

Labor Secretary Elaine Chao. Justice O'Connor swore her in for two of the positions she has held in the Federal Government, as chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission and, also, most recently, as Secretary of Labor. Through Secretary Chao, I have seen her on several occasions socially. I must say that she is an extraordinary individual. During her time on the Court, Justice O'Connor has proven herself to be a brilliant jurist and a strong defender of the Constitution. She is known for her fairness and her desire to seek practical solutions for even the most difficult decisions upon which the Court had to rule.

Justice O'Connor has proved to be an independent thinker and a vigorous questioner, narrowing in on precise legal issues with laser-like precision from the bench. She has lived up to the promise to respect the Constitution and to interpret the law judiciously, seeking the narrowest reach possible for the Court's rulings. Justice O'Connor is known for approaching each case individually, seeking to arrive at practical conclusions.

Justice O'Connor has been a great advocate for the Court. She has traveled the globe, speaking to thousands of students, lawyers, foreign dignitaries, and others on the judiciary, the Constitution, and the law. Justice O'Connor's love of this Nation, its judicial process, and the law is widely known.

In her most recent book, "Majesty of the Law, Reflections of a Supreme Court Justice," she insightfully describes the institution of the Court, its history, customs, and some of its most able members. Certainly, we will all agree that Justice O'Connor will long be remembered as one of the most distinguished persons ever to serve on the High Court. We wish her very well in her retirement.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I just found out that Sandra Day O'Connor has resigned from the Supreme Court. I think regardless of what our political persuasion is or our ideology, we all respect her for living up to her oath of office in that her presence on the Supreme Court is going to be missed by this country.

#### NOMINATION OF JOHN BOLTON

Mr. VOINOVICH. This is the third time I have come to the Senate floor to speak about the nomination of John Bolton to be the next ambassador to the United Nations. It is particularly apropos because the Senate is on the eve of going into the Fourth of July recess. The record before the Senate documents the allegations related to Mr. Bolton's lack of interpersonal skills and management style, the pattern of intimidation with intelligence analysts, and the allegations that Mr.

Bolton had a habit of cherrypicking intelligence to suit his perception of the world and his ideology.

The record has also documented Mr. Bolton's tendency to stray off message in a manner that could harm U.S. interests and his need for supervision from higher authorities to prevent him from hurting U.S. objectives. The record documents the fact that I was given assurances by the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, that Mr. Bolton would be supervised closely in his new position at the U.N. Because of these concerns—and according to other Members of the Senate, they were given the same assurances—the question we all have to ask is, Why would we send someone to the United Nations who needs supervision?

I did not come to the floor today to repeat the record, although these issues are very important to our decision to confirm Mr. Bolton as our next ambassador to the United Nations. I came to the floor to talk about why this nomination is particularly unique and why it is particularly important at this time in history that we send the right candidate to the United Nations.

The nominee that we send to the U.N. to be the face of the United States to the world community must be able to advance our objectives through diplomacy and improve the world's opinion of the United States at this critical time. America's image is in trouble. World opinion is increasingly negative when it comes to the United States. It is not limited to Muslim countries. Polls of traditional allies and nonallies reveal a dangerous rise in negative opinion since the beginning of the conflict in Iraq. The Associated Press reported that the popularity of the United States in many countries, including many in Europe, is lagging behind even Communist China.

According to the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, about two-thirds of Britain, 65 percent, saw China favorably compared with 55 percent who held a positive view of the United States. It is easy to understand why our friend, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, lost 30 seats in the Parliament.

The 9/11 Commission made this point in its report that negative opinions of the United States have a serious impact on U.S. national security objectives. The report stated that winning hearts and minds through public diplomacy is just as critical to the war on terrorism as other tools, such as military assets and intelligence. I know I am not the only American who is disturbed by these numbers. The allegations and the criticism do not reflect the facts and are in no way fair to the United States of America. Our country is a decent, generous country that has sacrificed a great deal for our brothers and sisters throughout the world. Our men and women have sacrificed their lives in many wars and peacekeeping operations so that others could be free from oppression and free to pursue happiness.

In Iraq, the deaths of over 1,700 Americans and the injuries borne by almost 13,000 Americans bear witness to this sacrifice. But the fact is, we have to do a better job of getting our message out.

