and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 691. A bill entitled the ''Public Land Management Participation Act of 1997''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. REID:

S. 692. A bill to require that applications for passports for minors have parental signatures; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the value of qualified historic property shall not be included in determining the taxable estate of a decedent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 694. A bill to establish reform criteria to permit payment of United States arrearages in assessed contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 695. A bill to restrict intelligence sharing with the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 696. A bill to establish limitations on the use of funds for United Nations peacekeeping activities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DODD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. Res. 82. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to urge the Clinton Administration to enforce the provisions of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 with respect to the acquisition by Iran of C-802 cruise missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. Con. Res. 24. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the importance of the Eastern Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. Con. Res. 25. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Russian Federation should be strongly condemned for its plan to provide nuclear technology to Iran, and that such nuclear transfer would make Russia ineligible under terms for the Freedom Support Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 691. A bill entitled the ''Public Land Management Participation Act of 1997''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I will take this opportunity to rise this afternoon to introduce a very important piece of legislation that I know the occupant of the chair will find interesting. It is called the Public Land Management Participation Act of 1997.

This legislation is intended to put the word ''public'' and the populace back into public land management and the word ''environment,'' back into environmental protection.

Passage of this act will ensure that all the gains that we made over the past quarter of a century in creating an open, participatory Government which affords strong environmental protection for our public lands are really protected.

For those who thought that those battles were fought and won with the passage of the National Environmental Protection Act in 1969 and the Federal Land Policy Management Act in 1976, I have some bad news. There is one last battle to be fought.

Standing in this very Chamber on January 20, 1975, Mr. President, Senator Henry ''Scoop'' Jackson of Washington State spoke to the passion Americans feel for their public lands. He said:

> The public lands of the United States have always provided the arena in which we Americans have struggled to fulfill our dreams. Even today dreams of wealth, adventure, and escape are still being acted out on those far-flung public lands. These lands and the dreams—fulfilled and unfulfilled—which they foster are part of our national destiny. They belong to all Americans.

I quote and emphasize, Mr. President, ''They belong to all Americans.''

Amazingly—there exist today legal authorities by which the President, without the public process or congressional approval, can create vast land management units called national monuments, world heritage sites, and biospheric reserves.

Special management units which affect how millions of acres of our public lands are managed. What people can do on those lands is also affected, what the future will be for surrounding communities.

That is a powerful trust to bestow on anyone, even a President.

On September 12, 1996, the good people of Utah woke up to find themselves the most recent recipient of a philosophy that says, ''Trust us. We are from the Government, and we know what is best for you.'' On that day, standing not in Utah but in the State of Arizona, our President invoked the 1906 Antiquities Act to create 1.7 million acres of national monument in southern Utah.

Notice, Mr. President, he did not do this in Utah. He did it in Arizona. One can only assume he might have had some protests if he had done it in Utah. The withdrawal, however, took place in Utah. It created a 1.7 million acre national monument in the southern part of the State. By utilizing this antiquated law, the President was able to avoid—that's right, avoid—Nation's environmental laws and ignore public participation laws as well. With one swipe of the pen, every shred of public input and environmental law promulgated in this country over the past quarter of a century was shoved into the trash heap of political expediency.

What happened in Utah last fall is but the latest example of a small cadre of administration officials deciding for all Americans how our public lands should be used. It is by no means the only one, Mr. President. As the Senator from Alaska, I have had a great deal of personal experience in this area.

In 1978, President Jimmy Carter created 17 national monuments in Alaska covering more than 55 million acres of lands. That is an area about the size of South Carolina. He withdrew these lands, with the stroke of his pen—no public process, no hearing, no participation from the State. This was then followed in short order by Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus, who withdrew an additional 50 million. A total of 105 million acres, Mr. President. All this land was withdrawn for multiple use without any input from the people of my State, the public, or the Congress of the United States. With over 100 million acres of withdrawn land held over Alaska's head, like the sword of Damocles; we were forced to cut the best deal we could. Twenty years later, the people of my State are still struggling to cope with the weight of these decisions.

I would not be here this afternoon if the public, the people of Utah and Congress, had not been denied a voice in the creation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. I would not be here if environmental protection procedures had not been ignored.

But the people were denied the opportunity to speak. Mr. President, Congress was denied its opportunity to participate, and environmental procedure was simply ignored. The only voice we have heard was the President's. Without bothering to ask us what we thought about it, he told the citizens of Utah and the rest of the country that he knew better than we did what was good for us.

Now, this is an administration that prides itself in a public process. There was no public process here, Mr. President. We had been debating for some time the issue of Utah wilderness. It was ongoing, but the President, for political expediency, took it upon himself to invoke the Antiquities Act. It has been a long time since anyone has had the right to make those kind of unilateral public land decisions for the American public. Since the passages of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act in 1976, we have had a system of law underpinning public land use decisions. Embodied with this law is public participation. Agencies propose an action, they present the action to the public, the public debates the issue. The public can then appeal bad decisions, the courts resolve the disputes, and the management unit is then created.

Where was this public process, Mr. President, in the special use designation of 1.7 million acres of Federal land in southern Utah? The answer is clear: There wasn't any. Since the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act

of 1969, activities which affect the environment are subject to strict environmental laws. Does anyone believe there was no environmental threat posed by the creation of a national monument?

Imagine how the sensitive natural features of the high desert environment would respond to the rhythmic pounding of unlimited hiking boots worn by legions of adoring visitors as they tromp through the area. Where is the NEPA compliance documentation associated with this action? There is not any.

The creation of specialized public use designations such as national parks and wilderness areas are debated within the Halls of Congress, right here. These debates provide for the financial and legal responsibilities which come with the creation of special management units.

