands of United Nations personnel who risked their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan to bring about successful and free elections in those countries or the role of the U.N. in effecting the withdrawal of Syrian military forces from Lebanon.

□ 1630

In March of 2005, Secretary-General Annan released a string of initiatives to combat terrorism, proposals that the United States Government has openly supported. And in the Sudan, the U.N. has committed aid workers, troops, police, and money to ensure the success of peace accords.

The U.N. also continues to provide a global voice and to be a powerful advocate for change around the world. How many millions of children's lives have been saved through UNICEF, Madam Speaker? How many millions of lives have been saved through disease treatment and eradication programs? How many have been made better through development assistance, cultural programs, and advances in education? Can we really justify cutting off our support for all these efforts simply because the U.N. does not implement every single one of our reform proposals?

Madam Speaker, that is the reason I will be supporting the Lantos-Shays substitute to this bill. Eleanor Roosevelt, our country's first representative to the United Nations, remarked, ''Do what you feel in your heart to be right, for you will be criticized anyway.'' It may be that the United States will still be criticized even if we adopt the substitute and these reforms are pushed through. But I would rather do the right thing and be criticized than give up and go home because things did not go 100 percent of the way that we wanted it to.

The Lantos-Shays substitute takes a realistic approach to reforming the United Nations. It includes virtually all of the reforms in H.R. 2745, with one crucial difference. The substitute gives the Secretary of State the flexibility to make decisions regarding funds based on the needs of the United States. The substitute avoids the counterproductive all-or-nothing diplomacy of this measure, while still promoting the reforms everyone agrees are needed.

Madam Speaker, legislating unrealistic ultimatums will not achieve the goal that we are seeking. I urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-advised and shortsighted legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I want to respond to my friend from Florida that the language that substitutes for debate around here is troublesome. Demagogic, I heard the gentleman say. Immoral, gun-boat diplomacy, contempt for the U.N. None of those inflammatory terms, in my judgment, apply to this debate.

And I suggest that we can disagree as to the one issue, and that is how to enforce the reforms we all agree are needed, without calling each other names or disparaging our motives.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the chairman, and I agree with him regarding our rhetoric. When I made my references I was referring to the Bush administration and not to the distinguished chairman and other Members in the body. And I stand by those statements, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HYDE. Well, reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, but the Bush administration is on your side, not mine, this time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, the second Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, commented during his tenure that ''the United Nations was not created to take humanity to heaven but save it from hell.'' A keen observation on the fundamental tensions present in such a massive and massively important institution.

The U.N. was built upon the very highest of ideals: support for human

rights, peaceful resolution of conflict, and respect for international law and conventions. However, the reality of the U.N.'s composition of 191 member states, often with 191 different national interests, has challenged these high ideals. We all know that.

Many are examining how to meet these challenges and improve the weaknesses of the organization: the Secretary-General's report, the U.N. High Level Advisory Panel, the Volcker Commission Investigation, the Mitchell-Gingrich report. And each of them, in addition to the bill we are debating today, is circling around the same group of reforms. But the central debate here on the House floor is not about what the reforms should be. Madam Speaker, the debate here is how you sell them.

There are 191 individual members of the organization that must agree on the reforms, sometimes unanimously, if we are to make the U.N. an even better organization than it already is. And this is where I diverge from some of my colleagues.

I share the views of the eight former U.S. ambassadors to the United Nations. I do not believe harsh, automatic penalties hold any chance of garnering support among the many nations needed to enact these reforms. I must note that their experience spans each of the five Presidencies, from Jimmy Carter to George W. Bush. We should be heeding their sage advice.

For this reason, I support the Lantos-Shays substitute, which authorizes the Secretary of State to withhold a portion of our U.N. dues at his or her discretion instead of the severe automatic penalties.

We should not advocate a policy of withdrawal from the world community on the one hand and ask for it to engage on the other. But H.R. 2745 would stir up exactly that resentment in its current form, resentment that will kill any hope for change.

In closing, Madam Speaker, the United Nations has a genuine opportunity to reform and, with our leadership, the potential for great success. We must add to this momentum by supporting the Lantos-Shays substitute.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, Madam Speaker; and I rise in strong support of this rule.

I think that the underlying legislation is much needed and long overdue. I have been working to help reform the United Nations since I first came to Congress, and I have not found anybody yet that disagrees with the fact that we very, very direly need to reform the United Nations. This once-utopian organization has degenerated into an institution that is largely dysfunctional and on the verge of becoming irrelevant, and that is why we need these reforms and we need them now.

