

ago, before I came to this House, we will see the same pillaging occur with individuals who represent Central American countries, particularly young women. The pattern does not change.

In my visit there 2 years ago, I had a chance to see women outside at 5 o'clock in the morning, over 300 women lining up to enter into these maquilas, these assembly plants, if you will, in free trade zones that were set up in El Salvador and Nicaragua. In El Salvador they were lined up to begin their work of 12 to maybe 14 hours a day, gaining maybe less than \$30 a week, living far from their families in areas that would not provide them with decent housing or even sanitation. And I am concerned because when we talk as a country, a great Nation protecting the rights of our workers here, we also set an example for those individuals that represent other foreign countries when we say we want to open up fair trade agreements.

In my opinion, this is not an agreement that I support. I can tell you by hearing from people there firsthand that have told me that they do not believe that they are going to reap any benefits; that the profits will go to the big corporations, whether they are U.S. or other foreign entities. That money, I do not believe, will stay there to help restabilize and provide infrastructure, clinics, education and decent housing for the people that will be working there for many years to come.

In fact, what we have seen occur in Mexico is that, yes, we set up our maquiladoras there along the border in an area like Ciudad Juarez, and soon we found that they could go for cheaper labor by leaving there, almost half of those maquilas, and transporting their factories to China where they could get a lower cost for wage labor and provide less protections for people in the workplace. Meanwhile, those products are coming back to this country.

My question is, why is it that this country feels somehow that it is good to provide incentives for big corporations who do not pay taxes here and allow for the squalor and mistreatment of people in an inhumane way abroad, yet we are supposed to be setting an example?

□ 1945

I know that the President a year ago introduced this proposal, and he has yet to bring it up because I understand that his own party is not in support. He has many Members that are very reluctant to support CAFTA because we have seen a number of jobs, over 750,000, that have left this country. In my district alone during NAFTA, we lost more than 1,000 jobs, many in the textile and agricultural industry, many of those low-paying jobs that were held by Latinos.

So when I think about CAFTA, I think about what is going to happen again to those individuals in this country, people who are right now trying to

make a living and will see soon their jobs leave this country and go abroad. What will they then be left with holding the bag?

All I can tell everyone is that there are many of us here, including the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, 14 members, a good majority of our Members, who voted against CAFTA, and I hope that everyone here is paying attention because we are not just speaking from our own districts, but we are talking also about individuals representing those different countries who have come here on different pilgrimages to come and talk and inform us as legislators. They too will be here this week to talk to us about what they see in terms of the wrongness about this CAFTA agreement.

And I hope that Members in our party as well as the other side of the aisle will come to some reason that we could maybe put this aside and maybe renegotiate this whole effort because I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are heading down a wrong path. I do not want to see any more of our jobs leaving and then bringing about what I would call a suppression of the workforce in those Central American countries, particularly when it affects women. When we see 14- and 15-year-old women having to work for 14 and maybe 16 hours a day, 6 days a week, not being able to go to school, not having any health care coverage, not having a decent wage to help support their own families, then I have to ask the question why are we heading down that path? And that is something that I truly believe my constituents support me on, and I have heard from them as well. We had a forum at Cal State Los Angeles recently where we had ten individual witnesses speak, and there is a resounding no for CAFTA.

So I would urge my colleagues to pay attention and to heed the concerns that we have here in the Congress such as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and other Members that have been leading the cause.

THE UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Members about the United Nations Reform Act of 2005, which the House will be considering on Thursday of this week. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), whose skillful leadership was essential in both crafting and moving this important bill through committee, and I would like to thank the House leadership, whose commitment and support to this legislation of global importance has been critical to moving it swiftly to the House floor for consideration.

The United Nations Reform Act of 2005, Mr. Speaker, aims to institute long-overdue U.N. reforms by addressing and correcting the numerous scandals and institutional failings that have characterized the United Nations, a flawed structure that gives rise to discrimination and negligence at best, and corruption, profiteering, and collusion at worst.

The Oil-for-Food scandal is a primary example of these failings. As a result of the mismanagement of the contracts, out right graft and corruption when the administration of the Oil-for-Food program by the U.N. staff and by Saddam Hussein was implemented, it not only made a mockery of the humanitarian aid program, but it collected an estimated \$20 billion while the U.N. turned its head. Yet the Oil-for-Food program is but one example of an institution that is rife with financial scandal.

