functions of the United Nations could not be neutral in relation to the principles of the Charter. Nor could they be regarded, or allowed to be regarded, as representing representatives of their own nations. They had to represent the international community as a whole.

Here too, Hammarskjoelld based his argument on a very careful reading of the Charter itself—in this case Articles 100 and 101. Article 100 forbids the Secretary-General or any of his staff either to seek or to receive any permission, let alone assistance, from States. And Article 101 prescribes “the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity” as “the paramount consideration in the employment of the staff.”

Once again, Hammarskjoelld was arguing in the context of the Cold War, in which first one side and then the other had tried to insist on the right to be represented, within the Secretariat, by people who were loyal to its political or ideological point of view.

Again, the context has changed, and I am glad to say that States today, while extremely anxious about the maintenance of their national security and pointed to senior positions, no longer seek—or at least, not in the same way—to exercise political control over them, once appointed. But the principle of an independent international civil service, to which Hammarskjoelld was so attached, remains as important as ever. Each successive Secretary-General must be vigilant in defending it, even if, on occasion, changing times require us to depart from the letter of his views, in order to preserve the spirit.

To give just one example: Hammarskjoelld insisted that United Nations staff should have permanent appointments and expect to spend their whole career with the Organisation. That may have been appropriate in his time. It is less so now that the role of the United Nations has expanded, and more than half of our employees are serving in missions in the field. This is a development which Hammarskjoelld would surely have welcomed, since it reflects a transition from the “static conference” model to the “dynamic instrument” model which he so strongly believed in.

But what is clear is that his ideal of the United Nations as an expression of the international community, whose staff carry out decisions taken by States collectively rather than bending to the will of any one of them, is just as relevant in our times as in his. And that, of course, has very important implications for the role of the Secretary-General himself.

Hammarskjoelld pointed out that Article 99 of the Charter—which allows the Secretary-General, on his own initiative, to bring matters to the Security Council’s attention when in his view they may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security—makes him clearly a political rather than a purely administrative official.

In practice, Secretaries-General, including Hammarskjoelld, have invoked this article very sparingly. I myself have never yet found it necessary to do so. But the fact that the Secretary-General has this power could very much affect the way he is treated by the Security Council, and by the Member States in general.

Few people now question the responsibility of the Secretary-General to act politically, or to make public pronouncements on political issues.

In fact, the boot today is if anything on the other foot: I find myself called on to make official statements on almost everything that happens in the world, from marriages to the possibility of human cloning!

I do my best to satisfy this demand with due regard to the obligations of the Security Council and General Assembly. But those bodies would find it very strange if on each occasion I sought their approval before opening my mouth. Their members can, and do, take exception to some of my statements—and thank goodness they do. There must be freedom of speech for governments, as well as for international officials! But they do not question my right to make such statements, according to my own understanding of the purposes and principles of the United Nations as set out in the Charter.

No doubt Dag Hammarskjoelld would also disagree with some of the specific positions I have taken. But I suspect he would envy me the discretion I enjoy in deciding what to say. And I have no doubt he would strongly endorse the principle that the Secretary-General must strive to make himself an authentic and independent voice of the international community.

What he might not have foreseen is the way our concept of the international community has developed in recent years. In his time it was essentially a community of separate nations or peoples, for whom all practical purposes were represented by States.

So if we go back to the things about today’s world that we would have to explain to him, if he unexpectedly joined us now, probably the most difficult for him to adjust to would be the sheer complexity of a world in which individuals and groups of all kinds are constantly interacting—across borders and across oceans, economically, socially and culturally—without expecting or receiving any permission, or even assistance, from their national governments.

He might well find it difficult to identify the precise role, in such a world, of a body like the United Nations, whose Charter presupposes the division of the world into sovereign and equal States, and in which the peoples of the world are represented essentially by their governments.

He might find that difficult—and if so, he would not be alone! But I am convinced he would relish the challenge. And I am sure he would not stray from his fundamental conviction that the essential task of the United Nations is to protect the weak against the strong.

In the long term, the vitality and viability of the Organization depend on its ability to perform that task by adapting itself to the changing realities. That, I believe, is the biggest test it faces in the new century.

How would Hammarskjoelld approach that task?

First of all he would insist, quite correctly, that States are still the main holders of political authority in the world, and are likely to remain so. Indeed, the more democratic they become—the more genuinely representative of, and accountable to, their peoples the greater also will be their political legitimacy. And therefore it is entirely proper, as well as inevitable, that they will remain the political masters of the United Nations.

He would also insist, I am sure, on the continuing responsibility of States to maintain international order—and, indeed, on their collective responsibility, which their leaders solemnly recognised in last year’s Millennium Declaration, “to uphold the free of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level”.

And he might well say that, with a few but not all exceptions, the more fortunate countries in this world are not living up to that responsibility, so long as they do not fulfil their longstanding commitments to much higher levels of development assistance, to much more generous debt relief, and to duty- and quota- free access for exports from the least developed countries.

But then he would also see that his own lifetime coincided, in most countries, with the high watermark of State control over the lives of citizens. And he would see that States today generally tax and spend a smaller proportion of their citizens’ wealth than they did 40 years ago.

