# UKRAINE SUPPORT ACT; URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF BURMA TO END THE PERSECUTION OF THE ROHINGYA PEOPLE AND RESPECT INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS FOR ALL ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS MINORITY GROUPS WITHIN BURMA; AND AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

---

## MARKUP

BEFORE THE

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

**H.R. 4278, H. Res. 418 and H. Res. 494**

MARCH 25, 2014

**Serial No. 113–152**

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

87–333PDF WASHINGTON : 2014

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: 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

# CONTENTS

Page

MARKUP OF



APPENDIX

**UKRAINE SUPPORT ACT; URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF BURMA TO END THE PERSECUTION OF THE ROHINGYA PEOPLE AND RESPECT INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS FOR ALL ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS MINORITY GROUPS WITHIN BURMA; AND AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT**

---

**TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2014**

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m., in room 2172 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Edward Royce (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ROYCE. This committee will come to order. Pursuant to notice we meet today to mark up three bipartisan measures.

Without objection, all members may have 5 days to submit statements for the record and any extraneous material on any of today's items, and we will now call up the Ukraine Support Act, H.R. 4278.

Without objection, the bill is considered read and open for amendment at any point.

[The information referred to follows:]

I

113TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

# H. R. 4278

To support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 21, 2014

Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

# A BILL

To support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and for other purposes.

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Ukraine Support Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

**SEC. 2. UNITED STATES POLICY.**

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

(2) to support the people of Ukraine in their desire to address endemic corruption, consolidate democracy, and achieve sustained prosperity;

(3) to support the efforts of the Government of Ukraine to bring to justice those responsible for the acts of violence against peaceful protestors and other

unprovoked acts of violence related to the anti-government protests that began on November 21, 2013;

(4) to support the efforts of the Government of Ukraine to recover and return to the Ukrainian state funds stolen by former President Yanukovych, his family, and other current and former members of the Ukrainian government, along with others legitimately charged by government authorities with similar offenses;

(5) to assist the Government of Ukraine in preparations for the presidential election scheduled for May 25, 2014, and to participate in efforts to ensure that this election is conducted in accordance with international standards;

(6) to promote democratic values, transparent and accountable government institutions, and advance United States national security interests through United States international broadcasting, including the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), Incorporated;

(7) to support needed economic structural reforms in Ukraine, including in the fiscal, energy, pension, and banking sectors, among others;

(8) to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy supplies to

Ukraine and other European countries, including United States promotion of increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency;

(9) to condemn the armed intervention of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, including its continuing political, economic, and military aggression against that country;

(10) to work with United States allies and partners in Europe and around the world, including at the United Nations, to ensure that all nations refuse to recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation and reaffirm the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(11) to refuse to recognize the legitimacy of the illegal referendum in Crimea on March 16, 2014, on the status of that region of Ukraine, which was held under conditions of occupation and coercion by Russian forces;

(12) to support the deployment of international monitors to Ukraine to assess the current status of its territorial integrity and the safety of all people in Ukraine;

(13) to encourage the Government of Ukraine to continue to respect and protect the rights of all ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities;

(14) to call on all Ukrainians to respect the legitimate government authorities, as well as all Ukrainian laws and the Constitution of Ukraine in all regions of Ukraine, including Crimea; and

(15) to honor and abide by its commitments undertaken pursuant to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, on April 4, 1949, and entered into force on August 24, 1949.

# TITLE I—ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS

### SEC. 101. SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN UKRAINE.

(a) In General.—The President is authorized and encouraged to provide assistance to support democracy and civil society in Ukraine by undertaking the activities described in subsection (b).

(b) Activities Described.—The activities described in this subsection are—

(1) improving democratic governance, transparency, accountability, rule of law, and anti-corruption efforts;

(2) supporting Ukrainian efforts to foster greater unity among people and regions of the coun-

try, combat anti-Semitism and promote respect for religious freedom;

(3) supporting the people and Government of Ukraine in preparing to conduct and participate in free and fair elections, including through domestic and international election monitoring;

(4) assisting Ukraine in diversifying its economy, trade, and energy supplies, including at the national, regional, and local levels;

(5) strengthening democratic institutions and political and civil society organizations; and

(6) expanding free and unfettered access to independent media of all kinds in Ukraine and assisting with the protection of journalists and civil society activists who have been targeted for free speech activities.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of amounts made available to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) for fiscal year 2014, $50,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

**SEC. 102. ECONOMIC REFORM IN UKRAINE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Ukrainian economy is weak and vulnerable, as evidenced by short-term debt interest rates as high as 15 percent, a high proportion of foreign

exchange-denominated government debt that will mature in 2014 and 2015, a banking sector with non-performing loans at the high level of 14 percent, a financing gap which the Government of Ukraine has estimated will amount to $35 billion over the next two years, and a large underground economy. This economic condition undermines democratic prospects in Ukraine.

(2) Years of poor economic management and performance have undermined and may continue to undermine political stability and unity within Ukraine.

(3) On March 6, 2014, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4152, to redirect previously appropriated funds to cover the cost of roughly $1 billion in loan guarantees for Ukraine.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to work with other countries and international institutions to stabilize the Ukrainian economy, while promoting critically needed structural economic reforms in Ukraine, including—

(1) cutting the massive natural gas subsidies that have led to market inefficiencies;

(2) reducing the bloated public sector;

(3) maintaining a market-determined exchange rate;

(4) strengthening the vulnerable banking sector; and

(5) reducing corruption.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that loan guarantees provided by the United States for Ukraine should be used to promote government, banking and energy sector reform, and anti-corruption efforts in Ukraine.

**SEC. 103. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMING TO UKRAINE AND NEIGHBORING REGIONS.**

(a) FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) The Russian Government has deliberately blocked the Ukrainian people's access to uncensored sources of information and has provided alternative news and information that is both inaccurate and inflammatory.

(2) United States international programming exists to advance the United States interests and values by presenting accurate and comprehensive news and information, which is the foundation for democratic governance.

(3) The opinions and views of the Ukrainian people, especially those people located in the eastern regions and Crimea, are not being accurately represented in Russian dominated mass media.

(4) Russian forces have seized more than five television stations in Crimea and taken over transmissions, switching to a 24/7 Russian propaganda format; this increase in programming augments the already robust pro-Russian programming to Ukraine.

(5) United States international programming has the potential to combat this anti-democratic propaganda.

(b) PROGRAMMING.—Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), Incorporated, and the Voice of America service to Ukraine and neighboring regions shall—

(1) provide news and information that is accessible, credible, and accurate;

(2) emphasize investigative and analytical journalism to highlight inconsistencies and misinformation provided by Russian or pro-Russian media outlets;

(3) prioritize programming to areas where access to uncensored sources of information is limited

or non-existent, especially populations serviced by Russian supported media outlets;

(4) increase the number of reporters and organizational presence in eastern Ukraine, especially in Crimea;

(5) promote democratic processes, respect for human rights, freedom of the press, and territorial sovereignty; and

(6) take necessary preparatory steps to continue and increase programming and content services to Russia.

(c) PROGRAMMING SURGE.—RFE/RL, Incorporated, and Voice of America programming to Ukraine and neighboring regions shall—

(1) prioritize programming to eastern Ukraine, including Crimea, and to ethnic and linguistic Russian populations, as well as Tatar minorities;

(2) prioritize news and information that directly contributes to the target audiences' understanding of political and economic developments in Ukraine, including countering misinformation that may originate from other news outlets, especially Russian supported news outlets;

(3) provide programming content 24 hours a day, seven days a week to target populations, using

all available and effective distribution outlets, including—

(A) at least 8 weekly hours of total original television and video content in Ukrainian, Russian, and Tatar languages, not inclusive of live video streaming coverage of breaking news, to be distributed on satellite, digital, and through regional television affiliates by the Voice of America; and

(B) at least 14 weekly hours the total audio content in Ukrainian, Russian, and Tatar languages to be distributed on satellite, digital, and through regional radio affiliates of RFE/RL, Incorporated;

(4) expand the use, audience, and audience engagement of mobile news and multimedia platforms by RFE/RL, Incorporated, and the Voice of America, including through Internet-based social networking platforms; and

(5) partner with private sector broadcasters and affiliates to seek and start co-production for new, original content, when possible, to increase distribution.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2014, in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes, up to $10,000,000 to carry out programming in the Ukrainian, Balkan, Russian, and Tatar language services of RFE/RL, Incorporated, and the Voice of America, for the purpose of bolstering existing United States programming to the people of Ukraine and neighboring regions, and increasing programming capacity and jamming circumvention technology to overcome any disruptions to service.

(2) OFFSET.—Section 102(a) of the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 8412(a); Public Law 111–73; 123 Stat. 2068) is amended by striking "$1,500,000,000" and inserting "$1,490,000,000".

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall submit to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate a detailed report on plans to increase broadcasts pursuant to subsections (a) and (b).

**SEC. 104. OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should prioritize investments in Ukraine.

**SEC. 105. ENHANCED ASSISTANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT IN UKRAINE.**

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to assist Ukraine to eliminate the human rights abuses associated with the Berkut forces in order to foster a democratically reformed police force with strong public oversight, which is critical to fostering political unity and stability throughout Ukraine.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of amounts made available to carry out section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) for fiscal year 2014, $8,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to enhance United States efforts to assist Ukraine to strengthen law enforcement capabilities and maintain the rule of law.

(c) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The congressional notification requirements contained in section 1207(l) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) shall apply to the initiation of activities under a program of assistance under subsection (b) to the same extent and in the same manner as such congressional notification requirements apply to the initiation of activities under a program of assistance section 1207(b) of such Act.

## SEC. 106. ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION AMONG CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN NATO MEMBER STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of appropriate United States departments and agencies, shall seek to provide enhanced security cooperation with Central and Eastern European North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member states by undertaking the activities described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The activities described in this subsection are—

(1) enhancing existing security cooperation, including defense and military-to-military cooperation, among Central and Eastern European NATO member states;

(2) enhancing security relationships among the United States, the European Union, and Central and Eastern European NATO member states;

(3) providing defense articles, defense services, and military training to Central and Eastern European NATO member states;

(4) expanding the scope and frequency of military exercises among Central and Eastern European NATO member states; and

(5) supporting greater reform, professionalism, and capacity-building efforts within the military, intelligence, and security services in Central and Eastern European NATO member states.

**SEC. 107. UNITED STATES-UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) in fiscal year 2013 the United States provided Ukraine with nearly $2,000,000 in assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.; relating to International Military Education Training) and nearly $7,000,000 in assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763; relating to the Foreign Military Financing Program); and

(2) Ukraine has been a longstanding member of NATO's Partnership for Peace.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) United States assistance to Ukraine under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act

of 1961 and section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act should continue;

(2) consistent with section 506(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2318(a)), the President is encouraged to draw down defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense, in order to provide non-lethal assistance, which could include communication equipment, clothing, fuel and other forms of appropriate assistance, to the Government of Ukraine; and

(3) the Administration should expeditiously conclude its current review of all security assistance to the Government of Ukraine.

**SEC. 108. RECOVERY OF ASSETS LINKED TO CORRUPTION IN UKRAINE.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Administration should provide expedited assistance to the Government of Ukraine to identify, investigate, secure, and recover assets stolen from the Government of Ukraine or linked to acts of corruption by former President Viktor Yanukovych, members of his family, and other former or current Ukrainian government officials, and their accomplices in any jurisdiction through appropriate United States Government and multilateral programs, including the Department of Justice's Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative, the Egmont Group, the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative, the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network, and the Asset Recovery Focal Point Initiative.

**SEC. 109. EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Article 1 of the Agreement Establishing the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) states that the EBRD should support investments in countries that are committed to and applying the principles of multiparty democracy, pluralism, and market economics, and the EBRD has recognized that Russian "progress in the application of these principles . . . has been uneven".

(2) Russia received 21 percent of the investments made by the EBRD in 2013, which is more than any other country received from the EBRD in that year, and has received an inordinate ratio of investment from the EBRD since the 2006 Capital Resources Review.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) should increase investments in Ukraine and cease new investments in the Russian Federation, and the United States Government should press the EBRD to support new investment in Ukraine and halt consideration of new investment in Russia.

# TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

## SEC. 201. CONTINUATION IN EFFECT OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE BLOCKING OF CERTAIN PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SITUATION IN UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—United States sanctions described in subsection (b), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (a) of section 206 in accordance with subsection (b) of such section; or

(2) the date that is 30 days after any date subsequent to January 1, 2020, on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a determination that the termination of such sanctions imposed is in the vital national security interests of the United States.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—United States sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions imposed under the following executive orders:

(1) Executive Order 13660 (March 6, 2014; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

(2) Executive Order 13661 (March 16, 2014; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

(3) Executive Order 13662 (March 20, 2014; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

**SEC. 202. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS ON PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLENCE OR WHO UNDERMINE THE INDEPENDENCE, SOVEREIGNTY, OR TERRITORIAL OR ECONOMIC INTEGRITY OF UKRAINE.**

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to impose sanctions with respect to those individuals within and outside of the Government of the Russian Federation whom the President determines wields significant influence over the formation and implementation of Russian foreign policy, in particular with respect to the violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, democracy, and territorial integrity.

(b) CRITERIA FOR IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—A foreign person or an alien is subject to sanctions under subsection (c) in accordance with the provisions of such subsection if the foreign person or alien, on or after November 21, 2013—

(1) is knowingly responsible for or complicit in, or engaged in, directly or indirectly—

(A) actions that significantly undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;

(B) actions that significantly threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(C) acts of significant corruption in Ukraine, or the seizure or expropriation of significant economic assets from Ukraine, including the expropriation of private or state assets for personal gain, or the facilitation or transfer of the proceeds of such expropriation to foreign jurisdictions; or

(D) the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Ukraine or citizens of the Russian Federation;

(2) is a current or former senior official of the Government of the Russian Federation who has engaged in any activity described in paragraph (1);

(3) operates in the arms or related materiel sector in the Russian Federation that has engaged in any activity described in paragraph (1);

(4) is a current or former leader of an entity that has, or whose members have, knowingly engaged in any activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) or of an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section;

(5) has knowingly materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) or of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

(6) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section.

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—With respect to a foreign person who the President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State (or their designees), determines meets the requirements described in subsection (b), the President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State (or their designees), shall to the extent necessary investigate, block during the pendency of an investigation, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reason to believe, meets any of the criteria described in subsection (b) is—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who meets any of the criteria described in subsection (b), regardless of when issued.

(II) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, no court shall have jurisdiction to review a revocation decision under this clause, and no court shall have jurisdiction to hear any claim arising from, or any challenge to, such a revocation.

(III) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subclause (I)—

(aa) shall take effect immediately; and

(bb) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(2) PENALTIES.—A foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that

commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(3) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this section.

(4) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (c) with respect to a foreign person or alien if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is vital to the national interest of the United States; and

(2) not less than 15 days after the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of the waiver and a justification for such waiver.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 2 years, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report with respect to whether senior foreign political figures of the Russian Federation are responsible for engaging in activities described in subsection (b).

