

Ralph Bunche did not want to be remembered as the first African American who was the first to graduate from University of California at Los Angeles as valedictorian or the first to graduate from Harvard with a Ph.D. in government and international relations, or the first to become Chief U.N. Mediator.

Least of all, the first to win the Nobel Peace Prize. He wished to be remembered simply as an American who answered his country's call of duty.

That is not a shortcoming . . . It is not a slight to any man or woman of color in our society . . . it is, however, a statement of hope, the hope I grew up with, that we can one day be a society that judges us not for our differences but for our accomplishments and the fact that we, as human beings, made a difference.

Ralph Bunche was one of those human beings who made a difference and left an extraordinary legacy.

By tailoring the language in the 11th and 12th Chapters of the U.N. Charter, Bunche made it possible for the United Nations to recognize the peaceful self-determination of those being exploited by colonialism, and through sheer force of will he recovered from an assassination attempt which killed 4 of his colleagues to negotiate an armistice agreement ending the first Arab-Israeli war.

With an eye for the future he presided over the conference which finalized the statues for the International Atomic Energy Agency.

And in response to an international crisis he established the foundations for the first international peace-keeping operation in Egypt.

This legacy is manifest in his dedication to the United Nations, and to the cause of peace for which we will always remember him.

His words were perhaps prophetic when he said: "If today we speak of peace, we also speak of the United Nations, for in this era peace and the United Nations, have become inseparable. If the United Nations cannot ensure peace there will be none.

"If war should come it will be only because the United Nations has failed.

"But the United Nations need not fail.

"Surely every man of reason must work and pray to the end that it will not fail."

Those are not popular words today but they are truthful words, a heartfelt notion from a man whose life and work centered on a way to bring people—all people—together to solve problems.

In concluding his Nobel Lecture, he said: "There will be no security in our world, no release from agonizing tension, no genuine progress, no enduring peace, until, in Shelley's fine words, reasons voice, loud as the voice of nature, shall have waked the nations."

Today we honor this visionary man of peace as an accomplished scholar, a distinguished diplomat, a tireless campaigner for the civil rights of all people

in every nation, and as one of the 20th centuries foremost figures and a role model for every young man and woman, black or white, Christian, Muslim, or Jew.

I ask all my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the life and work of Ralph Bunche by passing this resolution.

—————

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 83—PROMOTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEMOCRACY CAUCUS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BIDEN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 83

Whereas a survey conducted by Freedom House in 2003, entitled "Freedom in the World", found that of the 192 governments of nations of the world, 121 (or 63 percent) of such governments have an electoral democracy form of government;

Whereas, the Community of Democracies, an association of democratic nations committed to promoting democratic principles and practices, held its First Ministerial Conference in Warsaw, Poland, in June 2000;

Whereas, in a speech at that Conference, Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, stated that "when the United Nations can truly call itself a community of democracies, the [United Nations] Charter's noble ideals of protecting human rights and promoting 'social progress in larger freedoms' will have been brought much closer", that "democratically governed states rarely if ever make war on one another", and that "in this era of intra-state wars, is the fact that democratic governance—by protecting minorities, encouraging pluralism, and upholding the rule of law—can channel internal dissent peacefully, and thus help avert civil wars";

Whereas a report by an Independent Task Force cosponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations and Freedom House in 2002, entitled "Enhancing U.S. Leadership at the United Nations", concluded that "the United States is frequently outmaneuvered and out-matched at the [United Nations]" because the 115 members of the nonaligned movement "cooperate on substantive and procedural votes, binding the organization's many democratic nations to the objectives and blocking tactics of its remaining tyrannies";

Whereas, at the First Ministerial Conference of the Community of Democracies, the representatives of the participating governments agreed to "collaborate on democracy-related issues in existing international and regional institutions, forming coalitions and caucuses to support resolutions and other international activities aimed at the promotion of democratic governance"; and

Whereas that agreement was reaffirmed at the Second Ministerial Conference of the Community of Democracies in Seoul, Korea, in November 2002: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. PROMOTION OF A DEMOCRACY CAUCUS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS.

Congress urges the President to instruct any representative of the United States to a body of the United Nations to use the voice and vote of the United States to seek to establish a democracy caucus within the United Nations as described in this Resolution.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE OF THE DEMOCRACY CAUCUS.

The purpose of the democracy caucus referred to in section 1 should be to advance the interests of the United States and other nations that are committed to promoting democratic norms and practices by—

(1) supporting common objectives, including bolstering democracy and democratic principles, advancing human rights, and fighting terrorism in accordance with the rule of law;

(2) forging common positions on matters of concern that are brought before the United Nations or any of the bodies of the United Nations;

(3) working within and across regional lines to promote the positions of the democracy caucus;

(4) encouraging democratic states to assume leadership positions in the bodies of the United Nations; and

(5) advocating that states that permit gross violations of human rights, sponsor terrorist activities, or that are the subject of sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council are not elected—

(A) to leadership positions in the United Nations General Assembly; or

(B) to membership or leadership positions in the Commission on Human Rights, the Security Council, or any other body of the United Nations.

SEC. 3. CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE DEMOCRACY CAUCUS.

Participation in the democracy caucus referred to in section 1 should be limited to countries that—

(1) are qualified to participate in the Community of Democracies, an association of democratic nations committed to promoting democratic principles and practices; and

(2) have demonstrated a commitment—

(A) to the core democratic principles and practices set out in the Final Warsaw Declaration of the Community of Democracies, adopted at Warsaw June 27, 2000; and

(B) to the democratic principles set forth in—

(i) the United Nations Charter;

(ii) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and

(iii) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL MEETING.