Some other notable examples include in 1995, for example, scandal consumed the Kenya office of UNICEF, the U.N. body created to provide assistance to the world's disadvantaged children, when that office defrauded or squandered up to \$10 million in agency funds. Another example, in 1996, a senior U.N. official at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the body providing technical assistance for the least developed countries, was investigated on suspicion of embezzling between \$200,000 and \$600,000.

Another example, in 1997, 16 past or present employees of the United Nations Development Programme, which was created to help countries design and carry out development programs in poverty eradication, employment creation, and sustainable livelihoods, they were placed under investigation after more than \$6 million was siphoned off over an 8-year period.

To combat these deficiencies, the United Nations Reform Act before us this week has built in budget certification requirements, accountability provisions to address the mismanagement and the corruption, including: holding the United Nations Secretary General accountable to certify that the United Nations' budget is maintained at the approved level; two, requiring that the U.N. budget be more transparent by requiring more details on the budget categories; three, creating an Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Board of External Auditors, including the ability to appoint a special investigator and staff to investigate matters involving senior United Nations officials and also creating an Office of Ethics which will be responsible for creating and managing a code of ethics for all United Nations employees, including education and annual training and publishing of U.N. staff salaries.

The scandals involving U.N. peacekeeping are even more horrible than these. One example, Mr. Speaker, while

I finish this Special Order, of these terrible crimes is appalling and unacceptable, but, unbelievable, the appearances of crimes involving sexual misconduct on the part of U.N. peacekeepers over the past decade have become frequent to include incidents of, for example, the Congo, where the U.N. peacekeepers and civilian personnel stand accused of widespread exploitation in a sexual manner of refugees; two, Burundi, where two U.N. peacekeepers were suspended following allegations of sexual misconduct; three, Sierra Leone, where U.N. peacekeepers were accused by Human Rights Watch of systematic rape of women; and, four, Bosnia, where the U.N. police mission was accused of misconduct, of corruption, and sexual trafficking.

This is just horrendous. The U.N. repeatedly and reportedly quashed an investigation into involvement of U.N. police in enslavement of Eastern European women in Bosnian brothels.

In response, the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, is going to have some provision to deter these horrible incidents and bring a level of respect to the United Nations, and I hope that our colleagues will support this Hyde bill this week.

Among others, it includes provisions that mandate the: adoption of a minimum standard of qualifications for senior leaders and managers; adoption of a uniform Code of Conduct which applies equally to all personnel serving in U.N. peacekeeping operations regardless of category or rank; written acknowledgement by personnel sent as peacekeepers that misconduct may include immediate termination of participation in an operation; and establishment of a permanent, professional, and independent investigative body dedicated to United Nations peacekeeping.

It is monstrous that an international organization charged with operating peacekeeping missions around the world and with assisting nations to rebuild after major turmoil has experienced an alarming number of scandals involving sexual exploitation, rape, sex trafficking, misconduct, harassment, and other criminal acts.

However, not only has systemic mismanagement and corruption been a recurring characteristic of the United Nations, but the U.N. organization is being corroded by discrimination against Israel and anti-Semitism as never before.

The viciousness with which Israel continues to be attacked at the U.N., and the reluctance of Member states to defend Israel or to accord it the same treatment as other countries, suggests that there is a considerable anti-Semitic component behind the policies pursued in U.N. forums.

In addition to multiple manifestations of anti-Semitism at the U.N., the most notorious being the 1975 U.N. General Assembly resolution equating Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, with racism, Israel continues to be subject to debilitating forms of discrimination within that organization.

Israel is not allowed to present candidacies for open seats in any U.N. body, is not able to compete for major U.N. bodies, and cannot participate in U.N. conferences on human rights, racism and a number of other issues.

By contrast, there are several U.N. groups devoted to "Palestinian Rights," and a disproportionate representation of Palestinian issues through different committees and commissions.

