

CONDEMNING THE VIOLATION OF UKRAINIAN  
SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, AND  
TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY BY MILITARY  
FORCES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

---

---

MARKUP

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

**H. Res. 499**

MARCH 6, 2014

**Serial No. 113-126**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/> or  
<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

86-961PDF

WASHINGTON : 2014

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

EDWARD R. ROYCE, California, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey	ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DANA ROHRBACHER, California	BRAD SHERMAN, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
TED POE, Texas	THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
MATT SALMON, Arizona	BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	KAREN BASS, California
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina	WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
ADAM KINZINGER, Illinois	DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
MO BROOKS, Alabama	ALAN GRAYSON, Florida
TOM COTTON, Arkansas	JUAN VARGAS, California
PAUL COOK, California	BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER, Illinois
GEORGE HOLDING, North Carolina	JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III, Massachusetts
RANDY K. WEBER SR., Texas	AMI BERA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	ALAN S. LOWENTHAL, California
STEVE STOCKMAN, Texas	GRACE MENG, New York
RON DeSANTIS, Florida	LOIS FRANKEL, Florida
DOUG COLLINS, Georgia	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina	JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
TED S. YOHO, Florida	
LUKE MESSER, Indiana	

AMY PORTER, *Chief of Staff*

THOMAS SHEEHY, *Staff Director*

JASON STEINBAUM, *Democratic Staff Director*

# CONTENTS

	Page
MARKUP OF	
H. Res. 499, Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation ..	2
En bloc amendment to H. Res. 499 offered by the Honorable George Holding, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy III, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Honorable Adam Kinzinger, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, the Honorable Mark Meadows, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina, and the Honorable Scott Perry, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania .....	15
Amendments to H. Res. 499 offered by: .....	
The Honorable William Keating, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts .....	23
The Honorable Ted Poe, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas .....	25
Amendment to the Poe amendment offered by the Honorable Alan Grayson, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida .....	34
Modified Grayson amendment to the Poe amendment .....	35
The Honorable Tulsi Gabbard, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii .....	38
APPENDIX	
Markup notice .....	42
Markup minutes .....	43
Markup summary .....	45
The Honorable Eliot L. Engel, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York: Prepared statement .....	46
The Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy III: Prepared statement .....	47



**CONDEMNING THE VIOLATION OF  
UKRAINIAN SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE,  
AND TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY BY MILITARY  
FORCES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

---

**THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2014**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:31 a.m., in room 2172 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Edward Royce (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ROYCE. This meeting will come to order.

And pursuant to notice, we meet today to mark up House Resolution 499 condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, Ukrainian independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.

I now call up the resolution, and without objection it is considered read and open for amendment at any point.

[The information referred to follows:]

.....  
(Original Signature of Member)

113TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**H. RES.** \_\_\_\_\_

Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**RESOLUTION**

Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.

Whereas the United States has been strongly committed to the sovereignty, democratic development, and prosperity of Ukraine since the recovery of its independence in 1991;

Whereas the Ukrainian people have the right to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other countries and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

Whereas closer relations with Europe hold out the prospect of a more stable and prosperous Ukraine, which would be of benefit to all countries, including Russia;

Whereas the military intervention by the Russian Federation in Crimea is a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity;

Whereas this military intervention is a violation of international law, including the Russian Federation's obligations under the United Nations Charter;

Whereas this military intervention is a violation of the Russian Federation's obligations under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine;

Whereas by its military intervention in Ukraine, the Russian Federation has violated the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act Declaration of Principles Regarding Relations Between Participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe;

Whereas the Russian Federation's military intervention in Crimea represents a reckless escalation of its long-standing efforts to pressure Ukraine through political, diplomatic, and economic means to reduce its ties to Europe and the West and force it into a closer association with Russia, including through the establishment of a Eurasian Union;

Whereas the Russian Federation has used and is continuing to use coercive economic measures, including the manipu-

lation of energy prices and supplies, to place political pressure on Ukraine and other countries in the region;

Whereas the Government of Ukraine has exercised extraordinary restraint to date in response to the use of force against it on its territory; and

Whereas the immediate deployment of international monitors from either the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe or the United Nations to Crimea and in other Ukrainian regions would provide transparency and objective reporting regarding threats of violence and military activity, and also enhance the security of the Ukrainian people in all regions: Now, therefore, be it

1       *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

2               (1) condemns the violation of Ukrainian sov-  
3       ereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by  
4       military forces of the Russian Federation;

5               (2) states that the military intervention by the  
6       Russian Federation—

7               (A) is in breach of its obligations under  
8       the United Nations Charter;

9               (B) is in violation of the 1994 Budapest  
10       Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which  
11       it pledged to respect the independence and sov-  
12       ereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine  
13       and to refrain from the threat of use of force  
14       against the territorial integrity or political inde-  
15       pendence of Ukraine; and

1           (C) poses a threat to international peace  
2           and security;

3           (3) calls on the Russian Federation to remove  
4           all of its military forces from Ukraine's Crimean pe-  
5           ninsula, other than at those operating in accordance  
6           with its 1997 agreement on the Status and Condi-  
7           tions of the Black Sea Fleet Stationing on the Terri-  
8           tory of Ukraine, and to refrain from interference in  
9           all regions of Ukraine;

10          (4) declares that the Ukrainian people have the  
11          right to determine their own future free from out-  
12          side interference;

13          (5) commends the Ukrainian Government for  
14          its continued restraint and avoidance of military  
15          provocations;

16          (6) calls on the Ukrainian Government to con-  
17          tinue to protect the rights of all minority popu-  
18          lations within Ukraine and make clear that it rep-  
19          resents all Ukrainian citizens;

20          (7) calls on all Ukrainians to respect the legiti-  
21          mate government authorities in all parts of Ukraine,  
22          including in eastern and southern Ukraine;

23          (8) calls for the deployment of independent  
24          monitors from the Organization for Security and Co-

1 operation in Europe in Crimea and other areas of  
2 Ukraine;

3 (9) calls upon the President and the leaders of  
4 the other democratic states to not attend the G-8  
5 summit in Sochi, Russia and to consider expelling  
6 Russia from the group, given its international ag-  
7 gression and internal repression that are incon-  
8 sistent with democratic standards;

9 (10) calls on the Administration to work with  
10 our European allies and other countries to impose  
11 visa, financial, trade, and other sanctions on senior  
12 Russian Federation officials, majority state-owned  
13 banks and commercial organizations, and other state  
14 agencies, as appropriate;

15 (11) states that the United States should par-  
16 ticipate with its European allies and other countries  
17 in a joint effort to provide the Ukrainian govern-  
18 ment with financial, economic, and technical assist-  
19 ance, including asset recovery, to assist an economic  
20 recovery program that includes fundamental re-  
21 forms;

22 (12) calls on the United States, its European  
23 allies, and other countries and international organi-  
24 zations to provide assistance to ensure that new elec-

1 tions scheduled for May 2014 are free, fair, and in  
2 full accordance with international standards;

3 (13) calls on the United States and its Euro-  
4 pean allies and other countries to develop a long-  
5 term strategy to support economic development in  
6 Ukraine, including enhanced relationships with  
7 Western countries, organizations and institutions;

8 (14) supports efforts by Ukraine to achieve en-  
9 ergy independence; and

10 (15) affirms the right of all countries in the re-  
11 gion to exercise their sovereign rights within their  
12 internationally recognized borders free from outside  
13 intervention and to conduct their foreign policy in  
14 accordance with their determination of the best in-  
15 terests of their peoples.

Chairman ROYCE. Furthermore, without objection, all members here may have 5 calendar days to submit statements for the record or any extraneous materials that they might want to provide. And after my brief remarks, I think I will recognize those who wish to offer amendments.

Okay. After my opening remarks, let us do it this way. Any members who would like to speak on this resolution, let us get that debate out of the way, and then we will go to the members' amendments, some of which will be accepted en bloc after they make their case, and some will be voted on independently that are more controversial.

I would also like to thank the members for their cooperation in considering this resolution so quickly. As we heard during this morning's testimony, Ukraine is in a very difficult, very tense situation. Time is of the essence. Congress needs to have its voice put in play soon on this, and this resolution is a straightforward declaration by the House in support of freedom-loving Ukrainians in their time of trial. It also condemns Russia's unprovoked aggression, in no uncertain terms.

This resolution is one part of a larger effort to provide assistance to Ukraine and to impose real costs on Russia for its actions, which this committee is working on. This resolution, among other provisions, condemns the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty and independence and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation. It declares the Ukrainian people have the right to determine their own future, free from outside interference.

Importantly, the resolution calls on the administration to work with our allies to impose visa, financial, and other sanctions as appropriate. This action cannot go unchallenged. The action by Russia cannot go unchallenged. And as part of an effort to show Moscow how isolated they are, world leaders are speaking out. The House should speak out as well.

And with that, I will open the committee to any comments that members would like to make on the resolution itself at this time.

Mr. Meadows.

Mr. MEADOWS. I just would like to thank the chairman for his work and, quite frankly, for bringing this to the attention of the House in such an expedited manner. The chairman is correct in terms of the critical nature. Every hour makes a difference. And so I would just like to thank the chairman for his leadership and the committee for their work on bringing this forward, and I support the resolution. Yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Any other members who would like to be heard on the resolution at hand? Mr. Brad Sherman of California.