Where are the proceedings from those debates? There aren't any, Mr. President. They simply don't exist because, in the heat of an election year, the administration determined that the public process, environmental analyses and congressional deliberations were simply a waste of time.

Mr. President, either you believe in a public process or you do not; you can't have it both ways. If we can no longer trust the administration to involve the public in major land use decisions, then where does it fall? It falls right here to the Congress.

Mr. President, the legislation which I offer today will require any future designations of national monuments, world heritage sites, or biospheric reserves to follow the public participation principles laid down under existing law over the past 25 years. No poetic images, no flowery words, no smoke and mirrors, just good old-fashioned public land management process.

Before these special land management units can be created, my legislation will require that the agencies gather and analyze resource data affected by the land use decisions; full public participation in the creation of these units with all appeal rights protected; compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act; congressional review and ratification, and Presidential signature.

No longer will an administration be able to sidestep public participation and environmental reviews to further political agendas. Nobody—not even the President of the United States—should be above the law.

The Public Land Management Participation Act will make all future land use decisions a joint responsibility of the public, the Congress, and the President—no more loopholes.

I don't question the need for national monuments, world heritage sites, or biospheric reserves. Sometimes they are needed to protect historic treasures, natural resources, et cetera. But if they are to serve the common good, they must be created under the same system of land management law that has governed the use of the public domain for the past 25 years.

There has always been a sacred bond between the American people and the lands they hold in common ownership. No one, regardless of high station or political influence, has the right to impose his will over the means by which the destiny of those lands is decided. This legislation reestablishes that bond.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 691

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Public Land Management Participation Act of 1997.''

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to ensure that the public and the Congress have both the right and a reasonable opportunity to participate in decisions that affect the use and management of all public lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF PUBLIC AND CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN DECLARATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

The Antiquities Act (16 U.S.C. 431a) is amended by adding the following new section:

''431b. PUBLIC AND CONGRESSIONAL ROLES IN NATIONAL MONUMENT DECLARATIONS.—(a) The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall provide an opportunity for public involvement and by regulation shall establish procedures, including public hearings where appropriate, to give Federal, State, and local governments and the public, adequate notice and opportunity to comment upon and participate in the formulation of plans relating to the declaration of national monuments upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States pursuant to the authority of the Antiquities Act (16 U.S.C. 431).

''(b) In addition, the Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture shall, prior to any recommendations for declaration of an area,

''(i) ensure compliance with all applicable federal land management and environmental statutes, including the National Environmental Policy Act (40 U.S.C. 4321–4370d);

''(ii) cause mineral surveys to be conducted by the Geological Survey to determine the mineral values, if any, that may be present in such areas;

''(iii) identify all existing rights held on federal lands contained within such areas by type and acreage; and

''(iv) identify all State lands contained within such areas.

''(c) After such reviews and mineral surveys, the Secretary of the Interior or Agriculture shall report to the President his recommendations as to what lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States warrant declaration as a national monument.

''(d) The President shall advise the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to declaration as national monuments of each such area, together with a map thereof and a definition of its boundaries. Such advice by the President shall be given within two years of the receipt of each report from the Secretary. After the effective date of Public Land Management Participation Act, a recommendation of the President for declaration of a national monument shall become effective only if so provided by an Act of Congress.''

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF PUBLIC AND CONGRESSIONAL ROLES IN WORLD HERITAGE SITE LISTING.

Section 401 of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1) is amended

(1) in subsection (a) in the first sentence, by

(A) inserting ''(in this section referred to as the Convention)'' after ''1973''; and

(B) inserting ''and subject to subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f)'' before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b) in the first sentence, by inserting '', subject to subsection (d),'' after ''shall''; and

(3) adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d) If the area proposed for designation is not wholly contained within an existing unit of the National Park System, the Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture;

''(1) shall provide an opportunity for public involvement and by regulation shall establish procedures, including public hearings where appropriate, to give Federal, State, and local governments and the public, adequate notice and opportunity to comment upon and participate in the formulation of plans relating to the designation of any lands owned by the United States for inclusion on the World Heritage List pursuant to the Convention.''

''(2) After such review, the Secretary of the Interior or Agriculture shall report to the President his recommendations as to what lands owned by the United States warrant inclusion on the World Heritage List pursuant to the Convention.''

''(3) The President shall advise the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the designation of any lands owned by the United States for inclusion on the World Heritage List pursuant to the Convention. Such advice by the President shall be given within two years of the receipt of each report from the Secretary. After the effective date of Public Land Participation Management Act, a recommendation of the President for designation of any lands owned by the United States for inclusion on the World Heritage List shall become effective only if so provided by an Act of Congress.''

''(e) The Secretary of the Interior or Agriculture shall object to the inclusion of any property in the United States on the list of World Heritage in Danger established under Article 11.4 of the Convention unless

''(1) The Secretary has submitted to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate a report describing the necessity for including that property on the list; and

''(2) The Secretary is specifically authorized to assent to the inclusion of the property on the list, by a joint resolution of the Congress enacted after the date that report is submitted.

''(f) The Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture shall submit an annual report on each World Heritage Site within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains the following information for each site:

''(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the site.

''(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the site.

''(3) A list and explanation of all nongovernmental organizations contributing to the management of the site.

''(4) A summary and account of the disposition of complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the site.''.

SEC. 5. CLARIFICATION OF PUBLIC AND CONGRESSIONAL ROLES IN THE DESIGNATION OF UNITED NATIONS BIOSPHERE RESERVES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''Sec. 403. (a) No Federal official may nominate any lands in the United States for designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

''(b) Any designation of an area in the United States as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect, unless the Biosphere Reserve is specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

''(c) The Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture shall provide an opportunity for public involvement and by regulation shall establish procedures, including public hearings where appropriate, to give Federal, State, and local governments and the public, adequate notice and opportunity to comment upon and participate in the formulation of plans relating to the designation of any lands owned by the United States as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

''(d) After such review, the Secretary of the Interior or Agriculture shall report to the President his recommendations as to what lands owned by the United States warrant inclusion as a Biosphere Reserve.