There are a lot of areas that this legislation deals with, whether it is cronyism, corruption, or financial mismanagement. But I just want to stress one that relates to budgetary reform and the way that people vote on that.

Right now, the United States contributes about 22 percent of the general budget of the United Nations and 28 percent of the peacekeeping budget. If you take the last 128 nations that contribute dues, if you put all their dues together, that adds up to less than 1 percent; yet they have the same vote. Those 128 nations have the same vote as the United States. In fact, if you take the top three countries, they contribute over half the dues, and yet everybody has the same vote on budgetary matters.

Imagine a family, if you will, where the dad goes out and works all year and provides income for his family. And at the time to decide how to spend it, the four kids get up and say, this is what we want to do, this is where we want to go on our vacation, this is what hotel we want to stay in. Well, that is the way the United Nations works, and that is why we need the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act we are considering today.

One of the reforms in this act would say that when you vote on budgetary matters, then you weight those votes. That would do two things: number one, it would mean that the countries that contribute the most money would have more leverage in making sure that the money gets spent where it is supposed to be spent and in making sure that they get the results they want to get. And it also would encourage some of the other countries to contribute more money to the dues of the United Nations.

One of the areas we often hear criticized is this area of cronyism. It is unbelievable, but the United Nations, if you count the full-time and the contract employees, they have over 43,000 employees. To put that in perspective, a lot of multibillion dollar corporations do not have that many employees. Ebay, people have heard of that, is a company worth $52 billion, and the United Nations has five times as many employees as they have. Anheiser Busch, which makes and sells beer around the world, the U.N. has a third more employees than they have.

So I think it is time that we got a handle on how the money that American taxpayers send off to the United Nations gets spent, and this haphazard budgetary process can be changed by weighted voting.

There is no doubt in my mind that the time is now for reform at the U.N. This organization has become a shadow of its former self and likely bears little resemblance to what its founders had envisioned. Amid charges of cronyism, corruption, and financial scandal in recent months, the relevance and reputation of the United Nations has deteriorated drastically. What's more, the U.N. appears to engage in anti-American sentiment for sport, promoting it around the globe.

This is a true slap in the face to the United States. After all, we are going to contribute 22 percent of the U.N.'s general budget and 28 percent of its peacekeeping budget this year. This means a funding request for Fiscal Year 2006 of $439 million by President Bush. The top 10 contributors of U.N. dues account for more than 76 percent of all dues paid while the 128 countries with the lowest dues account for less than 1 percent of dues paid. However, among the 192 member countries, everyone's vote is worth the same. Imagine this scenario: parents agreeing to fund the family vacation, but allowing the children to dictate where the family goes, what hotel they stay at, and what activities they do. That's what is happening at the U.N. right now and that is why we need to support the Hyde Bill.

H.R. 2745 calls for weighted voting on budgetary matters. Weighted voting on budgetary matters would give the U.N.'s biggest contributors more leverage to ensure that their money is achieving the purposes for which it is intended. Weighted voting would encourage other countries to increase their contribution to the organization.

The State Department said the U.S. paid nearly $3.9 billion in contributions to the U.N. system in 2004. And who knows where that money went? Some of it likely went to fund patronage jobs of which the U.N. has many. Between full-time employees and contract workers, the U.N. employs almost 43,000 people. Let me put that in perspective: 43,000 workers is more than five times more the total employed by eBay, a company worth almost $52 billion. Another kicker: total U.N. employment is nearly one third greater than that of Anheuser-Busch, another multi-billion dollar company.

As elected officials, we have an obligation to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money. It is our responsibility to bring reform to the U.N.'s haphazard budget practices and the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005 is a step toward accomplishing that goal. The American people deserve nothing less.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 8 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. First, I want to thank my friend from Utah for his most gracious words at the outset of this debate, and I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), for his leadership on foreign policy matters and for his invaluable assistance on the Committee on Rules.

Madam Speaker, as we embark upon today's historic debate, at the outset I would like to publicly express my respect, my admiration, my affection, and my friendship to the chairman of the House Committee on International Relations. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has been a giant in this body for many years. His contributions to the work of the Congress and to the welfare of our Nation are without limits, and it has been one of the great

privileges of my congressional career to have had the opportunity of serving on his committee.

