

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IT'S TIME TO DIVERSIFY THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1996

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, as the 104th Congress comes to an end, it may be time to again address the issue of United Nations reform. Earlier this Congress the new Republican majority attempted to gut America's commitment to the United Nations under the guise of reforming that institution. Their attempt went too far, and it was wisely rejected by the Senate and by the Clinton administration. But the need to reform the United Nations is still as present today as it was last year. Indeed, in early 1993 President Clinton announced his own plans for U.N. reform.

As soon as it took office, the Clinton administration signaled that, for the first time, America would actively promote the restructuring of the United Nations Security Council to recognize the emerging power realities of the 21st century. It boldly advanced a plan and pressed for U.N. action by 1995. The administration's laudable goal was to make the Council look more like the rest of the world.

Today, the administration plan for Security Council restructuring is dead in the water, a victim of bureaucratic infighting and a diminution of the image of the United Nations in the eyes of many Americans. President Clinton deserves credit for moving the issue of Council restructuring to the front burner. His predecessors had stonewalled growing pressures for reform, hoping to continue indefinitely the cozy arrangements of 1945 that gave the five victorious powers of World War II permanent seats and a veto in the Council.

But a half-century later, those five countries no longer have the collective dominance to maintain world security on their own. The empires of Britain, France, and Soviet Russia have all dissolved. The U.S. share of world economic output has been halved, from 50 percent in 1945 to 26 percent today, though America remains a military giant. Only China has grown in relative standing, but it is still essentially a non-contributor to world peace and security.

The defeated Axis countries have rebounded in economic and political influence, and leading developing countries such as India, Egypt, Brazil, and Pakistan have become frequent contributors to U.N. peace operations. As we increasingly rely on a complex mix of peacekeeping forces, economic sanctions, and occasional military enforcement to maintain international security, it has become more and more important for the Security Council to include this next tier of states with significant military, economic, and political resources.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time again to consider restructuring the Security Council.

Neither the United States nor the world at large needs to add more veto-wielding mem-

bers to the Security Council. The Council does not need more countries that can gum up decisionmaking with a veto, or to impede American-led initiatives to protect our global allies. If anything, it needs fewer. And Americans have had enough experience with China's subtle linkage of its Security Council veto power to bilateral Sino-American relations to want to invite more countries to play that kind of game.

For their part, the developing countries have made it clear they will not allow veto power on the Council to be tilted even more heavily toward the Northern industrial countries. But the proposed solution of many—adding some large developing countries as permanent members with veto power—would make the Security Council virtually unworkable.

It would be preposterous to grant Nigeria—or India, Brazil, Pakistan, or even Germany or Japan—a veto over Council decisions. None of them has the power in the real world to take decisive action beyond their borders, or to prevent the major powers from taking such action. Moreover, each of these regional actors is distrusted by the smaller countries in its region.

But it is equally preposterous to simply assume that we can continue to control the United Nations with a small group of nations that reflect neither the current and future centers of global power, nor the reality of ethnic and religious diversity. The Clinton administration had the right idea: we need to make the Security Council look more like the rest of the world, and we need to do it sooner rather than later.

This could be accomplished by expanding the Council's regional representation.

One way of expanding the Council by region is by calculating which two or three states in each region make the most substantial contribution to U.N. peace operations, and for a seat for each region to rotate between those states. The criteria for making this calculation would include their U.N. financial contributions; the number of troops and other military assets they provide and precommit to U.N. peace operations; their participation in U.N. arms control treaties; and their adherence to recognized human rights standards.

An ancillary benefit of this reform plan is that it would broaden the representation of the world's major ethnic and religious groups in the Security Council. Currently, only the Christian faith is represented; China, whose population is predominantly Buddhist, is represented by an ideologically secular government. By opening up the Council to regional representation the important voices of the Jewish, Islamic, and Hindu community would also be heard during critical deliberations on international crises. While not a central element for the United Nations, religion has become a growing undercurrent to many of its challenges and conflicts. Perhaps, by indirectly providing a voice for diverse religious beliefs, the United Nations may be better able to resolve particularly difficult and longstanding conflicts.

Because Israel is not a member of a friendly regional bloc, I propose that Israel be given

permanent status on the Security Council. Many Middle East countries are, in varying degrees, hostile to the State of Israel, and would thus not represent its interests in the Council to the degree an African, Asian, or Latin American nation might represent its neighbors. In an expanded Security Council with greater regional representation, Israel would only be protected by having a permanent voice in the Council's deliberations.

On its merits, this framework gives the Council the benefit of regular participation by ten major states at the price of only six new seats. It avoids new vetoes. And with one exception, it does not lock in by name states whose influence or contributions may decline in the future. And, perhaps most important, it stabilizes the Security Council by making it more reflective of the world's ethnic, religious, and economic realities.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the 105th Congress convenes, the issue of United Nations reform will be a top priority.

TRIBUTE TO THE VILLAGE OF SAG HARBOR ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1996

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Village of Sag Harbor, an historic seaside village on the South Fork of Long Island that is celebrating its 150th anniversary this year.

It is my great hope that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in honoring this bucolic maritime port with a heritage as long and rich as America's. Settled in 1707, Sag Harbor and its residents have borne witness to nearly every significant event in this Nation's history. Strategically situated on Long Island's South Fork, with an ideal harbor that was home to a fleet of whaling ships in the 1800's, this village has pioneered many developments and milestones that have made America great.

During its 3 centuries, this colonial-era village has been first among its peers in many ways. Our Nation's first President, George Washington, designated Sag Harbor as the first port of entry in New York State, because at the time this east end port was busier than even the New York City harbor. In 1803, Sag Harbor was the first New York village to establish a volunteer fire department and in 1859 it was first on Long Island with gas street lights.

On March 26, 1846, the State of New York approved the act of incorporation and the first meeting of the Incorporated Village of Sag Harbor was held on May 11. The original village board included Samuel A. Seely, Lemuel W. Reeves, and John Hildreth, who was elected president of the board of trustees.

From 1760 to 1850, during the height of the whaling industry, Sag Harbor was second only

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.