

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment, as modified, to the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment, as modified, to the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110 noes 313, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

AYES—110

Abercrombie	Frelinghuysen	Ose
Aderholt	Frost	Oxley
Baca	Gerlach	Pallone
Baird	Gilchrest	Pastor
Ballance	Gonzalez	Platts
Ballenger	Graves	Quinn
Barton (TX)	Green (TX)	Radanovich
Bass	Greenwood	Renzi
Becerra	Grijalva	Reyes
Bell	Gutierrez	Rodriguez
Biggert	Gutknecht	Rothman
Bishop (NY)	Harris	Roybal-Allard
Boehrlert	Hill	Ryan (OH)
Bono	Hinchev	Sandlin
Boucher	Hinojosa	Serrano
Bradley (NH)	Houghton	Shadegg
Brown (OH)	Johnson (CT)	Shays
Cannon	Kaptur	Sherwood
Capuano	Kelly	Simmons
Carson (OK)	Kilpatrick	Smith (WA)
Castle	Kirk	Snyder
Clyburn	Kolbe	Solis
Cole	Maloney	Stupak
Crenshaw	Markey	Sullivan
Crowley	Marshall	Sweeney
Davis, Tom	Matheson	Thomas
DeFazio	McCarthy (MO)	Thomas
DeGette	Meehan	Towns
Delahunt	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Miller (NC)	Upton
Diaz-Balart, M.	Miller, Gary	Van Hollen
Ehlers	Moore	Velazquez
Evans	Napolitano	Viscosky
Farr	Neal (MA)	Weiner
Foley	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Ford	Olver	Weldon (PA)
Frank (MA)	Ortiz	Wicker

NOES—313

Akin	Capps	Dunn
Alexander	Cardin	Edwards
Allen	Cardoza	Emanuel
Andrews	Carson (IN)	Emerson
Bachus	Carter	Engel
Baker	Case	English
Baldwin	Chabot	Eshoo
Barrett (SC)	Chocola	Etheridge
Bartlett (MD)	Clay	Everett
Beauprez	Coble	Fattah
Berman	Collins	Feeney
Berry	Conyers	Filner
Billirakis	Cooper	Flake
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Fletcher
Bishop (UT)	Cox	Forbes
Blackburn	Cramer	Fossella
Blumenauer	Crane	Franks (AZ)
Blunt	Cubin	Gallely
Boehner	Culberson	Garrett (NJ)
Bonilla	Cummings	Gibbons
Bonner	Cunningham	Gillmor
Boozman	Davis (AL)	Gingrey
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Goode
Boyd	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Brady (TX)	Davis (TN)	Goss
Brown (SC)	Deal (GA)	Granger
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Green (WI)
Brown-Waite,	DeLay	Hall
Ginny	DeMint	Harman
Burgess	Deutsch	Hart
Burns	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Burr	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Burton (IN)	Doggett	Hayes
Buyer	Doolley (CA)	Hefley
Calvert	Doolittle	Hensarling
Camp	Doyle	Herger
Cantor	Dreier	Hobson
Capito	Duncan	Hoefel