This Act seeks to end discrimination against Israel in the United Nations system and ensure fairness and objectivity in the United Nations' handling of Israeli-Palestinian issues by: expanding WEOG to afford Israel permanent membership in this group with full rights and privileges; mandating a State Department review and assessment of the work performed by the various United Nations commissions, committees, and offices focusing exclusively on the Palestinian agenda, followed by the submission of a report recommending areas for reform, including proposals for the elimination by the U.N. of such duplicative entities and efforts; and withholding proportional U.S. contributions to the United Nations until such time as the recommendations are implemented.

The Commission on Human Rights and its feeder body, ECOSOC, are also emblematic of these deficiencies within the U.N. system.

There remains great difficulty in securing support for condemnations of gross human rights violators, when the worst offenders sit on the actual Committee, dictate the agenda and block any meaningful resolutions from being adopted.

Yet, there have been few condemnations and measures, if any, addressing the continuing gross human rights violations by serial abusers such as Iran and Syria.

While gross human rights offenders such as Syria, Libya, Iran, and Saudi Arabia have been members of this U.N. human rights body, these regimes have not been censured, condemned, or held accountable in any way for their deplorable human rights record.

In response, among other provisions, this Act stipulates that: a Member State that fails to uphold the values embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or are under U.N. Security Council sanctions be ineligible for membership on any United Nations human rights body; secret voting in the Economic and Social Council should be abolished, and a recorded vote must be conducted to determine such membership of the Commission; and countries that meet that criteria should be ineligible for membership on the Commission.

Similarly at the IAEA we remain concerned that serial proliferators continue to be accorded full rights and responsibilities within this organization.

A few years ago, proliferators such as Iran and Iraq, who was under Security Council sanctions at the time, were scheduled to serve as Chairs of the Conference on Disarmament.

Iran, a nation who continues to be under investigation by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) due to its breaches and failures of its safeguards obligations, served on the Board of Governors of the IAEA.

Countries who are in non-compliance of their obligations under international agreements and in violation of the rules that serve as the basis for individual U.N. bodies, cannot and must not be entrusted with the enforcement of those very rules and obligations.

This Act addresses these and other concerns by seeking the establishment of: an Office of Compliance and Enforcement within the Secretariat of the IAEA to function as an independent body of technical experts that will as-

sess the activities of Member States and recommend specific penalties for those that are in breach or violation of their obligations; and a Special Committee on Safeguards and Verification to advise the IAEA Board of Governors on additional measures necessary to enhance the agency's ability to detect undeclared activities by member nations.

Furthermore, it seeks the suspension of privileges for Member States that are under investigation, or are in breach or non-compliance of their obligations, and seeks to establish Membership criteria that would keep such rogue states as Iran and Syria from serving on the IAEA Board of Governors.

The IAEA section of this Act reinforces U.S. priorities concerning the safety of nuclear materials and counter proliferation by: calling for U.S. voluntary contributions to the IAEA to primarily be used to fund activities relating to Nuclear Security or Nuclear Verification and inspections; by seeking to prioritize funding for inspection to focus on countries of proliferation concern; by seeking to prevent states-sponsors of terrorism, proliferations, and countries under IAEA investigation from benefiting from certain IAEA assistance programs.

The United Nations Reform Act of 2005 also ensures transparency in the IAEA budget process by calling for a detailed breakdown of expenditures.

The U.N. is accountable to neither taxpayers nor voters.

As a safeguard, the United Nations Reform Act of 2005 targets crucial areas of the U.N. organization to ensure that U.S. taxpayer money hauled off to Turtle Bay is spent in an efficient, transparent, and accountable manner.

Additionally, the bill empowers the Administration to fix the U.N. by making it very clear that U.S. funding to that body will be drastically cut unless the U.N. takes the appropriate actions to save itself.

I look forward to Thursday's debate and ask my colleagues to render their full support to this much-needed legislation.

CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at a White House news conference 2 weeks ago, President Bush called on Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement this summer. Last week in this Chamber, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most powerful Republican in the House, promised a vote by July 4. Well, he actually promised a vote last year, and then he promised a vote again in May, but this time he means it, I think, and we are going to actually vote on this by July 4.

I am joined tonight by the gentleman from Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from Toledo, Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), two of my colleagues from my State; and there will be the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and others coming along later.