''(e) The President shall advise the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the designation of any lands owned by the United States for inclusion as a Biosphere Reserve. Such advice by the President shall be given within two years of the receipt of each report from the Secretary. After the effective date of Public Land Participation Management Act, a recommendation of the President for declaration of a Biosphere Reserve shall become effective only if so provided by an Act of Congress.

''(f) The Secretary of State shall submit an annual report on each Biosphere Reserve within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains the following information for each reserve:

''(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the reserve.

''(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the reserve.

''(3) A list and explanation of all nongovernmental organizations contributing to the management of the reserve.

''(4) A summary and account of the disposition of the complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the reserve.''

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF S. 691

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

Public Land Management Participation Act of 1977.

SECTION 2. PURPOSE

To ensure that the public and the Congress have both the right and a reasonable opportunity to participate in decisions that effect the use and management of all public lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States.

SECTION 3. CLARIFICATION OF PUBLIC AND CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN DECLARATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS

This section amends the Antiquities Act by adding language that requires future National Monument Declarations be proceeded by full public participation and Congressional Ratification.

3(a) Directs the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to develop regulations that allow Federal, State, and local governments and the public to comment on and participate in the National Monument declaration process.

3(b) Directs the Secretaries to conduct mineral surveys and identify all existing rights on lands contained within proposed National Monument boundaries.

3(c) Authorizes the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to make recommendations to the President lands which warrant inclusion in a National Monument.

3(d) Authorizes the President to make recommendations to the Congress lands which warrant inclusion in a national monument. Further states that no declaration of a monument shall become effective until so provided by an Act of Congress.

SECTION 4. CLARIFICATION OF PUBLIC AND CONGRESSIONAL ROLES IN WORLD HERITAGE SITE LISTING

This section amends the National Historic Preservation Act by adding language that requires future World heritage Site designations be proceeded by full public participation and Congressional ratification.

d(1) Directs the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to develop regulations that allow Federal, State, and local governments and the public to comment on and participate in the World Heritage Site Listing process.

d(2) Authorizes the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to make recommendations to the President lands which warrant inclusion in a World heritage Site.

d(3) Authorizes the President to make recommendations to the Congress lands which warrant inclusion in a World heritage Site. Further states that no declaration of a World heritage Site shall become effective until so provided for by an Act of Congress.

(e) Directs the secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to object to the inclusion of property in the United states on a list of World heritage in Danger without explicit approval to do so by a joint resolution of Congress.

(f) Requires the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to submit an annual report to Congress detailing the cost of operating each World heritage Site, who contributed to the management of the site, and how any complaints about the site were handled.

SECTION 5. CLARIFICATION OF PUBLIC AND CONGRESSIONAL ROLES IN THE DESIGNATION OF UNITED NATIONS BIOSPHERE RESERVES

This section amends the National Historic Preservation Act by adding language that requires future Biosphere Reserve designations be proceeded by full public participation and Congressional ratification.

(c) Directs the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to develop regulations that allow Federal, State, and local governments and the public to comment on and participate in the Biosphere Reserve declaration process.

(d) Authorizes the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to make recommendations to the President lands which warrant inclusion in a Biosphere Reserve.

(e) Authorizes the President to make recommendations to the Congress lands which warrant inclusion in a national monument. Further states that no declaration of a Biosphere Reserve shall become effective until so provided for by an Act of Congress.

(e) Directs the secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to object to the inclusion of property of the United states without explicit approval to do so by a joint resolution of Congress.

(f) Requires the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to submit an annual report to Congress detailing the cost of operating the site, who contributed to the management of the site, and how any complaints about the site were handled.

By Mr. REID:

S. 692. A bill to require that applications for passports for minors have parental signatures; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PASSPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation which will help resolve a serious problem that plagues this Nation. Last year, and unless we do something this year, 1,000 young boys and girls will be abducted from their home and taken to foreign countries. Most of them will never come back to this country. These are young people who have every right to be in this country, but one of their parents gets a passport and takes them someplace.

This legislation I am introducing involves a young boy by the name of Mikey Kale. His father was Croatian. His father got a passport signed—not notifying the mother—and went to Croatia. This is one of the happy endings of these stories. This young boy was allowed to come home with his mother—not allowed to come home. She went through a lot of time and effort and spent a lot of money to get him so she could bring him home.

Most of the time the children never return. For example, Mr. President, this last week on ABC's ''Prime Time,'' they featured a case very similar to the Mikey Kale case, a case that involved a mother who took a daughter to Costa Rica. She did not have custody of the child. Sole custody was awarded to the father. A warrant was issued for her arrest. For more than 3 years this father has searched, and suffered, trying to get back his daughter. He has been unable to do so. It appears, even pursuant to that television program, that they know where the child is, but because of the complexity of the law in Costa Rica, the child has not been allowed to return.

Extradition law, generally, does not include child abduction. So most parents are stymied. I repeat, 1,000 young boys and girls each year are abducted in this manner. Usually, these abductions take place during or after a contentious divorce, sometimes even by an abusive parent, many times by an abusive parent. At a time when these children are most vulnerable and most uncertain about their future, they are snatched and taken to a foreign country.

The tragedy of this wrong is best illustrated by an ordeal forced upon people from the State of Nevada. No family should have to go through what

Fred and Barbara Spierer went through in 1993. Barbara's ex-husband obtained a passport for 6-year-old Mikey without Barbara's knowledge, consent or approval. On Valentine's Day, 1993, he abducted Mikey, boarded an airplane, and left for his country of Croatia, his native country. At that time, that country was, for lack of a better description, in a state of war. After tremendous emotional and financial efforts, the Spierers were able to get Mikey to come home.