Our President, who made an outstanding case for our need to stay the course in Iraq the other night, has stated on a number of occasions that we need to improve our public diplomacy, and he has been very successful in pushing forward that agenda in recent months. As I mentioned before, the President has nominated Karen Hughes to head up his public diplomacy efforts at the State Department, understanding that it is going to take a talented individual to get the job done. He has also been very successful in strengthening relationships with key allies in the last several months.

The President has been very clear about the importance of diplomacy in dealing with the world and the most pressing national security issues. During the President's May 31 press conference at the White House, just a month ago, he stated:

The best way to solve any difficult situation is through diplomacy.

In response to questions about Iran, the President stated that U.S. policy is to let diplomacy work its way and to solve the problem with diplomacy, working with the EU-3, France, Great Britain, and Germany.

In response to questions about North Korea, the President said:

We want diplomacy to work.

Repeating:

We want diplomacy to be given a chance to work.

And that is exactly the position of the Government.

Based on these statements, there is no doubt that U.S. national security strategy is going to rely on diplomacy for the months ahead, and our ambassador to the United Nations must have the ability to implement this Presidential strategy.

I recently spoke with Comptroller General David Walker who heads the Government Accountability Office and is an expert on change in governmental organizations and how one achieves reform in a governmental organization. He said that in order to be successful on reform, you need someone who respects the institution to be reformed and who is respected by the institution.

In a March 2005 article in the Los Angeles Times, it was reported that Mr. Bolton was asked why he opposed offering incentives to North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons program.

Mr. Bolton stated, "I don't do carrots."

Any competent diplomat knows you need both a carrot and a stick to be successful. One would assume by that statement that Mr. Bolton's mode of diplomacy is solely through carrying a big stick.

I will read a few quotes of many Mr. Bolton has spoken over the years:

There's no such thing as the United Nations.

If the U.N. Secretary Building in New York lost 10 stories, it wouldn't make a difference.

Not only do I not care about losing the General Assembly vote, but actually see it as a "make my day" outcome.

Most recently, in answering a question from Juan Williams from National Public Radio, Mr. Bolton said:

If I were redoing the Security Council today, I'd have one permanent member because that's the real reflection of the distribution of power in the world.

Mr. Williams queried:

And that one member would be, John Bolton?

Mr. Bolton responded:

The United States.

This is not a man who is perceived to respect the U.N. and who will be respected by the institution if he goes there.

The other issue that makes this nomination particularly unique is the great opportunity we have before us to reform the United Nations. This is not an ordinary time in regard to the U.N. The U.N. has serious problems that need attention now. We all know about the flaws in the oversight system and the corruption related to the Oil for Food Program.

There are also serious problems with the general management of the U.N., the Commission on Human Rights, and the standards of conduct for U.N. peacekeepers. All of these areas require reform now.

The bipartisan U.S. task force, led by Newt Gingrich and George Mitchell, has issued a report detailing several recommendations for reforming the U.N. and calling for action.

The report notes that without a renewed and more effective United Nations, the challenges to international security, development, and general well-being will be all the greater because, as the report states, "an effective U.N. is in American interests."

The opportunity to finally reform the U.N. is even greater now because we have the support of U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan. He finally gets it, Mr. President.

In an article in *Foreign Affairs Journal* and in a recent article in the *Wall Street Journal*, Kofi Annan stated, "The desire for change is widespread, not only in the U.S., but among many member-states, and also many U.N. staff."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED WE STAND  
(By Kofi A. Annan)

This Sunday marks the 60th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter in 1945. Debate about "reform" of the U.N. has been raging almost from that moment on.

This is because—especially but not only in the United States—idealism and aspiration for the U.N. have always outstripped its actual performance. For 60-years Americans—

conservative and liberal alike—have expected much from the U.N. Too often, we have failed to meet those expectations.

In Washington, the debate now centers on two documents which appeared last week: the report of the bipartisan Task Force led by former Speaker Newt Gingrich and former Senator George Mitchell, and the Henry J. Hyde United Nations Reform Act, adopted by the House of Representatives.

There is considerable overlap between the two prescriptions, as there is between both and the reforms that I myself have proposed—or, where they are within my power, am already implementing. That is not surprising. The desire for change is widespread, not only in the U.S., but among many other U.N. member-states, and also many U.N. staff.

All of us want to make the U.N.'s management more transparent and accountable, and its oversight mechanisms stronger and more independent.