(B) FORM.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(2) REQUESTS BY CHAIRPERSON AND RANKING MEMBER OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after receiving a written request from the chairperson and ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees with respect to whether a senior foreign political figure of the Russian Federation is responsible for engaging in activities described in subsection (b), the President shall submit a response to the chairperson and ranking member of the committee which made the request with respect to the status of the person.

(B) FORM.—The President may submit a response required by subparagraph (A) in classified form if the President determines that it is necessary for the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMITTED.—The term "admitted" has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(13)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A)).

(2) ALIEN.—The term "alien" has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(3)).

(3) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term "financial institution" has the meaning given that term in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term "foreign person" means—

(A) an individual who is not a United States person or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence into the United States;

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental entity which is not a United States person; or

(C) any representative, agent or instrumentality of, or an individual working on behalf of a foreign government.

(5) PAROLED.—The term "paroled" means paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)).

(6) SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.—The term "senior foreign political figure" means—

(A) a current or former—

(i) senior official in the executive, legislative, administrative, military, or judicial branches of a foreign government (whether elected or not);

(ii) senior official of a major foreign political party; or

(iii) senior executive of a foreign-government-owned commercial enterprise;

(B) a corporation, business, or other entity that has been formed by, or for the benefit of, any such individual;

(C) an immediate family member (including spouses, parents, siblings, children, and a spouse's parents and siblings) of any such individual; or

(D) a person who is widely and publicly known to be a close associate of such individual.

(7) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term "United States person" means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

(g) TERMINATION.—This section and any sanction imposed by this section shall remain in effect until the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (a) of section 206 in accordance with subsection (b) of such section; or

(2) the date that is 30 days after any date subsequent to January 1, 2020, on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a determination that the termination of this section and the sanctions imposed by this section is in the vital national security interests of the United States.

**SEC. 203. REPORT ON CERTAIN FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On February 26, 2014, the Department of the Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network advised United States financial institutions of

their responsibility to take reasonable, risk-based steps regarding the potential suspicious movement of assets related to Viktor Yanukovych departing Kyiv and abdicating his responsibilities and other senior officials resigning from their positions or departing Kyiv.

(2) United States financial institutions are required to apply enhanced scrutiny to private banking accounts held by or on behalf of senior foreign political figures and to monitor transactions that could potentially represent misappropriated or diverted state assets, the proceeds of bribery or other illegal payments, or other public corruption proceeds.

(3) On March 3, 2014, the Government of Ukraine announced that it had initiated criminal proceedings against a number of former Ukrainian officials or close associates of former Ukrainian officials.

(4) On March 5, 2014, the European Union, based on information from Ukraine's Prosecutor General, issued a Council Regulation requiring the European Union to freeze the funds and economic resources of various former Ukrainian officials and their close associates.

(5) The Government of Canada has taken similar action against the same individuals.

(6) The measures being taken against these former Ukrainian officials and their close associates increase the risk that they will seek to move their assets in a deceptive fashion.

(7) Foreign financial institutions should apply similar, enhanced due-diligence and reporting requirements.

(8) The United States has a strong interest in seeing the international financial system protected from illicit financial activity, including money laundering, terrorism and proliferation financing, transnational organized crime, and the misappropriation of state assets, and international sanctions evasion, among others.

(9) The Department of the Treasury possesses a range of authorities to insulate the United States financial system from entities or jurisdictions that pose an illicit financing risk.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use all of its regulatory and statutory authorities to closely scrutinize all foreign financial institutions, including those in the Russian Federation, that may be complicit in enabling foreign persons and transnational criminal enterprises to evade or otherwise circumvent United States and international sanctions, launder the proceeds of criminal activity, finance acts of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or any other illicit activity that presents risks and vulnerabilities to the United States financial system.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 2 years, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(A) foreign financial institutions that are in direct or indirect control of Government of Ukraine state-owned or controlled assets without the knowledge or approval of the Government of Ukraine;

(B) foreign financial institutions that may be complicit in illicit financial activity, including money laundering, terrorism and proliferation financing, transnational organized crime, misappropriation of state assets, or otherwise engaged in any activity prohibited under United States law that are—

(i) organized under the laws of the Russian Federation; or

(ii) owned or controlled by a foreign person described in section 202(b); and

(C) foreign financial institutions that are directly or indirectly assisting or otherwise aiding the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, including, the Crimea.

(2) FORM.—The report required to be submitted under this subsection shall be submitted in an unclassified form, to the extent appropriate, but may include a classified annex.

**SEC. 204. AMENDMENT TO THE IRAN, NORTH KOREA, AND SYRIA NONPROLIFERATION ACT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran continues its longstanding effort to obtain banned components for its nuclear and missile programs in violation of its obligations under successive United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

(2) Russian entities, including Rosoboronexport, have been sanctioned with respect to proliferation activities, particularly sanctions under the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106–178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) The Department of State must expeditiously restore the deterrent effect of the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act by fully applying and enforcing such Act.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Section 2 of the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106–178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) PLAN TO EXPEDITE REPORTS AND SANCTIONS UNDER THIS ACT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Ukraine Support Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate, a plan, to include specific timetables, to expedite the implementation of this Act with respect to submission of reports required under subsection (a) and the application of measures to certain foreign persons under section 3.".

**SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

It is the sense of Congress that the President should greatly expand the list of 18 Russian officials and others published on April 12, 2013, who were engaged in actions described in section 404 of the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law

112–208; 22 U.S.C. 5811) regarding the death of Sergei Magnitsky, illegal activity by officials of the Government of the Russian Federation, or violations of human rights and other offenses in Russia.

**SEC. 206. CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—A certification described in this section is a certification of the President to Congress that Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity is not being violated by the Russian Federation or any other state actor.

(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit the certification described in subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees in writing and shall include a justification for the certification.

(2) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

**SEC. 207. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**

Except as otherwise provided, in this title the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(2) Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

Chairman ROYCE. And after my brief remarks I will recognize our ranking member, Mr. Eliot Engel from New York, and then any other members seeking recognition to speak on the bill. We will then proceed to consideration of a manager's amendment, then to an en bloc package of bipartisan amendments, and then to any free standing amendments that may remain before the committee.

Now, let me make the observation that Russia's armed intervention in Ukraine and its illegal annexation of Crimea have created an international crisis and the danger, obviously, is far from over. President Putin has deployed Russian forces on Ukraine's borders and may yet attempt to carve off additional pieces of eastern or southern Ukraine. If we wish to prevent him from further aggression then the United States and our allies must take immediate action to strengthen Ukraine's sovereignty, to strengthen their independence, to target responsible Russian officials and others in order to give the Russians second thoughts before they take any additional action.

This bill provides much needed assistance to Ukraine's struggling democracy which will be tested in the Presidential election that is scheduled there for May 25th. This includes security assistance. It also supports the reform of its police force and the removal of those responsible for the violence against peaceful protesters. In addition, it promotes economic reform, anti-corruption efforts, the recovery of assets stolen by former Ukrainian officials and other urgently needed measures.

This legislation enhances the availability of accurate news and information needed to counter the propaganda sent in by Moscow, and that propaganda from Moscow is being used right now to create confusion and fear and unrest in the country. And so this legislation will authorize increased funding for Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and the Voice of America, and it will enable these institutions to expand their broadcasting in Russia. There will be additional reporters, additional stringers so that in the Russian language, Ukrainian language, Tatar language—the languages spoken in Ukraine and this part of the world—there will be the ability for people to hear in real time what is really going on instead of just what is on Russian television.

If we are to help Ukraine break free of Russia's grip then we must help it escape from Moscow's control over its energy supply. The U.S. has a readily available tool to help accomplish this goal, which is to remove existing restrictions on our export of oil and natural gas into Ukraine and into Eastern Europe. This will not only boost the U.S. economy and create American jobs but also enhance our national security by undermining Russia's ability to use its energy exports to blackmail other countries, including our allies in Europe. Tomorrow the committee will hold a hearing on the very important and timely subject of the geopolitical potential of U.S. energy exports which is of direct relevance to the situation we face in Ukraine.

Let me also make the observation that our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs recently told a committee in the House an energy-independent U.S. and net exporter of energy as a nation has the potential to change the security environment around the world, notably, in Europe and in the Middle East.

And so as we look at our strategies for the future, I think we have got to pay more and particular attention to energy as an instrument of national power. The reason we are concerned about this is this is 70 percent—70 percent of the exports out of Russia today.

It is 52 percent of the entire budget for the Russian military and Russian Government that is coming because of the ability of Russia to have a monopoly on Ukraine—a monopoly, frankly, that Russia has used to its advantage in the past to undermine Ukraine.

This bill ramps up pressure on Putin and his accomplices who have played key roles in Russia's aggression. By specifically targeting them we can demonstrate that they will pay a heavy personal price for the confrontation they have engineered. The sanctions are aimed not only at the government officials but also at those who hold no official position but nevertheless wield great influence over government policy, including the so-called oligarchs.

I am pleased to have worked closely with Ranking Member Engel on this bipartisan bill. I believe it will send a clear message of American resolve. I think it will be heard in Kiev. I think it will be heard in Moscow and, frankly, throughout the region.

And with that, let me turn to our ranking member, Mr. Engel of New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for holding this markup of the Ukraine Support Act. I am very pleased to be the lead Democratic co-sponsor of this legislation and I want to commend you for once again working with us in a bipartisan way.

I say this, and I cannot say this too often, that I wish the rest of the Congress would take its cue from this committee and to show that we really can work in a bipartisan way to do what is best for our country.

President Putin's invasion of Crimea is a blatant violation of international law and also of Russia's commitments to its neighbor. The phony referendum he organized at the barrel of a gun has culminated in the first outright annexation of territory in Europe since the end of World War II and now he is massing troops on Ukraine's border, greatly increasing the risk of further violence and conflict in Ukraine and the wider region.

The United States must take a strong stand against this naked aggression. H.R. 4278 reaffirms our strong support for the people of Ukraine at this very difficult time. It authorizes assistance for the country as it seeks to regain its economic footing and prepares for democratic elections.

It supports efforts to help Ukraine recover looted assets and professionalize its law enforcement and it requires additional broadcasting to Ukraine and other countries in the region to counter the outrageous propaganda generated in Moscow while endorsing the deployment of international monitors throughout Ukraine.

The legislation also supplements the President's efforts to impose sanctions on those responsible for violating Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, looting Ukraine's economy and violating human rights in Ukraine.

It sends a clear message to Putin and his cronies that Russia's reckless actions will have serious consequences. On that note, I would like commend President Obama for imposing sanctions that have already started to impact Russian economy and for leading the effort to suspend Russia's participation in the G–8.

Finally, the bill expresses support for continuing U.S. security assistance to Ukraine and reaffirms our commitment to the security of our NATO partners in Eastern and Central Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the House recently passed legislation to provide $1 billion in loan guarantees to Ukraine and the European Union has pledged $15 billion in assistance. But the most significant element of the international community's assistance to Ukraine will be provided by the International Monetary Fund.

The IMF is now the most important international body for emergency rescue of countries facing serious economic difficulties. But the future of the IMF and our influence within that organization requires that Congress pass legislation to put into effect the 2010 plan to slightly adjust the voting shares on the IMF board and activate the IMF reserve account, known as the New Arrangements to Borrow.

The IMF is not in our committee's jurisdiction but it is, clearly, in the interest of the United States that Congress act as soon as possible to maintain the IMF's critical role in international crises.

I am told that by passing IMF reform it will ultimately mean about $6 billion of extra aid to Ukraine. I believe that we need to take a firm stance together and we are doing it with this legislation.

I think that Russia needs to understand that we are going to boost Ukraine so that ultimately the Russian aggression will prove a detriment to what they think they have done rather than give them a plus because of the stealing of territory from Ukraine.

This will only further our resolve to bring Ukraine looking westward rather than eastward. So we are making clear by passing this bill to the people of Ukraine that the United States is with them and that we are committed to helping them build a more democratic, prosperous, secure and just Ukraine, as I said before, looking westward rather than eastward.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this very important legislation. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Engel. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen had asked for some time for a brief opening statement.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. This bill is important because it shows our strong support to the Ukrainian people and it says to all freedom-loving friends and allies in the region that the U.S. will not stand idly by as Russia bullies its way in an attempt to rebuild another Soviet Union.

The Obama administration must get tough against Russia by sanctioning more Russian oligarchs by adding more names to the Magnitsky List, revoking the 1–2–3 agreement with Russia and reexamining our PNTR agreement with Moscow.

I would also like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for including in the bill language to support the Iran, North Korea and Syria Nonproliferation Act, INKSNA.

The language reasserts that the administration must comply with reporting requirements to fully implement this act, language that was approved by the full House of Representatives last Congress by a vote of 418 to 2. The reports have been delinquent for 4 years and that is not acceptable.

I would also like to note, Mr. Chairman, that I have a commitment from the full committee to move a free standing INKSNA legislation through the House this year and my staff is eager to work with your staff to make this happen. I thank the chairman for that.

And while it is vital that we continue to support the Ukrainian people, we must not let this overshadow our Venezuelan friends who continue to be brutally oppressed under Maduro and his cronies, and that is why I have introduced a bipartisan bill.

I thank the members of this committee who have co-sponsored it—H.R. 4229, the Venezuelan Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, which seeks to hold accountable violators of human rights of the Maduro regime and I hope that we can markup this bill soon, Mr. Chairman. Three more were killed yesterday in Venezuela and one of the opposition leaders, Maria Corina Machado, was stripped of her congressional seat by Maduro.

Why? Because she had the audacity to come to the United States, here, in this shining city on the hill to speak in front of the OAS. She was denied the opportunity to speak before the OAS and now she is potentially facing a charge of treason for coming to speak here.

So I urge my friends and colleagues to hold those accountable who are violating the human rights of and the dignity of others in Venezuela and throughout the entire hemisphere. I thank the chairman for the time.

Chairman ROYCE. Let us go to Mr. Brad Sherman of California.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you. I think it is important that we adopt bipartisan legislation as quickly as possible and that we avoid—that we avoid controversial and partisan division and avoid those divisive elements that are only tangentially related to helping the Ukraine.

I think is important that the sanctions provisions give the President flexibility especially because there are going to be some individuals who, our intelligence indicates, inside the councils of Russia are trying to push toward restraint and there will be others in Putin's circle who are pushing in the wrong direction.

And so we need to calibrate these sanctions person by person and I think can only be done by the executive branch. Putin comes off looking tough and trying to look victorious. But we should point out that he has in effect seized the consolation prize.

There will be those in Moscow who will ask the question who lost the Ukraine because they had a pro-Russian Government in Kiev and now they have a pro—a Russian Government only in the Crimea.

Putin backed a kleptocrat, he lost the Ukraine and now he is trying to look like a winner in the world and a winner to his own people by seizing one province wrongfully. Because that seizure was wrongful, we have to impose sanctions to show that we are dedicated to the concept of territorial integrity and the rule of international law.

But our ultimate focus has to be on preventing Russia from trying to take more of the Ukraine and demonstrate that there will be massive sanctions that will undermine the Putin regime if he goes further into the Ukraine.