The members of the democracy caucus referred to in section 1 should hold a ministerial-level meeting at least once each year to coordinate policies and positions of the caucus.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to support a United Nations Democracy Caucus to address questions that underlie a countless number of our foreign policy decisions, particularly in today's climate:

How can the United States be more effective in advancing our foreign policy priorities?

How can we be more active in collaborating with our allies on issues of common concern?

How can we be more productive in promoting the values upon which this nation was founded and getting our message across to those around the world who look to us for leadership?

Three years ago, in Warsaw, Poland, the United States took a step to address these questions when it became one of eight convening countries of the "Community of Democracies," a network of representatives of over 100 nations that meets every 2 years to promote the advancement of global democracy and human rights.

Two years later, in Seoul, Korea, many of these countries reaffirmed their commitment to collaborating with one another and agreed to work together in existing international and regional organizations.

Hence, the idea of establishing a "democracy caucus" within the United Nations began to take form.

The idea is simply this: democratic nations share common values, and should work together at the United Nations to promote those values.

A simple notion that, in my view, makes extraordinary sense.

What has happened in the last several years is that support for the establishment of a democracy caucus in the United Nations has begun to take root among foreign policy experts in the United States.

Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has endorsed the idea, as has Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

In addition, it has been endorsed by a broad-based coalition of organizations and advocacy groups like Freedom House, Human Rights Watch, the American Jewish Committee, the American Bar Association and the Council for Community of Democracies.

In recent months, even senior Bush administration officials have expressed interest in the establishment of a democracy caucus—recognizing that the United States would be more effective if we were to work together and organize with other like-minded countries.

Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, Kim Holmes, recently deemed a U.N. democracy caucus as "an idea whose time has arrived".

Working together with like-minded nations is a logical and practical way to conduct foreign policy. We build coalitions in the Senate. We build coalitions in Congress. And it makes sense to build coalitions in the United Nations, not only for the sake of forging common positions on issues of mutual concern, but also to provide a counterbalance to other coalitions that are well organized in the United Nations, but do not necessarily share our goals.

The 115-member nonaligned movement (NAM) is an example. Last year, an Independent Task Force co-sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations and Freedom House argued that "the United States is frequently outmaneuvered and outmatched at the UN" because the cooperative work of the NAM "binds the organization's many democratic nations to the objectives and blocking tactics of its remaining tyrannies."

A democracy caucus would give us a new and potentially effective tool within the United Nations to counter coalitions that act in a manner inimical to our interests.

So today I am submitting a resolution promoting the establishment of a democracy caucus within the United Nations.

The resolution is straightforward: it expresses the support of this Congress for a U.N. democracy caucus and outlines the vision that I, and others, have of what such a caucus would do, and how it would go about doing it.

The general idea is that a democracy caucus would convene at the U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, and other U.N. bodies on a regular basis.

Members of the democracy caucus would work together to forge common positions to bolster democracy and democratic principles, advance human rights, and fight terrorism.

Furthermore, this bill also talks about who will join a democracy caucus.

We need to establish a criteria for which countries would be considered democracies, and which would not. Fortunately, we are not starting from scratch.

The Community of Democracies forum has established such criteria by drawing on major principles of international law and international standards set forth in the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Drawing up this criteria was a collaborative process during the First Ministerial of the community of Democracies, and the guidelines have been effective in laying the foundation and advancing the goals of the forum.

Therefore, this legislation models the U.N. democracy caucus' eligibility criteria on that already established by and for the Community of Democracies.

I envision that the U.N. democracy caucus would advocate that states that are deemed to be gross violators of human rights, sponsors of terrorist activities, or subjects of United Nations sanctions, not be elected to leadership positions in the United Nations General Assembly or other United Nations bodies.

This issue has received, and deservedly so, much attention this year—particularly after Libya was elected to serve as chair of the Commission of Human Rights.

In my view, the credibility of U.N. institutions is undermined when the members of its bodies—and particularly those in leadership positions—fall into this camp of bad actors.

According to the Freedom House 2003 survey, of the world's 192 governments, 63 percent of them have an electoral democracy form of government.

Furthermore, in the 2002 meeting of the Community of Democracies in Seoul, 118 nations were invited to participate, based upon their commitment to shred democratic values.

These numbers tell us that a democracy caucus within the U.N. would have a strong base from which to begin its work; it could be robust from its inauguration.

At the First Ministerial Conference of the Community of Democracies in

Warsaw, Poland, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan said, "When the United Nations can truly call itself a community of democracies, the charter's noble ideals of protecting human rights and promoting 'social progress in larger freedoms' will have been brought much closer."

In that spirit, I submit a resolution in support of the establishment of a U.N. democracy caucus.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2199. Mr. BOND (for Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. EDWARDS)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2150 proposed by Mr. BOND (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2861, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

SA 2200. Mr. BOND (for Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2150 proposed by Mr. BOND (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2861, supra.

SA 2201. Mr. BOND (for Mr. DEWINE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1783 proposed by Mr. DeWINE (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) to the bill H.R. 2765, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

SA 2202. Mr. FRIST (for Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. HOLLINGS)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FRIST to the bill S. 189, to authorize appropriations for nanoscience, nanoengineering, and nanotechnology research, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2199. Mr. BOND (for Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. EDWARDS)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2150 proposed by Mr. BOND (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2861, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. —. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY.

The matter under the heading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" under the heading "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY" in title III of division K of section 2 of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (117 Stat. 513), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of the fifth undesignated paragraph (beginning "As soon as"), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and the impact of the final rule entitled 'Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR): Equipment Replacement Provision of the Routine Maintenance, Repair