All of us would like the General Assembly to streamline its agenda and committee structure, so that time and resources are devoted to the burning issues of the day, rather than to implementing resolutions passed years ago in a different political context.

All of us are eager to make the U.N.'s human rights machinery more credible and more authoritative, notably by replacing the present Commission on Human Rights with a Human Rights Council, whose members would set an example by applying the standards they are charged to uphold.

All of us would like to see a Peacebuilding Commission created within the U.N., to coordinate and sustain the work of helping countries make the transition from war to peace—so that we do not repeat the dangerous relapse into anarchy that we witnessed in Afghanistan before 2001 and more recently in Haiti, as well as several African countries.

And all of us want to impose stricter standards of conduct on U.N. peacekeeping missions, especially to put an end to sexual abuse and exploitation.

Those are some examples, among many. I believe this convergence of expectations offers us—perhaps for the first time in 60 years—a chance to bridge the gap between aspiration and performance.

Where there are differences—not so much between the U.N. and the U.S., but between the Hyde Act and the other proposals on offer—these relate essentially to two points: the method to be used to make reform happen, and the global context which makes U.N. reform so important.

For Mr. Hyde and his colleagues, reform can only be brought about by threatening a draconian and unilateral cut in the U.S. contribution to the U.N. budget.

I believe that approach is profoundly mistaken and would, if adopted by the U.S. government as whole, prove disastrously counterproductive. It would break the reformist coalition between the U.S. and other member-states whose collective pressure could otherwise make these reforms happen.

The U.N. is an association of sovereign states, which agreed, when they ratified the Charter, to share the expenses of the Organization "as apportioned by the General Assembly." The scale of assessment, which determines the share borne by each member-state, is renegotiated every six years; and every year the General Assembly passes a resolution—invariably supported by the U.S.—enjoining all members to pay their contributions promptly, in full and without conditions.

The way to make changes or reforms, therefore, is to negotiate agreement with other member-states.

As the Gingrich-Mitchell task force put it, "to be successful, American diplomacy must

build a strong coalition including key member-states from various regions and groups . . . many of whom share America's strong desire to reform the United Nations into an organization that works." Such a coalition will not be built by one nation threatening to cut its own contribution unilaterally. Other states will not accept such a "big stick" approach.

Fortunately, the Hyde withholding proposal is not backed by the administration, or indeed by the task force.

Even more important, however, is the global context The U.N. does not exist in a vacuum, or for its own sake. It is a forum in which all the world's peoples can come together to find common solutions to their common problems—and, when they so choose, also an instrument with which to pursue those solutions.

There are surely more shared global problems and threats today, or anyway not fewer, than when the U.N. was founded.

Among the most worrying are the proliferation of terrorist groups and weapons of mass destruction, and the danger that the latter will fall into the hands of the former.

Those are very serious threats to people in rich and poor countries alike. The failure of last month's review conference on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to address them seems breathtakingly irresponsible. I hope the world's political leaders will now take up the issue, with much greater urgency.

To deal with such issues, we need, among other things, a stronger and more representative Security Council.

But the threats that seem most immediate to many people in poor countries are those of poverty, disease, environmental degradation, bad government, civil conflict, and in some cases—Darfur inevitably springs to mind—the use of rape, pillage and mass murder to drive whole populations from their homes.

We can only make progress if we address all these threats at once. No nation can reasonably expect cooperation on the things that matter to it most, unless it is prepared in return to help others with their priorities. And, as the U.N.'s own high-level reform panel pointed out, the different kinds of threats are closely interconnected. Neglect and misgovernment in Afghanistan allowed terrorists to find a haven. Chaos in Haiti caused attempted mass migration to Florida. And poor health systems in poor countries may make it easier for a disease like avian flu to spread spontaneously, or even to be spread deliberately, from one continent to another.

So development and security are connected—and both in turn are linked to human rights and the rule of law. The main purpose of my "In Larger Freedom" report was to suggest things that can and should be done, by all nations working together, to achieve progress on all these fronts and to make the U.N. a more effective instrument for doing so.

Decisions can be taken this September, when political leaders from all over the world meet at U.N. Headquarters for the 2005 world summit. Over 170 have said they will come, and President Bush is expected to be among them.

The stakes for the U.S., and for the world, could hardly be higher. The opportunity to forge a common response to common threats may not soon recur. It is in that context, and for that reason, that a reformed and strengthened U.N. is so badly needed.