We also have to call on the government of Kiev to do everything possible to refute Putin's charge that this a regime of winners. This cannot be at a time of national crisis anything other than a government of national unity.

We need to see the Ukrainian Government do all that it can to involve those who were elected and there was a majority in the party of regions—those who are open to the use of not only the Ukrainian language but the Russian language and those who are willing to continue—to consider federalist principles and the devolution of power to different regions, all to show that this government in Kiev is not going to represent just Maidan, just western Ukraine but even those Russian speakers in the south and the west.

Finally, as to energy exports from the United States, that, over a period of decades, might lower energy prices and affect the revenues of Saudi Arabia, Iran, Moscow and others. But I don't think that a country like the Ukraine that does not have a single LNG import terminal is going to be effected in the short or medium term by whether we export natural gas.

While technically we could export petroleum, we will be importing far more petroleum than we export for many years to come. So there is a brewing controversy on whether we should drill, baby, drill and export our—some oil and maybe more natural gas.

I am hoping that our focus today will be on things that affect the Ukraine in the short and medium term, and I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Just to recognize myself for a minute, I very much agree with the gentleman from California on his point for all Ukrainians to contemplate this issue of national reconciliation.

It is at this time that Ukrainians in the east, the south, the west all really need to figure out how to send the message that all Ukrainians are welcome regardless of language, regardless of ethnicity.

On, however, the issue of gas, we have already seen Hungary and Poland—we have seen the ability of the use of the gas lines that exist in Eastern Europe with the reverse flow of that gas to send 2 billion cubic meters last year into the Ukraine.

The Ukraine is in this tenuous position and, frankly, Russia's annexation was made easier by the energy grip it had. The fact that if we get energy or gas into Eastern Europe that we can use existing pipelines to get it to the Ukraine is an important consideration.

Now, clearly, it will take time to ship that gas. But at the same time, markets tend to move instantaneously with information and if we telegraph the message that that is our intent then he already begins to see the impact of that on the futures market of gas. Gazprom really is the state-controlled gas company that Putin has used to cut off the supply to Ukraine and earlier this month it did this just as it did in 2002 and 2009.

Gazprom recently wrote in the financial press as now saying it is going to double the price Ukraine pays for natural gas, which would really cripple the economy there.

So that is why—Mr. Sherman as well—I raised this as a consideration—a geopolitical tool here that could be used in order to send the message that we have got a strategy in order to undercut the ability of Putin to do this.

Do any other members seek recognition on the base text? Mr. Chabot.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Move to strike the last word.

I want to commend you and the staff for getting this timely legislation on Ukraine before the committee this morning. It is very important that the Congress map out a strong position on President Putin's acts of thuggery and I know we can count on the solid support of this committee today on H.R. 4278.

I also want to express my strong support for the resolution affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act. As we commemorate the 35th anniversary of the TLA let us remember that our diplomatic relationship with the People's Republic of China is premised on the expectation and the principle that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H. Res. 418 which raises awareness of the ongoing violence and discrimination of the minority Rohingya Muslim population in Burma. The resolutions call for the U.S. and international community to hold Burma accountable to end its blatant persecution of the Rohingya population comes at a critical time.

So I thank you for bringing these very important issues up this morning, Mr. Chairman. I yield back my time.

Chairman ROYCE. We go to Mr. Meeks.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank you and Ranking Member Engel for coming together and speaking with one voice.

I think that as we talk about what is going on in the Ukraine now it is important that there is unity and that we try to speak from the United States' point of view with one voice from both the Democrats and the Republicans because the issue involves or is important to all of us and that we look at those areas of which are our common denominator so that we try to deal with those matters that we can come to an agreement on.

Likewise, I think it is also important and I think that the President of the United States has been doing a good job in making sure that we are not speaking with one voice as the G–7 is currently meeting and operating—that also that we have to listen to the voices of our NATO allies because if it is just something done on a bilateral area and not a multilateral area then that then divides us and it weakens us and the resolve to make sure that Mr. Putin doesn't go further or look to divide us from our allies.

So it is important as a conversation and the President's negotiating that we are doing certain things and we take into consideration our NATO allies and their position and how far that they can go and move and we lead in that direction because, you know, the dialogue and the conversation.

But if ever we get to the point where we say that we don't care what they think or how it affects them then it will affect us also in a negative way. It will affect the leverage that we will have on Mr. Putin.

So we have got to make sure that we are mindful of, you know, where our allies are. Especially, I know I have talked to some members yesterday from the German Parliament and they have deep concerns in regards to Mr. Putin and moving forward and wanting to make sure that we stay in lock step—they stay in lock step with the United States.

They have some other problems also and they want to make sure that those are listened to, that we work together. And I think what I have heard by the President talking about that if there are some—further movement by Mr. Putin then our allies are ready to escalate the sanctions and we should be ready to move forward and get—and tighten those sanctions in that regard.

But I just, you know, want to be mindful, you know, it is easy to say to—sometimes to go to war or to send weapons or do that. That is the easy thing to do. The hard thing to do sometimes is to sit down and try to figure out how we stay in line with our allies and work together and I hope that they do that.

I hope that we do that because just as this is important for us to stay together and come together it is important for us to make sure with our international allies and to that regards, you know, we talk about, you know, our colleagues to the west. It is important for us to be reengaged and reinvigorate those relationships.

And so as we talk about the Ukrainian issue we have got to make sure, and I couldn't agree more with what you said, Mr. Chairman, and what Mr. Sherman said about Ukrainians coming together, it is now time for them to unite, to speak with one voice also.

That is tremendously important. It is important for us also to make sure that right now, not waiting until another time, that we engage with the Moldovans and the Georgians and the people from Azerbaijan and all of the other countries in the region, that we are talking to them and they know that we have an interest in their overall well being and their economy and in their democracies.

Let us not wait until there is something else that happens and then we all of a sudden are jumping in. Let us show, and I think that that is what this bill does—it shows that we are going to stand by the Ukraine.

We are going to try to help them with their economic circumstances so that they can stand on their feet and improve their democracy. It sends the right message. I believe then thereby it will send the right message to our other allies in the region.

That is tremendously important and, again, I end as I started, Mr. Chairman, because we could get into a lot of other debate here that could divide us but you and Mr. Engel have chosen not to do that. You have chosen to focus on what brings us together and I think you should be complimented for that, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Meeks.

We go to Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I will be opposing—again, probably the lone voice in some of these debates—opposing this measure and I do so in great despair as to the direction of what is going on in our country today in relationship to Russia.

I worked for many, many years and put my life at risk several times. I was not in the military but put my life at risk several times in order to defeat communism. I spent my whole life trying to defeat communism. We were not trying to defeat—we were not trying to become hostile to the people of Russia.

We were against the Soviet Union, which is not Russia. Now we have a situation in which there is a, obviously, distinct difference of national interests and instead of trying to play a constructive role it appears that we have opted out instead to fan the flames of hostility between our two countries.

There are many people who I worked with over the years who are stuck in the Cold War. They cannot sit by and understand that Russia has its national interests as we have our national interests and try to find ways that we can work together in peace and friendship, understanding that we are two great powers that have national interests at stake.

I do not—in this particular debate if we are to be listened to and to be—and try to find a peaceful solution the Russians have to respect that we are there trying to find a solution, not try to utilize this controversy as a means of defeating them and pushing them into a hole because, after all, they are Russians and they are thugs and they are gangsters and, of course, our people are—would have never committed such crimes as sending an army into Crimea.

I would like to commend my good friend, Congressman Engel, who worked very closely with me when we backed the Kosovars' right to self-determination and supported the bombing of Serbia in order to protect those people's right of self-determination.

What do the people of Crimea want? I don't think anybody in here will disagree with the fact that it is clear the people of Crimea would rather be part of Russia than be part of a pro-European or European-directed Ukraine.

Well, the people of Crimea just like the people of Kosovo have their right of self-determination or should have. I think Russia was wrong. I think Putin was wrong in trying to send in a military force.

I think that clouded the issue. But the hypocrisy on our side of suggesting or trying to suggest this is out and out aggression for the people of Crimea to have their will to be part of Russia is a little bit overwhelming.

I remember—just more recently than Kosovo I remember—didn't we support South Sudan breaking away from Sudan? Yes, we did. Well, let us—you know, let us be just in our criticism.

Yes, Putin should not have sent in those troops but this was and, again, he should not have had the right—he shouldn't have had the wording they had on their referendum in Crimea. They could have had an adequate wording on the ballot and, yes, they should have had the OSCE in to determine what the people of Crimea want officially.

But in our heart of hearts we know that the people of Crimea and especially those of us who have been there—10 years ago I visited Crimea. They all spoke Russian.

Now, what is that? It is a historic reality unfortunately because Stalin murdered so many people there and ethnic Russians moved in and we know that, and we are sorry about that.

But self-determination is based on people who live in a given territory determining their future and in this case the Russians are supporting the people of Crimea's right to determine where they want to go and we are opposing that and making it sound like it is naked aggression and doing so at great—I say great damage to the long-term security of both the United States and Russia.

Russia and the United States should be best friends because we face the same ultimate enemies of a radical Islamic movement that would murder our own people and, yes, an emerging China that hasn't had one bit of reform at all.

Yet we have placed Russia—sanction after sanction on Russia that has had dramatic reform, whose churches are full, yet we give China, what, we give China technology. We give them subsidies.

We give them recognition and yet they murder religious believers even as we do, and we ignore that. The double standard that we have for Russia has been aimed at pushing them into a hostile relationship with us and I oppose that whole concept. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher.

We go now to Mr. Connolly of Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the chair.

I am astounded at the apology I have just heard from my friend from California. Reform? I think not. Apparently, once a KGB agent always a KGB agent.

Mr. Putin seems to have learned nothing from history other than there is power at the end of the barrel of a gun. To cite Russian speakers in Crimea as a rationale for one of the most audacious power grabs in the 21st century, in Europe no less, forgets history.

Crimea was settled by Stalin, by Russian speakers, and they—and he expelled and executed the native population of Crimea, and this so-called referendum in Crimea was also done at the barrel of a gun. Russia's interests weren't threatened in the Crimea.

The new government in Kiev never abrogated the treaty that allowed Russian privileges—naval privileges through 2042. The Ukrainians didn't occupy Russian military stations in the Crimea and around the region. It was the other way around.

For the United States and its allies to allow this naked aggression to go unaddressed would be truly an abrogation of our moral responsibility and turn our back on what we should have learned from 20th century history.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONNOLLY. If I may continue for a second. We need to stop talking about he better not go further. I am stuck at Crimea and I hope my colleagues are too. It is wrong.

It cannot be allowed to stand and we must make him pay a price, and the difference between now and Stalin is that his economy is integrated into the global economy. The ruble will fall. The stock market will pay a price.

Investment will suffer because we are going to help make it so until he relents, until they pay a price that is so great, systematic, comprehensive in their economy that he will understand that we no longer operate by the rule of the jungle in Europe or, indeed, anywhere on the face of the planet, not with our blessing, not with our apology.

So I strongly support the legislation in front of us, Mr. Chairman, and I respectfully but forcefully disagree with virtually everything my friend from California has just said and I now would yield for a question.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The question is I would take it that you also opposed America's support for the people of Kosovo and the South Sudan for their self-determination, and could you cite any polls that indicate that the people of Crimea—every indication that I have seen from the experts indicate that they overwhelmingly want to be part of Russia—do you have any polls that indicate any different?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, you have asked several questions. I decidedly see Kosovo and South Sudan as distinctly different. Both of those were in fact subject to international sanctions, to international controls and to, in the case of Kosovo, concerted NATO action pursuant to law—pursuant to statutes that govern that action.

This has none of that, not even the pretense of it other than an action by—a unilateral action by the Russian parliament——

Mr. ENGEL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY [continuing]. And a patsy action by the Parliament in Crimea.

Mr. ENGEL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, and I agree with everything the gentleman just said. Let me say to my friend, my colleague from California who really stood with me and others very valiantly throughout the entire Kosovo War in 1999 and has been a strong supporter of human rights, but I disagree with him tremendously in trying to say that there is any kind of analogy between what happened in Crimea and what happened in Kosovo.

I don't believe that every separatist movement claiming some kind of referendum should be allowed to form either an independent country or to be part of a power grab. What happened in Kosovo was genocide. That didn't happen in Crimea.

What happened in Kosovo was the Serbian leaders trying to drive every ethnic Albanian out of Kosovo and the ones that he couldn't drive out he actually murdered them. That was a situation that came about by the actions of the Serbian Government.

So I think to draw any kind of analogy whatsoever between what happened in Kosovo to what happened in Crimea is just incorrect. We don't think that every minority group or majority group that is part of another country has a right to declare its own country.

But when genocide is happening I think that tilts the balance and that is why NATO, as Mr. Connolly points out, uniformly said enough is enough and intervened to stop the genocide. So no analogy at all between Crimea and Kosovo.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I know my colleague, Brad Sherman, wanted to ask a question. Would the chairman indulge me to yield to my colleague?

Chairman ROYCE. If you wish to yield at this time that would be——

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the chair.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would just point out the people of South Sudan were faced with mass murder, perhaps genocide. The people of

Kosovo were faced with mass murder and ethnic cleansing, and the people of Crimea saw that their rights were being protected.

They are an autonomous region. They continued to have their language rights. There is a difference. I yield back.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say on a point of personal privilege——

Chairman ROYCE. I think the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I know, but I want my colleague to know he knows he has my deep respect. But on this issue, he also has my passionate disagreement.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. We now have—we now go to Judge Ted Poe of Texas.

Mr. POE. I thank the chairman. Mr. Chairman, this issue is of importance to the United States' national security interest. I think we are living in a fantasy land if we think that the bully-bear Putin wants to be nice to the neighbors that surround him.

That is absolutely naive. He watched as we watched when the Russians invaded Georgia. There was a little bit of press worldwide about the invasion of the Republic of Georgia and I am not talking about the state of Georgia in the South.

I know some of my Georgia friends are concerned about thinking that Georgia has been invaded and they didn't know about it. But in any event, he watched to see what we would do. He took one-third of the country.

We said that is not nice. You shouldn't do that. You are invading a sovereign country, and we moved on and he is still there. One-third of Georgia is still occupied by the Russian army. The West, the world did nothing.

So he then looked at the Crimea. That was next on his list, and I agree with my friend from Virginia, we should be concerned about Crimea first before we are wondering about whether he is going into Moldova, the rest of the Ukraine, Estonia, Belarus. You know, those are possibilities.

And what happened in Crimea? He marched in. We watched, and dealing with Putin he has started Cold War II. We should be aware of this, and whether we like it or not he chose this activity.

So I think it is in our national security interest and the security of our allies and our friends that he be told no, you can't do this without some consequences. This legislation presents those consequences to the Russian bear, letting him know no, you are not going to get away with it this time.

And so I have—as mentioned earlier, I have great respect for my friend, Mr. Rohrabacher from California. But on this issue I think we should act, act decisively and act with the appropriate measure of sanctions to let, you know, the Napoleon of Siberia know he can't just invade countries and the rest of the world just moves on, and there should be consequences. I support the legislation.