I stress, this problem is more common than we would like to think. It has been suggested that we do something about it. This legislation will do that. What, in effect, this legislation would do is say if you are going to take a child outside the United States, you must have the signatures of both parents. If one parent has custody, then only that signature is required. If there is joint custody, it would take both signatures. It is not difficult to get the signatures of both parents to take a child outside the country. Thousands of parents throughout the United States are currently undergoing the same emotional and financial stress that the Spierers experienced. This simple change in the law would prevent future agony and distress.

As I indicated, Mr. President, few parents are as fortunate as the Spierers. Few will ever see their children again. Recovery rates for children, once they are in a foreign country, are extremely low. It is a sad fact that once a child leaves the United States, it is nearly impossible to get the child returned as most nations do not recognize custody orders from the U.S. courts.

As I said, most extradition treaties do not cover international parental abductions. Experience shows that foreign governments are generally reluctant to extradite parental abductors. Often when facing extradition, the abducting parents will hide the child with a friend or relative in a foreign country or even go to another foreign country, complicating things even more. This action prevents the child from ever being returned.

At any rate, getting a child returned in the United States is extremely expensive, far beyond the resources of most families. Many families have to spend in excess of $50,000 just in lawyers trying to retrieve their children, often, to no avail. Prevention is the only feasible way of dealing with international parental abductions. The best way to prevent international parental abductions is to make it more difficult for parental abductors to obtain passports for the minor children.

The aim of the Mikey Kale Passport Notification Act is prevention. It prevents parental abductors from obtaining U.S. passports for their minor children. This, Mr. President, seems the least we could do.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the value of qualified historic property shall not be included in determining the taxable estate of a decedent; to the Committee on Finance.

THE ESTATE TAX HISTORY PRESERVATION ACT

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that will provide a new tax incentive for qualifying owners of national historic landmark houses that will encourage the preservation and public accessibility to these houses. It is designed to prevent private owners of historical properties from being forced to sell because of concern over the financial burden of Federal estate taxes.

Under current law, the value of historical property is included in determining the taxable estate of a decedent. This raises serious concerns to families that are maintaining and opening to the public these architectural historical homes. They are sharing these treasures with our Nation. To force the operation of these privately funded museum properties to end, due to fear over future estate tax burdens that will be thrust on their descendants is depriving our citizens the opportunity to enjoy the architectural wonders of these homes. Tourists in many States will be denied the opportunity to visit these homes and experience the heritage of these historical sites.

Mr. President, I propose that an estate tax exemption be provided for qualified historical properties. The number of historical homes that will qualify is modest since this legislation requires private, taxable ownership and national historical landmark status, as well as a willingness on the part of the owner to operate the premises as a museum subject to strict requirements. While the legislation has minimal effects on Federal revenues it plays a major role in preserving extraordinarily important properties.

This bill is an opportunity for the Government to encourage preservation of history. Historical homes help preserve the themes of our common heritage and highlight the unique pattern of each community. They contribute to the perpetuation of the historical fabric of our national life. They are a source of a community's pride in accomplishment and beauty.

Section 1(b)(7) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 states that:

> Although the major burdens of historic preservation have been borne and major efforts initiated by private agencies and individuals, and both should continue to play a vital role, it is nevertheless necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to accelerate its historic preservation programs and activities to get maximum encouragement to agencies and individuals undertaking preservation by private means, and to assist State and local governments and the National Trust Historic Preservation in the United States to expand and accelerate their historical preservation programs and activities.

That is what this legislation does. It encourages private citizens to preserve historical properties rather than sell or develop them despite their desire to do so. Winston Churchill recognized the importance of preserving historical properties when in 1943 he said ''We shape our buildings, and afterwards our buildings shape us''.

Mr President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 693

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCLUSION FROM ESTATE TAX FOR HISTORIC PROPERTY SUBJECT TO PRESERVATION EASEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue of 1986 (relating to taxable estate) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2057. QUALIFIED HISTORIC PROPERTY.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of the tax imposed by section 2001, the value of the taxable estate shall be determined by deducting from the value of the gross estate an amount equal to the value of any qualified historic property included in the gross estate.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFIED HISTORIC PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified historic property' means any historic property if—

''(i) on or before the date on which the return of the tax imposed by section 2001 is filed, a qualified real property interest described in section 170(h)(2)(C) in such property is held by a qualified organization for the purpose described in section 170(h)(4)(A)(iv), and

''(ii) such property is covered by an agreement meeting the requirements of subsection (c) which is entered into on or before such date.

''(B) TREATMENT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.—Such term includes personal property included within, or associated with, qualified historic property (as defined in paragraph (1)) if such personal property—

''(i) is held by the decedent holding such qualified historic property,

''(ii) has been so included within, or associated with, such qualified historic property throughout the 10-year period ending on the date of the decedent's death, and

''(iii) is covered by the agreement referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii) which covers such qualified historic property.

''(2) HISTORIC PROPERTY.—The term 'historic property' means—

''(A) any building (and its structural components)—

''(i) which is designated as a National Historic Landmark under section 101 of the National Historic Preservation Act throughout the 10-year period ending on the date of the decedent's death,

''(ii) which was owned by the decedent or a member of the decedent's family (as defined in section 2032A(e)(2)) throughout such 10-year period, and

''(iii) which was originally used for residential purposes, and

''(B) any other real property to the extent reasonably necessary for public view and visitation of the property described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.—The term 'qualified organization' has the meaning given to such term by section 170(h)(3).