"IN LARGER FREEDOM": DECISION TIME AT  
THE UN

(By Kofi Annan)

OUR SHARED VULNERABILITY

Ask a New York investment banker who walks past Ground Zero every day on her

way to work what today's biggest threat is. Then ask an illiterate 12-year-old orphan in Malawi who lost his parents to AIDS. You will get two very different answers. Invite an Indonesian fisherman mourning the loss of his entire family and the destruction of his village from the recent, devastating tsunami to tell you what he fears most. Then ask a villager in Darfur, stalked by murderous militias and fearful of bombing raids. Their answers, too, are likely to diverge.

Different perceptions of what is a threat are often the biggest obstacles to international cooperation. But I believe that in the twenty-first century they should not be allowed to lead the world's governments to pursue very different priorities or to work at cross-purposes. Today's threats are deeply interconnected, and they feed off of one another. The misery of people caught in unresolved civil conflicts or of populations mired in extreme poverty; for example, may increase their attraction to terrorism. The mass rape of women that occurs too often in today's conflicts makes the spread of HIV and AIDS all the more likely.

In fact, all of us are vulnerable to what we think of as dangers that threaten only other people. Millions more of sub-Saharan Africa's inhabitants would plunge below the poverty line if a nuclear terrorist attack against a financial center in the United States caused a massive downturn in the global economy. By the same token, millions of Americans could quickly become infected if, naturally or through malicious intent, a new disease were to break out in a country with poor health care and be carried across the world by unwitting air travelers before it was identified.

No nation can defend itself against these threats entirely on its own. Dealing with today's challenges—from ensuring that deadly weapons do not fall into dangerous hands to combating global climate change, from preventing the trafficking of sex slaves by organized criminal gangs to holding war criminals to account before competent courts—requires broad, deep, and sustained global cooperation. States working together can achieve things that are beyond what even the most powerful state can accomplish by itself.

Those who drew up the charter of the United Nations in 1945 saw these realities very clearly. In the aftermath of World War II, which claimed the lives of 50 million people, they established at the San Francisco conference in 1945 an organization (in the words of the charter) to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." Their purpose was not to usurp the role of sovereign states but to enable states to serve their peoples better by working together. The UN's founders knew that this enterprise could not be narrowly conceived because security, development, and human rights are inextricably linked. Thus they endowed the new world organization with broad ambitions: to ensure respect for fundamental human rights, to establish conditions under which justice and the rule of law can be maintained, and, as the charter says, "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom."

When the UN Charter speaks, of "larger freedom," it includes the basic political freedoms to which all human beings are entitled. But it also goes beyond them, encompassing what President Franklin Roosevelt called "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear." Both our security and our principles have long demanded that we push forward all these frontiers of freedom, conscious that progress on one depends on and reinforces progress on the others. In the last 60 years, rapid technological advances, increasing economic interdependence, globalization, and

dramatic geopolitical change have made this imperative only more urgent. And since the attacks of September 11, 2001, people everywhere have come to realize this. A new insecurity entered every mind, regardless of wealth or status. More clearly than ever before, we understand that our safety, our prosperity indeed, our freedom—is indivisible.

#### A NEW SAN FRANCISCO MOMENT

Yet precisely when these challenges have become so stark, and when collective action has become so plainly required, we see deep discord among states. Such dissonance discredits our global institutions. It allows the gap between the haves and the have-nots, the strong and the weak, to grow. It sows the seeds of a backlash against the very principles that the UN was set up to advance. And by inviting states to pursue their own solutions, it calls into question some of the fundamental principles that have, however imperfectly, buttressed the international order since 1945.

Future generations will not forgive us if we continue down this path. We cannot just muddle along and make do with incremental responses in an era when organized crime syndicates seek to smuggle both sex slaves and nuclear materials across borders; when whole societies are being laid waste by AIDS; when rapid advances in biotechnology make it all too feasible to create "designer bugs" immune to current vaccines; and when terrorists, whose ambitions are very plain, find ready recruits among young men in societies with little hope, even less justice, and narrowly sectarian schools. It is urgent that our world unite to master today's threats and not allow them to divide us and thus master us.

In recent months, I have received two wide-ranging reviews of our global challenges: one from the 16-member High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, which I had asked to make proposals to strengthen our collective security system; the other from 250 experts who undertook the UN Millennium Project and devised a plan to cut global poverty in half within the next ten years. Both reports are remarkable as much for their hardheaded realism as for their bold vision. Having carefully studied them, and, extensively consulted UN member states, I have just placed before the world's governments my own blueprint for a new era of global cooperation and collective action.