Madam Speaker, let me make it clear that there is no Member of this body who is opposed to far-reaching reforms at the United Nations. We must approve legislation to fight corruption, hypocrisy, ineffectiveness, waste, and anti-Americanism at this important global institution. There is no disagreement, Madam Speaker, between Chairman HYDE and me as to whether the U.N. must be reformed. Where we part ways is on how to accomplish this incredibly important goal.

Madam Speaker, the good Lord gave us Ten Commandments. The legislation before the House today gives us 39.

□ 1645

While I know there has been some inflation over time, there is no rational explanation for such an explosion of legislative commandments.

The United Nations Reform Act is truly a guillotine on autopilot. If the United Nations accomplishes 38 out of 39 commandments, but only accomplishes one-half of the last commandment, the United States will automatically cut off 50 percent of our contributions to the United Nations. Secretary of State Rice will have absolutely no choice in the matter. The President of the United States will have no choice in this matter. The Congress will have no choice in this matter.

The bill under consideration is also a death blow to United Nations peacekeeping. Upon enactment of this legislation, the United States will be forced to oppose any new or expanded peacekeeping mission until a comprehensive series of peacekeeping reforms are implemented, many of which we all know will take years to accomplish. Rwanda-style genocides could unfold before our eyes, and the United Nations would have to turn its back.

Madam Speaker, I agree that peacekeeping desperately needs reform, but it boggles the mind to think that this body would approve legislation which automatically cuts off all U.S. support for U.N. peacekeeping unless congressionally mandated commandments are immediately implemented.

We are not alone, Madam Speaker, in our deep opposition to the United Nations Reform Act in its current form. This Republican administration is strongly opposed to this legislation. Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns said yesterday that this legislation ''would undermine American credibility at the United Nations and would call into question our reliability as the founder and host Nation and leading contributor to the United Nations.''

Eight of our former Ambassadors to the United Nations, Republicans and Democrats alike, ranging from Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick to Ambassador Danforth, a former distinguished Republican Senator, all oppose this legislation.

Madam Speaker, my Republican colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and I will offer a substitute amendment to promote U.N. reform effectively. Our substitute, which is rational, responsible and bipartisan, does not have the rigid and arbitrary dictate that automatically cuts 50 percent of our dues. This provision makes the bill, which has many good provisions in it, a guillotine on autopilot. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Lantos-Shays substitute.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), one of the leading voices on the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

We are all sinners even though we have the 10 Commandments, but can Members imagine how much more sin we might be committing had those commandments been mere suggestions? That is why the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act does have commandments that the U.N. should and must adhere to. I rise in strong support of this bill.

On Monday as we were preparing for the debate on reforming the United Nations, a constituent of mine was at one of the sessions of the Economic and Social Council, one of the many United Nations bodies, and he was immediately struck by the almost Orwellian and secretive nature of the proceedings, as well as by the vitriolic, anti-American attacks in which the chairman and other members of the committee were engaged.

My constituent made several observations to me that reaffirmed that lives, not just policies, are at stake in our efforts to reform the U.N. institutions. This same constituent sent me a postcard like this one that reaffirmed to me the need for this. It had a note encouraging the Congress to overhaul the United Nations, and the picture on the postcard is a sculpture of a broken world, implying that the United Nations is the means by which to fix it.

However, how can the United Nations be considered a legitimate source of stability or an instrument for the protection of the most vulnerable populations or a tool for the promotion of human rights and good governance when it is plagued with graft and corruption, when sexual predators and traffickers in human beings are part of the policing and peacekeeping mission, and when the Human Rights Commission is a country club of rogue states made up of dictators and tyrants and thugs?

Reforming the United Nations is necessary for its survival, and it is long overdue. However, reform must not be limited to rearranging the deck chairs, but instead to correcting the organization's serious institutional and systemic flaws. The U.N. has paid lip service to nominal efforts to reform itself, and the few times that those promises have been kept, it is when the United States has leveraged its financial support for the organization and its specialized agencies.

For this reason, the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005 mandates spending cuts in specific programs, redirects funds to priority areas, and, yes, withholds 50 percent of U.S.-assessed dues if certifications are not made in critical areas. Those commandments must be adhered to.

If we are serious about making the United Nations relevant again, and I think in a bipartisan way we are, if we are serious about restoring it to reflect its core mission, and I think in a bipartisan way we are, if we are serious about saving the United Nations from itself, then we must render our overwhelming support for the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005.