''(4) TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED HISTORIC PROPERTY HELD BY A CORPORATION.—In the case of a corporation all of the stock in which was held on the date of the decedent's death by the decedent or members of the decedent's family (as defined in section 2032A(e)(2))—

''(A) stock in such corporation shall be treated for purposes of this section as qualified historic property to the extent that the value of such stock is attributable to qualified historic property held by such corporation, but

''(B) the requirements of subsection (c) shall be met only if each member of the decedent's family holding such stock on such date sign the agreement referred to in subsection (c).

''(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR AGREEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), an agreement meets the requirements of this subsection if—

''(A) such agreement is a written agreement signed by each person in being who has an interest (whether or not in possession) in the historic property (other than the qualified organization),

''(B) such agreement is entered into with a State historic preservation agency (or similar State agency) and filed with the Secretary with the return of the tax imposed by section 2001,

''(C) such agreement provides that the only activities carried on at the historic property are activities which are substantially related (aside from the need for income or funds or the use made of the profits derived) to—

''(i) the public view and visitation of such property and the property described in the last sentence of subsection (b)(1) with respect to such property), and

''(ii) the maintenance and preservation of such property and surrounding areas for such public view and visitation,

''(D) such agreement provides that the historic property will be open to the public for a period of at least 20 years beginning on the date on which the return of the tax imposed by section 2001 is filed, and

''(E) such agreement provides that any admission fees (if any) shall bear a reasonable relationship to admission fees for other comparable tourist sites and shall be approved by such State historic preservation agency (or similar State agency).

''(2) TREATMENT OF FOOD, LODGING, AND MEETING FACILITIES PROVIDED TO GENERAL PUBLIC.—The regular carrying on—

''(A) a trade or business of providing lodging shall be treated as not substantially related for purposes of paragraph (1)(C),

''(B) a trade or business of providing food shall be treated as not substantially related for purposes of paragraph (1)(C) unless—

''(i) such food is only provided to individuals who pay the generally applicable admission fees (if any) for admission to the property by individuals to whom no food is provided, and

''(ii) only an insubstantial portion of the structures on the historic property is devoted to the provision of such food, and

''(C) a trade or business of providing facilities for meetings or events shall be treated as not substantially related for purposes of paragraph (1)(C) unless all of the net proceeds from such trade or business are used for maintenance or preservation of the historic property.

''(3) OPEN TO THE PUBLIC.—For the purposes of paragraph (1)(D), the 20-year period referred to in such paragraph shall be suspended during reasonable periods of renovation.

''(d) TAX TREATMENT OF DISPOSITIONS AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AGREEMENT.—

''(1) IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL ESTATE TAX.—If, during the 20-year period referred to in subsection (c)(1)(D)—

''(A) any person signing the written agreement referred to in subsection (c) disposes of any interest in the qualified historic property, or

''(B) there is a violation of any provision of such agreement (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary), then there is hereby imposed an additional estate tax.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFEREES WHO AGREE TO BE BOUND BY AGREEMENT.—No tax shall be imposed under paragraph (1) by reason of any disposition if the person acquiring the property—

''(A) is a qualified organization or is a member of the family (as defined in section 2032A(e)(2)) of the person disposing of such property, and

''(B) agrees to be bound by the agreement referred to in subsection (b)(4) and to be liable for any tax under this subsection in the same manner as the person disposing of such property.

''(3) AMOUNT OF ADDITIONAL TAX.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the additional tax imposed by paragraph (1) with respect to any property shall be an amount equal to the applicable percentage of the excess of—

''(i) what would (but for subsection (a)) have been the tax imposed by section 2001 (reduced by the credits allowable), over

''(ii) the tax imposed by section 2001 (as so reduced).

''(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable percentage is the percentage determined in accordance with the following table for the year (of 20-year period referred to in subsection (c)(1)(D)) in which the event described in paragraph (1) occurs:

''If the event occurs during:	**The applicable percentage is:**
The 1st 12 years of such 20-year period	100 percent
The 13th or 14th year of such period	80 percent
The 15th or 16th year of such period	60 percent
The 17th or 18th year of such period	40 percent
The 19th or 20th year of such period	20 percent.

''(4) DUE DATE.—The additional tax imposed by this subsection shall be due and payable on the day which is 6 months after the date of the disposition or violation referred to in paragraph (1).

''(5) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—Any person signing the agreement referred to in subsection (c) (other than the executor) shall be personally liable for the additional tax imposed by this subsection. If more than 1 person is liable under this subsection, all such persons shall be jointly and severally liable.

''(6) CERTAIN OTHER RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of sections 1016(c), 2013(f), and 2032A(f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

''(e) OTHER SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) COORDINATION WITH DEDUCTION FOR TRANSFER OF EASEMENT.—Section 2055(f) shall not apply to any interest referred to therein with respect to property for which a deduction is allowed under subsection (a).

''(2) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION OF INDEBTEDNESS ON EXCLUDED PROPERTY.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 2053 for indebtedness in respect of property the value of which is deducted under subsection (a).

''(3) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL INVENTORIES OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.—The Secretary shall require the submission to the Secretary of such inventories of personal property which is qualified historic property as the Secretary determines are necessary for purposes of this section.''

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 1014 of such Code is amended by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting '', or'' and by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) in the case of property the value of which was deducted under section 2057(a), the adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the decedent immediately before the death of the decedent.''

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 2056A(b)(10) of such Code is amended by inserting ''2057,'' after ''2056,''.

(3) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 11 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2057. Qualified historic property.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 694. A bill to establish reform criteria to permit payment of U.S. arrearages in assessed contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 695. A bill to restrict intelligence sharing with the United Nations: to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 696. A bill to establish limitations on the use of funds for U.N. peacekeeping activities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

UNITED NATIONS REFORM LEGISLATION

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a package of three bills which address the most critical issues affecting our relations with the United Nations. These are the U.S. arrearage in financial contributions to the United Nations, the sharing of U.S. intelligence with the United Nations, and U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping activities.