My report, entitled "In Larger Freedom," calls on states to use the summit of world leaders that will be held at UN headquarters in September to strengthen our collective security, lay down a truly global strategy for development, advance the cause of human rights and democracy in all nations, and put in place new mechanisms to ensure that these commitments are translated into action. Accountability—of states to their citizens, of states to one another, of international institutions to their members, and of this present generation to future ones—is essential for our success. With that in mind, the UN must undergo the most sweeping overhaul of its 60-year history. World leaders must recapture the spirit of San Francisco and forge a new world compact to advance the cause of larger freedom.

#### FREEDOM FROM FEAR

The starting point for a new consensus should be a broad view of today's threats. These dangers include not just international wars but also civil violence, organized crime, terrorism, and weapons of mass destruction. They also include poverty, infectious disease, and environmental degradation, since these ills can also have catastrophic consequences and wreak tremendous damage. All of these can undermine states as the basic units of the international system.

All states—strong and weak, rich and poor—share an interest in having a collective security system that commits them to act cooperatively against a broad array of threats. The basis of such a system must be a new commitment to preventing latent threats from becoming imminent and imminent threats from becoming actual, as well as an agreement on when and how force should be used if preventive strategies fail.

Action is required on many fronts, but three of them stand out as particularly urgent. First, we must ensure that catastrophic terrorism never becomes a reality. In that case, we must make use of the unique normative strength, global reach, and convening power of the UN. To start, a comprehensive convention against terrorism should be developed. The UN has been central in helping states negotiate and adopt 12 international antiterrorism conventions, but a comprehensive convention outlawing terrorism in all its forms has so far eluded us because of debates on "state terrorism" and the right to resist occupation. It is time to put these debates aside. The use of force by Most lawyers recognize that the provision includes the right to take preemptive action against an imminent threat; it needs no reinterpretation or rewriting. Yet today we also face dangers that are not imminent but that could materialize with little or no warning and might culminate in nightmare scenarios if left unaddressed. The Security Council is fully empowered by the UN Charter to deal with such threats, and it must be ready to do so.

We must also remember that state sovereignty carries responsibilities as well as rights, including the responsibility to protect citizens from genocide or other mass atrocities. When states fail to live up to this responsibility, it passes to the international community, which, if necessary, should stand ready to take enforcement action authorized by the Security Council.

The decision to use force is never easy. To help forge consensus over when and how resort to force is appropriate, the Security Council should consider the seriousness of the threat, whether the proposed action addresses the threat, the proportionality of that proposed action, whether force is being contemplated as a last resort, and whether the benefits of using force would outweigh the costs of not using it. Balancing such considerations will not produce made-to-measure answers but should help produce decisions that are grounded in principle and therefore command broad respect.

#### LIVING IN DIGNITY

Accepting our solemn responsibility to protect civilians against massive violations of human rights is part of a larger need: to take human rights and the rule of law seriously in the conduct of international affairs. We need long-term, sustained engagement to integrate human rights and the rule of law into all the work of the UN. This commitment is as critical to conflict prevention as it is to poverty reduction, particularly in states struggling to shed a legacy of violence.

The UN, as the vehicle through which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and two international human rights covenants have been promulgated, has made an enormous contribution to human rights. But the international machinery in place today is not sufficient to ensure that those rights are upheld in practice. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights operates on a shoestring budget, with insufficient capacity to monitor the field. The high commissioner's office needs more support, both political and financial. The Security Council—

and in time, I hope, the proposed Peacebuilding Commission—should involve the high commissioner much more actively in its deliberations.

The Commission on Human Rights has been discredited in the eyes of many. Too often states seek membership to insulate themselves from criticism or to criticize others, rather than to assist in the body's true task, which is to monitor and encourage the compliance of all states with their human rights obligations. The time has come for real reform. The commission should be transformed into a new Human Rights Council. The members of this council should be elected directly by the General Assembly and pledge to abide by the highest human rights standards.