Mr. SHERMAN. I support the resolution. Happy to co-sponsor it. I think it is important in this resolution not only to urge Russia to do what it should do, and I think the resolution does a good job of that, but to also urge those in Kiev to broaden their coalition to include people in the government that were with the party that actually won the last internationally monitored election, and to not adopt measures that would question the use of the Russian language or reduce the level of official language status that the Russian language has according to laws that existed at the beginning of this year.

If we want a united Ukraine, the government in Kiev has got to not be a government of the winners but a government of the entire country. And I hope that that is part of the message we send, whether it is in the text of the resolution or not, and I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Grayson of Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support this resolution and strongly object to and condemn Russian interference in any other country, including neighboring countries. That being said, I think that the resolution fails to come to grips with the fundamental issue that is facing us around the world when we are addressing the situation, which is this. The Ukraine is an artificial creation, and, specifically, a creation of Lenin and Khrushchev slapping together a Ukrainian population with a Russian-speaking population and a Russian Ukrainian-speaking population.

Time after time and in election after election, we have seen a sharp geographic division in the country between east and west. In the west, you have Ukraine and Ukrainian speakers. In the east, you have both Russians and Ukrainians who speak Russian primarily. Once again, over and over again, we see in the west one party winning 80 or 90 percent of the vote, the Ukrainian party; the other party in the east winning 80 or 90 percent of the vote, the Russian party.

These are Siamese twins joined at the hip, and they need to be over time very carefully and tenderly separated. That is the only way that we are going to see any sort of resolution of the situation.

I would hope to see U.S. policy that recognizes that. I would hope to see U.S. policy that favors regional autonomy and the right to self-determination to both sides of the country. It is clear now that in the west there is a strong desire for the western part of the Ukraine to join Poland and other neighboring countries as part of the EU. That is not shared by many people in the eastern part of the country.

The Russians and the Russian speakers in the east favor a different policy entirely. We have to come to grips with that. If autonomy means anything, it means the right to determine who it is who will be determining your future. In the west, there is a desire to see the EU help determine the future of the Ukraine. In the east, there is a desire to see Russia help determine the future of the Ukraine.

The area that the Russians are now using military forces to try to control is an area that voted for the deposed government with over 90 percent of the vote. Again, I don't in any way agree with what the Russians have done, but I do have to wonder what point there is in engaging in this kind of Cold War attitude, this "us versus them" attitude, and failing to come to grips with the underlying problem.

Basically, we are talking about a country that cannot even agree on an alphabet. And as long as that remains true, there will be no peace in the Ukraine, regardless of what we do or what the Russians do.

I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Yielding myself such time as I may consume, let me point out that there are many countries in which more than

one language is spoken. But in the case of the Ukraine, when the vote for independence came, the Russian-speaking portion of the country, as well as the Ukrainian-speaking portion, voted overwhelmingly for independence.

Likewise, when the vote came on the referendum, basically, on Yanukovich, to remove him from his post, 328 members, both east and west, from the east and the western portion of the country, voted in favor of his removal. That is 100 votes above and beyond the number required for passage as, indeed, the parliamentarians who belong to his own political party, the Party of Regions, voted overwhelmingly in favor of impeachment.

The EU observers, by the way, including the Polish and the French and the German foreign ministers, were at Kiev at the time, and immediately affirmed to the media that there had been no coup, that the overwhelming majority of Parliament had voted for a new government.

Now, as Ukraine goes to elections in May, this is an opportunity. It is an opportunity for us in the Congress, as we stress in this resolution, to encourage inclusion in the Ukraine. We recognize that Poland and Ukraine have an overwhelming majority of people who want an independent Ukraine.

And, yes, it is true; some look east and some look west, and ultimately it is up to the Ukrainian population to resolve this peacefully through their elected government. But I think we can assert the principle that Ukraine be allowed to serve both those roles, to trade to the east and trade to the west, to trade to the north with Poland and to the south with Moldova.

I think that we have an opportunity also in engagement, and I hope to do this, you know, in our delegation that we take with this committee in April in Kiev, to stress the importance of inclusion with respect to different languages, because so many conflicts start out over language. But in this particular case, if we recognize the history, part of this is because of Soviet meddling in the past.

The eastern Ukraine once had an additional 8 million Ukrainian speakers. Joe Stalin, unfortunately, during the collectivization, forced collectivization of the country, moved them out to Siberia. Most of them perished, most of the population that was moved. And, subsequently, there were the purges under the Soviet system.

So, yes, Russian speakers moved in, but what is interesting about Ukrainian independence is the overwhelming support from all parts of the country, whether Tatar or Ukrainian or Russian speaking. And given this important consideration, I think we have here before us a resolution that carefully explains, in a way that will help bring leverage to wind down this crisis, our recognition that all minority groups need to be included there.

And I think the template for democratic governance—and I don't doubt this is going to be difficult, because Ukraine does not have a history of compromise in its political system. But what we are suggesting here, and with further EU engagement, our hope is that we can help bring together the different political parties and factions.

And the best way to do it is what is in this resolution, calling for an election in which everyone goes to the polls, and a legislature which is representative, and then bring in the forms which

end the corruption, because also a portion of this resistance that you see in the country is to the historical corruption, the endemic corruption there.

And that is the other issue that needs to be addressed, and we are addressing that as well with the engagement of Europe and the United States.

Mr. KINZINGER. Will the chairman—

Chairman ROYCE. And I will yield to Mr. Kinzinger.

Mr. KINZINGER. I just want to make the point that in the United—as a Republican from Illinois, the United States actually votes quite differently based on geography, and in some cases it seems like we actually speak different languages as well. But we are able to stand together as one country and achieve a common objective, so I just wanted to add that to the chairman's point.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Cicilline of Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to Mr. Grayson.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you. Responding to the point that was just made, if you go back and you look at the election results for the 1868 election and the 1872 election here in the United States, at the end of the bloodiest war that we have ever experienced, you don't see the polarization state by state that you see in the recent Ukrainian elections going back to 2004.

There is actually a greater polarization today in the Ukraine determined by the election results than there was in those elections. There was no state in the United States that voted as much as 80/20 in the 1868 election. Many, many provinces in the Ukraine voted more than 80/20, either for the pro-Ukrainian party or the pro-Russian party.

That is the fact, and that shows that they have reached the end of the line. There must be some kind of acknowledgement of the fact that the people in the eastern part of the Ukraine do not want to be part of the EU, and the people in the western part of the Ukraine do not want to be lorded over by Russia.

And we need to—if we are going to have any hope of progress, we need to recognize that. We have had our velvet divorces around the world before. Nobody claims anymore that the Czech Republic should be slapped together with Slovakia.

Sometimes it is done in a less peaceful manner as occurred with Sudan and South Sudan recently. But the fact is that there are irreconcilable differences between these two parts of the population, and I will vote for this resolution, but I think that it is a shame that the resolution does not acknowledge the basic fact that has caused the situation in the first place.

Chairman ROYCE. Could I ask if Mr. Cicilline would yield me some time? I understand the gentleman's point. I would point out, if we are looking at the 1868 and 1872 elections, I am not sure if you follow this logic that that would be borne out, because Confederate soldiers were not allowed to vote in those elections. Indeed, the distance between the north and the south would be far greater if they had been given the franchise to vote.

This is different than in the Ukraine, because in the Ukraine, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, those who had been on the side of the Soviet Union were allowed the franchise, were allowed

the right to vote. I would make that as an example of the fact that we, in the United States, have gone through something as wrenching, perhaps more wrenching with respect to the Civil War, and have eventually come closer together.

I think the point that you make, Mr. Grayson, which is the most concerning one is about the fact that the difference with respect to language itself creates probably more of an impediment than anything else, and that is an area where we can weigh in, where we can assure minority rights and do so, and articulate the fact that all minority rights should indeed be guaranteed and respected.

And I think this way forward is perhaps the one way we can underscore your vision of trying to address this issue. I do not think a balkanization of the east and the Ukraine would—based upon the polling that I have seen, it is opposed by the Ukrainians themselves. And I think a better resolution would be one, as I stated earlier, where Ukraine looks east and west, and I think this resolution overall urges that right to self-determination to all of the people of the Ukraine.

Mr. Cicilline, did you want to reclaim time to make a point?

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you. You are like the timekeeper now.

I just—I thought the chairman made a great point earlier, and I just want to reiterate it to make sure it wasn't lost in his powerful overall point, which is the situation we see in Ukraine, in terms of the ethnic divisions, was engineered by the Russians. This was engineered by Stalin. Stalin intended to populate east Ukraine so that some day, whether it was in 2014 or whether it was 20 years after he did it, some day he could claim legitimacy to that very important part for him.

So I hope that point is not lost, that this is something that was engineered in the mind of Stalin.

I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island, and I yield back.

Mr. GRAYSON. May I ask for some time?

Chairman ROYCE. Recognizing Mr. Grayson.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you. Just to be historically accurate, it wasn't Stalin that added the eastern part of the Ukraine. It was Lenin, and it was Khrushchev. So the gentleman seems to be misinformed in that regard.

Chairman ROYCE. If I could—it was Mr. Khrushchev with respect to, if I—Mr. Grayson, yielding myself such time as I may consume, it was in 1956 that Mr. Khrushchev actually transferred Crimea to the Ukraine, thus creating the current boundaries of the country. And you are correct, Mr. Lenin prior to that.

But, you know, so many countries across eastern Europe are the consequence of these machinations over time. And I think the bottom line, again, is that self-determination has to be left to the people of the country. And I believe if we have a fair and free election in May, that this will be the best way forward for the Ukrainian population.