The United Nations Reform Act of 1997 is a bill that I have been working on for over a year in my former capacity as chair of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on International Operations. With the United Nations now entering its second half-century, the question being raised is not whether the United Nations can continue its growth for another 50 years, but whether it can survive as an important international institution for the next 5.

With a new Secretary of State who formerly served as U.N. Ambassador, with a new U.N. Ambassador who formerly served as a respected Member of Congress, and with a new U.N. Secretary General, I believe that we have a unique opportunity over the next 2 years to genuinely restore a bipartisan consensus on the United Nations within Congress and among the American people. That is the intent of this legislation, which sets reasonable and achievable reform criteria for the United Nations, linked to a 5-year repayment plan for the nearly $1 billion in

arrearages that have built up in the U.N. system over the past few years.

The plan would set up a five-step annual process under which the President would each year have to certify that specific reform guideposts have been met at the United Nations, permitting the payment each year of one-fifth of outstanding U.S. arrearages.

In the first year, the President would have to certify that a hard freeze zero nominal growth budget at the United Nations had been maintained and that budgetary transparency at the world body had been enhanced through opening up the United Nations to member State auditing and fully funding the new U.N. inspector general office.

In the second year, the President would have to certify that U.S. representation had been restored to a key U.N. budgetary oversight body, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [ACABQ].

In the third year, the President would have to certify that a longstanding U.N. peacekeeping reform goal had been achieved. This reform would ensure that the United States receives full credit or reimbursement for the very substantial logistical and in-kind support our military provides to assessed U.N. peacekeeping missions.

In the fourth year, the President would have to certify that a significant reform in the United Nations' budget process had been achieved. This reform would be to divide the U.N. regular budget into an assessed core budget and a voluntary program budget. The source of much of the United Nations' problems stems from the fact that the United Nations' assessed budget is increasingly used for development programs and other activities that should not be included in our mandatory dues for membership. This reform can be achieved without a revision in the U.N. Charter.

Finally, in the fifth year the President would have to certify that a major U.N. consolidation plan has been approved and implemented. This plan must entail a significant reduction in staff and an elimination of the rampant duplication, overlap, and lack of coordination that exists throughout the U.N. system.

Clearly, there is an urgent need to turn around the United Nations' dangerous slide into constant crisis, which could ultimately threaten the organization's usefulness as an important tool for addressing world problems. I am convinced that this can only be achieved through the kind of bold reform agenda that is set forth in this legislation.

Mr. President, I believe it is useful for us to look back on the original purpose of the United Nations, as it was envisioned 51 years ago. The United Nations was created from the ashes of World War II, with the hope of avoiding future world-wide conflagrations through international cooperation. The main focus for this mission was the Security Council, the only entity empowered under the U.N. Charter to act on the great questions of world peace. The General Assembly was intended to be a forum for debate on any issue that any nation wanted to bring before the assembled nations of the world. The U.N. Secretariat was to be a small professional staff needed to support the activities of the Security Council and General Assembly.

The U.N. system was also to conduct specific activities in technical cooperation, such as those undertaken by the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Telecommunications Union. Finally, the United Nations was to have an important role in responding to international humanitarian crises. Most critical is the work of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, who today protects over 40 million of the world's most vulnerable men, women, and children—particularly women and children, who comprise 80 percent of the world's refugees.

Regrettably, the United Nations system that exists today falls short of the intentions of its founders. There are two interrelated, fundamental problems with U.N. system. One is that there are those who attempted to use the world organization to advance agendas that frankly do not reflect world realities. The more the United Nations is used to transcend what some see as the harsh realities of the world and its Nation-State system, the less relevant the United Nations becomes to the real world in which we all live.

Closely related has been the massive and uncoordinated growth of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The U.N. General Assembly and its related bodies in the specialized agencies have used the tool of the budget to grow the U.N. bureaucracy far beyond what is needed to respond to real world problems. The small professional staff of the U.N. Secretariat now approaches 18,000—counting the proliferation of consultants and contract employees—and the staff of the U.N. system worldwide now exceeds 53,000.

Too many nations simply do not find a compelling need for efficiency and budgetary restraint in the U.N. system. Of the U.N.'s 185 member nations, a near-majority 91 countries are assessed at the minimum .01 percent rate, paying essentially nothing toward U.N. budget. The top ten assessed countries—United States, Japan, Germany, France, Russia, Britain, Italy, Canada, Spain and Brazil—are billed for 78 percent of the U.N. budget, with the United States, at 25 percent, paying nearly twice that of any other country. In just 10 years of supposed zero-growth budgets, the U.N.'s budget has doubled. In the last 18 years the U.N.'s budget has tripled.

There are those who argue that all of the U.N.'s problems come from the United States. But the United Nation's difficulties with the United States arise from these deeply rooted problems within the U.N. structure itself. Even many supporters of the United Nations have characterized today's U.N. system as bloated, inefficient, duplicative, and disorganized. For instance, Canadian businessman and six-time U.N. Under-Secretary-General Maurice Strong has stated that the United Nations ''could work better than it does today with less than half as many people.'' I believe it is significant, and encouraging, that the new Secretary General, Mr. Kofi Annan, has appointed Mr. Strong to be his top adviser on reform issues.

The surprising thing is that among serious analysts of the United Nations there is remarkable agreement on what needs to be done. The U.N. system needs to be significantly reduced in size and needs true consolidation among its far-flung, duplicative elements. The budget process needs similarly dramatic reform. The United Nations needs to concentrate on a few key achievable missions—security, humanitarian relief, purely technical cooperation—and refrain from its proliferating exercises in internal nation-building and grandiose missions of global norm-setting. All of these basic reform needs have been addressed in the U.N. reform legislation I am introducing today.