I would just like to close by saying that it is very fitting that this bill before us should have the name of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), who has been the conscience of the House, the voice of the people for so many years, has had such a distinguished public service career in the House and led us through some very difficult times as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary as well as chairman of our Committee on International Relations. I am so pleased that this bill before us, which will reform this wonderful peacekeeping institution, will have his name as part of its reform legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I also want to add to the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), when it comes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). I have served with the chairman both on the Committee on the Judiciary and on the Committee on International Relations. I have profound respect and deep affection for him, but I do not like his bill.

It is clear that there is a consensus that the United Nations needs reform. We want reform. Our allies want reform. The Secretary General wants reform. Just this week a congressionally created task force chaired by the former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and the former majority leader Senator George Mitchell issued a report urging adoption of many of the proposals put forth by the Secretary General; but it did not recommend that Congress withhold dues to serve as a catalyst to bring about those reforms.

Presumably, they were in agreement with the eight former U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, both Republican and Democrat, who stated yesterday in a letter to the congressional leadership, and I would ask my

colleagues to pay close attention to this particular excerpt, ''Withholding U.S. dues to the United Nations may sound like smart policy, but would be counterproductive. It would create resentment, build animosity and actually strengthen opponents of reform. It would place in jeopardy the reform initiatives most important to U.S. interests.'' Remember, these are Americans who represented our Nation at the United Nations. They understand how the institution works. They know how to get things done.

Yes, Madam Speaker, I am optimistic that reform will occur, but it will not happen as a result of this bill, it will happen in spite of this bill.

If it were a thoughtful effort to effect change, why did the committee proceed before the Gingrich-Mitchell task force that we created and funded back in December even made its recommendations?

No, this bill will not promote U.N. reform, Madam Speaker. It is more likely to undermine those efforts. Support for this bill will reinforce a growing belief that we are not committed to strengthening the United Nations, to working with our like-minded allies to make it a more effective tool to promote our interests.

I recognize that some, a few, on the other side honestly believe we should end any participation, any U.S. participation in the United Nations. They prefer to go it alone, but they forget that without the United Nations it would fall on us to do much of what the United Nations is doing on the planet today, and that the United Nations has supported the United States in some of our critical foreign policy needs. It was the United Nations that organized and ran the elections in Iraq and in Afghanistan and played a critical role in forcing the Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon.

The Ambassadors are correct, resentment towards the United States will increase. That is because what this bill simply says is unless you do everything we want, we will cut off your funds. In other words, if you do not play the game according to our rules, we will take our ball and go home.

This take-it-or-leave-it approach does not help us, it hurts us. A recent GAO report stated, and again I am quoting, ''Recent polling data show that anti-Americanism is spreading and deepening around the world. Such anti-American sentiments can increase foreign public support for terrorism directed against the United States, impact the cost and effectiveness of military operations, weaken the United States' ability to align with other nations in pursuit of common policy objectives, and dampen foreign publics' enthusiasm for U.S. business services and products.''

□ 1700

That is a quote from our own GAO. This bill is bad for our national security interests, it is bad for America, and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I love history. In fact, this is not necessarily unprecedented. The Kassebaum-Solomon amendment in 1985 asked for change, and meaningful change took place. In 1994, we insisted on an oversight committee and an oversight committee took place. And under the bipartisan Helms-Biden approach, once again we insisted on changes with the United Nations. The United Nations responded to it. This bill is keeping a tradition that is historical going back for at least 20 years in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me echo what has been said about the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). There has never been a finer Member of Congress in the history of the Republic than the gentleman from Illinois. He was one of the most eloquent speakers I have ever known in this House. We really appreciate all his hard work on this bill.

Now, let me say to my friend from Massachusetts, I have been listening to this stuff for 20 years. You cannot do anything to put pressure on the United Nations, because if you do, the whole world is going to hate us. The sky is going to fall, Henny Penny. The State Department has been working with the United Nations for the last 20 years that I have been here and working on the Foreign Affairs Committee, International Relations now. The problems still exist. The only difference is, it is worse now than it has ever been.

We have got to do something about it. Mr. Bolton needs to be confirmed on the other side because we need a tough guy over there to force the issue. We have got an Oil-for-Food scandal that is growing daily. Kofi Annan, the head of the United Nations, the Secretary-General, said, Oh, I didn't have anything to do with it. We now are finding memos where he talked to the people in the oil industry saying that he would give them unqualified support.

A few months ago, he said, Oh, I never did that, and he said he would never resign under any circumstances. Now he is hedging his bets on that because the case against him and the Oil-for-Food scandal is growing and growing and growing. He is the head man over there. On his watch, everything has been going haywire.