Let me recognize Mr. Connolly from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to associate myself with your remarks, Mr. Chairman. I certainly appreciate Mr. Grayson's reminding us of the historical context, but where do we go with that? I am concerned about two things here. One is there is no end of boundaries and borders we could start redrawing

based on artificiality or convenience from the Mideast to Africa to, as you point out, Mr. Chairman, former Soviet Republics.

Many boundaries are very arbitrary, and, you know, we have paid a price sometimes for that arbitrariness. But to go back in and decide that we are going to redo them all because somebody in history got it wrong I think is somebody else's task, way beyond the work of this committee.

Secondly, I also believe that the danger of dwelling too much on that is that unwittingly—unwittingly, it gives a rationale for what Putin has already done. The fact that the Crimea was added to the Ukraine in 1956 in no way—and I know Mr. Grayson is not suggesting this—but it in no way justifies what Russia and Putin have done. Who wants to go down that road in terms of that justification?

So I believe the resolution in front of us is a balanced one, as you suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to support it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Did Mr. Kinzinger want some time? Or is he—all right. Mr. Chairman, I would yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Unless Mr. Grayson—

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr.—

Mr. CONNOLLY [continuing]. Unless Mr. Grayson wants more time.

Mr. GRAYSON. I would simply reiterate that—I have already indicated that I support the resolution, but I think the resolution is at best a half-measure that doesn't acknowledge the underlying cause or attempt to come up with a solution. Self-determination has to be the key. The way to self-determination in the Ukraine is through devolution, local autonomy, and perhaps ultimately through independence. I don't see this crisis ending in any real way without that happening.

I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. I am just going to close my arguments, yielding myself such time as I may consume, with this point. The resolution does not assert a position on Crimean secession. What it does is call for all citizens in Ukraine to respect the current government authorities, and that is a necessary step in promoting stability and rule of law in the country.

And the resolution also calls on the Ukrainian Government to protect the rights of all minority populations within Ukraine, which is important, particularly for ethnic Russian minorities in the eastern and southern regions.

I think Mr. Duncan of South Carolina was seeking recognition.

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the chairman for his effort here, you know, and I appreciate the comments that brought this into historical perspective. But the time and history that I think about as we talk about the Ukraine is 1776, 1777. I think about a people in the Ukraine that are seeking liberty and seeking self-governance, and I think about—when we talk about the Crimea and we talk about the different ethnicities of the Ukraine territory, I think about, should we be concentrating on trying to engineer another state? Or should we let the Ukrainians deal with that?

And definitely the Russians are involved in not just the Crimea, but by sinking one of their own ships and blocking the naval passage for the Ukrainian Navy to have access to the Black Sea for their own protection and their own protection of their maritime fleet, we definitely see Russia socioengineering and militarily involved there.

So when I think about 1776, and I think about this being the Ukraine's 1776 moment, pursuing self-governance, pursuing liberty, the things we take for granted in this country, I also think about their desire for help from another free country—the United States of America. And I think about the French courts at the time in 1777 when Ben Franklin is asking for financial aid so that this fledgling nation could win its war and win its independence and actually pursue self-governance.

And so as we debate and vote further on today with financial loan guarantees, we need to keep in mind that we wouldn't be here had not another country stepped up to provide that opportunity for us.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. Before we go to the en bloc, are there any other members seeking recognition on the underlying bill?

[No response.]

Seeing none, in order to expedite consideration, and with the prior concurrence of the ranking member, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments, which members have before them, be considered en bloc—the Holding amendment, Number 15; the Kennedy amendment, Number 8; the Kinzinger amendment, Number 10; the Meadows amendment, Number 32; the Perry amendment, Number 31.

Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 499**

**OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING OF NORTH CAROLINA**

Page 6, line 9, strike “and”.

Page 6, after line 9, insert the following:

- 1           (15) supports efforts by Ukraine to improve
- 2           transparency, combat corruption, and protect indi-
- 3           vidual rights through an independent judiciary and
- 4           strong rule of law; and

Page 6, line 10, strike “(15)” and insert “(16)”.



**AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 499**  
**OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS**

After the first clause of the preamble, insert the following:

Whereas on January 29, 2014, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives agreed to House Resolution 447, supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear, which resolution was agreed to by the House of Representatives on February 10, 2014;

In the second-to-last clause of the preamble, strike “and” at the end.

After the second-to-last clause of the preamble, insert the following:

Whereas the instability in Ukraine has forced 230 Peace Corps volunteers to leave Ukraine; and



**AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 499**

**OFFERED BY MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS**

Page 5, line 12, after “Russian Federation Officials,” insert “Russian and Ukrainian oligarchs and others complicit in Russia’s intervention and interference in Ukraine,”.



**AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 499**

**OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS OF NORTH  
CAROLINA**

Strike paragraph (9) of the resolved text and insert the following:

1           (9) calls upon the President and the leaders of  
2           other democratic states to boycott the G-8 summit  
3           in Sochi, Russia, to convene a G-7 summit in June  
4           2014 outside of Russia that does not include Russia,  
5           and to consider expelling Russia from the group,  
6           given its record of international aggression, domestic  
7           repression, and human rights records that are incon-  
8           sistent with democratic standards;



**AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 499**  
**OFFERED BY MR. PERRY OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Page 4, line 9, add at the end before the semicolon the following: “, including by ending its support of separatist and paramilitary forces in the Crimea”.



Chairman ROYCE. Do any members seek recognition to speak on any of the en bloc items that they have—Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to voice my support, obviously, for my amendment in the en bloc that is now up for consideration. It includes an amendment that I offered that would include a reference to a resolution that the House already passed on February 10. Additionally, it seeks to add a clause and has some grammatical corrections to make sure that that cause fits in, to say that the “instability in the Ukraine forced 230 Peace Corps volunteers out of Ukraine.”

Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, I am a former Peace Corps volunteer. It is an organization that has a special place in my heart. And recognizing that on February 24, 2014, Peace Corps announced that all Peace Corps volunteers in Ukraine are safe and accounted for, but they had to be evacuated, rounded up and evacuated. Peace Corps had been working in Ukraine since 1992 under an agreement brokered by President George Bush and the former Ukrainian President Kravchuk.

To date, over 2,740 American volunteers have lived and worked in Ukraine, fostering a competitive, collaborative, cooperative spirit between our two countries. They served in Ukrainian schools, bringing resources and innovative practices to the country’s education system, fostering foreign exchange of information, and best teaching practices.

They have worked tirelessly on social and economic development, working in tandem with the Ukrainian communities, supporting critical service providers, assisting local institutions, fostering cooperation between non-NGOs, government entities, and private enterprises.

Perhaps most importantly for me, Mr. Chairman, a Peace Corps volunteer named Alex Kaplan is a native of my district, and he was one of the many Americans who were evacuated from the Ukraine within the last 2 weeks as the crisis escalated. He was teaching secondary education at a local school, as well as volunteering at a local animal and homeless shelter, a girls orphanage, and several English language clubs. He talked in a recent article, in a recent interview, about the strong bonds he formed with his community

and, most importantly, the fact that he would go back in a heartbeat to continue his service once the threat subsides.

Since the inception of the Peace Corps, volunteers like Alex have embodied the spirit of service, peace, and cooperation that are the fundamental pillar of American foreign policy. Their inclusion in this resolution underscores the enduring commitment to those values and a world that is freer and fairer than before.

I ask for your consideration for the amendment. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.

We will go to Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania, and then Mr. Sherman of California.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to just speak on behalf of my amendment regarding the paramilitary forces in Crimea. It seems that Mr. Putin continues to propagate the myth that Russia does not interfere in the internal affairs of other nations. The fact is that Russia has a very long history of interfering in former Soviet states, and it seems that Mr. Putin mourns the loss of the empire and has set one of his goals to reconstruct a modern version of it through his proposed Eurasian Union.

But to do so, he needs Ukraine, and he doesn't need a democratic revolution so close to Moscow that threaten his de facto autocracy. So he reserves the right to resort to economic blackmail and, in Georgia in 2008, and now Ukraine, military intervention to keep his neighbors in line.

Russia has been stoking separatist sentiment for years in Crimea and now is doing it at gunpoint. Strong evidence suggests that members of Russian security services are at the heart of the highly organized anti-Ukraine forces in Crimea. While these units wear uniforms without insignia—a violation of international law, by the way—they drive vehicles with Russian military license plates and freely identify themselves as Russian security forces when asked by the international media and the Ukrainian military.

My amendment and this amendment simply reflects the consensus of international community and identifies the reality of the facts on the ground by calling on the Russian Federation to end its support for separatist and paramilitary forces in Crimea.

And I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We go now to Mr. Sherman.

Mr. SHERMAN. Just a brief comment, the Meadows amendment does call on the President not to attend the G8 or G7. I support that, but with the hope that Russia will respect the territorial integrity of the Ukraine, and nothing would make me happier than for Russia to do the right thing and the President to enjoy his trip to Sochi.

But I don't want to offer an amendment on this. I think it is understood that we are calling for this boycott on the assumption that the Russians don't get the message between now and then.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We go now to Mr. Holding of North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as we heard during our hearing, in both the immediate and long term, Ukraine is going to require a wide range of assistance from the United States and our international partners. My amendment adds a resolve clause to the resolution that expresses the support of the

House to work with our partners in Ukraine to improve transparency, combat corruption, and protect individual rights through an independent judiciary and a strong rule of law.