As complements to my U.N. reform bill, I am also introducing two U.N.-related bills which I sponsored in the last Congress. The first would protect U.S. intelligence information which is shared with the United Nations or any of its affiliated organizations by requiring that procedures for protecting intelligence sources and methods are in place at the United Nations that are at least as stringent as those maintained by countries with which the United States regularly shares similar types of information. This requirement may be waived by the President for national security purposes but only on a case by case basis and only when all possible measures for protecting the information have been taken.

This legislation grew out of my concern about reports of breaches of U.S. classified material by the United Nations in 1993, 1994, and in 1995 when the United Nations pulled out of Somalia. I am pleased to note that more attention is being paid by this body to the problems that can result when U.S. intelligence information is shared with international bodies. Condition 5 of the recently approved resolution of ratification for the Chemical Weapons Convention, which protects U.S. intelligence shared with the Organization for the Protection of Chemical Weapons, was based on my intelligence-sharing legislation.

To complete the package of three bills, I am introducing today the International Peacekeeping Reform Act of 1997 which I also sponsored in the 104th Congress. Before any funds can be made available for U.N. peacekeeping activities, this legislation requires the President to certify to Congress that hostilities have ceased and all parties agree to a U.N. peacekeeping role, that

the percentage of the U.S. assessed share of the total cost of the operation does not exceed the percentage of the U.S. assessed share for the regular U.N. budget, and that adequate measures have been taken to protect U.S. intelligence information provided in support of the operation.

Furthermore, my bill would require that, if the operation is to include units of the U.S. Armed Forces to carry out combat missions, the President must certify that the operation advances U.S. security interests, that U.S. participation is critical to the operation's success, that the units will be under the operational command and control of the U.S. armed forces, and that the U.S. military personnel will be fully protected by the Geneva Convention of 1949 governing the treatment of prisoners of war. This legislation requires the President to notify Congress of the intent to support an international peacekeeping operation at least 15 days before any vote of the United Nations Security Council to establish, expand or modify such an operation. If the President determines that an emergency exists which prevents him from meeting the 15-day advance notice requirement, the notice is to be provided in a timely manner, but no later than 48 hours after the Security Council vote.

The three measures I am introducing today will, I believe, go a long way toward setting a new course in our relations with the United Nations. If we in Congress fail to rise to the challenge; if the U.N. attempts to defend an unsustainable status quo; if the Administration's new foreign policy team does not reach out to Congress to achieve a genuine bipartisan consensus on the need for U.N. reform; if the U.N.'s dangerous slide to expensive irrelevance continues, then we will have lost a unique opportunity for reform. If this should happen, it is not at all clear to me whether such an opportunity will soon return.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to consider the legislation I am introducing today as the best course for restoring the bipartisan consensus in this country on the United Nations.

Mr. Prsident, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''United Nations Reform Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARREARAGES IN ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002, no funds shall be available for obligation or expenditure to the United Nations for the payment except under procedures of United States assessed contributions to the United Nations more than one year in arrears at the time of passage of this Act under United States Government accounting except under procedures under subsection (b);

(b) PROCEDURES FOR THE RELEASE OF UNITED STATES ARREARAGES TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—In accordance with procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 34 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, for each fiscal year 1998 through 2002, the President may make available for obligation or expenditure to the United Nations an amount not to exceed 20% of United States assessed contributions to the United Nations more than one year in arrears at the time of passage of this Act under United States Government accounting if on January 31 of each fiscal year 1998 through 2002 the President determines and certifies to the relevant committees of the Congress that the applicable reform criteria for each fiscal year has been met.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) RELEVANT COMMITTEES OF THE CONGRESS .—The term ''relevant committees of the Congress'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) APPLICABLE REFORM CRITERIA.—The term ''applicable reform criteria'' means—

(A) for fiscal year 1998 that the United Nations has maintained a zero nominal growth budget in United States dollar terms and has made all of its programs, offices and activities open to auditing by the national auditing and inspecting agencies of its member states to include, but not be limited to the United States General Accounting Office and the State Department Office of Inspector General, that the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services has been fully funded at its request level, and that all products of the Office of Internal Oversight Services relevant to United Nations budgetary and administrative matters are available to all United Nations member states;

(B) for fiscal year 1999 that all criteria for fiscal year 1998 continue to be met and that United States representation on the United Nations Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has been restored;

(C) for fiscal year 2000 that all criteria for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 continue to be met and that procedures for assessing contributions for United Nations peacekeeping activities have been reformed to ensure that for all logistical, in-kind, and non-cash aid provided by the United States to support United Nations assessed peacekeeping activities that the United States either receives from the United Nations cash reimbursement for the full value of such aid or credit toward the payment of assessed contributions for peacekeeping operations;

(D) for fiscal year 2001 that all criteria for fiscal years 1998 through 2000 continue to be met and that the United Nations has divided its regular budget into a small ''core'' assessed budget representing only those activities determined by the General Accounting Office to be necessary for the United Nations to maintain its existence under the terms of the United Nations Charter and a voluntary ''program'' budget that would include all United Nations programs, developmental activities, regional activities, economic and social activities, and related staff; and

(E) for fiscal year 2002 that all criteria for fiscal years 1998 through 2001 continue to be met and that the United Nations has approved and implemented systemwide structural reform, entailing a significant reduction in staff, that would eliminate all outdated activities and program duplication and would encompass all relevant United Nations specialized agencies.

S. 695

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RESTRICTIONS ON INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED NATIONS.

The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 13. RESTRICTIONS ON INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED NATIONS.