Chairman ROYCE. Would the gentleman yield time to the Chair?

Mr. POE. I certainly will.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, thank you. I did want to make one observation here, Mr. Poe, and that is what we are not talking about is a revival of the Cold War.

What we are talking about is trying to get some leverage on Russia in order to wind down this situation and I think we should be clear here.

We are not reviving confrontation. The individual who did that is the head of state for Russia and he, obviously, has the ability to wind this down. But if we put additional pressure on him and those close to him, I think we might have considerable more success at this than we have in our attempts to cooperate with him over the many years where he has rejected the approach of cooperation and he has chosen aggression—aggression against the Ukraine, aggression against other countries.

I don't think we can allow him to proceed unchallenged or we are going to be faced with this challenge again and again. There will be other unnecessary crises that will result if we don't move decisively.

So yes, the United States stands ready to cooperate with Russia but we need to give an incentive for Russia to cooperate with us. Again, this is one of the reasons why I have suggested that by bringing competition into this with respect to gas into Ukraine and Eastern Europe and breaking the monopoly that Russia has—it is 70 percent of the export out of Russia, it is 52 percent of the entire budget for his military and government—if we do this along with the other steps that we take here to build democracy, to build support for institutions within Ukraine, I think we have taken a decisive step to create those second thoughts, to create that leverage. And my time has expired so I will now go to Mr. Grayson of Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ranking Member Engel. I want to join in some of the comments that were made by my friend Dana from California.

Less than 2 weeks ago in response to a question from the gentleman from central Florida, Secretary Kerry said that without a doubt if there were a free and fair election in Crimea, Crimea would vote to join Russia.

I think that is an important fact. In fact, I think that is the central fact of the situation that we face today.

All over the world, millions of people are stuck in the wrong country and the term—the great accomplishment of the 20th century was to seek the end of colonialism, the end of colonies, millions and millions of people stuck in the wrong country by means of military force by European powers.

Maybe the goal of the 21st century is to see the fulfillment of that principle that groups of people can join together and create a country, join another neighboring country, be part of the country that they want to be part of—the principle of self-determination.

We can't ignore the fact that 2 million people in the Crimea feel that at least until now they were stuck in the wrong country. This situation was created when, in 1956 Khrushchev, as a gift, gave the Crimea to the Ukraine.

At that point it didn't matter too much because both Ukraine and Russia were part of the Soviet Union. Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union at the beginning of the '90s it has mattered a lot and in fact there are Russian speakers, large groups of Russian speakers, who are now beyond the border of Russia, and one of the great issues of Russian foreign policy for the past 20 years has been what do we do about that—how do we deal with the fact that there are substantial numbers of people who are now outside of our border who identify themselves as Russians or ethnically Russian or culturally Russian or indistinguishable from the people within our borders.

The old Soviet Union contained 15 states with borders that were arbitrary. Now, there are actually parts of the old Soviet Union that are fundamentally different from Russia. For instance, if in fact we saw Russian military action against Lithuania, obviously, we would repudiate that. We would do everything we could to stop that.

The Lithuanians historically, ethnically, in terms of religion, in terms of culture are fundamentally different from the Russians. The Crimeans are not.

In one election after another after another in the entire 20 years that the Ukraine has been an independent country again, since it was an independent country hundreds of years ago, the Crimean population has shown that it is loyal to the Russians. It identifies with the Russians. It has voted over and over again with the Russian party contesting elections in the Crimea.

Now, recently we saw that the candidate whom the Crimeans supported by over 90 percent of their votes the Russian-speaking candidate was thrown out of office. Now, you may say that he was thrown out of office for good reason. There are allegations against him that he was corrupt.

There are allegations against him that he used the military against his own people to stay in power. But the fact is from the perspective of the Crimeans, their leader, the one that they placed in charge of their country, was thrown out of power.

So it should come as no surprise, as Secretary Kerry recognized, that the Crimeans had had enough and they wanted to leave this artificial entity called the Ukraine.

Now, in fact, the Russians did assist. They assisted by disarming the local Ukrainian army and navy. That is what they did. They did it virtually bloodlessly. They did that so that the Ukrainian army and navy could not interfere in the referendum that was held.

That is the fact of the matter. Why are we pretending otherwise? Why are we speaking about naked aggression? Why are we speaking about stealing Crimea? Why are we speaking about bullying or the new Soviet Union or thuggery or audacious power grabbing or bully-bear Putin or Cold War II?

I am surprised that Judge Poe didn't tell us that he has said that the Iron Curtain has descended over Sevastopol. The fact is, as the chairman has recognized, this is not some new Cold War that is occurring. In fact, it is quite the contrary.

We should be pleased to see—pleased to see when a virtually bloodless transfer of power establishes self-determination for 2 million people somewhere in the world—anywhere in the world.

And, in fact, what we are seeing here instead is the vilification of Putin, the vilification of Yanukovych, the vilification of anybody who we try to identify as our enemy. Before it was Saddam Hussein. Before that—before and since then it has been Assad.

This does not help. The basic provision here, the basic principle here is self-determination. That is what is happened in the Crimea and it is not for us to determine otherwise. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Would the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to make clear that the adjectives used or referenced are not the adjectives we use in this carefully worded resolution, first of all.

Second, the problem or the difficulty isn't so much with the example of a Lithuania. The problem is with the example of an Estonia or Latvia, countries in which people were moved out during Stalin's tenure into Siberia and replaced with ethnic Russians so that today in those two countries you have strong minorities of Russian speakers in Estonia and Latvia.

You have the same situation in Crimea to a greater extent because in Crimea the majority of the ethnic population in fact perished in the gulags and so within migration of Russian speakers into the area you have a different circumstance.

Part of the problem in terms of the way in which the referendum was held was, clearly, it was unconstitutional. It was illegal. It occurred under Russian military occupation and coercion. But you also had a situation where opponents were silenced.

International monitors were barred and, most importantly, voters were not given the option of preserving Crimea's current status with Ukraine because the only choice on the ballot was independence and de facto independence.

And, frankly, I think the vote itself was unnecessary because the Ukrainian Government had made it clear that it would discuss increasing autonomy for Crimea and, frankly, that was probably the way to solve this thing.

By allowing Crimea to have that autonomy within whatever you wanted to call, you know, let us say one country two systems but you would—you would basically be giving to Crimea the autonomy that the local population desired.

The Presidential elections that are now planned for May 25th are going to provide a legitimate opportunity for all Ukrainians to make their voices heard on the future of their country. I am going to lead a delegation there in April.

We are going to speak to all factions in the Ukraine. Mr. Sherman spoke to the issue that we want to convey one of an attitude of national reconciliation for Ukrainians.

But right now we are faced with a certain challenge and that challenge is if we do not send a strong message here, what happens with respect to Estonia or with respect to Latvia if a similar situation surfaces where the argument is made that a Russian population lives within those two countries, and we can, of course, extend that to any number of countries on the periphery of Russia, as you have pointed out, I think that we have got to get back to a process whereby this is done in consultation with the international community and there isn't an excuse given for Russia to move aggressively on other countries, using as an argument, frankly, propaganda that is not really occurring.

And the propaganda component of this was the thought that ethnic Russians were being beaten. This is why in our legislation one of the most important aspects, to me, is also the inclusion of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty broadcasting into the country in these languages to allow ethnic Russians to know in real time what is actually happening in the country to offset propaganda.

But I did want to bring up those points with respect to the underlying resolution. We are going now to Mr. Smith of New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Engel, for introducing this comprehensive legislation to support Ukraine in its urgent effort to meet its current crisis including viability of its democratic institutions.

Russia's land grab in Crimea violates the core principles of the bilateral and multilateral treaties between Ukraine and Russia, the Budapest Memorandum, the United Nations Charter, as well as the Helsinki Final Act.

The proposed legislation includes a strong sanctions component against Russians responsible for this aggression. H.R. 4278 also authorizes targeted sanctions against Ukrainians involved in undermining the democratic processes and provides assistance to the Ukrainian Government for identifying and recovering stolen assets.

It is, after all, these criminal officials including, and especially, Yanukovych and his cronies who have so harmed the Ukrainian people and placed the country in the vulnerable position which Russia has ruthlessly exploited.

Another key provision of the bill provides support for Ukraine's democracy and civil society, and here I want to recognize the importance of supporting as well the faith-based groups and organizations that played such a prominent role on the Maidan and in supporting the movement for democracy and the rule of law.

The Ukrainian democracy movement is in large part a religious movement. Orthodox and Catholic clergy, for example, were prominent in the protests and the drama of priests carrying icons confronting soldiers became as much a symbol of the democratization movement as anything else.

Religious and faith-based organizations are very much part of civil society and democratization and a conscientious voice for the rule of law and anti-corruption efforts, and this legislation with the amendment that will be offered shortly includes them specifically, and I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Mr. Lowenthal of California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank you, Chairman Royce, and Ranking Member Engel for bringing forward the Support Ukraine Act, which I strongly support. It is critical to the United States to back Ukraine sovereignty, its territorial integrity and its independence.

I condemn Russia's attempt to annex Crimea in violation of international law. I strongly support the sanctions for individuals responsible for the loss of Ukrainian assets who have significantly undermined democratic processes in the Ukraine or have committed human rights abuses.

However, I would like to raise an issue that is contained in the Support Ukraine Act which probably is not within the jurisdiction of this committee. As we seek to promote democratic values in the Ukraine and to support those democratic and uphold those values, we must not lose sight of our own democratic values here in the United States.

The bill provides broad discretion to the administration and its staff in the Department of State and Homeland Security to revoke visas for individuals they determine to meet certain criteria.

While I understand and support the need to provide discretion to the administration under these extraordinary circumstances, I remain concerned about the lack of any judicial recourse for those that are affected.

As this bill moves forward, which I do support and hope that it does, I will request that the Judiciary Committee address this lack of judicial recourse. Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. And if—would the gentleman yield for just one moment?

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Yes, I would.

Chairman ROYCE. If I could respond to Mr. Lowenthal. The sections of the bill regarding visa sanctions, including the preclusion of judicial review, these are not amendable at our markup.

I just wanted to explain this, that those portions which concern the immigration and nationality act and parts of Title 28 of the U.S. Code that deals with the judicial proceeding portion of this, they are in the legislative jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. So that will be part of the process.

We go now to Mr. Weber of Texas.

Mr. WEBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With great respect for my friend from California who is from the best named city there, Sherman Oaks, I want to address the idea that there is a brewing controversy over drilling and selling natural gas, and I want to bring my colleague's attention to the fact that when President Bill Clinton was in office there was a controversy over drilling in the ANWR.

And a lot of the comments and I think my colleague in California said drill—the brewing controversy of drill, baby, drill. There was a bumper sticker that was very prevalent in Texas back during the controversy over ANWR that said drill here, drill now, pay less. Joaquin, you might remember that.

And the comments were made, those who were against drilling in ANWR, that look, it would take 10 years for any of that oil to reach us. By the time the permits were done, by the time the pipeline was built, by the time production was done it would be 10 years before we would see any of that oil. It is pointless.

And so if memory serves me correct, Bill Clinton left office in 2001. Had we drilled then we would have the benefit of that energy now. I think this current crisis points up the fact that it is indeed a controversy that when America can become energy independent it not only serves to create jobs in this country, which we sorely need right now, but it also produces energy independence, national security for America and even produces national security around the world.

Ask our friends in the Ukraine if they would rather be buying LNG—and I have three LNG plants either in my back yard or in my district—ask them if they would rather be buying gas from America or the Russian bear, as Judge Poe called him.

I think the answer is pretty straightforward. We cannot, in my opinion, ignore the fact that this is a national security controversy, if we want to use my colleague's words from California, but that it is an important one that needs to be had, and had we drilled in the ANWR 15-plus years ago we would be in lot better shape. The world would be a safer place.

So the question I pose: 10 years from now are we still going to be saying oh, we have got this brewing controversy about drill for natural—LNG and natural gas and export it to other countries?

It means jobs for us. It means a balance of trade for us. It means national security for us, and it means—I would argue it means international security around the world. So that the kinds of things that we saw Putin do the Ukraine in cutting off their energy supply cannot be done.

Now, I am going to switch gears to Part B. When you have a Crimean legislature that votes unanimously to be reannexed into Russia, where are the people to stand up and say no? And I was told by one of my colleagues when we last had this discussion, well, if you had a gun aimed at your head you would say no, too.

You would have joined—you would have joined, rather, and voted for annexation, and I reminded him that 56 signers of our Declaration signed their name to a document, stuck their finger in the face of the—the eye of the biggest tyrant in the world, King George, back then—the most powerful country with the most powerful army.

And in signing that Declaration they signed their death warrant knowing that they would either be shot on sight or hung as a traitor. If people in Crimea did not want to be annexed where were the voices to stand up and say no?

So it troubles me that we are guaranteeing them money and that we are getting involved, as my friend from California, Congressman Rohrabacher, says, in a situation where, clearly, it seems as if either they were unwilling to stand up and fight for their own liberty or unwilling to pay that price, and yet we are going to get involved and we are going to get between the two.

That is very troubling. I have great respect for Chairman Royce. I have been overseas with him and watched him amongst the other countries and the knowledge he has and the way he is respected.

So I am going to wrestle with this one, and I have great respect for my colleague, Mr. Sherman, from Sherman Oaks, the best named city in California.

Mr. SHERMAN. Gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBER. I will yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. We are about to have hearings on the whole issue of energy exports. My hope is to keep that out of this resolution here because it can be controversial. Had we drilled at ANWR, there are various things that would have happened, but I think that Russia would be hurting just as much for every barrel of oil that it exports as today. I don't think it would have affected world prices. And I would point out that in Japan now, they are paying triple what we are for natural gas. They are paying one and a half times what they are in Germany. And I doubt that we are going to see a decline in what Europe is willing to pay for Russian natural gas, knowing that the Japanese are there as potential buyers. I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Mr. Sherman, I will shut up and yield back. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank the gentleman from Florida. We are going to have to move to consider the manager's amendment en bloc and other amendments. I have got Ms. Frankel from Florida seeking time and Mr. Keating. I thought I would recognize them and then try to move to, since we are going to have members who are going to have amendments, but let us now go to Ms. Frankel.

Ms. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do support this act, but I do have—I have enjoyed this debate and I would like to raise two questions and then I would yield my time to those who would like to answer. This has to do with the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Under the Budapest Amendment of 1994, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Russian Federation made assurances to protect Ukraine in the event its territory or sovereignty is threatened by a foreign entity in exchange for Ukraine voluntarily giving up its uranium and nuclear warheads to Russia, at the time the world's third largest arsenal.