No human rights agenda can ignore the right of all people to govern themselves through democratic institutions. The principles of democracy are enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which, ever since it was adopted in 1948, has inspired constitutions in every corner of the globe. Democracy is more widely accepted and practiced today than ever before. By setting norms and leading efforts to end colonialism and ensure self-determination, the UN has helped nations freely choose their destiny. The UN has also given concrete support for elections in more and more countries: in the last year alone, it has done so in more than 20 areas and countries, including Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq, and Burundi. Since democracy is about far more than elections, the organization's work to improve governance throughout the developing world and to rebuild the rule of law and state institutions in war-torn countries is also of vital importance. Member states of the UN should now build on this record, as President George W. Bush suggested to the UN General Assembly in September 2004, by supporting a fund to help countries establish or strengthen democracy.

Of course, at the UN, democratic states sometimes have to work with nondemocratic ones. But today's threats do not stop neatly at the borders of democratic states, and just as no democratic nation restricts its bilateral relations to democracies, no multilateral organization designed to achieve global objectives can restrict its membership to them. I look forward to the day when every member state of the General Assembly is democratically governed. The UN's universal membership is a precious asset in advancing that goal. The very fact that nondemocratic states often sign on to the U.N.'s agenda opens an avenue through which other states, as well as civil society around the world, can press them to align their behavior with their commitments.

#### FREEDOM FROM WANT

Support for human rights and democracy must go hand in hand with serious action to promote development. A world in which every year 11 million children die before their fifth birthday, almost all from preventable causes, and 3 million people of all ages die of AIDS is not a world of larger freedom. It is a world that desperately needs a practical strategy to implement the Millennium Declaration on which all states solemnly agreed five years ago. The eight Millennium Development Goals that are to be achieved by 2015 include halving the proportion of people in the world who live in extreme poverty and hunger, ensuring that all children receive primary education, and turning the tide against HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other major diseases.

The urgency of taking more effective action to achieve these goals can hardly be overstated. Although the deadline is still a decade away, we risk missing it if we do not

drastically accelerate and scale up our action this year. Development gains cannot be achieved overnight. It takes time to train teachers, nurses, and engineers; to build roads, schools, and hospitals; and to grow the small and large businesses that create jobs and generate income for the poor.

The U.N. summit in September must be the time when all nations sign up not just for a declaration but also for a detailed plan of attack on deadly poverty by which all can be judged. That summit will be a moment for deeds rather than words—a moment to implement the commitments that have been made to move from the realm of aspirations to that of operations.

At the core of this plan must be the global partnership between rich and poor countries, the terms of which were set out three years ago at the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico. That historic compact was firmly grounded in the principles of mutual responsibility and mutual accountability. It reaffirmed the responsibility of each country for its own development and elicited concrete commitments from wealthy nations to support poorer ones.

In September, all developing countries should undertake to put forward, by 2006, practical national strategies to meet the Millennium Goals. Each country should map the key dimensions and underlying causes of extreme poverty, use that map to assess its needs and identify necessary public investments, and convert that assessment into a ten-year framework for action, elaborating three-to-five-year poverty-reduction strategies for the meantime.

Donors must also ensure that developing countries that put such strategies in place really do get the support they need, in the form of market access, debt relief, and official development assistance (ODA). For too long, ODA has been inadequate, unpredictable, and driven by supply rather than demand. Although such aid has been increasing since the Monterrey summit, already with noticeable results, many donors still give far less than the target of 0.7 percent of gross national income. All of them should now draw up their own ten-year strategies to meet the 0.7 percent target by 2015 and ensure that they reach 0.5 percent by 2009.

We need action on other fronts, too. On global climate change, for example, the time has come to agree on an international framework that draws in all major emitters of greenhouse gases in a common effort to combat global warming beyond the year 2012, when the Kyoto Protocol is due to expire. We need both a commitment to a new regulatory framework and far more innovative use of new technologies and market mechanisms in carbon trading. We must also learn the lesson of December's devastating tsunami, by putting in place a worldwide capability to give early warning of all natural hazards—not just tsunamis and storms, but floods, droughts, landslides, heat waves, and volcanic eruptions.

#### A RENEWED UN

If the U.N. is to be a vehicle through which states can meet the challenges of today and tomorrow, it needs major reforms to strengthen its relevance, effectiveness, and accountability. In September, decisions should be reached to make the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council more strategic in their work. Just as we contemplate creating new institutions such as a Peacebuilding Commission, we should abolish those that are no longer needed, such as the Trusteeship Council.