Making improvements in these areas will all be crucial to the long-term stability in Ukraine, and they are also the foundation on which strong democratic governance is built. And I ask members to support my amendment and support the en bloc package.

I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois.

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for accepting my amendment in this package. It strengthens our underlying bill by adding, and it calls on the administration to oppose visa, financial, trade, and other sanctions on not only Russian Federation officials, but also on Russian and Ukrainian oligarchs and anyone else complicit in Russia's intervention and interference.

The President has made it clear the steps that Russia has taken violate Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity and our breach of international law. I am pleased Congress and the administration are moving forward together toward implementing tough sanctions and would hope that our friends in the EU would consider the long-term implications that weakness toward Russia will mean.

I would also like to add my support for Mr. Keating's amendment. I have been concerned in what I have seen in terms of our allies, the French, having a naval contract with the Russians. And it is a naval contract to sell ships to the Russians that are actually beneficial in controlling the Black Sea coastline. And one of the difficulties Russia had in their illegal war with Georgia was their inability to control the Black Sea coastline, and this contract with French shipbuilders would actually give them that ability.

So I hope our EU partners look very closely at their mil-to-mil relationship with Russia and consider doing the right thing on behalf of freedom-seeking people all over the globe.

And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Meadows, were you seeking recognition on your amendment? So recognized.

Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will be very brief. The amendment—I appreciate the chairman's consideration of this en bloc, basically calling on a boycott, joining with the President and asking other democratic states to boycott the G8 summit in Sochi, to convene a G7 summit someplace outside of Russia. I appreciate my colleague from California's pointing out—Mr. Sherman—his support of the amendment.

And certainly all of us want to recognize the fact that if Mr. Putin decides to go a different direction and reverse this course he is on, we will gladly look at restoring relationships.

I also want to say that in spite of what may have been heard here today, I want the Ukrainian people to recognize that Democrats and Republicans, the administration and Congress, are joining together to make sure that we stand alongside the freedom-loving people of the Ukraine, and we will stand up for them in this

particular venture. And so I would urge the support of this amendment.

And I thank the chairman and yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Are there any other members seeking recognition? Mr. Brooks of Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has been said that to some degree America has been playing marbles, which if you have ever played marbles as a kid you know that the long-term strategy is not very in-depth, while Russia is playing chess. And if you play chess, you understand that you have to calculate each potential move of your opponent, and for each of those moves have your responses available and at hand in order to ensure ultimate success.

In that vein, with the economic sanctions that we are seeking, I am inquiring of the members what our next move is depending on what Russia does. So if we evict them from the G8 and they become—or we become a part of the G7, or if we do impose significant economic sanctions, what might Russia's responding move be, by way of example? How do we react if Russia's next move is to say, "We are no longer going to allow you to hitch a ride to the International Space Station"?

What does America do under those circumstances inasmuch as we are likely years away from having a human spaceflight capability given the President's rather unilateral termination of the Constellation Program years ago, and the President's decision to not only mothball our space shuttles but to put them in museums rather than have them available as a contingency, such as what has arisen?

What do we do if Russia's next move is to say to the United Launch Alliance, as was evidenced by a hearing this week in the Senate, that Russia is no longer going to deliver engines to the United Launch Alliance which in turn supplies our capabilities of launching satellites into space?

Many of those satellites are military in nature, highly classified, and so my query to, say, Mr. Meadows or Mr. Keating or the chairman, or any other members is, what is our next move if Russia decides as their next move to deny us access to manned space flight to the International Space Station? Or denies us the rockets that we need to put our satellites in space?

Now, don't get me wrong with my query. I intend to support this resolution, because to a large degree I see it as authorizing the executive branch to determine what economic sanctions are appropriate, and I personally believe that that is the executive branch's responsibility and duty. And I hope that they will play chess rather than marbles, but please, if anyone has any suggestions in particular on how we are going to resume our manned space flight capabilities in a short period of time, I would like to hear it.

Mr. KINZINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, I will.

Mr. KINZINGER. I think it is very interesting a cosmonaut and an astronaut are actually coming back together. If it hasn't happened already, it is happening within the next few days. Even during the Cold War, we had great relationships in terms of some of that. There was the Soyuz U.S. mission or something that happened.

I also do wonder if Vladimir Putin, when he makes a decision to go into Ukraine or Georgia or terrorize his neighbors, if he sits around and wonders all these questions, too, and then decides he doesn't want to do anything because he is afraid it might hurt our space alliance. So I would just humbly and kindly say to my friend that I think reacting from a position of strength on the United States is the best thing that we can do against this incursion into Ukraine. And while I think what is the next step is a worthy question to have, I don't think our adversaries wonder with quite the caution that the gentleman is asking the question.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you. I appreciate your comments, but I note that you did not answer my question. If anyone has any idea as to how we are going to engage in manned space flight if Russia does tit for tat, I am anxious to hear. If anyone has any suggestions on how we are going to be able to launch our satellites, given our reliance on Russian engines, I am anxious to hear.

In the alternative, I would hope that the members of this committee would significantly increase funding for NASA so that we can very quickly resume those launch capabilities and return America to the preeminent position in space that we held for decades.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Brooks, I am going to yield myself such time as I might consume. The point you raise is the very reason why we need to use the leverage that we have at our disposal right now in order to get Russia to recognize that it cannot continue to escalate this crisis in eastern Ukraine.

You see, if we were to wait and not take action, it is probable that Russia would be emboldened to believe there were no consequences for its actions. And at that point, it might move or attempt to move its agents, city hall by city hall, across the eastern part of the country, encouraging them to lift the Russian flag and creating a division within each of those provinces, each of those communities, each of those towns, and thus really magnifying what could end up being a civil war within Ukraine and the east.

However, if we take action now and show that there are economic consequences, and if Europe stands with us, and if Russia is isolated internationally so that the vote, let us say, at the United Nations has only one vote in opposition and that is the veto from Russia, but the rest of the international community, all calling here for the rule of international law, then it is quite probable that with that type of leverage we can deescalate this conduct on the part of Putin and get us back to the point of cooperation.

But at this point, if we do not take decisive action, then it is far more likely that the escalation will eclipse the joint cooperation on programs such as the one you are most concerned about right here. So in that context, I would suggest that this is the most responsible action we can take in order to weigh in and have Russia consider the considerable downside effects should they continue to escalate the crisis.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ROYCE. I will yield.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to respond to the gentleman from Alabama's comments about an amendment

I plan to offer in a few minutes. I just want to remind everyone that suspending military cooperation, that was already one of the first acts that our administration already did. That is done.

So the purpose of the amendment I will be offering is to reach out to those other countries, our allies in Central Europe and our NATO members, to do the same as we are doing. So just to clarify that, Mr. Chairman, before I offer the amendment I wanted that point clarified.

I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Keating.

Hearing no further requests for recognition, the question occurs on the bipartisan en bloc amendment. All those in favor say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, no.

[No response.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the en bloc amendment is agreed to.

Does Mr. William Keating have an amendment at the desk?

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H. Res. 499, offered by Mr. Keating of Massachusetts. On page 5, between the eighth and ninth resolved clauses, insert the following new paragraph.

Chairman ROYCE. Without objection, the amendment is considered read. The Chair recognizes Mr. Keating from Massachusetts to explain the amendment.

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H.RES. 499 (UKRAINE)  
OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS**

On page 5, between the eighth and ninth resolved clauses, insert the following, new paragraph:

( ) calls on NATO allies and European Union member states to immediately suspend military cooperation with Russia, including restricting sales to the Russian government of lethal and non-lethal military equipment that might be used to support further aggression in Ukraine or elsewhere in the region;

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. NATO Secretary-General Rasmussen announced that NATO was suspending most of the alliance's meetings with Russia and was reviewing the entire range of NATO-Russia cooperation. The Baltic States, Poland, and other allies in Central Europe have called on NATO members in the EU to impose an arms embargo. The UK has said it is reviewing its arms exports to Russia.

However, other NATO members have said an arms embargo would be premature. The key reason, of course, is concern about possible revenue losses. This amendment calls on European allies to suspend export of military equipment that could be used to support Russian aggression in the region. This is an obvious step for allies to take in response to an unprovoked act of military aggression in their own neighborhood.

I ask for support of this amendment. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Do any other members seek recognition? Any further debate on this amendment?

[No response.]

Hearing no further—no further requests for time, we will go then to the vote on the amendment. All those in favor of Mr. Keating's amendment please say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, no.

[No response.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

Are there any other amendments? The Chair recognizes Mr. Poe of Texas.

Mr. POE. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H. Res. 499, offered by Mr. Poe of Texas, page 6, line 9, strike "and," page 6, after line——

Chairman ROYCE. Without objection, the amendment will be considered read. The Chair recognizes the author to explain his amendment.

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 499**  
**OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS**

Page 6, line 9, strike “and”.

Page 6, after line 9, insert the following:

- 1           (15) calls on the United States to increase nat-  
 2           ural gas exports to Ukraine and other European  
 3           states and former Soviet Republics to reduce Rus-  
 4           sian control of energy exports; and

Page 6, line 10, strike “(15)” and insert “(16)”.



Mr. POE. I thank the chairman. Mark Twain once said that history doesn't repeat itself, but it does rhyme. Well, Russia is being the poet these days. First, the Russians moved into Moldova in 1992. They moved into Georgia in 2008. I happened to be in Georgia 2 weeks after the tanks came rolling in, and now they are doing the same thing with the Ukraine.