So my first question really would be probably to Mr. Grayson and then Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate your answer, is how would you relate this Ukraine Support Act to that agreement? And secondly, do either of you believe that this act will in any way affect negotiations either with Iran or Syria? I would yield my—Mr. Grayson, you want to take a stab at that?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I think it is fair to say that the Russians have skated around the agreement that they signed 20 years ago. I think that there is a great deal of troubling details with regard to how the situation has unfolded. I think the chairman quite accurately enumerated many of them. The question for me is whether that somehow trumps the desire and the need for the people of Crimea for self-determination. In my case, I think it doesn't. That doesn't mean that we need to overlook the fact that the Russians appear to have violated the agreement that you mentioned, overlook the fact that the Russians doubled the legal amount of soldiers that they had in the Crimea leading up to the referendum and a number of other irregularities. But I don't think that we are on the right side of history as President Obama might say. We are standing against the right of the people of the Crimea for self-determination.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chair, or maybe Mr. Engel, could you answer that question, your thought of how the Budapest Memorandum of 1994 relates to this discussion?

Chairman ROYCE. Would you repeat that question, Ms. Frankel?

Ms. FRANKEL. There was, it is my understanding Ukraine voluntarily gave up its nuclear arsenal with the promise from the United States, United Kingdom, and the Russian Federation to protect their sovereignty, so it seems to me there may be some precedent or implications if we do not move forward with this type of act. But I just wanted to get your sense of that.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, I would just point out that the political document that you refer to, Ms. Frankel, was not a security treaty. The United States is not bound under that document. And so I don't think that is relevant to the debate of the resolution here, nor do I think this resolution complicates in any way the suggestion that I think you are alluding to.

Ms. FRANKEL. Well, Mr. Chair, if I may?

Chairman ROYCE. Yes. Perhaps I don't understand exactly what you are asking.

Ms. FRANKEL. I think it supports it. I think that just in terms of precedent, I mean if we do not back up in some way an agreement, we got Ukraine to give up a nuclear arsenal with an assurance to maintain, that we would protect their territorial integrity. Obviously, Russia is violating that.

Mr. ENGEL. Ms. Frankel, if you would yield to me?

Ms. FRANKEL. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. I think you are right on the money with that one, absolutely. That was signed at a time when Russia perhaps felt more vulnerable than it feels now and Putin feels strengthened now for many reasons, one of which is the energy revenues that he gets making Russia a power again. And therefore, he has conveniently neglected, abrogated, or whatever it is, agreements that Russia signed back then because he feels he is stronger now. He is a bully now and he can afford to do it. So I think you are quite right. This legislation stands up to that and says there is bad faith by Russia. It is not simply a matter, as some of my colleagues have put it of self-determination. It is a matter of Putin being a bully because he just feels that he can be.

Ms. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman ROYCE. Would the gentlelady yield? Again, the point I was making is that the document itself does not require a military response clearly, but Putin's logic would dictate that we take what steps we could to leverage the conduct of Russia in order to penalize Russia for violating the agreement that Ukraine made as you have articulated and so that Russia understands that there will be a consequence in the future if this conduct continues. And I think what gives us all pause is this speech he made to the Duma recently in which he said the boundaries of Russia are not the boundaries of the current map of Russia, that Russian populations anywhere are considered part of Russia. That type of extra territoriality is perhaps a signal that we have to be aware of other intentions and hence, prudence would suggest that we need to move decisively with leverage in order to put pressure on Moscow not to attempt this.

Mr. Keating.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to close and frame this resolution that I am supporting, this legislation this way. What was done and what Russia did was illegal. Now there are other means of dealing with issues of autonomy. There are international ways to deal with that, and with Kosovo they did that with the Security Council.

It can be done under the Ukraine constitution and the Prime Minister has made clear that he is open to discussions and dialogue on these issues of autonomy. If it is done legally everyone's rights, including groups like the Crimean Tatars, everyone's rights are better protected. That is the way it should happen. The way it has happened has been at the barrel of a gun. That is what this legislation addresses. The illegality of what was done and I don't think that should be lost in us. And I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. If there are no further speakers on the underlying bill, I recognize myself to offer a manager's amendment which was provided to your offices last night and the clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Royce of California.

Chairman ROYCE. Without objection, the manager's amendment is considered read and I will recognize myself briefly to explain the amendment.

[The information referred to follows:]

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278
## OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(14) to encourage the Government of Ukraine to promote and protect the human rights, as recognized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of all individuals as they seek freedom, democracy, and equality under the law;

Page 5, line 16, after "civil society" insert ", including community-based and faith-based organizations,".

Page 16, line 2, strike "continue" and insert "be increased".

Page 16, line 2, insert "and" at the end.

Page 16, line 7, strike "non-lethal" and insert "security".

Page 16, line 10, strike "; and" and insert a period.

Page 16, strike lines 11 through 13 and insert the following:

(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States, in consultation with the Government of Ukraine, to enhance Ukraine's self defense, including through appropriate assistance to improve the capabilities of the country's armed forces.

(d) REVIEW OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of appropriate United States departments and agencies, shall submit to Congress a report on the results of a review of all United States security assistance to the Government of Ukraine.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

Page 18, line 16, strike "206" and insert "207".

Page 22, line 2, after "subsection (b)" insert "and is not included in the classified annex of a report submitted to the appropriate congressional committees under subsection (e)(1)".

Page 24, line 18, strike "foreign".

Page 26, line 11, before "every" insert "at least once".

Page 26, line 16, strike "whether".

Page 26, line 17, strike "are responsible for engaging" and insert "that have been determined to have engaged".

Page 27, strike line 17 through 24.

Page 27, line 25, strike "(f)" and insert "(g)".

Page 29, beginning on line 2, strike "means" and all the follows through line 20 and insert "has the meaning given the term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.".

Page 30, line 5, strike "(g)" and insert "(h)".

Page 30, line 11, strike "206" and insert "207".

Page 30, after line 19, insert the following:

**SEC. 203. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS ON PERSONS COMPLICIT IN OR RESPONSIBLE FOR SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 20, 2014, the Department of the Treasury designated four individuals and one financial institution for acting for or on behalf of or materially assisting, sponsoring, or providing financial,

material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, a senior official of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(2) Widespread corruption at senior levels of the Government of the Russian Federation, in combination with the suppression of political freedoms and the concentration of enormous wealth in the hands of individuals exercising extensive influence over government policy, has contributed to the establishment of an authoritarian system that does not respect the rights of the Russian people.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State (or their designees), is authorized to impose sanctions against a foreign person under paragraph (1)(A) of section 202(c) in accordance with the provisions of such section, and the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) is authorized to impose sanctions against an alien under paragraph (1)(B) of section 202(c) in accordance with the provisions of such section, if the foreign person or alien is a senior foreign political figure or a close associate of such senior foreign political figure with respect to which, in the case of a foreign person the President determines, or, in the case of an alien the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security knows, or has reason to believe, meets each of the criteria described in subsection (c).

(c) CRITERIA FOR IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The criteria described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The foreign person or alien is responsible for, or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, acts of significant corruption in the Russian Federation, including the expropriation of private or public assets for personal gain, corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources, bribery, or the facilitation or transfer of the proceeds of corruption to foreign jurisdictions.

(2) The foreign person or alien has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, an act described in paragraph (1).

(d) WAIVER.—The waiver provisions of subsection (d) of section 202 shall apply with respect to this section and any sanction imposed by this section to the same extent and in the same manner as such waiver provisions apply to section 202 and any sanction imposed by such section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms "foreign person", "alien", and "senior foreign political figure" have the meanings given such terms in section 202(f).

Page 30, line 20, redesignate section 203 as section 204.

Page 33, strike line 7 through page 34, line 13 and insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 2 years, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(A) foreign financial institutions that are in direct control of Government of Ukraine state-owned or controlled assets in a manner determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be contrary to the interests of the Government of Ukraine;

(B) foreign financial institutions determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be complicit in illicit financial activity, including money laundering, terrorism and proliferation financing, transnational organized crime, or misappropriation of state assets, that are—

(i) organized under the laws of the Russian Federation; or

(ii) owned or controlled by a foreign person described in section 202(b); and

(C) foreign financial institutions that are directly or indirectly assisting or otherwise aiding the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, including the Crimea.

(2) FORM.—The report required to be submitted under this subsection shall be submitted in an unclassified form, to the extent appropriate, but may include a classified annex.

Page 34, line 14, redesignate section 204 as section 205.

Page 35, line 10, strike "Not later" and insert the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later".

Page 35, after line 18, insert the following:

"(2) SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON SYRIA.—In the submission of reports under subsection (a), in accordance with the plan required under paragraph (1), the President is encouraged to place a special emphasis on any foreign person in Russia, including any Russian Federation official, that is engaged in any activity described in subsection (a) with respect to the government of President Bashar al-Assad and any affiliates thereof.

"(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude or exempt the President from fulfilling or otherwise deviating from the requirements under subsection (b).".

Page 35, line 19, redesignate section 205 as section 206.

Page 36, line 5, redesignate section 206 as section 207.

Page 36, line 21, redesignate section 207 as section 208.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. . PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND REPORT ON COMPLIANCE BY RUSSIAN FEDERATION OF ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER INF TREATY.**

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that there are reports that the Russian Federation is in material breach of its obligations under the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that includes a determination as to whether or not the Russian Federation is in material breach of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(2) ADDITIONAL MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—If the President determines that the Russian Federation is in material breach of its obligations under the INF Treaty, the report shall also include the following:

(A) A description of the measures taken to hold the Russian Federation accountable for its violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(B) A description of the measures being taken to ensure that the Russian Federation completely and verifiably eliminates any military system that constitutes a material breach of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(3) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

☒

Chairman ROYCE. This amendment includes several items which were shared with the ranking member and which were distributed to all members' offices. There are also additions from other members of the committee, Mr. Smith and Mr. Cicilline. As I noted in my opening statement, the underlying legislation is a strong message of support for Ukraine and pushes back against Russian aggression and this amendment contains a few more items in support of that cause.

Importantly, the amendment allows for the President to target those corrupt officials closest to Putin, targeting them for their asset and visa bans and last week four individuals and one financial institution were targeted for providing material support to Russian officials. We can and should ramp this up. This is Putin's power base. Expropriation, corrupt government contracts, bribery, it is all rampant and it is all despised by the Russian people. And this provision lets them know whose side we are on.

The amendment also calls for close scrutiny of Russia's efforts to arm Bashar al-Assad in Syria and I appreciate Ms. Ros-Lehtinen's and Mr. Cotton's close attention to that issue. Moscow's support has been essential in Assad's 3-year slaughter of his own people.

The amendment also calls for a determination as to whether or not Russia is in material breach of the INF Treaty. There is recent credible reporting that Russia has violated this treaty. The administration owes Congress, I think, a determination in this regard. And on security assistance, the amendment answers increasingly bipartisan calls to do more to help improve the capability of Ukraine's armed forces, which have been neglected for decades.

And lastly, the amendment includes several technical changes to perfect the language in the underlying bill. So do any other members seek recognition to speak on the manager's amendment? I will go to Mr. Engel.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak in strong support of the manager's amendment. I want to tell our colleagues specifically what the amendment does. It amends the base text as follows. It adds language on Ukraine and human rights. It has language on community and faith-based organizations in Ukrainian civil society. It adds language to help improve the capabilities of Ukraine's armed forces. It adds language allowing the President to sanction those who are complicit in significant corruption in Russia. It also adds language requiring closer scrutiny of Russia's efforts to arm the Bashar al-Assad regime in Syria. It requires the President to report on whether Russia has materially breached its obligations under the INF Treaty. It includes a number of technical and perfecting changes to the language in the underlying bill.

So Mr. Chairman, I think that these amendments strengthen the bill and are right in line with what we are attempting to. I strongly support them and I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Rohrabacher from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I rise in respect to my colleagues, but in strong disagreement with this manager's amendment as well. There is no doubt there is significant corruption in Russia. There is no doubt about that. And there is no doubt there is significant corruption in a huge chunk of this planet and the governments that control the people on those chunks of the planet. We know that, for example, Mr. Yanukovych who was elected as President of Ukraine who was then removed, I might add, from being the President of Ukraine, that he was elected because the people that we have supported, and I say we because I was deeply involved in supporting this Orange Resolution they had. They had conducted themselves in a very corrupt way and the people of Ukraine were upset with the pro-Western group that had been put in place and they elected this pro-Russian Yanukovych and they elected him to be their President. All right.

Right now, simply to condemn the corrupt leaders of Russia in a world like this is a hostile act toward Russia. It is a hostile act toward those particular people that run Russia. I am not saying we shouldn't recognize them, they do not meet anywhere near the honesty standards that we have, but for us to single them out right now as compared to what is going on in China, as compared to what is going on in so many other countries in the world is telling them we consider them our enemy. And this is what we are talking about today is an effort to rush headlong into the Cold War again by declaring war on these people. That is what we are doing.

We are declaring war on them as individuals, singling them out from all the corrupt dictators around the world. Let me note with Assad, yes, I think Assad is a corrupt dictator and he has had a rotten regime in Syria and Putin has supported him. But of course, our guys support al-Qaeda, the people who murdered 3,000 Americans on 9/11. Our allies are supporting those guys. So no, we are going to condemn Russia for supporting Assad because he is a corrupt dictator.

What did Russia just do? They just gave $2 billion in support for General Sisi. Well, thank God they did that, but they are not going to be doing that in the future if we start singling them out in such a hostile way that they know that we are at war with them as individuals and war with Russia again. That is not what is best for our country. And it is not what is best for the world.

And as far as one last note, from what I understand what happened in Crimea, not one person was killed, maybe one, maybe there was one. What happened in Kosovo when we were supporting self-determination which we should have supported, and in Sudan, we are talking about thousands of people who lost their lives, yet we have to go and condemn the Russians of course when no one lost their life in an attempt to make sure that people of Crimea had a right to control their own destiny and their own self-determination. So I would oppose this manager's amendment as well as the bill.

Chairman ROYCE. I am going to recognize myself for a few minutes here. First, I want to make it clear that this bill includes measures to address and sanction corrupt Ukrainian officials as well. Asset seizures, sanctions, visa bans, all apply in this legislation to those Ukrainian officials involved in that kind of conduct, but it also applies to the Russian oligarchs that have been involved in this situation.

Why? Well, for one reason we should look at every bit of leverage we have in this situation in order to put pressure on Russia to make certain that Moscow does not move into southern Ukraine or eastern Ukraine or in other territories. And second, corruption is the most despised activity in Russia today. It is one of the reasons Russians view the actions of the state as so irresponsible. So it is not as though in targeting corruption related to these activities we are doing something that runs cross current with the interests of the people in Russia.

The authority in the legislation, if you look at it, is very permissive. In other words, we are saying that the administration has the ability to do this. Why would we want to give the administration this authority? Because again, we are sending the message that Moscow needs to ramp this down, that we need to have a resolution of this crisis. And the only way we are going to get there is if we have significant leverage here. So there is a lot of flexibility involved in the language that we have in the document.

Frankly, and lastly, this group is Putin's power base. We have seen the way that things have been nationalized in Russia and power transfer to oligarchs that are very close to the head of state. And if we are going to succeed in this endeavor, those who have been engaged in ill-gotten gains need to be penalized, need to feel that there is a consequence for that type of activity. So for those reasons I think this is important.

