

Congress to pay for not only the balance of the annual operating costs, but to provide funds for recreation facility construction and rehabilitation as well. As visitation goes up, so will fees and ultimately overall program funding. This legislation is designed to reverse the current trend of decreasing appropriations for visitor services.

One of the key features of this legislation, and of any successful fee program, is providing program incentives. By permitting the agencies to retain all funds without further appropriation, my legislation provides substantial incentives for both the public and the agencies administering the program. Further, most of the funds would be kept right in the area they are collected, with some allowance made for areas which cannot collect adequate recreational fees.

Other important features of this bill include the following: First, developing a consistent recreation fee policy for the 5 primary Federal land management agencies; second, providing flexibility in the amount of fees charged, but ensuring that fees collected are fair; third, limiting recreational fees to developed recreation sites and other specific recreational services provided by the federal agencies; fourth, ensuring congressional oversight of rates charged; fifth, permitting the use of volunteers to collect fees; sixth, ensuring accountability of fees collected; seventh, prohibiting fees for Federal hunting and fishing licenses; and eighth, guaranteeing access to private property without requiring the payment of any fee.

Taken together, these reforms will fundamentally change the manner in which the fee programs on Federal lands currently operate. These are changes which will work to the benefit of all recreational users of Federal lands. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this legislation, I welcome their input, and that of the public who uses our Federal lands.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANDREA H. SEASTRAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 552 through 557 I was unavoidably detained due to district travel plans and therefore unable to vote.

Had I been present I would have voted "no" on rollcalls 552, 555, and 556 and "yes" on rollcalls 553, 554, and 557.

THE EMPLOYMENT OF U.S. CITIZENS IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that U.S. citizens are allocated approximately 15 percent of U.N. posts, despite the fact that U.S. assessed contributions amount to 25 percent of the organization's regular budget. The geographic distribution formula for U.N. employees, which includes

population and membership as well as contributions, does not appear to reflect the disproportionate responsibilities born by the United States within the U.N. system. A separate concern is that the U.N. Secretariat consistently fails to meet even this relatively low employment allocation; only 10 percent of all U.N. employees are U.S. citizens.

I believe this is a serious problem that deserves high-level consideration. My reservations about U.N. employment policies are outlined in a letter I sent recently to the Department of State. I ask that my letter, and the Department's response, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, June 16, 1995.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,

Secretary of State,

Department of State,

Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write to inquire what steps the Administration has taken to increase the employment of U.S. citizens in the United Nations system.

My inquiry is prompted by the most recent report to Congress on this subject, as required by section 181 of P.L. 102-138, which was submitted on June 2.

My reading of the report indicates the following:

(1) The United States accepts the U.N. Secretariat's ability to exclude large numbers of U.N. positions from the application of the principle of equitable geographic distribution; and

(2) The United States accepts a geographic distribution formula for U.N. employees which allocates the United States roughly 15% of U.N. posts, even though the United States contributes 25% of the U.N. regular budget and about 30% of U.N. peacekeeping costs.

I would appreciate a clarification of whether these statements reflect U.S. policy, and if so, the date these policies were adopted, and why.

I am concerned that even this relatively low allocation is barely met in the U.N. Secretariat, and is not being met in eight of the nine U.N. agencies on which the report focuses. As a whole, the report states that only 10% of all U.N. employees are U.S. citizens, a level which has not increased significantly over time.

I find it difficult to believe that there are insufficiently qualified U.S. applicants for available U.N. posts, particularly in the area of humanitarian relief and aviation expertise where large numbers of U.S. citizens have unique skills and are seeking employment.

I would therefore appreciate an answer to the following questions:

(1) What are the principal obstacles to increase hiring of U.S. citizens in the U.N. system? Do these obstacles vary by agency?

(2) Is a registry kept of U.S. citizens interested in and qualified for U.N. posts which are advertised?

(3) What office within the State Department is responsible for assisting U.S. citizens seeking employment at the United Nations, and how many personnel does that office have?

(4) What specific steps has the Department taken, both with the Secretariat and with other U.N. agencies, to address the underrepresentation of U.S. citizens?

I understand that equitable geographic distribution of U.N. posts is one among several principles guiding decisions on U.N. employment, the foremost of which I hope would be competence. I am puzzled nonetheless that U.S. representation remains so persistently low within the U.N. system.

I would appreciate any information you could supply, and stand ready to work with you to address this imbalance.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Ranking Democratic Member.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, July 19, 1995.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: This is in response to your letter of June 16 to Secretary of State Christopher inquiring about the steps the Administration has taken to increase the employment of U.S. citizens in the United Nations system. As you are aware, the Secretary of State is responsible for leading and coordinating the U.S. Government's efforts to ensure that the staffs of UN agencies and other international organizations include an equitable number of Americans in professional positions.

In your letter, you asked for information regarding the United Nations Secretariat's geographic distribution formula, and clarification of U.S. policy regarding the application of this formula. Prior to 1962, the UN's geographic distribution system for professional staff was based simply, and informally, on member states' contributions to the regular budget. The UN first debated the geographic distribution issue during the General Assembly's seventeenth session in 1962.

In this debate, the United States proposed a resolution calling on the secretary General to consider giving weight to the factors of population and membership, as well as the financial contributions of states, and to consider widening the categories of Secretariat staff subject to geographical distribution. The formula eventually approved called for 60% of the posts to be filled on the basis of member states' assessed contributions, and the remaining 40% to be filled based on their population and membership. The GA also recognized that not all professional posts should be included within the geographic distribution formula. These included posts with special technical and language requirements, national restrictions, and all General Service (administrative) positions.

The formula in place today maintains the same three weighted factors: contributions, population and membership. Over the years, the weight given to contributions has decreased slightly, from 60% in 1962 to the current 55%. Therefore, even though the United States may contribute 25% to most UN agencies, the desirable ranges of U.S. professional representation in these agencies average between 15% to 18%. Other major contributors to the UN have similarly proportional ranges.

Following are our responses to your other four questions.

1. What are the principal obstacles to increased hiring of U.S. citizens in the UN system? Do these obstacles vary by agency?

The historical under-representation of Americans in many of the UN agencies is due to a number of factors, including stiff competition from nationals of other member countries, the lack of foreign language skills by some American candidates, and our lack of participation at most UN agencies in Junior Professional Officer (JPO) programs which encourage promotion from within. In addition, some Americans are deterred from considering such positions because of the high cost of living in many UN cities, the lack of employment opportunities overseas for spouses, and other family and career considerations. It is for these reasons that Americans tend to be better represented in many of the New York offices of the UN Secretariat, and at the New York headquarters