This is not the first time the Russians have used the economic and political weapon of natural gas against the Ukrainians. They have turned off the gas twice before. And, once again, I happened to be in the Ukraine when they turned off the gas in winter, and it was cold. And it was for political reasons, but it was an economic weapon that the Russians used against the Ukrainian people.

As we look at the Ukrainian situation, it is a situation that is bigger than just Ukraine. It is the Russian influence on the region and holding that region hostage with the use of energy, primarily natural gas.

This past weekend the Russians even warned that Ukraine's discount on natural gas was in jeopardy, but there is something that we can do, not only to help the Ukrainians but help stability in the area, and help the United States as well. And that is by selling American natural gas to the Ukrainians, the former Soviet Republics, even to Western Europe. There is a demand and the American supply is overwhelming.

We have more natural gas than we can use in the United States. Our current reserves are roughly 97 times what the U.S. consumed in all of 2011. There is so much natural gas in North Dakota that

there are 1,500 flare-ups now, which would be equivalent to heating over 1 million homes. That is gas that they are burning off.

We have abundant natural gas in this country, primarily in Texas. There is an ice cream company in Texas that says—Blue Bell, it is the best in the world, by the way—that says as their commercial, “We eat all we can, and we sell the rest.” Well, I think that should be our policy with natural gas—we use all we can and we sell the rest.

And here is an opportunity that we could buttress the economic political weapon the Russians are using against the former Soviet Republics to bring them back, and that is the use of natural gas. And this legislation would simply ask the—put part of this bill a requirement that the United States have a policy of moving forward with exporting natural gas to the Ukraine and other countries.

According to The New York Times, the Obama administration is pushing the idea. The Head of the State Department, Bureau of Energy Resources, Carlos Pascual, is a former Ukrainian Ambassador to Ukraine, he said Gazprom’s influence will be weakened as American supplies are shipped onto the global market. His team is already working to help the Ukraine and other countries break away from the dependence of Russian natural gas, and American exports would send a signal that the global gas market is changing and the United States is a player, but also the Russian influence, economically and politically, is diminishing.

So my amendment calls for our Government to increase American natural gas exports to the Ukraine, the former Soviet Republics, and European countries.

And I reserve.

Mr. CHABOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE. Yes.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would just like to correct the record in one respect. I agree with everything that the gentleman said except the greatest ice cream in the world is made in Cincinnati. It is Graeter’s ice cream. [Laughter.] I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Do you export it?

Mr. CHABOT. Yes, we do. And everybody loves it.

Mr. POE. I reserve.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Sherman of California.

Mr. SHERMAN. I rise in opposition, reluctant opposition, to my colleague’s amendment. I think it is important that we have a resolution that passes overwhelmingly on the floor of the House in just a few hours. It would be brought up under a suspension. The way to do that is to focus on where we are unified, which is our foreign policy toward the Ukraine.

This House is not all that unified on energy policy. As a matter of fact, we just had votes on the floor of the House where there was substantial opposition to a bill dealing with energy policy. I think we have got another energy policy vote this afternoon, which will not pass on a suspension.

The issue of exporting natural gas is controversial as a domestic issue. Consumers in the United States, and especially manufacturers in the United States, enjoy the fact that natural gas prices are

substantially lower than they are on the world market. Exporting natural gas would then cause Americans and others to pay the world price.

In addition, I don't have to tell the gentleman that we have some environmentalists in our caucus that do not want to see an increase in fracking, an increase in natural gas production. And regardless of where any member stands here on whether we should export natural gas, whether Federal land should be open to more exploration, I would call upon everyone who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to say, "Let us bring a foreign affairs resolution to the floor of the House, rather than one that there will be pressure on at least Democrats to vote against on these domestic energy issues."

We had one series of votes on controversial energy issues this morning. We have another one this afternoon. We don't have to turn this foreign affairs resolution into a third partisan divide, can't pass on a suspension, or maybe can't pass on a suspension, controversial vote.

The chair of our T&T, including Trade Subcommittee, and I have had hearings on this issue. I see merits on both sides of whether we should export natural gas. What I don't see is a reason to put it in the Ukrainian resolution.

Mr. DEUTCH. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. The gentleman is recognized for a point of order.

Mr. DEUTCH. To follow Mr. Sherman's comments, is the—does this committee have jurisdiction over the export of natural gas?

Chairman ROYCE. Well, we would have jurisdiction over exports and export promotion. And on top of that, in the resolution itself it makes reference to Ukrainian energy independence. So, yes, very clearly it would be germane, and it would be—

Mr. DEUTCH. Parliamentary inquiry—

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. DEUTCH [continuing]. If this language is added to the resolution, will the Energy and Commerce Committee then command jurisdiction?

Chairman ROYCE. I don't think so. I will recognize the Parliamentarian.

The PARLIAMENTARIAN. Sir, that would depend on an intervening decision by that committee to seek a sequential referral with the House Parliamentarians, and we can't prejudge that.

Mr. DEUTCH. Right. And I would just join my colleague, then, in the great concern that that potential claim of jurisdiction could slow down this very important statement that the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Congress should put forward immediately. There is no time for delay.

I yield back.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ROYCE. I will recognize the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I know we have had hearings on this issue as well and spoken to numerous folks in the industry and analysts on Wall Street. The fact is, the current law already exists for the administration and for the Department of Energy to grant these permits. It doesn't require new law. All this is doing

is encouraging them to use the laws that are already on the books to do that.

So I don't see where there would be any jurisdictional issues personally that go back to the Energy and Commerce Committee. And, additionally, the economists that I have spoken to about whether or not prices would rise in the United States if we export LNG or CNG have already been debunked. In fact, if they listen to the gentleman as he explained, they are actually burning off excess right now. And so many of the folks that are going to deploy new gas resources are not doing it because right now of the price of natural gas, so it is actually hurting us.

And, thirdly, if this isn't a foreign policy issue, I mean, I think most people would agree that Russia has undue influence over this country, over Ukraine, because of the energy that they supply. So it is a foreign policy issue, and I would argue and speak out in strong favor of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, further to my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, I—

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Deutch.

Mr. DEUTCH [continuing]. Just to clarify, I appreciate my friend's belief that the Energy and Commerce Committee would not have jurisdiction. But just to confirm, it is the position of staff of this committee that indeed they would have the ability to claim jurisdiction.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, that is not an inquiry, first of all. But let me respond to the overall point. Given the desire on the part of the institution to move this legislation, I do not believe for one moment that they would request referral on this initiative from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

And let me just take a moment here to explain that Mark Udall of Colorado is making this case for natural gas exports, given the Ukraine crisis. I understand that there might be some various perspectives on the committee on this issue, but I would also ask the members to remember this is a non-binding resolution.

It is a non-binding resolution that comes in the face of Mr. Udall's call for action and the actions for others in order to do something to remove or at least signal—think this through, members, if you would—signal to the Ukrainian Government and to Europe that right now feel very much under the thumb of Russia that there is a way forward should the gas be cut off, that there is the hope that that gas could be exported from the United States into their markets, thus relieving the pressure that Russia might otherwise bring into play.

I think the wider issues that have been made here, the economic benefits of exporting liquified natural gas, the fact that the Department of Energy did look at this long and hard, the administration looked at this, and the DoD and DOE decided that it outweighs the costs. The Department of Energy has found that America can produce more than enough natural gas to meet domestic demand affordably while also supporting export markets.

And the report concludes that the net benefits of exports apply to consumers as well as the overall economy and that these benefit increase along with the level of exports. And other studies, of course, have reached similar conclusions.

My takeaway from this is because it is non-binding, because it is sent as a message to Russia in the middle of Russia's attempt to use this as a weapon, that at the end of the day, although there might be a divided vote on the amendment, I would suggest in the general scheme of things that this is not a final vote on the House floor, which would occur on something out of the Department of Energy for enactment of the final decision on such a provision. And so I just put that in context for everyone's consideration.

I think Mr. Meadows was requesting time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make sure that we set the record straight with regards to natural gas exports and speak in favor of this amendment, and would share with some of my colleagues opposite. The fact that we have met many of the greenhouse gas emissions standards—in fact, have met the Kyoto levels without passing that—is a direct response to our energy solution here in the United States, using much more natural gas.

Quite frankly, the greenhouse gas emissions have been lowered, according to the EPA, by over 5 percent as a reduction that comes directly from the use of natural gas. And so some of the concerns that we might have with regards to greenhouse gas emissions would be addressed with regards to exporting natural gas instead of oil or other fossil fuels.

I would also like to add that by most estimates, by many estimates, we have well over a 200-year supply of natural gas, and so the amount that the Ukraine would use or any consumption that might be used as a result of supplanting this particular flow from Russia would certainly be offset by the years and years of reserves that we have now. And so I would just urge my colleagues to support this resolution and do all that we can to provide relief for the freedom-loving people of Ukraine.

And I yield back.

Mr. DUNCAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADOWS. Certainly.

Mr. DUNCAN. I want to thank him for his comments. I want to just point out that this is not setting energy policy for the nation. This is taking available energy surplus that we have and exporting it to a nation that is in dire concern about the future of their energy security, because of the gas pipelines that are controlled by the Russians that go through the Ukraine.

This isn't just a Ukrainian issue. It is also going to spill over into a European issue because of those gas lines.