No reform of the U.N. would be complete, however, without Security Council reform. The council's present makeup reflects the

world of 1945, not that of the twenty-first century. It must be reformed to include states that contribute most to the organization, financially, militarily, and diplomatically, and to represent broadly the current membership of the U.N. Two models for expanding the council from 15 to 24 members are now on the table: one creates six new permanent seats and three new nonpermanent ones; the other creates nine new nonpermanent seats. Neither model expands the veto power currently enjoyed by the five permanent members. I believe the time has come to tackle this issue head on. Member states should make up their minds and reach a decision before the September summit.

Equally important is reform of the U.N. Secretariat and the wider network of agencies, funds, and programs that make up the U.N. system. Since 1997, there has been a quiet revolution at the U.N., rendering the system more coherent and efficient. But I am deeply conscious that more needs to be done to make the organization more transparent and accountable, not just to member states, but to the public on whose confidence it relies and whose interests it ultimately must serve. Recent failures have only underlined this imperative.

I am already taking a series of measures to make the U.N. Secretariat's procedures and management more open to scrutiny. But if reform is to be truly successful, the secretary-general, as chief administrative officer of the organization, must be empowered to manage it with autonomy and flexibility, so that he or she can drive through the necessary changes. The secretary-general must be able to align the organization's work program behind the kind of agenda I have outlined, once it is endorsed by member states, and not be hamstrung by old mandates and a fragmented decision-making structure that jeopardize setting a central strategic direction. When member states grant the post this autonomy and flexibility, they will have both the right and the responsibility to demand even greater transparency and accountability.

#### DECISION TIME

In calling on member states to make the most far-reaching reform in the organization's history and to come together on a range of issues where collective action is required, I do not claim that success through multilateral means is guaranteed. But I can almost guarantee that unilateral approaches will, over time, fail. I believe states have no reasonable alternative to working together, even if collaboration means taking the priorities of your partners seriously to ensure that they will take seriously your own in return—even if, as President Harry Truman said in San Francisco 60 years ago, "We all have to recognize, no matter how great our strength, that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please."

The urgency of global cooperation is now more apparent than ever. A world warned of its vulnerability cannot stand divided while old problems continue to claim the lives of millions and new problems threaten to do the same. A world of interdependence cannot be safe or just unless people everywhere are freed from want and fear and are able to live in dignity. Today, as never before, the rights of the poor are as fundamental as those of the rich, and a broad understanding of them is as important to the security of the developed world as it is to that of the developing world.

Ralph Bunche, a great American and the first U.N. official to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, once said that the U.N. exists "not merely to preserve the peace but also to make change—even radical change—possible without violent upheaval. The U.N. has no

vested interest in the status quo." Today, these words take on new significance. The U.N.'s mission of peace must bring closer the day when all states exercise their sovereignty responsibly, deal with internal dangers before these threaten their citizens and those of other states, enable and empower their citizens to choose the kind of lives they would like to live, and act with other states to meet global threats and challenges. In short, the U.N. must steer all of the world's peoples toward "better standards of life in larger freedom." The U.N. summit in September is the chance for all of us to set out on that path.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, Kofi Annan also stated there is considerable overlap between the Mitchell-Gingrich task force report and the reforms he himself is proposing, and that he is prepared to implement them.

He stated:

All of us want to make the U.N.'s management more transparent and accountable, and its oversight mechanisms stronger and more independent.

He stated:

All of us want to make the U.N.'s human rights machinery more credible . . . by replacing the present Commission on Human Rights with a Human Rights Council.

He also stated:

All of us want to impose stricter standards of conduct on U.N. peacekeeping missions, especially an end to sexual abuse and exploitation.

These statements indicate we are in a unique position with the U.N. and there is a sincere interest in reform. We have to seize this opportunity now.

When you are dealing with an organization that understands the need for reform and is echoing our objectives and is ready to cooperate, we need to send in not the "bad cop," or the guy with the "sharp elbows," or the guy who says, "I don't do carrots." We need to send the "good cop," the guy who knows how to reap the benefits of the environment for change and make it happen.

John Bolton is a bold contradiction to the efforts to improve the image of the U.S. at this critical time, as well as a contradiction to the President's efforts to ramp up public diplomacy.

John Bolton is a bold contradiction to efforts to reform the U.N. If we do not send the right person to the U.N., there is substantial risk we might lose this unprecedented and ripe opportunity to achieve important reforms.