Mr. Cicilline was seeking to be recognized.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank you and Ranking Member Engel for holding today's markup on these three important issues, particularly with respect to the situation in Ukraine.

Even as we address the crisis in Ukraine, I appreciate that we are also reaffirming our commitment to human rights in Burma and our strong economic relationship with Taiwan. But I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and our Ranking Member Engel for leading this committee again in a bipartisan manner as you respond to the situation in Ukraine and leading the Congress in a thoughtful, unified response to this crisis.

Following the recent unilateral annexation of Crimea by Russia, the legislation before this committee condemns the aggressive actions by Russia and supports Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial borders. It is also critical the United States make clear that our Government will stand in solidarity with our NATO allies. This bill will be integral in demonstrating our support of the Ukrainian people and our commitment to Ukrainian territorial integrity.

I would like to thank you, Chairman Royce, for your inclusion of Section 205 of the Ukraine Support Act which calls on President Obama to expand the list of Russian officials sanctioned under the Magnitsky Act.

I was also pleased that President Obama and other world leaders have decided to suspend Russia's membership in the G8. This action illustrates Russia's loss of international stature due to its violation of international law and undermining of the democratic process in Ukraine.

Finally, I offer my thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, for working with me to include my amendments language in the manager's amendment. I believe it is critically important to reaffirm that the United States policy is to encourage Ukraine to protect the fundamental human rights of all individuals. The underlying bill encourages Ukraine to respect the rights of ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities which is important. But this amendment will make clear that the United States will continue to protect and defend the rights of all Ukrainians as they pursue freedom, democracy, and equality under the law.

I thank you again, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding and for his contribution to this base text because I think he made a very good point. I think when we were writing the language in terms of respecting the rights of ethnic and linguistic minorities in Ukraine, his point that we should expand that and touch on the importance of promoting and protecting human rights across the board is particularly important given the troubling reports of attacks against peaceful protesters and intimidation of journalists and activists in Ukraine. Protecting the fundamental human rights of all individuals are going to be essential to a successful democracy in Ukraine. I therefore thank the gentleman again for his contribution.

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have a situation right now where you have an armed force, whether shots are fired or not. You have an armed force walking into a sovereign nation and tearing a sovereign European country apart. I don't know in any way why anybody on this committee would defend that, would call that some kind of self-determination, would call that anything but an aggression and a rebuilding of the Soviet Union.

I think it is completely legitimate to go after corrupt officials in Russia. My friend from California is very quick to go after corrupt officials in Afghanistan every time the issue of Afghanistan comes up and in fact, becomes the impetus for the argument about why we should pull out of Afghanistan.

I also would like to remind folks that have talked about the issues all around the globe. I agree, China is a major threat to the United States and probably one of our chief competitors in the world with the exception, of course, of al-Qaeda and global terrorism. But I would remind everybody that China has yet to invade a neighbor in the way that Russia is invading, has invaded Georgia, is invading Ukraine, is ready to rebuild the Soviet Union. And the second we see China do that I think we ought to also respond very strongly. A lack of strong response here will mean that China is more likely to do just that exact thing.

And then I wanted to address the issue of Assad because I think this is a big issue. Assad has murdered almost 200,000 of his own people. He did it initially with chemical weapons that choke children to death and people to death as they basically die, as they realize they are dying from their own lack of breath and are unable to survive. So now instead of using chemical weapons, he has decided to use barrel bombs which you load with 55-gallon drums filled with explosives and igniters, drop them on an area that you want to empty. It doesn't matter if there are children there; women, men, it really doesn't matter because you just drop this barrel bomb and kill whoever is in the way.

There is no defending Assad in Syria. The opposition, some of them have links to al-Qaeda, but that is partially because Assad is attacking Free Syrian Army and allowing al-Qaeda-linked opposition to grow so that he can do the narrative that he is some savior of Christian religion in Syria. So I think all of the Russian influence we are seeing in Syria, the rebuilding of the Soviet Union that we are seeing going on right now, I think it is essential and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership. It is essential that we react very strongly to this because the lack of doing this will not only mean that Russia is going to continue to push the lines, it is going to continue to claim ethnic minorities everywhere that surrounds it. The Baltics are next, right? Moldova is next. They can claim that they are a Russian interest anywhere. But it is not acceptable and if we see what is going to happen, China can take the same impetus if we stand by.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back and I thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We go now to Mr. Smith, who worked to include good language on community-based and faith-based organizations in this Ukrainian civil society thrust in the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you for including it, Mr. Chairman. And I just want to make a very brief point again, to my good friend, Mr. Rohrabacher. You contrast this legislation and this effort with Iran Sanctions Act championed by Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and many others, but she was the leader, which targets the entire populace of Iran. This is targeted, it is modest. It is proportionate. It holds harmless the Russian people, while picking out those who have committed egregious acts of corruption and violence and my friend from California is right. Yanukovych won a free and fair election in 2010. He won it against Yulia Tymoshenko. I have actually chaired hearings and heard from her daughter because she was then unjustly imprisoned after the fact by Yanukovych. Yanukovych was unfortunately in a race to the bottom corruption-wise as well as repression.

During the Maidan demonstrations, he actually sent out his bully boys and people were wounded on Independence Square. They would follow people who were wounded to the hospital and then they would disappear, presumably tortured, killed, and never heard from again. That is where the faith-based organizations, Mr. Chairman, in one of their many acts of bravery stepped in and actually opened up the monasteries and the churches as a place of refuge, brought in nurses and doctors and denied access to Yanukovych's bully boys and said, "You are not coming in." So they were right there throughout all of this, but again, this legislation is all about targeting.

And I would remind my colleagues, I wrote the Belarus Democracy Act in 2004, 10 years ago. It targeted Lukashenka who until recently was known as the last dictator of Europe. He has a despicable regime. I have met with him in Minsk. This man tortures. His bully boys, like Yanukovych's, are known for their use and employment of torture against the civil society and especially against those who are in the opposition.

We tried to do this with China, I say to my friend and colleague. I offered legislation that is law today that has been absolutely unimplemented, first by the Bush administration and now by the Obama administration, that targets people who commit repressive acts in the People's Republic of China. So this idea of targeting individuals is not new. It is certainly with precedent. It holds harmless the general population of these countries and says we are going after the offenders, those who have committed acts of human rights abuse and violence and the like. So I think this is an excellent bill. It is a modest bill and again, it is proportionate. It goes after those who are committing——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You just mentioned the targeting of—your legislation, the targeting of individuals in China who are engaged in corrupt practices. Am I not a co-sponsor of that bill?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, you are. One is already law. Passed in the year 2000.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And let me just note that what we are discussing here is the fact that we are not enforcing that law, but yet we now want to enforce a law like this on people who are equally corrupt and let me just note I would in no way try to defend these people who run Russia as being anything but corrupt officials, but the fact is that they will be the ones who we will enforce this notion on and thus, if you are the only one in the world who ends up having such a standard enforced, is there some reason for them not to think that we are going to war with them?

Mr. SMITH. I say to my friends, enforcement even of the Magnitsky Act has been shoddy and spotty as the gentlelady from Florida pointed out and there is language in this bill that calls for an expansion of that list. There are people who have committed horrific deeds that are not on the list. We are calling on the administration to do a better job with that which is already law as it relates to Russia, as it relates to China, although that is not the context of this debate. And to say with regards to Ukraine and as the chairman pointed out so well, this not only applies to the Russians who have committed misdeeds, but also to the Ukrainians. I thank my friend.

Mr. ROHRABACHER [presiding]. Mr. Vargas from California seeks recognition.

Mr. VARGAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it. I wasn't going to speak. I think it is important that we have a robust discussion and I think the discussion here today has been fascinating.

The only thing that I would want to add is this, that it is dangerous when we canonize a strong man and I think some of the language that I heard today about Putin filling the churches in Russia and somehow unifying people around the Russian area is dangerous. We have seen this in the past where a strong man comes to power. He is held up by his own people and then begins to almost become an other worldly figure around the world. This is very dangerous. And I hope we don't lose sight of that.

Again, some of the language I heard today canonizing Putin in that way I think is dangerous. I just wanted to mention I do support the measures before us. Thank you.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This bill, in terms of what it does, not what it says, but what it does essentially seems to accomplish two things. One is that it increases aid to the Ukraine. The second is that it imposes sanctions on some class of individuals who are powerful individuals in Russia. And the manager's amendment specifically goes to some substantial lengths to strengthen the part of the bill that imposes sanctions on individuals in Russia.

I'd like to hear from the proponents of this bill and this manager's amendment exactly what they think will be different in the real world as a result of the passage of this bill.

I don't want to sound flip, but I will tell you that we weren't expecting Putin to visit Disney World any time in the near future, so the fact that this bill prevents him or some of his colleagues from doing so doesn't seem to me to be reflective of anything that would actually affect their motivations, much less affect their actions. And that concerns me.

I understand that as a Congress, there's only so much that we can do to affect a situation so far from our shores. In fact, I think that that's true in general that there's a very narrow limit to what we can accomplish when dealing with foreign policy as a whole. But I do want to hear what it is that this bill, the passage of this bill and this manager's amendment will do that will be different, that will actually make a difference and affect the motivations of people who are in charge in Russia.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman. Will you yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. I appreciate that, Mr. Grayson. The people wielding power in Russia are not just the officials in that country. The people who have enormous power there are people who have stolen enormous amounts of money. They have basically taken resources because of their political pull, because of their closeness with President Putin, but they have transferred a lot of that wealth offshore. They are susceptible because they do like to travel abroad, and they do like to move their money out of the country. They are susceptible to pressure if we apply smart sanctions. They are friends, they are accomplices of President Putin, and so they do have enormous influence at the end of the day on Russia's foreign policy. And the combination of Putin's concentration of power not just for his own advantage, but for the advantage of these individuals who have this wealth at risk, the combination of repression against the people, and against the political rights of all Russians, and the theft, if you think about it, the theft of Russia's wealth through corruption have resulted now in an authoritarian system that is pursuing an aggressive foreign policy, one that has started in the Ukraine but may not end there on the basis of President Putin's last speech to the Duma.

So, we have an ability here to send a message cross current with that approach, or a message that instead says to the Russian people we stand with you against those who have received ill-gotten gains. In particular, these individuals have benefitted as we know from the dissolution of Rule of Law in Russia. So, as we're looking for leverage, this is a way to put enormous pressure on Moscow. That would be the calculus in terms of the smart sanctions that we have, in my view, in the bill.

Mr. GRAYSON. All right. I'll reclaim my time.

So, just to pursue this further, what we're talking about here is using the fact that the Russian oligarchs have amassed a large amount of offshore assets outside of Russia which we will use to pressure against them to get them to them to pressure, presumably Putin, to change Russian foreign policy and make it more, shall we say, discreet.

So, for instance, one could picture the United States and the European Union working together to actually seize, through sanctions, the assets of Russian oligarchs that are held outside of Russia including, for instance, ownership of the Brooklyn Nets. One could picture, for instance, nationalizing the Nets. I'm not sure that would be worth very much, but one could do that.

So is it, in fact, anticipated that this bill would be used for the purpose of actually seizing assets of Russian oligarchs that are held offshore in the United States or in Europe, or elsewhere?

Chairman ROYCE. Our President will be meeting with heads of state in Europe to discuss next steps, but this would give the President the ability to freeze those assets. And I would argue that the specter of those assets being freezed will focus the mind of those close to President Putin. This is not as confrontational as other approaches that might be suggested, but it is one that I think is effective because the amount of wealth we're talking about, the amount of ill-gotten gains, and the amount of influence that these people have is truly disproportionate.

Russia is no longer a society in which the direct influence of the people are as influential as those who have replaced them with political pull, by being close to the head of state. So, their input, I think, at the end of the day is going to be important.

I've raised other leverage that we have in the legislation, as well, but for this issue that's the calculation.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thanks for the explanation, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I was simply going to observe, I find it interesting that our friend from Florida has made a passionate case for the justification of the power grab in the Crimea because of Russian heritage, and the will of Russian majority at the expense of a very substantial Tatar minority. And, of course, we ignore in the process of that rationalization the fact that Russian thugs were bussed into Crimea deliberately to influence the outcome, deliberately to intimidate those who might have a different point of view.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman——

Mr. CONNOLLY. But my only point is, I find it odd having given that passionate statement we're suddenly now concerned about the efficacy of the sanctions legislation in front of us.

Which is it? Do you favor the power grab in Crimea, or do you, in fact, simply want to make sanctions even more effective? I yield back.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I certainly will.

Mr. GRAYSON. Okay, it's both. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. All right. We recognize Mr. Yoho of Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate it. And I understand the intent of what we're trying to do here. And I do support the intent of supporting the people of the Ukraine; however, I think the process that we're going through is a little bit misguided. And what we're talking about is, you know, Russia stepping up and showing their power.

I've got in front of me kind of the history of the Crimean peninsula, and it says that Crimea is an autonomous parliamentarian republic within Ukraine subject to the Constitution of Ukraine, in accordance with the laws of Ukraine, but they also have their own constitution, and they stand as kind of an independent state, from what I read here. And 58 percent of the population of Crimea is ethnic Russia.

Again, I support the intent of what we're trying to accomplish, but I think what we're seeing in Russia is Mr. Putin stepping up. He's emboldened. You're seeing Venezuela emboldened. You're seeing China emboldened along with Iran and Syria. And I think the reason we're seeing that is we're trying to project strength, but they see us as weakened.

And I know I don't need to remind everybody that we're $17.4 trillion in debt. The Government was shut down in September and October because of the lack of funds, and yet we want to give more money to a country, and we have to borrow that money; yet, we have people in our own country that can't get health insurance, or they can't send their kids to school. And for us to project strength, I think it's time we strengthen America and rebuild America.

And that's the only way you can show up in a fight say, or in a confrontation, you can't show up when you're hemorrhaging. And I think the rest of the world knows we're hemorrhaging. So, again, I support what we're trying to accomplish.

And I need to just for information to pass this out, that we gave the Ukraine over $102 million last year and we've committed or obligated $3.6 billion since 1990 to help them do all the things that we should have been monitoring that has brought us to this point. And to go forward and say money is the solution without being from a point of strength, I think is erroneous. And I just think it sends the wrong message that we can solve this problem.

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. Yes, sir, I will.

Chairman ROYCE. Okay. This bill only addresses already appropriated Fiscal Year '14 funds, not any new money. What we're doing in this legislation for the members' edification here is we're prioritizing and moving the funding that was appropriated specifically focused on what we can do on democracy building in the Ukraine here with respect to taking such issues as the Overseas Private Investment Corporation which pays for itself, but we're giving it added impetus for those businesses that are going to invest there. The OPIC insurance policy will stand behind those businesses, and other funding to build civil society with respect to the training of law enforcement and so forth.

Mr. YOHO. Will the gentleman yield back?

Chairman ROYCE. I will.

Mr. YOHO. On page 6 of this bill, it says "Congress finds the following, Ukrainian economy is weak and vulnerable." And then it goes on to say, "A financing gap which the Government of Ukraine has estimated will amount to $35 billion over the next 2 years."