Hoekstra	McDermott	Ryun (KS)
Holden	McGovern	Sabo
Holt	McHugh	Sanchez, Linda
Honda	McInnis	T.
Hyde	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Hostettler	McKeon	Sanders
Hoyer	McNulty	Saxton
Hulshof	Meek (FL)	Schakowsky
Hunter	Meeke (NY)	Schiff
Hyde	Mica	Schrock
Inslee	Michaud	Scott (GA)
Isakson	Miller (FL)	Scott (VA)
Israel	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Miller, George	Sessions
Istook	Mollohan	Shaw
Jackson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Sherman
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Shimkus
(TX)	Murphy	Shuster
Jenkins	Murtha	Simpson
John	Musgrave	Skelton
Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Slaughter
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Smith (MI)
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Jones (NC)	Ney	Smith (TX)
Jones (OH)	Northup	Souder
Kanjorski	Norwood	Spratt
Keller	Nunes	Stark
Kennedy (MN)	Nussle	Stearns
Kennedy (RI)	Oberstar	Stenholm
Kildee	Obey	Strickland
King (IA)	Osborne	Tancredo
King (NY)	Otter	Tanner
Kingston	Owens	Tauscher
Kleczka	Pascarell	Tauzin
Kline	Paul	Taylor (MS)
Knollenberg	Payne	Taylor (NC)
Kucinich	Pearce	Terry
LaHood	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lampson	Pence	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Peterson (MN)	Thornberry
Lantos	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
Larsen (WA)	Petri	Tiberi
Larson (CT)	Pickering	Tierney
Latham	Pitts	Toomey
LaTourette	Pombo	Turner (OH)
Leach	Pomeroy	Turner (TX)
Lee	Porter	Udall (NM)
Lee	Portman	Vitter
Lewis	Price (NC)	Walden (OR)
Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Walsh
Lewis (GA)	Putnam	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Rahall	Waters
Linder	Ramstad	Watson
Lipinski	Rangel	Watt
LoBiondo	Regula	Waxman
Lofgren	Rehberg	Weller
Lowey	Reynolds	Whitfield
Lucas (KY)	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (NM)
Lucas (OK)	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Lynch	Rogers (MI)	Wolf
Majette	Rohrabacher	Woolsey
Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen	Wu
Matsui	Ross	Wynn
McCarthy (NY)	Royce	Young (AK)
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Young (FL)
McCotter	Rush	
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman	Ferguson	Jefferson
Bereuter	Gephardt	Millender-
Berkley	Hayworth	McDonald
Davis, Jo Ann	Janklow	Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1541

Mr. SANDERS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. PALLONE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment, as modified, to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was absent today for medical reasons. If I had been in attendance, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 363.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 363 I was in a meeting with the Commissioner of the EU. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, I was chairing a meeting with the Commissioner of External Affairs, Chris Patton, of the European Union; and we were not able to conclude it in time. Therefore, I missed the vote on the Kolbe amendment to the Hyde amendment. Had I been here, I would have voted “no” on the Kolbe amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HYDE, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 108–206.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. PAUL:

Page 32, after line 3, insert the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

Subtitle C—Limitations

SEC. 131. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED BY THIS ACT FOR ANY UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS OR ANY AFFILIATED AGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay any United States contribution to the United Nations or any affiliated agency of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed (Mr. HYDE) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

□ 1545

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment takes away the funding from the United Nations as well as any affiliated U.N. agency.

Mr. Chairman, last year we spent \$3.25 billion on the U.N. as well as the other agencies at the U.N. I do not believe that is money worthwhile. It is not a good investment. I do not think the money is spent well. The amendment, as I said, defunds the United Nations as well as its agencies. We pay 21 percent of the budget, and on peace-keeping missions we pay over 27 percent. I think this is essentially wasted money.

We also lose our sovereignty when we look to the U.N. for guidance. When we

declared war or when we went to war without declaration of war last fall, we had a resolution on the floor which cited the U.N. 23 different times. I do not believe we should go to war under U.N. resolutions, and we have essentially been in Iraq under U.N. resolution because in the early 1990s it was under U.N. resolution that we went to war. The old-fashioned way of going to war was a declaration of war.

We went into Korea over 50 years ago under a U.N. resolution. We are still in Korea. We still have serious problems in Korea. There is still a confrontation that we have with the government of North Korea. I do not see where it is to our benefit, I do not see where it is a benefit to world peace to rely on the United Nations. Even though we rely on the United Nations for authority, when we want the United Nations to go along with our policy as our President asked earlier this year, it was refused. So in many ways we have a policy that does not make a whole lot of sense. We first rely on the United Nations, spend a lot of money, then they do not do our bidding.

It gets to be almost a joke around the world about some of the things the U.N. does. When you think about the Commission of Human Rights and who is appointed as the chairman of the Commission of Human Rights, nobody else other than Libya. And before the war it was actually Iraq who was supposed to chair the Disarmament Commission.

So this I think in many ways reflects the ineptness of the United Nations and its inability to pursue any policy that is in our interest. So it is for this reason, whether it is rejoining UNESCO and throwing more money down another on another useless program, we here are spending a lot of money giving up our sovereignty. Much of this money should be spent here at home.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me time.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, in the strongest possible opposition to the Paul amendment which would cause great harm to our national interests. Mr. Chairman, I do not look upon the United Nations through rose-colored spectacles. It is obvious that for every criticism my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), has of the United Nations, I could probably cite a half dozen. But the fact remains that many of the activities of the United Nations are clearly in the U.S. national interest.