We have got U.N. peacekeeping forces raping women and kids, and nothing has been done about that. We have got all kinds of problems over there and something must be done. How do you do that? We say, Well, let's follow the same course we have been following for the last 20 years. The State Department says, My gosh, we'll go over there and we'll do something about it. I have high regard for Condoleezza Rice. I think she is a dynamite lady and going to do a dynamite job. But this body needs to put the hammer by using American taxpayers' dollars on the U.N. to clean up that mess over there. We cannot go on day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year letting this thing be completely out of hand.

The gentleman talked about the Mitchell and Gingrich report. They said that it is a mess over there. How do you clean it up? You make a change from top to bottom. How do you do that when the rest of the world or much of the rest of the world says, Oh, my gosh, we don't want the United States dictating to us. I can understand that. We are the big guy on the block. They do not want us dictating to them, and we do not want to dictate to them. We want to work with them. But the fact of the matter is they are not listening in many cases and the corruption goes on and on and on, the mismanagement goes on and on and on, and nothing changes. And the United States keeps pouring in 25 percent, or almost that much, of the funds out of the taxpayers' pockets in this country for that body.

How do you change it? You take out the hammer, and the hammer is the money. You say to the world body, the United Nations, If you don't clean up that mess, we are going to withhold funds. And if we withhold funds, you are going to have a big, big problem over there.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is one of my dearest friends in this place and the gentleman from Massachusetts is not a bad friend, either. We have traveled together. I have high regard for him, even though he is wrong a lot of the time. But I just want to say, something has to be done. There must be something in the water in Massachusetts. I do not know. But something has to be done. And what has to be done is we have got to put pressure on the U.N. and the best way to do it is to say, either you change things over there or we are going to withdraw funds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and classmate, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about the gentleman from Illinois, also. There are probably no two people that are more opposite than the two of us. I want the gentleman to know, I am going to miss him when he really does leave the floor.

Mr. Speaker, if H.R. 2745 is enacted, it will be a huge step backward for women around the world, because it would end U.S. funding for CEDAW. CEDAW is the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, which is the U.N. treaty on the rights of women around the world. CEDAW is a United Nations treaty that supports international standards to discourage sex-based discrimination and encourages equality in education,

health care, employment and all other arenas of public life for all women around the world. This treaty serves as a powerful tool for women worldwide as they fight against discrimination. It also leads to substantial improvements for women's lives across the world.

The impact of CEDAW can be seen in countries like Australia where the government cited its treaty obligations in passing national legislation against sexual harassment in the workplace based on CEDAW, or in Pakistan where education for young women was introduced in primary schools after treaty ratification in Pakistan, causing sharp increases in female enrollment in their schools.

To date, 170 countries have ratified CEDAW. Sadly, the United States continues to be the only industrialized nation that has not ratified, leaving us in the company of Afghanistan, North Korea, and Iran. It is time to abandon this unfavorable distinction. It is time to be a world leader and a champion of human and women's rights. We must ratify CEDAW, and we must do it now. That is why I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my resolution on CEDAW, H. Res. 67, to support the Lantos amendment, and to vote against this base bill unless we do something drastically to improve it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the bill. I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for his service and this bill. I had some prepared remarks, but I have got to respond to the last speaker who talked about CEDAW. It seems to me that that is a perfect example of what is wrong with the United Nations and our funding the United Nations. What a joke CEDAW is. We are the only industrialized country that has not signed that treaty. Women do better here than anyplace in the world. There is no person who supports equal rights for women more than I do, and I think that CEDAW is a joke because of those who have supported it, look at how they treat women.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to ensure accountability of each and every American taxpayer dollar that goes to the United Nations. From the U.N. Oil-for-Food program, to its lack of action with respect to the genocide in Darfur, to the horrendous human rights abuses by U.N. peacekeeping staff during their mission in the Congo, what did they care about CEDAW. The U.N. is rife with fraud and abuse and needs reform.

Two of the most important items this bill requires are to direct the U.S. permanent representative to aggressively pursue a definition of terrorism and to mandate that the U.N. adopt criteria for membership on any human rights body. The U.N. counts some of the world's leading human rights violators and state sponsors of terrorism among its membership and even taps many of them to be in leadership positions on its subcommittees. This is outrageous and ironic.