From this he might well conclude that we should not rely exclusively on State action to achieve our objectives on the international level.

A great deal, he would think, is likely to depend on non-State actors in the system—private companies, voluntary agencies or pressure groups, philanthropic foundations, universities and think tanks, and, of course, creative individuals.

And that thought would surely feed into his reflection on the role of the United Nations.

Can it confine itself, in the 21st century, to the role of coordinating action by States? Or should it reach out further?

Perhaps it is presumptuous of me to suggest that this would be part of Hammarskjoelld’s vision of the role of the United Nations in the 21st century—because it is, of course, my own vision.

No doubt if he were alive today he would offer us something nobler and more profound.

But I like to think, Ladies and Gentlemen, that what I have just described would find some place in it.

Thank you very much.

HONORING MS. GARLAND MILLER

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have a longstanding commitment to supporting women who venture out into the professional world. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring a constituent, Ms. Garland Miller, as a woman who has had immense success in founding and running her own company.

Ms. Miller is the President of Schoolfield and Associates, a highly successful bookkeeping and association management firm in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS
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my district. I would like to congratulate Ms. Miller, who is celebrating 25 years of business in Chevy Chase and Bethesda, Maryland. A graduate of the University of Maryland, Ms. Miller and her family have lived in my district for generations. She has over 100 clients, and employs several people. Thanks to leaders like Ms. Miller, women entrepreneurs have made great strides in the business world. She serves as a role model for other women in the business community. On behalf of my colleagues, I would like to wish Ms. Garland Miller many more successful years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED BRYANT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was inadvertently delayed getting back to Washington from my district, and as a result missed Rolcall votes 349 and 350. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both votes. As an original co-sponsor of H.R. 717, I regret being unable to cast a vote in favor of this important legislation that will have a positive effect on those children who suffer from Duchenne muscular dystrophy.

HONORING HUBERT TABOR FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to place your life in harms way in order to defend our Nation is indeed a noble and honorable action. Hubert Douglas Tabor dedicated himself by serving in World War II and is certainly worthy of the praise and admiration of this body. During the campaign in Northern Burma, Hubert placed his well-being before all else in order to ensure a victory for the Allies in that war-stricken area.

Hubert was raised on a farm in Colorado. Throughout his time there, he grew tired of horses and wished to escape from the farm life by signing up for the Army. However, after entering the Army, the Army recognized that Hubert possessed superior riding skills and was sent to Ft. Riley, Kansas to be a member of the 124th Cavalry. This unit was the last mounted cavalry in the Army and it was with the 124th that Hubert deservedly received his silver spurs due to his accomplishments in the service. Upon his relocation to Burma, his role was that of a packer.

The 124th Cavalry, teamed with the 56th Cavalry and the 613th Field Artillery Battalion, was charged with the duty of opening the Burma Road that was closed by the Japanese enemy's flank. His friend was killed in the line of duty while Hubert survived, but not without debilitating injuries.

Due to his bravery and courage, Mr. Speaker, Hubert Tabor was awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze Star. This battle was brutal, but Hubert offered his patriotism to our country and fought for its sake in Burma. I would like to take this moment to recognize the incredible sacrifices that Hubert made for our country and thank him for his service to our Flag. Hubert helped to make our country great and I extend my warmest regards and best wishes to Hubert for many years to come.

THE BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2001 (H.R. 2941)

HON. GARY G. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I introduced the "Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act of 2001 (H.R. 2941).” I would like to thank my colleagues U.S. Representative MALONEY, Chairman MIKE OXLEY and Chairwoman MARGE ROUKEMA for joining me in supporting this important measure.

The biggest barrier that cities and communities face when trying to acquire and redevelop contaminated “Brownfields” properties is their lack of access to adequate and affordable capital to carry out critical activities including site assessment, remediation planning, cleanup and initial redevelopment activities.

This legislation is designed to facilitate the provision of assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the cleanup and economic development of Brownfields.

For nearly 25 years, HUD’s Section 108 Loan Guarantee program has encouraged local economic development by giving cities access to the up-front financing needed for key site preparation and infrastructure projects that make an area ready for revitalization. This bill would, in essence, improve the ability of local governments to use HUD’s Section 108 Loan Guarantee program and the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) program to address Brownfields projects by recognizing one of the new realities of the redevelopment process—that environmental evaluation and cleanup activities have become a necessary part of the process for reusing old, often abandoned sites, and that the public sector frequently must jump start that process.

This legislation will modify HUD’s existing Section 108 Loan Guarantee program to make it a more flexible and usable tool for Brownfields projects and provide BEDI grant funding in a more flexible form.

First, it authorizes, for the first time ever, appropriations specifically for the BEDI program, to clarify through the conventional authorization and appropriation process that Brownfields redevelopment assistance is a congressional priority.

The authorization of such sums as may be necessary is for fiscal years 2002–4. This 3-year authorization would result in need for authorization after 3 years and prompt a timely congressional re-examination of the need for such funding and funding levels.

Second, it establishes the BEDI program as an independent program by separating it from the requirement that local governments obtain BEDI grant funding. While Congress has funded the BEDI program at a level of $25 million annually since FY 1998, the program has existed solely as a line item in appropriations.