The International Atomic Agency monitors and exposes countries such as North Korea and Iran attempting to develop nuclear weapons. The World Health Organization works to prevent infectious diseases throughout the world, and it was critical recently in putting a stop to the spread of SARS. UNESCO, which the President wisely

decided to rejoin, will provide us an opportunity to make our voice heard in the educational, cultural and scientific field of the international organization. UNICEF, the United Nations International Children's Fund, is providing invaluable assistance across the globe to millions of children in desperate need; and the U.N. itself, more often than not, is helpful in attaining our own foreign policy objectives.

The absurdity of the United States, the one remaining superpower, the most powerful civilizing force on the face of this planet in the 21st century, withdrawing from the United Nations is nothing short of absurd; and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to reject overwhelmingly this amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, whether you think the U.N. is an efficacious organization or you think it is a useless organization, whether you think that we are advantaged as a country of being a member of the U.N. or you think we ought not be a member of the U.N., you can vote for the Paul amendment with confidence that you are doing the right thing. Let me explain.

Both the Department of Defense and the Congressional Research Service have documented that we have spent over \$19 billion of taxpayers' money on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. Now, the U.N. has legitimized our claim that this ought to be credited against our dues because they have credited \$1.8 billion of this against our dues.

I am going to vote for this amendment. I will vote for any amendment that denies funding to the U.N. without any argument whether we ought to be long, any argument of whether it is good or bad, but the simple argument that, in all fairness, please do an accounting of the monies we have spent on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. Please credit appropriate amounts of that to our U.N. dues. Then, if there are dues left over, we will pay those dues. But until that accounting is done, everybody in this Congress, we are in very tough financial times now, ought to vote yes for the Paul amendment that will demand that the accounting is done; and then we can debate another day whether or not we ought to be members of the U.N. or whether or not it is an efficacious organization.

But, for today, the simple fact that we have not been credited for almost \$17 billion of monies that we have spent on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities is more than a legitimate right to vote for this amendment. Vote for the Paul amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a tempting amendment to the bill, but more mature thought says no, it is not all that

good of an idea. The fact is we still need the U.N. and its agencies to promote peacekeeping efforts in some parts of the world, to assist in the global anti-terrorist campaign to help rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan, to promote nuclear non-proliferation by rogue states such as Iran and North Korea, and help implement our legislation designed to fight against HIV/AIDS.

Without the World Food Program, there would be more starvation and suffering in the world. Without the Food and Agricultural Organization, there would be scant support for global food standards. And without the International Civil Aviation Organization, there would be no effective management of civilian airplane traffic around the world.

Finally, to the extent that we decide to commit any U.S. troops as part of a regional West African peacekeeping force in Liberia, we certainly should not be cutting off funding for U.N. peacekeeping when we will need those same peacekeepers to relieve our troops, providing us with an exit strategy, safeguarding our interests.

With great respect, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I once again urge a yes vote on this amendment to limit the funding to the United Nations and to all its agencies.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) mentioned that there were some programs under the United Nations which were sort of "feel-good" programs, social welfare programs, and I think I would grant that some of these programs have had some benefit. That in itself is not enough for me to endorse the concept of international welfare through the United Nations.

However, too often I think they leave doing these programs that are designed to help people who are truly suffering versus getting involved with what we call peacekeeping missions. The United Nations are not allowed to declare war. They never go to war, and yet too often we get involved in war. That is why they were called peacekeepers in Korea. That is why it is a peacekeeping mission when we go to Iraq. But, still, the armies are raised, and young men are called off, and people are killed on these peacekeeping missions. Therefore, I say that the United Nations has tended to take away the responsibilities of this Congress to make these very, very important decisions.

I believe in many ways that by joining the United Nations we have allowed our Constitution to be amended merely by U.N. vote. If the U.N. votes and says something and we go along with that, we do that by majority vote here in the Congress. Where if we look to the Constitution for the authorities that we

are allowed to do and what we are not permitted to do, we look to article I, section 8; and what the U.N. is doing is not permissible under the article.