Let us empower our new ambassador to the U.N. and the administration with reforms that have some teeth and will effect change. The United Nations' reputation of being a credible and effective international peacekeeping body has been tarnished. It is no wonder so many Americans question the efficacy and the very necessity of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and bill and thank Mr. HYDE for his service and this bill. The United Nations Charter includes some very laudable goals, but when the rubber meets the road, the U.N. has failed miserably to put these ideals into practice, especially in recent years.

As a founding member of the U.N. and a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, we have a duty to insist on a higher standard. And as Members of Congress, we have a duty to ensure accountability of each and every American taxpayer dollar that goes to the U.N.

From the U.N. Oil for Food program to its lack of action with respect to the genocide in Darfur, Sudan to the horrendous human rights abuses by U.N. peacekeeping staff during their mission in the Congo, the U.N. is rife with fraud and abuse and needs reform.

This bill includes a call for certifiable reforms including: Shifting 18 programs from the regular assessed budget to voluntary funded programs so their funding would not be automatic; all new programs started by the U.N. to include sunsetting provisions; cuts and streamlining in the funding for the 15,484 conferences and scheduled meetings that occurred in 2004 and 2005, some of which cost $7–8,000 per hour; creation of an ethics office to provide oversight over the U.N. budget and financial disclosure form.

And two of the most important items this bill requires are to direct the U.S. Permanent Representative to aggressively pursue a definition of terrorism and to mandate that the U.N. adopt criteria for membership on any human rights body.

The U.N. counts some of the world's leading human rights violators and state sponsors of terrorism among its membership and even taps many of them to be in leadership positions on its subcommittees. This is completely outrageous and dangerously ironic.

Let us empower our new ambassador to the U.N. and the administration with reforms that have some teeth and will effect change. The United Nations' reputation of being a credible and effective, international peacekeeping body has been sorely tarnished. It is no wonder so many Americans question the efficacy and the very necessity of the United Nations.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am a proud original cosponsor of the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act, and I rise today in support of the rule and with a profound sense of gratitude for the leadership that my mentor and friend, HENRY J. HYDE of Illinois, has provided on this bill and throughout an illustrious career in this Congress. I also want to commend for what I know will be a vigorous debate that has already begun the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his thoughtful consideration of this bill.

One of the extraordinary things about this debate as it unfolds before the American people, Mr. Speaker, is the degree of agreement between the two men that I just mentioned. It is a rare piece of legislation indeed where there is so much agreement about the goals. But I believe what will become apparent to any observer of this debate is that we are not so much arguing over the ends as the means, and that is a legitimate argument that will be, I believe, a great service to the country. The United Nations is desperately in need of fundamental reform, and the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act does just that.

In 1994, staffers at UNICEF's Kenya office defrauded and squandered up to $10 million by some estimates. In the Congo last year, U.N. peacekeepers and civilian personnel stand accused of widespread sexual exploitation. And we all know of the $10 billion Oil-for-Food scandal. Both sides agree it is time for reform in the wake of years of mismanagement and outright scandal. But I submit humbly that it is time for U.N. reform with teeth, and that is precisely what the Hyde U.N. Reform Act provides. It focuses on budgets, streamlining, prioritization of programs, oversight, accountability, peacekeeping, and human rights. But the Hyde bill also uses the leverage of withholding up to 50 percent of U.S. assessed dues if certifications are not made in key areas.

Under the Hyde bill, the U.N. must achieve 32 of 39 reforms, 14 of which are mandatory, or face the potential loss of 50 percent of U.S. assessed dues. Let us be clear. This is the point of contention, Mr. Speaker, that is, who controls the power of the purse. I submit at the beginning of this debate that the power of the purse is the power of the American people. It is not for the State Department or even the Secretary of State to say when and how the resources of the American people will be spent. That is the function of the Congress of the United States even where the United Nations is concerned. It is time to save the U.N. from its own scandals and mismanagement. It is time for U.N. reform with teeth.

Let us begin the debate. Then let us pass the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, billions of dollars in coverups, fraud investigations, abuses of power, calls for resignation, shredded documents. I am not talking about the Nixon or the Clinton administrations, though both contained plenty of the above. I am talking about the U.N., that most sacred cow of international organizations. It has been the subject of many scandals. Billions of dollars intended to help the Iraqi people were stolen from the Oil-for-Food program.