That's deficit spending, and a large underground economy has developed. This economic condition undermines, and I want to emphasize this, this economic condition undermines democratic prospects in the Ukraine.

Again, we're at a $500 billion deficit, and it's soon to return to $1 trillion because of our economy. And it goes on to say, "Years of poor economic management and performance have undermined and may continue to undermine political stability and unity within Ukraine."

Chairman ROYCE. If the gentleman would yield, I just need to——

Mr. YOHO. We're supposed to be talking about the United States on the way this is—poor economic management and performance. So, yes, sir, I'll yield.

Chairman ROYCE. I think when the gentleman reads that statement it sounds as though this measure would appropriate $35 billion. That is not—it referenced the fiscal problem——

Mr. YOHO. Right. I understand.

Chairman ROYCE [continuing]. That exists in the Ukraine. But the lion's share of that is being shouldered by Europe. I think if you totaled, and I'm doing this by memory, but if you totaled up the provisions here in terms of supporting law enforcement in the Ukraine, et cetera, it's about $68 million.

The reference that you're citing is simply the facts on the ground in Ukraine, but——

Mr. YOHO. Oh, I agree with that.

Chairman ROYCE [continuing]. Not what we're committing to. And I do want that to be understood here. And, again, the $68 million or so that we do commit here is money that was already appropriated for the budget for Foreign Affairs that we are reprioritizing for this purpose. So, I think that clarifies a little bit——

Mr. YOHO. If I had my druthers, I'd rather pay off our debt with that money at this point in time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I'm out of time. It's up to the chairman.

Mr. GRAYSON. I ask for unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes, absolutely, Mr. Grayson.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you very much.

My reading of the bill, Congressman Yoho, is that we're actually taking money from the Pakistani aid budget and putting it into the Ukraine aid budget instead, so rather than stealing from Peter to pay Paul, we're actually stealing from Paracha to pay Pavel. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. And I believe, if I could—would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. In terms of that portion of the budget, I think it's broadcasted in Pakistan that we're taking the funds and applying it here, for the record.

Now, are there any second-degree amendments to the manager's amendment? Hearing no second-degree amendments, the question occurs on the manager's amendment. All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

Mr. YOHO. No.

Chairman ROYCE. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the manager's amendment is agreed to.

And I would now to call up en bloc, this is a number of amendments from colleagues on both sides of the aisle that were sent to your offices last night. They're in your packets this morning, so I'm going to ask unanimous consent that the following items be considered en bloc. Grayson Amendment 232. Keating Amendments 27 and 28. Lowenthal Amendment 23. Messer Amendment 120. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278
## OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 25, line 19, after "the President" insert "to impose additional sanctions".

Page 25, line 21, before the second period insert ", relevant executive orders, regulations, or other provisions of law".

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278
## OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(14) to work with United States allies and partners to condemn any violation by Russian Federation occupation forces or their proxies of the rights of ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities in Crimea, including the region's Tatar population;

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278
## OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 10, strike lines 15 through 17 and insert the following:

(1) prioritize programming to eastern Ukraine, including Crimea, and Moldova, and to ethnic and linguistic Russian populations, as well as to Tatar minorities;

Page 10, strike lines 18 through 23 and insert the following:

(2) prioritize news and information that directly contributes to the target audiences' understanding of political and economic developments in Ukraine and Moldova, including countering misinformation that may originate from other news outlets, especially Russian supported news outlets;

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278
## OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 3, strike lines 3 through 9 and insert the following:

(4) to support the efforts of the Government of Ukraine to identify, investigate, recover, and return to the Ukrainian state assets unaccounted for under the leadership and departure from Ukraine of former President Yanukovych, his family, and other current and former members of the Ukrainian government, along with others legitimately charged by government authorities with similar offenses;

Page 16, line 19, strike "stolen" and insert "missing".

Page 16, line 19, insert "purported" before "acts".

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278**

**OFFERED BY MR. MESSER OF INDIANA**

Page 5, line 4, strike "and".

Page 5, line 9, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 5, after line 9, insert the following:

(16) to maintain existing sanctions against and consider all available options for further sanctions on the Russian Federation until Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity are not being violated by the Russian Federation.

Chairman ROYCE. Do any members seek recognition to speak on the en bloc amendments? Hearing no further request for recognition, the question occurs on the en bloc amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

All opposed, no.

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

Are there any other members——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have an amendment at the desk, Amendment 98.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Connolly of Virginia. At the end of title I, add the following: Section 110. Annual report on security developments in the Russian Federation and their effects on——

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

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278**

**OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA**

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 110. ANNUAL REPORT ON SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND THEIR EFFECTS ON UKRAINIAN SOVEREIGNTY.**

(a) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2014, and September 30 of each year thereafter through 2020, the Secretary of State shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on the current and future security and foreign policy posture of the Russian Federation (in this section referred to as "Russia").

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the security situation in regions neighboring Russia, including Crimea.

(2) The goals and factors shaping the security strategy of the Government of Russia, including potential annexation of non-Russian territory.

(3) Trends in Russian security behavior that would be designed to achieve, or that are consistent with, the goals described in paragraph (2).

(4) An assessment of the global and regional security objectives of the Government of Russia, including objectives that would affect the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Middle East, or the People's Republic of China.

(5) A detailed assessment of the sizes, locations, and capabilities of the nuclear, special operations, land, sea, and air forces of the Government of Russia and how they affect neighboring countries, including Ukraine.

(6) Developments in Russian military doctrine and training and whether the developments have differed from before the annexation of Crimea.

(7) Other security developments involving Russia that the Secretary of State considers relevant to United States national security.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "specified congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

Chairman ROYCE. The Chair reserves a point of order and recognizes the author to explain the amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the chair. And I think this amendment has been provided both to the chairman and the ranking member for their consideration and clearance. This is a complementary amendment to a provision in the Senate bill requiring an annual report on security developments in the Russian Federation and the effects they might have on Ukranian sovereignty.

The report includes an assessment of the security situation in regions neighboring Russia, including the Crimea. The goal is, in fact, shaping the security strategy of the Government of Russia, including potential annexation of non-Russian territory, trends in Russian security behavior that would be designed to achieve Russian security goals, and an assessment of the global and regional security objectives of Russia that would affect NATO, the Middle East, or the People's Republic of China.

An assessment of the capabilities of Russian military and those capabilities' effects on potentially Russia's neighbors, and any other developments that the Secretary of State considers of strategic importance to our national security with respect to this subject.

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

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I want to just share with you, Mr. Connolly, I support your amendment.

Given Russia's continued aggression toward Ukraine, which may yet extend to other countries in the region, I think this report would be very useful in helping to gauge the potential impact from the future development of Russia's armed forces, and from its foreign policy. And, therefore, I would support its inclusion.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the chair.

Chairman ROYCE. Do any other members seek recognition to speak on this amendment? Hearing no further requests for recognition, the question occurs on the amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment—Mr. Duncan.

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

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN. Number 46.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment offered by Congressman Jeff Duncan of South Carolina to H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act. Section 2(8) following "increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency," insert "in Ukraine, which could be greatly enhanced by the advances in energy extraction and exploration technologies." Should read: "to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy supplies to Ukraine and other European countries, including United States promotion of increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency in Ukraine, which could be greatly enhanced by the advances in energy"——

Chairman ROYCE. Without objection the amendment will be considered read, and the Chair reserves a point of order, recognizes the author, Mr. Duncan to explain the amendment.

[The information referred to follows:]

Rep. Jeff Duncan (SC) Amendment to H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act

Amendment: Section 2(8) – following "increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency," insert "in Ukraine, which could be greatly enhanced by the advances in energy extraction and exploration technologies."

Should read: "to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy supplies to Ukraine and other European countries, including United States promotion of increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency in Ukraine, which could be greatly enhanced by the advances in energy extraction and exploration technologies."

Mr. DUNCAN. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I applaud the efforts of Chairman Royce and Ranking Member Engel in drafting this bipartisan legislation in support of Ukraine.

It really comes down to what side of history do we want to be on. When history is written do we want to be folks that—Members of Congress and Americans that support a sovereign nation, a sovereign nation facing aggression that harkens back to the Cold War. So, I believe that we should use every tool in the toolbox to support like-minded nations like Ukraine.

I support this legislation, but I believe the U.S. could do better to support the efforts and reduce Russian control of energy supplies to Ukraine and other European countries by increasing cooperation on energy extraction and exploration technologies such as hydraulic fracturing.

This actually is larger than just Ukraine, because Europe is looking west to the U.S. We talked earlier about L&G exports, to lessen European dependence and Ukranian dependence on Russian sources of energy. Today, Ukraine is heavily dependent on Russia for its source of energy. In the past, about 80 percent of Ukraine's oil and natural gas came from Russia. And according to the EU Energy Commissioner in 2012, about 60 percent of Russian natural gas headed Europe went through the Ukraine, pipelines that go through the Ukraine. It's total dependence on Russia, and that concerns our friends on the other side of the Atlantic.

Russia has used its leverage twice, in 2006 and 2009, to cut off the gas supply to Ukraine. Again, it's used its leverage twice to cut off the gas supply to Ukraine. In today's volatile situation, Russia has considerable leverage over Ukraine through its energy capabilities.

According to a recent Forbes article, Ukraine could hold more than 40 trillion cubic feet of recoverable shell gas. That's a move toward energy independence if they can harvest those resources.

With the incredible growth in U.S. natural gas resources, particularly from shell gas, with growth up 72 percent since 2000, and 49 percent since 2005, I believe that the U.S. and Ukraine should consider the benefits of energy extraction and exploration technologies; how to increase our cooperation to use U.S. expertise in fracking to help meet Ukraine's needs to develop this capability.

We're not forcing this technology on Ukraine, they have asked for it. Businesses are willing to get involved, and last year Ukraine signed a natural gas exploration deal with both Royal Dutch Shell and Chevron. This is something Ukraine wants. This is something; technology that we have. Regardless of where you come down on the political spectrum with regard to hydraulic fracturing, we're talking about Ukraine as a sovereign nation wanting to pursue this.

In that sense, we often say that it does more good to teach a man to fish rather than simply give him a fish. Well, I believe that it would be more sustainable for Ukraine in the long run if we apply this same principle.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I think we should support this amendment, and I urge our colleagues to support it. And with that, I yield back.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you. Do any other members seek recognition to speak on the amendment? I'm looking for baseball signals. Mr. Grayson is recognized.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to ask a few questions of the gentleman from South Carolina, specifically regarding the second part of his amendment.

Why does the gentleman think it would be constructive for this Congress to tell the Ukrainian Congress what it should be passing or not passing?

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, what we're doing is trying to give them the ability to have access to the hydraulic fracturing technology.

Mr. GRAYSON. Okay. I'm referring to the second part of the gentleman's amendment. Perhaps I'm misreading it, but the second part says that, in Section 102(b)(5) you would add the following terms, "reducing corruption." And, apparently, you're trying to give examples of how to reduce corruption in the Ukraine, "supporting reform efforts of the Government of Ukraine to pass legislation," et cetera, et cetera. That's what I'm referring to. Has the gentleman offered that amendment?

Mr. DUNCAN. I have that amendment coming up next.

Mr. GRAYSON. Oh, that's coming up next.

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAYSON. Okay.

Mr. DUNCAN. That would be Amendment 45. We're on 46.

Mr. GRAYSON. All right. Then I'll yield back. Thank you very much.

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes. Did you want to speak to this amendment, Mr. Sherman? Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I rise in cautious opposition to this amendment simply because we're going to spend all day tomorrow talking about energy, talking about energy exports. Then our subcommittee is going to have, and the gentleman is welcome to come and participate, I'm sure, in hearings I think a day after that on petroleum exports from the United States.

There's no reason to put in this bill things that divide Americans, things that raise hot button issues about environment, and energy. We ought to be focused as narrowly as possible on the Ukraine.

Now I will say this, your amendment does only a little bit to affect what is already in one sentence of the bill, but as for the idea that we need to focus on this now, we could do that in a separate bill months from now, weeks from now.

As to petroleum, no amount of effort in the United States is going to have a significant impact on the worldwide price of petroleum.

As to natural gas, they pay in Germany $10 roughly a unit, in Japan $16. Unless the gentleman has become a socialist, and I'm confident that he has not, he proposes that all of this energy development and export is going to be done by private companies who are going to sell for $16 rather than for $10. So, we may tomorrow have an interesting debate.

Japan has moth balled all of its nuclear electric generation facilities. It is buying a huge amount of natural gas, and maybe that natural gas could come from the United States, but what does that have to do with the Ukraine?

Whether we export natural gas, how much we drill is an interesting issue. That's why I'll be here tomorrow, and to think that if only we developed more natural gas in the United States our private companies would choose to sell it to the Ukraine for much less than Japan would pay for it seems unlikely. The Ukraine buys virtually all of its natural gas without it having to be liquified and regasified. Japan being an island has to have its natural gas liquified, then it has to turn it back into gassy state at great cost, so I don't see a reason for this bill to focus on a red button, hot partisan, environmentalist versus economic development energy issue, and for that reason would oppose the amendment

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentleman——

Mr. SHERMAN. Yield to the chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. I take the gentleman's point, but if we think through another alternative, what if we were to use the permitting process on L&G as basically a strategic asset for foreign policy, and what if we were to just for the sake of argument grant that permit on the condition that the export in this particular case go to Eastern Europe or Ukraine, because our situation is this right now.

We are flaring gas because of a glut. We're capping wells. It seems to me that—and, again, I'm moved somewhat by the arguments that our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs made about using this as a strategic asset. I understand your point, that if we open this up and it was simply the argument that you were to expand to every market in the world, but what if we reached some kind of compromise on the idea that the additional increase in the export of L&G would be for a national purpose.

Now, it would have the added benefit of increasing—it would actually increase the deficit for Russia if we did that. It would decrease our deficit if we did that. It would create more jobs in the gas and oil industry here in the United States if we did it. But I just raise it——

Mr. SHERMAN. I'm reclaiming my non-existent time.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that's an interesting issue to discuss tomorrow.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. It doesn't have to be dealt with in this bill. It will raise even some questions on the right as to whether we should tell a landowner who wants to drill for natural gas, export that natural gas to Japan and get paid $16 per unit for it, that we're not going to let that landowner do it. We're not going to let that oil company do it. They're going to have to sell to Ukraine for $9 a unit, or $10. That's a good discussion for tomorrow.

I haven't hesitated to criticize people in my own party over in the other body for not moving as quickly as possible to help the Ukraine. So far, not a single piece of legislation has been signed by the President on the Ukraine. And Crimea has been invaded, seized, and annexed. I would like this bill to go forward, and I look forward to tomorrow's hearings, and what you're proposing. And I also think that, speaking of seizing territory, I think we should seize the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee so that we're in a position to decide not only whether or not that energy is developed and under what conditions, but to whom it is sold. And there's one kind of naked aggression and power grab that I'm in favor of, and that's it.