The person we send to the U.N. will have great influence on the world's perception of the United States, our values, our decency, and will be critical to the urgent reforms that must be made at the U.N.

Our success on these issues—public diplomacy and U.N. reform—will have an enormous impact on our ability to win the war on terrorism, to promote peace in the world and, most importantly, whether we live in an America that is free from terror.

Mr. President, how many minutes do I have left?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 3½ minutes.

#### ADVERTISING FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I will comment for a couple of minutes on the very fine statement the leader made in regard to the advertising for prescription drugs. I think he made a clear statement and sends a large message to the drug companies that they have to reevaluate their advertising campaign. The statement confirms the fact to the American people that we are paying more for drugs because of those advertising costs.

I think it is particularly appropriate for us to be raising this issue at this time because this year millions of Americans—Medicare-eligible people—are going to be signing up to take advantage of the prescription drug benefits of the Medicare Modernization Act. It is very important that while they are signing up and taking advantage of this new opportunity—an opportunity that I think will make the largest improvement in public health since the advent of the Medicare Program—they don't just willy-nilly have drugs prescribed for them that they may or may not need.

I think one other point needs to be made, and that is, in this era in which we live, we all have to be our own best friend. At one time, I took Vioxx. I called my pharmacist and discussed other drugs I was taking. He told me Vioxx contributed to an increase in blood pressure. I was taking other drugs to bring down my blood pressure. I decided voluntarily that this doesn't make sense and I got off Vioxx. I lost 10 pounds. Now, once in a while when I have arthritic pain, I take a Motrin. But the fact is that all of us Members of Congress and the ordinary public have to pay a lot more attention to the drugs we are taking because, as the leader said, the side effects are significant and we have to be careful about it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

#### JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to make comments concerning our good friend, Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. It has been Catherine's and my honor to have become very close to the O'Connors.

I want to tell the Senate that I think Justice Sandra Day O'Connor is one of the most extraordinary and gracious women I have ever known. She has come to Alaska often. What most people don't know is she is a very fine fisherman. I think one of the most interesting letters I ever received in my life was the letter I received from Sandra Day after she had gone fishing to a remote fishing lodge in Alaska. She was the only woman there at the time. She fished through some rainy periods and sunny periods and gave a general

description of the joy she had being able to have the time to fish and to think as she did that. It was a real joy to read that letter.

I also asked Sandra Day O'Connor to come to Alaska and speak—she has been there many times—at the Anchorage Library. She gave a stirring address to mainly young women who were part of the Alaska State Bar Association. That evening, we had a dinner for Justice O'Connor, and her husband John asked for the privilege of introducing her. I want to tell the Senate that I think that was probably the most moving tribute I ever heard a husband deliver for his wife in my life.

Her husband John is a fine lawyer and a devoted husband. He told us a story of how he felt when Sandra Day got the call asking her if she would become a member of the Supreme Court. Sandra Day O'Connor, just 2 weeks ago, at my request, took a group of the Chinese delegates to the Senate-Chinese parliamentary conference to the Supreme Court of the United States. She took the time to take these Chinese representatives through the Court and explain our judicial process and how it is an essential function of our democracy to these delegates who came to meet to discuss issues of great importance to the nation of China and our own Nation. The way she handled those people and the gracious way in which she described the functions in the chamber, and took us to the courtroom and explained how the Court listens to the attorneys who present cases and how the Court reacts individually to statements, and the type of questions she puts to the attorneys who represent various litigants, was a most instructive session for our Chinese friends. Again, it demonstrated the depth of Sandra Day O'Connor. She is one great lady.

She has been an exemplary public servant who has made exceptional contributions not only to the Supreme Court but to our Nation. I think she will be remembered in this country as a groundbreaker, overcoming adversity and stereotypes. She was the first woman nominated to be a member of our Supreme Court.

She is a native of southeastern Arizona and she grew up on an isolated ranch owned by her parents. The ranch itself did not receive electricity or running water until she was seven. My wife's family had a similar experience living in another part of Arizona. I think that is one of the reasons we have become so close to the O'Connors.

She received her bachelor's degree in economics, magna cum laude, from Stanford University in 1950. After she received her bachelor's degree, O'Connor enrolled at Stanford Law School, graduating third in her class and serving on the Stanford Law Review. It was during law school that she met her husband, John.

After graduating from law school, she faced a tough job market as a female attorney. After having difficulty