Exporting natural gas and exporting the technology that would allow the Ukrainians to harvest and produce the resources that they have got is the right thing. In fact, last year Ukraine signed a natural gas exploration deal with both Royal Dutch Shell as well as Chevron, which pledged to invest as much as \$10 billion if adequate supplies of Shell gas were found.

The Ukraine has more than 40 trillion cubic feet of technically recoverable natural gas. This would allow the Ukraine to possibly have energy independence and lessen some dependence on a country that is sitting on their doorstep right now. This is the right thing. It does not set policy for this country other than it encourages taking some of the surplus we have got—that we have in this

country and helping a friend, helping someone that is pursuing the liberty that we enjoy.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Texas offering the amendment. I support it. I think it is the right thing, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me. And with that, I will yield back, Mr. Meadows.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Meeks of New York.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to go back to what Mr. Sherman had indicated, because I think that the message that we also want to show and send is that we are all together, that there is no division in the United States Congress, irrespective of beliefs on Shell gas, et cetera. And what this amendment could cause is division because some individuals will not be able to or may not vote for the resolution because they have a different opinion. And I think that is going to have to be taken into consideration here.

You know, I haven't made a decision on Shell gas or whether I am for selling it abroad or not. You know, that is a decision that is going to have to be made. I don't want to have to make that kind of decision, because the language that we utilize is important. Even though it is not binding, it is important and it is going to be read by others.

And so for the sake of unity, in my estimation, we should try to make sure that we come up with a resolution that we all can 100 percent say we are with and stand by and not cause any divisions, you know, that shows that there is any wrinkle between us, because that is then something that I think the Russians would love to exploit and say that we are not 100 percent together.

And I think that the idea of us, as the United States Congress, saying that we are all together on this resolution sends by far a stronger message to Russia than us debating back and forth or having someone vote no because they are not for selling of Shell gas or exporting Shell gas.

I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes. Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois.

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a tough one. I have been out there agreeing that the best way to counter the Russians in the next decade or two is export of natural gas to make our allies' reliance on them less important than their reliance on us, and I am 100 percent supportive of it.

That said, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if this is the place to put a resolution like this. I am undecided how I am going to vote on this, because right now I think the most important thing we can do as the United States Congress is to show unanimity on this issue, to show the people of Ukraine that we are behind them. And I don't know if this is the place to engage on a debate that may be very divisive, that while I am on one side of it, and I am very passionately on one side of it, I understand that there are people that disagree with me.

And I think and I am afraid, and with respect to Mr. Poe, I am afraid that the addition of this amendment will create division that will be, as was said by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, will be perceived by the Russians and even the Russian media as a Congress that is not united on support of the Ukrainian people.

While I also understand that I am probably in a big-time minority on my side for doing this, I am leaning toward opposing this amendment, not because of my disagreement with what is in it but because of my belief that it is extremely important for us to present a united front on this issue.

And with that, I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

We will go to Mr. Connolly of Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I actually support what Judge Poe is trying to do here. I think it actually is important from a foreign policy point of view to be very clear with respect to the Putin administration in Russia that we are prepared to even substitute ourselves as a natural gas supplier in the event that they continue down the road they have chosen.

But I want to echo what Mr. Meeks and what Mr. Kinzinger both just said. I think at this grave moment it is essential Congress speaks with one voice. It is essential we not divide this resolution today, so that there is no misconstruing the firm intent of Congress to resist the acts of aggression against Crimea and against the Ukraine by the Putin administration in Moscow. He needs to see that. He needs to hear that.

A divided opinion, even though I may be on Mr. Poe's side of this opinion, I think risks something very important in terms of our resolve and our ability to speak with one voice at this time of crisis. And I would urge my friend from Texas to consider that. I would urge the chairman to consider that as we proceed.

And with that, I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. I would like to recognize Mr. Grayson on the underlying amendment, and also for a second-degree amendment. Well, let me just recognize Mr. Grayson at this time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you. I will reserve the right to offer an amendment shortly, if that is okay with the chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. It is. It comes with my support, Mr. Grayson.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My 13-year-old daughter would like to see increased exports of natural gas from the United States to the Ukraine, and my 13-year-old daughter would also like a pony. So with that in mind, I would like to ask Mr. Poe, the gentleman from Texas, a few questions.

This resolution is about Russian military intervention in the Ukraine. Mr. Poe, are the Russians blocking the U.S. export of natural gas?

Mr. POE. This resolution expedites the policy of the United States to be—to supply the Russians with—or supply the Ukrainians with natural gas. As you know, this whole intervention by the Russians in the region is based upon trying to control their energy. So we are letting the Russians know, as the administration has already said, to supply them, the Ukrainians—if we have the capability, supply them with natural gas.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Poe, that is a little too complicated for me to understand. Aren't we already exporting all the natural gas that we can to the Ukraine and other countries in the region? Are the Russians preventing us from doing that?

Mr. POE. No, we are not. There are 1,500 flare-ups in North Dakota as we sit here today that are burning off enough natural gas to heat 1 million homes. So, no, we are not exporting all we can.

Mr. GRAYSON. What makes you think, Mr. Poe, that it is Russian military intervention in the Ukraine that is causing those gas producers to burn off that excess?

Mr. POE. Because, as they have done in the past, the Russians use their economic stranglehold on the former Soviet Republics by holding them hostage with natural gas. Ukrainians get 60 percent of their natural gas from Russia. And if they don't tow the line, the Russians turn off the gas, which they have done twice. So it's one of the reasons why the Russians move in, in my opinion, to areas—because they can control them economically; now they want to control them politically.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Poe, what is your plan for delivering natural gas from North Dakota to the Ukraine instead of having it flare off? Are you proposing a pipeline under the Atlantic Ocean?

Mr. POE. Well, there would have to be, of course, the infrastructure to do so. And if we had the infrastructure already, we could have done it. But we don't have that infrastructure, as you know, but this then sets a policy of the United States long term to the Russians that people in Eastern Europe, former Soviet Republics, are now going to have an option to get natural gas, and they are not going to have to get it only from the Russians.

Of course, it could not be done today, but it would be a policy, as the administration has already said, to export natural gas so that they have other options.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. Your specific wording, Mr. Poe, says that you are calling on the United States to increase natural gas exports in order to reduce Russian control of energy exports. Are you saying that the Russians are now in control of American energy exports?

Mr. POE. No, I didn't say that at all.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, that is what the words say.

Mr. POE. It doesn't say that. Read it again.

Mr. GRAYSON. Okay.

Mr. POE. Russians do not control American exports. We control them. But right now we don't allow our exporters to export natural gas because of a lot of other reasons we can discuss if you want to. All this does is set a policy saying that our answer to the Russians moving into other people's countries: We are going to fight back politically and economically with energy.

And this is the answer I think that we should tell the Russians. We should be a singular voice on this. "You are not going to be able to hold these countries hostage any longer over the issue of energy." And that is the political development that is taking place in the Ukraine. Sixty percent of their natural gas comes from Russia. Why don't we give the Ukrainians an option.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Poe, your amendment calls on the United States to do what you are describing here. Where is it in the Constitution of the United States that says that the U.S. House of Representatives, the representatives of the people of the United States, have any authority to call on the United States as a whole to do

anything? Can you point to the part of the Constitution where it says that?

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. We require Federal approval for export facilities for liquefied natural gas. There are those in the Republican party who think that the Obama administration has been too reluctant to issue those permits. There are those in the environmental community that think we have already issued too many permits. But I think it is reasonable to say that this is an issue that we need to confront, and our committee has substantial jurisdiction in the area.

But it is not Russia that is preventing the export of liquefied natural gas. That is a matter of the economic policy and the environmental policy that the administration has substantial control over.

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield back.

Mr. GRAYSON. And that is exactly my point. I know nonsense when I see it, and this is poorly written nonsense, with all due respect to the gentleman from Texas.

I yield the rest of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, I—

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Meadows.

Mr. MEADOWS [continuing]. I ask that we strike the last words of Mr. Grayson. You know, we are adding personalities here and personalities to this, and so I would ask that we would strike that.

Chairman ROYCE. Let me do this. Let me just admonish all members, direct your questions to the Chair and let us try to follow Jefferson's original rules of decorum here as we continue the debate.

Does anyone want to be recognized for an amendment?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to be recognized for an amendment, and I think we have a copy at the desk.

Chairman ROYCE. I ask if—do we have a copy of the amendment at the desk?

Ms. MARTER. We do, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentlelady—the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS. Is this coming in the form of a secondary amendment to this amendment?

Chairman ROYCE. That is correct. I believe this is a second degree amendment to the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Collins.

The clerk will read the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Second-degree amendment to Mr. Poe's amendment offered by Mr. Grayson of Florida, strikes the text of the amendment and substitute page 6, strike lines 1 to 4, and insert the following, "15, Calls on Ukraine and European countries and former Soviet Republics to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy exports, including by promoting energy efficiency and reverse gas flows from Western Europe."

[The information referred to follows:]

Second Degree Amendment <sup>offered by Mr. Grayson</sup> to Mr. Poe's Amendment ~~to H. Res. 499~~

Strikes the text of the amendment and substitute:

Page 6, strike lines 1 to 4 and insert the following:

"(15) Calls on Ukraine and European countries and former Soviet Republics to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy exports, including by promoting energy efficiency and reverse gas flows from Western Europe."

Chairman ROYCE. The gentleman is recognized on his amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you. The purpose of my amendment is simply to try to bridge the gap that has appeared here today and to try to make this effort—this initiative to help the people in the Ukraine resist Soviet—excuse me, Russian intervention militarily, and to stand up as free people, and that we can do so unanimously.