□ 1715

It appears that that happened because of conflicts of interest at the highest levels of the U.N. Countries like Syria, Sudan, Libya, North Korea, China and Cuba have had seats or still have seats on the Human Rights Commission, the U.N.'s body for addressing human rights issues. Those nations are all members of the U.N., and we should not kick them out, but they should not be setting policy on human rights. Members of this Commission can veto certain resolutions that come before the U.N.

Sudan, from its seats on the Commission, has vetoed efforts to condemn the genocide it is committing in Darfur. U.N. peacekeepers were recently found to be raping the children, the very people they were ordered to protect, in the Congo. We could go on and on.

The U.N. plays a vital role in mediating disputes, in caring for the poor, and facilitating dialogue. But the system seems to breed abuse and fraud and wasteful spending because of the U.N.'s huge bureaucracy. It is accountable to no one. Much of what happens happens behind closed doors.

Changes need to be made. They need to be made in the structure of the U.N. They need to be substantial, not cosmetic changes. The mess needs to be cleaned up.

I urge support for the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform plan, which will make changes of substance.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), also a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the rule and this important piece of legislation. And I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his leadership on this important issue, and it is an honor to serve with him on the Committee on International Relations.

World leaders gathered in 1945 to implement a vision that began with President Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations, was conceived by President Franklin Roosevelt and brought into existence by Harry Truman, now known as the United Nations. What the United Nations has become today would surely break the hearts of these great men.

More than just a group of countries working towards peace, the United Nations represents the idea that each human being deserved a better existence. What happens at the United Nations today does not represent these ideals. And until the United Nations becomes the body envisioned by these giants of the past, until it becomes a place where the good of mankind is truly advanced, and not a place where the agendas of tyrants and dictators are protected, we should not continue to pay 25 percent of the United Nations budget.

There are those who believe that we should simply leave the U.N. and start over, and there are moments when I wonder if really there is no other option. There may be a day when this becomes inevitable, but now is not the time to cut and run. Now is the time to hold the United Nations accountable. It is important for the United States to remain engaged and a player on the world's stage to enact these important reforms.

This legislation has offered 39 important reforms with the teeth of tied to funding, which will return honor and integrity to what was once a distinguished body.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005. It is tough but necessary medicine designed to finally at long last reform the United Nations so that they can realize the noble dream of its founders.

Today the United Nations is rife with scandal, corruption, hypocrisy, and missed opportunity. Clearly there are bright and committed people at the U.N., and I applaud them. But others with less laudable motives often hijack the U.N. mission, its programs, and undermine the vital missions of the United Nations.

Those of us who believe the U.N. can and must do better refuse to accept the status quo. Business as usual just does not cut it. The Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005 injects real and measurable accountability into the United Nations, and that is exceedingly important in a myriad of areas including the area of peacekeeping operations and in human rights.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his great leadership on this and on so many human rights issues around the world. This is important legislation. I hope the body will support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in wholehearted endorsement in echoing of all of the words of praise that have been directed toward the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations. I have known the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) to not only be gentlemanly and eloquent, but fair-minded and bipartisan in a substantial number of efforts, and I, like all of our colleagues here, deeply appreciate the work that he has done on behalf of this Nation and indeed this world throughout the course of his career, and I compliment him in that regard.

I also accept the chastisement of the distinguished Chair with reference to rhetoric, but I would urge that some of the rhetoric that I may have used is rhetoric that I learned here in the House of Representatives that has been used on both sides of the aisle much too often, in my judgment.

That said, I would like not to be an apologist for the United Nations. The United Nations needs to be reformed, and I think that it could be put better by the words of Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns, whom I quoted when I began. I further quote him in saying that it is more important to press for structural reforms. I think Ambassador Burns is absolutely mindful of what all of us are. The gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE); the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member; the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), his colleague in filing this measure; all of the members of the Committee on International Relations, indeed all the Members of this body recognize that the United Nations has problems. But if we are in the business of using this as precedent, then we would not want to establish a precedent where using the hammer, as the gentleman from Indiana referred to the monetary withholding as being the hammer, to cause people to undertake to do what we say. Then we establish that as a precedent, and we look up next month, 2 months from now, another country comes forward. We are not the only dues payor, we are the largest dues payor to the United Nations. So someone else that decides that it should reform in a way more likely to comport with their government's understandings could use this as a precedent. I do not think that that is a good thing. I do not think that is good policymaking, and I have tried to make that clear.

Let me give the Members the analogy by way of an exact example. I happen to be the president of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. It is the first time that an American has been the president, and we are holding the Assembly's conference here in Washington, D.C., and I thank the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate for the extraordinary effort that they have put in allowing that this Assembly be undertaken in appropriate fashion in a bipartisan way. Secretary Rice is one of the featured speakers at that Assembly.