''(a) PROVISIONS OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—(1) No United States intelligence information may be provided to the United Nations or any organization affiliated with the United Nations, or to any official or employee thereof, unless the President certifies to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that the Director of Central Intelligence (in this section referred to as the 'DCI'), in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, has required, and such organization has established and implemented, procedures for protecting intelligence sources and methods (including protection from release to nations and foreign nationals that are otherwise not eligible to receive such information) no less stringent than procedures maintained by nations with which the United States regularly shares similar types of intelligence information. Such certification shall include a description of the procedures in effect at such organization.

''(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived upon written certification by the President to the appropriate committees of Congress that providing such information to the United Nations or an organization affiliated with the United Nations, or to any official or employee thereof, is in the direct national security interest of the United States and that all possible measures protecting such information have been taken, except that such waiver must be made for each instance such information is provided, or for each such document provided.

(b) PERIODIC AND SPECIAL REPORTS.—(1) The President shall periodically report, but not less frequently than quarterly, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the types and volume of intelligence provided to the United Nations and the purposes for which it was provided during the period covered by the report. Such periodic reports shall be submitted to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives with an annex containing a counterintelligence and security assessment of all risks, including an evaluation of any potential adverse impact on national collection systems, of providing intelligence to the United Nations, together with information on how such risks have been addressed.

(2) The President shall submit a special report to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives within 15 days after the

United States Government becomes aware of any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence provided to the United Nations by the United States.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The restriction of subsection (a) and the requirement for periodic reports under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to the provision of intelligence that is provided only to, and for the use of, appropriately cleared United States Government personnel serving with the United Nations.

''(d) DELEGATION OF DUTIES.—The President may not delegate or assign the duties of the President under Secretary (a).

''(e) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(1) impair or otherwise affect the authority of the Director of Central Intelligence to protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure pursuant to section 103(c)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–3(c)(5)); or

''(2) supersede or otherwise affect the provisions of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.).''.

S. 696

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''International Peacekeeping Reform Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

(a) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available to the Department of State under the account ''Contribution for International Peacekeeping Activities'' or any other funds made available to the Department of State under any law to pay for assessed or voluntary contributions to United Nations peacekeeping activities shall be available for obligation or expenditure to the United Nations to establish, expand in size, or modify in mission a United Nations peacekeeping operations unless, with respect to such peacekeeping operation—

(1) the President submits a certification to the appropriate congressional committees under subsection (c); and

(2) except as provided in paragraph (b), the President has notified the appropriate congressional committees of the intent to support the establishment of the peacekeeping operation at least 15 days before any vote in the Security Council to establish, expand, or modify such operation. The notification shall include the following:

(A) A cost assessment of such action (including the total estimated cost and the United States share of such cost).

(B) Identification of the source of funding for the United States share of the costs of the action (whether in an annual budget request, reprogramming notification, a rescission of funds, a budget amendment, or a supplemental budget request.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION OF EXISTENCE OF EMERGENCY.—If the President determines that an emergency exists which prevented submission of the 15-day advance notification specified in paragraph (a) and that the proposed action is in the direct national security interests of the United States, the notification described in paragraph (a) shall be provided in a timely manner but no later than 48 hours after the vote by the Security Council.

(C) CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—The President shall determine and certify to the Congress that the United Nations Peacekeeping operation described under paragraph (a) meets the following requirements:

(1) The operation involves an international conflict in which hostilities have ceased and all significant parties to the conflict agree to the imposition of United Nations peacekeeping forces for the purpose of seeking an enduring solution to the conflict.

(2) With respect to any assessed contribution to such United Nations peacekeeping activity, the percentage of the United States assessed share for the total cost of the operation is no greater than the percentage of the United States assessed share for the regular United Nations budget.

(3) In the event that the provision of United States intelligence information involving sources and methods on intelligence gathering is planned to be provided to the United Nations to support the operation, adequate measures have been taken by the United Nations to protect such information.

(4) With respect to the participation in the operation of units of the United States Armed Forces trained to carry out direct combat missions—

(A) the operation directly advances United States national security interests,

(B) the participation of such units is critical to the success of the operation,

(C) such units will be under the operational command and control of the United States Armed Forces, and

(D) any member of the United States Armed Forces participating in the operation would have access to the full protection of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (signed at Geneva, August 12, 1949) if captured and held by combatants to other parties to the conflict.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the International Relations and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term ''adequate measures'' refers to the implementation of procedures for protecting intelligence sources and methods (including protection from release to nations and foreign nationals that are otherwise not eligible to receive such information) no less stringent than procedures maintained by nations with which the United States regularly shares similar types of intelligence information, as determined by the Director of Central Intelligence upon consultation with the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense; and

(3) the term ''direct combat'' means engaging an enemy or hostile force with individual or crew-served weapons while being exposed to direct enemy fire, a high probability of direct physical contact with the enemy or hostile force, and a substantial risk of capture.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 181

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that installment sales of certain farmers not be treated as a preference item for purposes of the alternative minimum tax.

S. 295

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] were added as cosponsors of S. 295, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to provide for compassionate payments with regard to individuals with blood-clotting disorders, such as hemophilia, who contracted human immunodeficiency virus due to contaminated blood products, and for other purposes.

S. 419

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 419, a bill to provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at prevention of birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 494

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 494, a bill to combat the overutilization of prison health care services and control rising prisoner health care costs.

S. 548

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], and the Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS] were added as cosponsors of S. 548, a bill to expand the availability and affordability of quality child care through the offering of incentives to businesses to support child care activities.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 570, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain small businesses from the mandatory electronic fund transfer system.

S. 652

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] were added as cosponsors of S. 652, a bill to facilitate recovery from the recent flooding of the Red River of the North and its tributaries by providing greater flexibility for depository institutions and their regulators, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 79

At the request of Mr. KEMPTHORNE, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 79, A resolution to commemorate the 1997 National Peace Officers Memorial Day.