

on the Endangered Species List, despite the fact that no one is trying to list it. Placing an animal on the Endangered Species List is a scientific decision not within the purview of Congress, and the administration has promised not to list the bird anyway, thanks to a compromise conservation plan. So the provision that is holding up the entire bill not only blatantly prioritizes politics over national security policy, it is legally meaningless.

I think Speaker RYAN put it best earlier this month when he said that playing politics over the NDAA is “shameless, and it threatens more than five decades of bipartisan cooperation to enact a national defense bill for our troops. The men and women who defend our country deserve better.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, then your party is chicken for prioritizing talking points over national security.

The sage-grouse is such an important issue to House Republicans that it makes you wonder what they will do next to contain the serious national security threat. Perhaps we will soon hear calls to build a wall on the Canadian border to prevent sage-grouse from sending their chicks across the border, even though some, I assume, are good hatchlings.

We may then hear about a plan to prevent sage-grouse from entering the country altogether until we find out what is going on. Maybe the Republicans will ban sage-grouse mating dances as breeding grounds for—well, if not terrorism, then, at least more sage-grouse.

But, seriously, colleagues, is this really what our constituents are most concerned about?

It is time to focus on passing a bill that provides accountability on defense spending to taxpayers and is in line with the Bipartisan Budget Act. Our inability to overcome this pointless provision is just further evidence that this Congress is for or, in this case, against the birds.

UNHCR'S BASH ISRAEL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, world leaders are gathering in New York for the United Nations General Assembly, and throughout this whole process we are reminded yet again of just how broken the U.N. system really is.

Nowhere is this more evident than at the U.N. Human Rights Council. What a misnomer. This body that is supposed to promote and defend human rights worldwide has become a tool used by human rights abusers. And the office that provides support to the Council, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, OHCHR, is no better, as it is overrun with an anti-Israel bias and an anti-Israel agenda.

We see this play out each time the Council meets for its Bash Israel Day—

yippee—a day dedicated to permanent Agenda Item 7, the only agenda item of the Council devoted to a single country, Israel.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Council. In those 10 years, Mr. Speaker, there have been over 70 resolutions condemning Israel and about 65 resolutions for all of the other countries combined. Seventy on Israel, 65 for every other country. Countries like China, Russia, Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and Cuba use the Council as a way to detract attention from their abuses and play upon the natural anti-Israel bias at the Council and the OHCHR.

So tomorrow, when the Council meets to discuss Agenda Item 7, it will be another Bash Israel Day that the administration failed to prevent. It will be another example of how this administration's influence fails to protect our friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Instead of continuing to legitimize this sham of a body, Congress must withhold all contributions and participation at the Council and to the OHCHR, and call for the dissolution of the Council. The administration must press the High Commissioner to denounce Agenda Item 7 and work against the inherent anti-Israel bias of the Council and the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights.

Earlier this year, Canadian Professor Michael Lynk was appointed as the Special Rapporteur for the Palestinian territories, despite his obvious bias and conflicts of interest, which we now know he lied about in his paperwork. This selection was so egregious that Canada's Foreign Minister from Professor Lynk's home country urged the U.N. to reconsider his appointment. The administration should echo those calls, but, instead, it has been silent.

The administration should also lead an opposition to the upcoming reelection next week of Jean Ziegler as an adviser to the Council. Ziegler is a notorious puppet of the Castro regime and an avowed defender of dictators and apologists for Islamic extremist groups and had no business being elected the first time around, let alone being reelected.

The Obama administration had an opportunity to block his candidacy while serving as the coordinator for the Western European and Others Group this year at the Council, but failed to do so; and now it looks as if Ziegler's reelection is a done deal, thanks to the administration's failure to act.

The administration, Mr. Speaker, continues to argue that only by being engaged and only by being full members of the U.N. can it advance our interests and protect Israel. Yet, next month, UNESCO is set to adopt a resolution that seeks to whitewash the Jewish and Christian religious and historical ties to Jerusalem. And while we might not be voting members of the full UNESCO body, this administration is an active member of UNESCO's exec-

utive committee, where this resolution was first approved.

Where was our influence then?

We can't even prevent a resolution that wipes away Jewish and Christian ties to Jerusalem, despite these being historical facts. It is very apparent that either the administration has no influence at the U.N. or the administration has no desire to upset the entrenched and damaged status quo.

That is why it is up to Congress, Mr. Speaker, to force the change at the U.N. I urge all of my colleagues to take a long, hard look at the Human Rights Council as a representation of all that is wrong and bad with the U.N., and to make reforming the U.N. a priority going forward. It will be up to us.

COMMEMORATING THE 1956 HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my very able colleague from Florida, Congressman DENNIS ROSS. And perhaps as we begin, we can welcome into our midst the very able Ambassador from Hungary to the United States, Ms. Reka Szemerkenyi.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding. And I do wish to say hello to our good friend from Hungary, Ambassador Szemerkenyi.

I am grateful, quite frankly, to have this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as I rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution and Freedom Fight.

Sixty years ago this October, Hungary stood tall in the shadows of communism and said: Enough is enough—eleg volt. Hungarian schoolchildren and college students took up arms against the totalitarian government and its Soviet policies.

On October 23, 1956, approximately 20,000 protesters convened next to the statue of General Jozef Bem, a national hero of Hungary. Despite orders to disband, protestors tore down a 30-foot bronze statue of Stalin near the city's Heroes' Square.

The following morning, power was consolidated and a new multiparty government was formed. The Hungarian Revolution spread like wildfire throughout the countryside.

On November 1, Prime Minister Imre Nagy announced Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and a declaration of neutrality. Embarrassed by the uprising, the USSR sent Soviet tanks and troops across the Hungarian border. Unfortunately, thousands of Hungarian civilians were killed, and the communist-backed government in Budapest was reinstalled.

In the months that followed the Hungarian Revolution, more than 20,000