I understand the geopolitical issue involved here. I do understand that one way to help the people of the Ukraine is in fact to help them to be energy independent, just as it would help the people of America if we were all energy independent.

So with that in mind, I introduce this amendment to call on the Ukraine and the European countries and former Soviet Republics to support energy diversification initiatives, to reduce Russian control of energy exports, including by promoting energy efficiency and reverse gas flows from Western Europe.

I want to point out that the chair has discussed a potential amendment to this language which I certainly think could be constructive. We just simply didn't have time to reach some conclusion, but the chair wants to discuss after this, if I understand the chair correctly, language to the effect of calling on the United States to increase gas exports and promote energy efficiency.

My understanding is that third order amendments are out of order. So I don't think we will be able to reach a conclusion on this given the timeframe that is contemplated. I offer my amendment with the chair's recommendation in mind.

I yield the rest of my time.

Chairman ROYCE. I will yield myself such time as I might consume. So currently the second-degree amendment to Mr. Poe's amendment as offered here by Mr. Grayson would read, "Calls on Ukraine and European countries and former Soviet Republics to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy exports, including by promoting energy efficiency and reverse gas flows from Western Europe."

I would suggest that, if he withdraws this amendment, we would work to offer an amendment, and I would ask unanimous consent to do so, which seeks to achieve exactly that language in the first paragraph and calls on the United States to promote increased gas exports and energy efficiency.

[The information referred to follows:]

Second Degree Amendment <sup>offered by Mr. Grayson</sup> to Mr. Poe's Amendment to H. Res. 499

Strikes the text of the amendment and substitute:

Page 6, strike lines 1 to 4 and insert the following:

“(15) Calls on Ukraine and European countries and former Soviet Republics to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy exports, including by promoting energy efficiency and reverse gas flows from Western Europe.”

, and calls on the United States to promote increased gas exports and energy efficiency

Chairman ROYCE. I think that that language would satisfy our desire collectively to send the message to Russia that there would be long-range consequences should this continue to escalate. At the same time, I suspect that that language would satisfy Mr. Poe and Mr. Grayson.

And with that suggestion, maybe I could open this to debate.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Engel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with what you just said. I think that this strikes a good balance. It talks about reducing Russian control of energy exports and, at the same time, it is likely not to get any negativity on the House floor. I do agree with our colleagues who have said that what we should aim for is for the maximum number of votes on the House floor to send an unequivocal message to the Russians that this Congress is united in opposing what they are doing.

I am sympathetic to some of the points that Mr. Poe has raised. I think this does strike a happy medium, and I support it. I think it is a good compromise.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Now, again, reclaiming my time here, I am going to ask unanimous consent to add to the end of the Grayson amendment the following language, “And calls on the United States to promote increased gas exports and energy efficiency.” Afterwards, there will be a vote on the Grayson amendment. Those who wish to vote in opposition—by the way, is there any objection?

[No response.]

Chairman ROYCE. Hearing none, afterwards there will be a vote on the Grayson amendment, as amended, without objection, and following that, the Poe amendment, as amended by the Grayson amendment. So my hope is that that will satisfy the members of this committee, and the final language I think should be one that sends a strong message to Russia.

Members seeking to be recognized? Yes, Mr. Lowenthal, and then Mr. Kennedy and any other members.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Could you please—

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL [continuing]. Repeat exactly the words—

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL [continuing]. That you want to add?

Chairman ROYCE. The addition, before the final period, in other words, “Reverse gas flows from Western Europe, and calls on the United States to promote increased gas exports and energy efficiency.”

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Promote.

Chairman ROYCE. I think—

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Perry had a question.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am curious about the verbiage “and reverse gas flows from Western Europe.” Does this essentially—I mean, it takes valving changes, and so on and so forth, and it takes a market that draws the gas to the customer. It doesn’t take us saying so. And does this mean that we are now going to advocate to sell our gas to Russia?

Chairman ROYCE. No, it does not, Mr. Perry. But I want to recognize Mr. Grayson for an explanation of his amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, the status quo these days is that Western Europe imports gas from Russia, and there is a perception on the part of many that that creates a certain dependency on the part of Western Europe to Russia, because Russia could turn off the tap in the same manner that Russia has turned off the tap to some of the former Soviet Republics.

So reverse gas flow is meant to denote, in essence, energy independence for Western Europe, so that Western Europe does not remain dependent upon Russian gas to the extent that it already may be.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Kennedy, did you seek recognition?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, Mr. Chairman. I was helping out Mr. Lowenthal. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Okay. Other members seeking recognition? Oh, Mr. Castro, yes.

Mr. CASTRO. I would just say, you know, since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, we essentially were encouraging Russia to become a capitalist democratic nation, and we encouraged their economic entanglements, now it seems like, not only with the United States but also with Europe.

They are now in a position to use those entanglements as leverage in the situation in which we all now find ourselves. So I think there is a question now going forward, once this is resolved, what our strategy is with respect to Russia and whether, you know, the society of nations, including the United States and Europe, is going to encourage further economic development with Russia or not.

I support along the lines where Congressman Poe is going. I do think that we need to be a supplier of energy to, you know, many of the nations that Russia now has a large share of the supply for. But I also think that we can’t pretend as though what has developed is only the product of what Russia has done. For many years,

we have encouraged that, except that now instead of, you know, essentially doing what we had hoped they have taken a turn toward imperialism and back toward their Soviet actions. And that is the situation in which we find ourselves.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, the question is on the Grayson amendment as modified—

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ROYCE. Yes. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Stockman. I have a real quick question. I tend to agree that if we adopt the language "reverse gas flows" that means Europe is going to sell to Russia. I just wish we would clarify that language, but I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

Mr. Grayson, would you like to elaborate any further on your amendment?

Mr. GRAYSON. Sure. Russia has the largest hydrocarbon reserves in the entire world. It seems unlikely that Russia will be importing natural gas anytime soon.

Chairman ROYCE. That is the language.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, actually, what we are doing is we are talking about reverse gas flows from Western Europe. That could be to Czechoslovakia, that could be to Poland, that could be to the Ukraine, that could be to any number of locations that are energy poor. Russia itself is enormously energy rich.

Mr. KINZINGER. On that—

Chairman ROYCE. Yes, Mr. Kinzinger.

Mr. KINZINGER [continuing]. What is wrong with Europe selling gas to Russia? That is a much better position than Russia selling gas to Europe, correct?

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ROYCE. Any other—

Mr. WEBER. I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Any other members seeking recognition? Mr. Weber.

Mr. WEBER. Yes. Just a question, I guess along with Mr. Grayson's amendment. So, actually, for Western Europe to become that energy proficient, is he promoting fracking over in Western Europe? I just had a question for him.

Chairman ROYCE. Reclaiming my time, I think the question before us is on the Grayson amendment, as modified by UC. All those in favor of the Grayson amendment, with our UC addition, please signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, no.

[No response.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

Hearing no further requests for recognition, the question occurs on the Poe amendment, as amended by the Grayson amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, no.

[No response.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

Are there any other amendments? Ms. Gabbard, yes.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. I believe my amendment is—

Chairman ROYCE. Ms. Gabbard, do you have an amendment at the desk?

Ms. GABBARD. I do have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read that amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H. Res. 499, offered by Ms. Gabbard of Hawaii. On page 3, in the last clause of the preamble, after the last “and” insert “regarding civil and political rights.”

Chairman ROYCE. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as read.

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 499**

**OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD OF HAWAII**

On page 3, in the last clause of the Preamble, after the last ‘and,’ insert:

‘regarding civil and political rights, and’;

On page 5, line 17, Strike ‘joint’ and insert ‘coordinated’;

On page 5, line 19, strike ‘an’ and insert ‘a domestic’;

On page 5, line 21, after ‘reforms’ insert ‘and effective anti-corruption measures.’

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Ms. Gabbard, would you explain your amendment?

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you very much. Very briefly, the amendment on page 3 directly relates to adding “regarding civil and political rights” so that as we look at the role of the international monitors and calling for them to move into the region, that they are not only looking at the direct threat of an escalating military tension but that they are also looking at the underlying tensions that exist within the civil and political arena.

The second amendment on page 5 seeks to address the need, as we look to provide aid and assistance to Ukraine, to get to that end state of stability on all levels, whether it be economic or in other areas, that we also encourage the reforms needed to address corruption, which has played a direct role in the weakened state that we are seeing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentlelady and thank her for the language on the anti-corruption measures which you have added to the base text here.

Any other members seeking recognition on the Gabbard amendment?

[No response.]

Hearing no further requests for recognition, the question occurs on the amendment from Ms. Gabbard. All those in favor say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, no.

[No response.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

Any other amendments? Any other members seeking recognition?

[No response.]

Hearing no further amendments to the measure, the question occurs on agreeing to House Resolution 499, as amended. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, no.

[No response.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the bill, as amended, is agreed to.

Without objection, H.R. 499, as amended, is ordered favorably reported, will be reported as a single amendment in the nature of a substitute. Staff is directed to make any technical and conforming changes, and that concludes our business for today.