I raise it only for this reason, and I see the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, who is the Chair of the Helsinki House side of the same Assembly that I am talking

about. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) can relate to what I am about to say, and I ask the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) to do so as well.

More than a year ago, the governing side of the OSCE was met with threats from the country Russia. And we agree even today that transparency and accountability in that organization is critical. They hold most of their undertakings behind closed doors. They operate on the consensus rule, and it primarily stagnates the mission of the OSCE. But Russia said that unless the United States paid more dues, interestingly enough in this particular instance, and that they paid less dues, and that reform measures that they were seeking were implemented, that they would withhold their dues from the OSCE. It did not stop the organization from running. It is not going to stop the Assembly from taking place here in Washington, D.C., July 1 through July 5. But what it did was that threat caused turmoil inside the organization that is in need of reform, and I think we run into the same kind of measure here in this particular proposal.

Listen, Madeleine Albright and John Danforth, Richard Holbrooke and Jeane Kirkpatrick are nobody's rookies, and they are not naive when it comes to what is needed. Thomas Pickering and Bill Richardson and Donald McHenry and Andrew Young, all eight of these individuals were people that served as our Ambassadors under Republican and Democratic administrations to the United Nations, and during that entire period of time, each of them in their own way contributed to meaningful reform. All of them have said, The need for United Nations reform is clear, but we urge that you carefully consider this legislation because it will not, it will not, do the necessary reforms at the U.N.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kindness and flexibility of my good friend from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the rule and the Henry J. Hyde U.N. Reform Act, and just as proud to rise in tribute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

When the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) feels something needs fixing, we had better take notice and know it needs fixing.

We need an organization of nations that cares about human rights, but we need a united group of nations that believes more in the rights of individuals than it believes that the right of individuals is to plunder others.

It should be noticed that at a time when the United Nations' reputation for truth, justice, and following its own rules is at an all-time low, it should be doing everything it can to bring information to light, whether it is good or bad. If the U.N. leadership, however, spent half the time lining the fabric of freedom than it has been lining the pockets of friends and family, then this would be approaching utopia. That is not the case.

Last month there was an investigator who had something called a conscience. He wanted to come forward with information. What did the U.N. do? They hired attorneys to have an injunction to keep us from knowing the truth.

It is time to be united and holding the United Nations accountable. Support the rule on the Henry H. Hyde bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Committee on Rules for yielding me this 1 minute.

I grew up in the Deep South in the late 1950s. Every other billboard in the South, in my part of Georgia, said, ''Get out of the United Nations.'' I did not think that was correct then, and I do not feel that way now. In fact, maybe we should have joined the League of Nations and we would never have had World War II. But if there is ever a time to reform an organization, it is absolutely now.

I am proud to support the rule and the bill, H.R. 2745, the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005.

The gentleman from California earlier talked about the Ten Commandments and the fact that we are burdening the U.N. with these 39 commandments. But really what he is suggesting is that they are not commandments at all. They become suggestions. It does not really matter, the number.

□ 1730

I think we need some teeth in this reform, and that is what the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act does. I am fully supportive. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this, and let us straighten out that organization.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity for having had a very quality debate here today. It is interesting to note once again that the ranking member and the chairman have said the need for reform is obvious. There is no disagreement on that point. It is seemingly the mechanism of doing that.

Once again I point out that in 1985, 1994 and 1999, this House set precedent by doing the exact same concept that is there. And it is true that maybe I have heard a new concept here that I do not need to make all Ten Commandments to get to heaven, but I also know that when I was in my classroom and I put high standards and high expectations, my kids met those standards; and if I wavered, then they wavered at the same time.

This is a good piece of legislation. It is an excellent rule, and I urge its adoption and passage of the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2745.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HENRY J. HYDE UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2745.

The Chair designates the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1733

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2745) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce that I am terribly flattered by the extravagant things that have been said, but I must confess I did not name this bill after myself. While I deeply appreciate the honor, I am a trifle embarrassed, not thoroughly embarrassed, but a trifle.

Mr. Chairman, most informed people agree that the U.N. is in desperate need of reform. Corruption is rampant, as evidenced by the ever-expanding Oil-for-Food scandal. U.N. peacekeepers have sexually abused children in Bosnia, the Congo, Sierra Leone and other