□ 1600

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 108-206.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I am the designee of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

Page 88, after line 17, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 406. LIMITATION ON THE UNITED STATES SHARE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR UNITED NATIONS REGULAR BUDGET.**

Section 11 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287e-3) is amended by striking "22 percent of the total of all assessed contributions for that budget" and inserting "the largest assessed contribution of any other permanent member country of the United Nations Security Council".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 2303, sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), I am happy to offer this amendment, which is the first step in reforming the United Nations.

In the run-up to the war with Iraq, France was able to hold U.S. policy hostage by virtue of its status as a permanent member of the Security Council and the veto power that goes with it, but France was not alone. The other permanent Security Council Members, China, Russia, United Kingdom, of course, also the United States, they all have a veto power; and they regularly obstruct our foreign policy goals and vote the opposite of the United States.

According to the State Department's voting practices in the United Nations of 2002, on votes important to U.S. interests, France and the U.K. voted with us just 50 percent of the time, Russia 22 percent of the time and China, 20 percent.

Even though the U.S. has no more power on the Security Council than any of the other four permanent members, it pays the lion's share of the United Nations' budget. The United States pays \$341 million a year, or 22 percent of the overall budget. China pays just \$24 million, even though it has the world's second largest economy. Russia pays a paltry \$19 million, which is less than Canada, Holland, Australia, or Switzerland.

This amendment would limit the U.S. contribution to the regular U.N. budget to no more than the highest amount paid by any other member of the Security Council. Our veto power should cost us no more than what China, France, Russia, or the U.K. pay for theirs.

This proposal would not affect U.S. payments to the U.N. for peacekeeping operations, voluntary programs, or membership organizations. It would only affect the U.N. regular budget. Even at this reduced amount, the U.S. would still contribute over \$1.4 billion in various U.N. programs, far more than any other country.

So aside from simple equity, enactment of this amendment would hopefully lead to reconsideration of how U.N. dues are assessed among permanent members. China and Russia are now essentially getting a free ride at our expense. The solution would be for all permanent members to pay equal amounts of the regular budget because of their veto power, and I say this amendment is a first step in the direction of reforming the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona by way of Arizona does raise an important issue of how our dues to the U.N. regular budget are calculated. I would be glad to hold follow-up briefings and a hearing in the committee on our role at the U.N. and how our membership should promote our national interests and how our current assessment should reflect a fair share of all the other member states of the U.N.

There are, however, serious problems with the way this amendment is written insofar as it unilaterally alters our existing financial obligations to the United Nations. It will reduce our assessment from the current 22 percent to the level of 6.5 percent, thereby generating close to \$250 million in new arrearages to the U.N. It would reduce

our share of the funding of the regular budget of the U.N. far below the level currently being paid by Japan and Germany and would give those countries every reason to reduce their contributions accordingly.

The amendment mistakenly makes the assumption that the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council are assessed their dues on the basis of their inclusion in this body. The assessments are made instead on the basis of a member state's share of the world gross domestic product. In the case of the U.S., however, our share should actually be well over 22 percent.

In short, the amendment would have the same practical effect as that of the gentleman from Texas' (Mr. PAUL) amendment, undercutting any role we would have in the U.N. and eventually leading to our withdrawal from the world body. If my colleagues voted against the Paul amendment, they should oppose this amendment as well.

In short, it takes a unilateral approach which could potentially harm U.S. interests and objectives around the world. Our contributions to the U.N. regular budget and to all other U.N. programs and agencies are agreed to by mutual consent of all U.N. members. If the U.S. were to unilaterally cut its assessment, we would start building arrears to the U.N. again just after completing a 3-year arrearage repayment effort under the Helms-Biden legislation where we obtained substantial management and administrative reforms in return for the payment of our back dues.

Adoption of this amendment would undercut those ongoing reform efforts, and I urge it be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire as to the amount of time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) both have 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois' remarks with regard to the United Nations and some of the implications of any change that we might make in how the dues are assessed against the United States, and I would point out that our gross domestic product is comparable to that of the balance of the Security Council and all the other priority members that are there; and even though it is indexed to the gross domestic product, it is certainly out of proportion.

Additionally, these members of the United Nations Security Council have exerted far more influence than their economy contributes to the world economy or to the United Nations dues or any type of forces that we might have out there, and so I would suggest that the United Nations has become a