And, again, I want to thank our ranking member, Mr. Engel from New York, and all of our committee members for their contribution and assistance today.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:57 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]



# A P P E N D I X



MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

**FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP NOTICE**  
**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS**  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

**Edward R. Royce (R-CA), Chairman**

March 6, 2014

**TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be held in Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live on the Committee website at <http://www.ForeignAffairs.house.gov>):

**DATE:** Thursday, March 6, 2014

**TIME:** Immediately following the conclusion of the Full Committee Hearing

**MARKUP OF:** H. Res. 499, Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.

**By Direction of the Chairman**

*The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202/225-5021 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee.*





**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS**  
*FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP*

<i>PRESENT</i>	<i>MEMBER</i>
X	Edward R. Royce, CA
X	Christopher H. Smith, NJ
X	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, FL
X	Dana Rohrabacher, CA
X	Steve Chabot, OH
X	Joc Wilson, SC
X	Michael T. McCaul, TX
X	Ted Poe, TX
X	Matt Salmon, AZ
	Tom Marino, PA
X	Jeff Duncan, SC
X	Adam Kinzinger, IL
X	Mo Brooks, AL
X	Tom Cotton, AR
X	Paul Cook, CA
X	George Holding, NC
X	Randy K. Weber, Sr., TX
X	Scott Perry, PA
X	Steve Stockman, TX
X	Ron DeSantis, FL
X	Doug Collins, GA
X	Mark Meadows, NC
X	Ted S. Yoho, FL
X	Luke Messer, IN

<i>PRESENT</i>	<i>MEMBER</i>
X	Eliot L. Engel, NY
	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, AS
X	Brad Sherman, CA
X	Gregory W. Meeks, NY
	Albio Sires, NJ
X	Gerald E. Connolly, VA
X	Theodore E. Deutch, FL
X	Brian Higgins, NY
X	Karen Bass, CA
X	William Keating, MA
X	David Cicilline, RI
X	Alan Grayson, FL
X	Juan Vargas, CA
	Bradley S. Schneider, IL
X	Joseph P. Kennedy III, MA
X	Ami Bera, CA
X	Alan S. Lowenthal, CA
X	Grace Meng, NY
X	Lois Frankel, FL
X	Tulsi Gabbard, HI
X	Joaquin Castro, TX

**3/6/14 Foreign Affairs Committee Markup Summary**

The Chair called up H. Res. 499 for consideration by the Committee.

H. Res. 499 (Royce), “Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.”

- 1) By unanimous consent, the following amendments (previously provided to Members of the Committee) were considered *en bloc* and agreed to by voice vote:
  1. Holding 15
  2. Kennedy 8
  3. Kinzinger 10
  4. Meadows 32
  5. Perry 31
- 2) Rep. Keating offered an amendment, Keating 1, agreed to by voice vote.
- 3) Rep. Poe offered an amendment, Poe 69.
  - a. Rep. Grayson offered an amendment in the second degree to Poe 69, agreed to (as modified by a unanimous consent request by the Chairman).  
Poe 69, as amended, was agreed to by voice vote.
- 4) Rep. Gabbard offered an amendment, Gabbard 1, agreed to by voice vote.

H. Res. 499, as amended, was agreed to by voice vote, and ordered favorably reported to the House by unanimous consent.

The Committee adjourned.



*Statement for the Record*  
*Submitted by the Honorable Eliot L Engel*

I strongly support H. Res. 499, a resolution Chairman Royce and I introduced, which condemns the recent violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity by Russia.

President Putin has violated international law and his country's commitments to its neighbor. His act of aggression risks inciting further violence and armed conflict between two peoples with deep historical and cultural ties.

And he has done this at a moment when Ukraine was on the verge of resolving several months of crisis with the selection of a new interim government. Rather than supporting stability, reconciliation, and Ukraine's return to political and economic health, he has chosen – on the flimsiest of pretenses – to promote discord and conflict, to set peoples and families against one another.

This resolution puts President Putin on notice that his reckless actions will have consequences. It calls on the Administration to work with our allies to impose sanctions on Russia – and I commend the President for signing an executive order this morning to start this process. It supports efforts to increase Russia's diplomatic isolation. It calls on Putin to accept international monitors in Crimea and return his troops to their bases. And it makes clear our support for meaningful assistance to Ukraine and to Ukraine's interim government.

The people of Ukraine, and the people of all countries in the region and throughout the world, have the right to determine their own future free of pressure and threats. As Ukrainians attempt to chart out their own course, they should know that the United States stands with them, and that we are committed to helping them build a more democratic, prosperous, secure, and just Ukraine.

I therefore call on my colleagues to support this resolution.



**Statement for the Record**

*Submitted by the Honorable Joe Kennedy*

Thank you Chairman Royce and Ranking Member Engel for calling this hearing today and for inviting the witnesses to testify on the current situation in Ukraine. I ask unanimous consent to submit the following Council on Foreign Relations article to the record.

## **An Energy Weapon vs. Russia?**

[http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2014/03/05/an-energy-weapon-vs-russia/?cid=nlc-public-the-world-this-week-link9-20140307&sp\\_mid=45296923&sp\\_rid=am9Hlmtlbm5lZHIhAZ21haWwuY29tS0](http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2014/03/05/an-energy-weapon-vs-russia/?cid=nlc-public-the-world-this-week-link9-20140307&sp_mid=45296923&sp_rid=am9Hlmtlbm5lZHIhAZ21haWwuY29tS0)

by [Michael Levi](#)

March 5, 2014

As the standoff between Russia and Ukraine drags on, there are increasing calls to use U.S. oil and gas exports to weaken Vladimir Putin's hand. There's something to this, but it's likely to be a lot less powerful than most pundits seem to think.

Europe imports about thirty percent of its natural gas from Russia. Russia could, in principle, cut off some or all of that supply. That prospect presumably makes European leaders less willing to take strong positions against Russia in its confrontation with Ukraine. People have argued that boosting U.S. natural gas export capacity (or, more precisely, changing policy to make that more likely in the future) could do two things. First, in the current crisis, it could deter Putin from using the gas weapon, lest he encourage Europeans to make concerted efforts to shift their long-term gas procurement to the United States when that becomes possible in a few years. Second, in future crises, it could blunt the Russian gas weapon, since U.S. exports would be available to fill in for Russian supplies.

(You might have noticed that I haven't said anything about oil. That's because the idea that U.S. oil exports would give Europe some sort of special buffer is silly. The world oil market is pretty flexible, and U.S. exports would be a drop in an already large sea. To the extent that Europe is constrained in its ability to switch oil sources quickly, that's because of infrastructure, something U.S. exports wouldn't change.)

There are two essential things to keep in mind when thinking through the claims about natural gas exports.

First, decisions about whom to export to and import from are made by commercial entities, not by governments. When a U.S. analyst says, "we should tell Europe we'll sell them our gas", the first response should be, "who's 'we'"? (The second response should be, "who's Europe?") The U.S. government doesn't get to sell gas to anyone; it can create a framework in which

commercial entities can sell gas, but after that, it's up to those businesses to decide where the gas goes. Similarly, "Europe" doesn't buy gas – all sorts of European companies do, within European and national regulatory frameworks.

Second, surging natural gas into Europe to respond to a crisis requires that there be infrastructure in place that can accommodate that surge. In the case we're talking about here, that means having a bunch of unused (or partly used) European natural gas import terminals that can suddenly absorb newly arrived U.S. supplies. And remember – back to the first point – these terminals will be built by private players.

So what does this all mean for the big strategic claims?

It is difficult to see how U.S. exports will substantially erode the long-run share of Russian gas in Europe. It is far more profitable for buyers of U.S. natural gas to ship it to Asia – where prices are far higher – than to Europe. (The exception is if European companies are willing to pay a hefty premium to get their gas from the United States – but remember, these are commercial entities, which makes it very difficult for them to do that.) There is, of course, a knock on effect from that, since if U.S. gas frees up other supplies that were destined for Asia, those supplies can potentially move into Europe instead. But Russia remains a relatively low-cost supplier into Europe, and can trim its prices to keep its market share. Moreover, unlike European gas companies, the big Russian players have much tighter ties with the state. If Moscow wants them to keep their share in the European market for strategic reasons, it may be able to make them do that. Russia would lose money – an important piece of geopolitical harm – but its leverage wouldn't be slashed.

What about supplying gas to Europe in a crisis? Here the basic constraint is infrastructure. Gas demand is seasonal, so during some parts of the year, there may be underutilized LNG import terminals. [UPDATE 3/6: Moreover, with a weak European economy, there is currently a lot of unutilized European LNG import capacity year-round; whether that persists indefinitely remains to be seen. Even in the current case, though, Russian imports into Europe greatly exceed spare LNG import capacity.] Were Russia to cut gas supplies to Europe during a crisis, if prices rose high enough, those terminals could be used to surge in some supplies. During other times (notably winter, when gas demand is most acute) the terminals will be fully utilized, making them unavailable to bring in new LNG supplies. The only way around that is to overbuild. This might happen by mistake, but unless European policymakers offer financial incentives, profit-seeking firms won't do it on purpose.

There is one other wrinkle worth thinking about here. The United States is currently able to take a harder line against Russia than Europeans are in part because the U.S. economy is insulated from energy-related turmoil. Were the prospect of surging gas into Europe a real one, we'd be having all sorts of debates here about the economic fallout for the United States from escalation with Russia. [UPDATE 3/6: It's worth distinguishing here between swinging U.S. gas from Asian to European customers, which wouldn't affect the U.S. market, and boosting total U.S. exports, which would.] Ironically, while being more connected to European gas markets might give the United States more tools in a future crisis, it could also deter Washington from aggressively confronting Russia.