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield back to the chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

It is our responsibility to set broad parameters on foreign policy. I do think this is a case where an absolutist position is probably not going to prevail. Either the absolutist position that all permits be granted, or the position that none be granted.

I do, however, think it is worth contemplating this concept originally raised by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs that additional permits granted be in our foreign policy interest, and this is something that I think as the weeks unwind here is worthy of consideration because it might be a way to bridge the divide.

I think Mr. Meeks was seeking recognition.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to join in with Mr. Sherman. I heard your idea, and it is something that is intriguing to me because I've been going back and forth as to what we should do. And I know talking to some individuals within my district, and making sure that I have foreign policy considerations also, but you've done such an excellent job, I think, in making sure that we have a bipartisan agreement where we don't have any of those agreements, and we can have a separate—and I think that will take place tomorrow because I am listening. I think that to have an intense debate focused on this issue and this issue alone would be beneficial to members. I know it would be beneficial to this member to have a real debate on what we should do. And maybe if we can show that we're just doing it for the Ukraine, and it helps us overall, our national interest, et cetera, that could win over some other members. But to do it in a bifurcated way, I think it's tremendously important moving forward because we've done such an excellent job, I think, on this bill in a bipartisan way. So, I would agree with Mr. Sherman. Let's debate that tomorrow. And I am intrigued by what the chairman has indicated, you know, setting as an example of how we could do it, and would love to hear more and have further debate in that regard. But I think that it should not be included in this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Would the gentleman yield?

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Duncan, if I could first explain Mr. Duncan's amendment very succinctly so that there's a full understanding. "To support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy supplies of Ukraine and other European countries, including the U.S. promotion of increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency in Ukraine, which could be greatly enhanced by advances in energy extraction and exploration technologies." This, specifically, is what Mr. Duncan is proposing.

The one advantage of the language we have in the underlying bill is that, frankly, it is so broad it goes to the concept. As you correctly identify, and as the gentleman from California has stated, the specifics of this will be debated tomorrow.

All I'm attempting to do here is to advance the argument that the focus should be on Ukraine to the extent that we can increase energy independence in Ukraine. I don't really believe at the end of the day that is that debatable, or divisive an issue.

I think when you get into the specifics in Energy and Commerce, that's where the argument is going to occur. And if I were on that committee, that's where I'd be advancing the arguments that I just made with Mr. Sherman, and one which at the end of the day Mr. Sherman, I suspect, might agree with me on. But that is not for the debate here and now, I concur, but the language we're using here I just don't see it as that objectionable because it is so broad based. It goes to the intent basically to leverage Russia.

And with that, I should yield finally to Mr. Duncan.

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, you made the points that I was going to make, so I really don't need to say anything further than Russia wants to control the Ukraine territory. They have the ability to control the Ukraine energy sources, just the nature of where we are with the natural gas and petroleum coming into Ukraine supplied by Russia.

This would give diversification for the sovereign nation of Ukraine to possibly go after its own resources, be energy independent, lessen its dependence on Russia, and really support its own sovereignty with regard to energy security.

So, with that, I appreciate the comments of the chairman. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. And I see it, enhancing cooperation with our European allies on advances in the technology in the energy field, that's going to provide the opportunity to increase those supplies. That's going to undermine at the end of the day President Putin's ability to leverage his energy supplies for increased political influence, so I support the amendment. But I think Mr. Cicilline wanted to speak on this issue.

Mr. CICILLINE. Just a question, Mr. Chairman.

I know this issue was raised when we considered the earlier resolution.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. CICILLINE. And I don't think anyone is suggesting diversification is not a good, sound policy, but that's actually not what the amendment does as I read it. It adds language that says, important language, "which would be greatly enhanced by the advances in energy extraction and exploration technologies."

We haven't had any discussion about that. That's actually what the amendment says. It adds that language, and I think for precisely the reasons my colleagues on the other side on the top tier mentioned this is going to invite a much broader debate between environmentalists and the industry about advancements in energy extraction and exploration technologies. And I, frankly, think it raises the danger that in this moment when we should be speaking with a very unified voice it's bringing into this discussion not energy diversification. I think that's already in the underlying manager's amendment, but new language about great advancements in energy extraction and exploration technologies. And I——

Mr. DUNCAN. Would the gentleman yield? It doesn't say what that technology is. It's just saying that—it's a statement, which would be greatly enhanced. And truly it would, it would be greatly enhanced. Their diversification initiatives would be greatly enhanced by energy extraction and exploration technologies regardless of what those may be.

If the U.S. has the ability to help the Ukraine become energy independent regardless of what those extraction techniques or exploration technologies are, they should be—we should be open to giving those to the Ukraine should they ask for them. I think it's just a statement there at the end.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes, reclaiming my time. That may well be the intention. I'm just suggesting that using this language is going to invite, likely to invite the kind of debate that I think is—that undermines the importance of doing this in a unified bipartisan way. And I——

Chairman ROYCE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Cicilline, the language—I guess I'm looking at this very legalistically, but the language says in Ukraine which could, fortunately says which could be greatly enhanced by the advances in energy extraction and exploration technologies. Does that give you any comfort, the—it's basically a statement of fact, in other words, in which we say it could be. That's the actual amendment, not his explanation of the amendment, but the actual——

Mr. CICILLINE. Right. Having the benefit of this discussion during this hearing, and it doesn't give me grave concern. What I'm saying is that language without a lot of discussion around it, I fear is likely to raise the kinds of concerns that will cause people not to support this. And I think that would be very bad. That's the reason I raise it.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Kinzinger is seeking time.

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I dealt with a week ago when we talked about this, I am a huge supporter of the idea of exporting our natural gas; playing a counter to Russia. I'm a huge supporter of what the gentleman from South Carolina is trying to do here. But this has been weeks, and we are finally getting a bill out, and I'm glad. And I commend the chairman on all his hard work to do it, but we saw the Senate getting mired down in a lot of issues, and I hope we don't do that here.

For that reason, and again I am completely supportive of the idea. I'm also on the Energy and Commerce Committee so, Mr. Sherman, we may have a little battle on the jurisdiction, but as a member of Energy and Commerce, we're talking about this. We're talking about this on the committee, and I am going to be on the side of helping Ukraine become energy independent with the help of the United States, but I will oppose this amendment because I think at this point we have got to move forward, get this thing out of here. And you see by what we're doing on the committee and the battle that we're having right now, this is going to be repeated on the floor, and while I disagree with my colleagues that would vote against it for that reason, there will be colleagues that will vote against it for that reason. And I think we're miring ourselves down in the situation similar to what the Senate had.

And I think, frankly, as the section reads already, "increase natural gas exports and energy efficiency," is actually pretty sufficient for what we're trying to do for this.

Chairman ROYCE. Could I ask the gentleman, Mr. Kinzinger, if we attempted with Mr. Duncan and Mr. Cicilline to work out some kind of diversification language, could you see yourself——

Mr. KINZINGER. Sure.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, then let me go to the real question, which is to Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Duncan, if we were to work with Mr. Kinzinger and Mr. Cicilline during the next ½ hour while we move forward with these amendments to try to get some type of language to the issue of diversification of energy for Ukraine, would that be permissible?

Mr. DUNCAN. I would support that.

Chairman ROYCE. Okay, then you'll withdraw the amendment pending

Mr. DUNCAN. I will withdraw the amendment.

Chairman ROYCE [continuing]. To work out language.

Mr. DUNCAN. And I would request—I have another amendment at the desk, Amendment 45.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Duncan of South Carolina.

Page 8, line 5, insert before the period at the end of the following: "such as by supporting reform efforts of the Government of Ukraine to pass legislation related to greater accountability for government officials; greater protection of private property; and increased transparency of government funds."

Page 16, line 14, insert, "(4) the Government of Ukraine should make greater efforts to secure the protection of classified information and military equipment."

[The information referred to follows:]

Rep. Jeff Duncan (SC) #45 Anti-Corruption Amendment to H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act

Page 8, line 5, insert before the period at the end the following: "such as by supporting reform efforts of the Government of Ukraine to pass legislation related to greater accountability for government officials; greater protection of private property; and increased transparency of government funds."

Page 16, line 14, insert, "(4) the Government of Ukraine should make greater efforts to secure the protection of classified information and military equipment."

Chairman ROYCE. The Chair is going to reserve a point of order and recognize the author to explain the amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Folks, Ukraine is effectively bankrupt. It needs at least $20 billion in aid to stabilize its finances. Now, the Ukraine and the EU signed an Association Agreement last week, Ukraine's financial situation, cultural polarization, and geographic divide alone present enormous challenges.

Furthermore, Russia's invasion of the Crimea captured the Ukraine's Belbek Air Base on March 22nd, and the seizure of a Crimean naval base yesterday add immense risk and volatility to the region. So, while the U.S. must support those in Ukraine seeking greater freedom from Russian pressure, we also have a responsibility to the American people who require accountability and transparency of U.S. tax dollars.

I'm concerned that the U.S. Government is not prioritizing anti-corruption efforts in the Ukraine strongly enough. In fact, on March 14th representatives of Ukrainian public organizations and initiatives made some bold public statements to Parliament of Ukraine and a visiting bipartisan U.S. Congressional delegation where they said it will be impossible to implement measures offered to Ukraine by the United States without large-scale anti-corruptive strategy.

The Parliament of Ukraine has yet to pass any law enabling new leaders of Ukraine to counteract corruption and change the system in the departments starting from now. So far there are no guarantees that money received by new Ukrainian authorities before the Presidential election for reforming and actual reloading of the state will be used transparently and for their designed purposes.

Ukraine must not receive a single cent from foreign partners until necessary anti-corruptive legislative will be adopted, and leave taxpayers who will repay these debts often sufficient instruments of control over budget expenditures. All those were quotes from that meeting of last March 14th.

My amendment is very simple. There are two sections that require U.S. policy toward Ukraine must emphasize more strongly anti-corruption efforts by the Government of Ukraine, and urge the Government of Ukraine to require greater accountability, protection of private property, and transparency.

This amendment also urges the Government of Ukraine to pass legislation to counteract corruption and secure the protection of classified information and military equipment since there has been many problems with the protection of these valuable assets.

Again, this amendment urges the Parliament in Ukraine to do these sort of things. To speak I think to the original question from the gentleman from Florida earlier, this is not mandating that the Ukrainian Parliament do anything. This is urging them to pass legislation related to greater accountability for government officials.

I think part of the revolution that we saw in Ukraine recently and the running off, so to speak, of the existing President was part of that anti-corruption mind set, so I would urge my colleagues to get behind this amendment and pass it. And with that, I'll yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Duncan. I don't see this as being controversial because I think all of us agree that Ukraine must confront corruption head on. That's why the bill prioritizes a number of anti-corruption initiatives here, including in the initial statement of policy, including in the subsection dealing with other donors and international institutions.

If you read through the section regarding the recovery of assets, and in the section imposing sanctions upon certain individuals and entities in the Ukraine that were involved in corruption, so adding this additional language with respect to the Parliament, et cetera, I think is——

Mr. DUNCAN. I reclaim some of my time here. This is just really a statement of the sense of this Congress——

Chairman ROYCE. Right.

Mr. DUNCAN [continuing]. With regard to corruption, with regard to private information, classified information, military equipment; what should the Ukraine do? We are responsible to American taxpayers. We're supposed to be good stewards of that money, and to make sure that it's not given to a government that's going to continue corruption, that there is a democratically elected Parliament that will address that would be a good thing. And this is the sense of Congress, so to speak. And with that, I'll yield back the balance.

Chairman ROYCE. Do any other members seek recognition to speak on this amendment? Mr. Grayson.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that the bill as it is now actually takes appropriate steps with regard to corruption, the issue of corruption in Crimea. I think this amendment does not.

In context what this does is this amends part of the bill that describes the policy of the United States to work with other countries and international institutions to stabilize the Ukrainian economy while promoting critical needed structural economic reforms in the Ukraine including, and then it lists a number of structural reforms, the last one being reducing corruption.

I think that that actually is apt. I think that's sensible, and I think that that correctly describes the policy of the United States. I think that this amendment, if I may say this, butchers that provision by adding in a whole bunch of non sequiturs. What this does is it says that it's the policy of the United States to reduce corruption by, among other things, providing greater protection of private protection. I don't see how that has anything to do with reducing corruption.

In addition to that, the whole premise of this amendment is to do these things by passing legislation in the Ukraine. So, I return to my original question. I don't understand why the gentleman from South Carolina thinks that the Parliament of the Ukraine needs pointers on how to deal with corruption in the Ukraine.

Mr. DUNCAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, I will yield to you with regard to a specific question. Can the gentleman tell us the existing state of law in the Ukraine, in other words, bills already passed by the Parliament to fight corruption, and what additional provisions the gentleman thinks are needed?

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank the gentleman. I point directly to the statements that I made earlier. On March 14th the representatives of Ukrainian public organizations and initiatives made some bold public statements to the Parliament of Ukraine, and a visiting bipartisan U.S. Congressional delegation where they said this. And you weren't in for this part of my testimony or opening statement, but "it will be impossible to implement measures offered to Ukraine by the United States without a large-scale anti-corruptive strategy." These aren't my words, these were their words. "The Parliament of Ukraine has yet to pass any law enabling new leaders of Ukraine to counteract corruption and change the system in their departments starting from now."So far, there are no guarantees that money received by new Ukrainian authorities before Presidential election for reforming and actual reloading of the state will be used transparently and for their designated purposes."

And the last one, "Ukraine must not receive a single cent from foreign partners until necessary anti-corruptive legislation will be adopted and we taxpayers who will repay these debts, Ukrainian taxpayers who will repay these debts often sufficient instruments of control over budget expenditures." Those are all quotes from the Ukrainians.

Mr. GRAYSON. I'll reclaim my time. Does the gentleman from South Carolina seriously believe that there is no anti-corruption legislation in existence in the Ukraine, that corruption is, in fact, legal in Ukraine at this point?

Mr. DUNCAN. I believe corruption is rampant in Ukraine.

Mr. GRAYSON. Not rampant. I'm asking do you think it's legal or illegal?

Mr. DUNCAN. For the Parliament or——

Mr. GRAYSON. I'm asking you whether you think the act of corruption is legal or illegal presently in the Ukraine?

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, I'm not sure whether it's illegal or legal in Ukraine.

Mr. GRAYSON. Okay. I'm going to go out on a limb and say that it's illegal.

Mr. DUNCAN. But in most countries it is illegal.

Chairman ROYCE. Could the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. I would just make a point, and this would be an example of what was legal and what they're attempting to change. If you are well connected to the prior President in the

Ukraine you could get loans at 3 percent. If you were a farmer you were getting loans at 17 percent. The consequences of that was that oligarchs close to the previous President were, in fact, using this. It was legal, and the EU was straining every sinew to try to get the Parliament in Ukraine to move on these types of reforms.

In this case, I think Mr. Duncan has a very real point. If we can join with the EU in pressing the Parliament to take concerted action, there is no question that there are going to be some interests in the Ukraine that are going to resist this, mainly those who are oligarchs. But those are the people that we're trying to target here in order to bring about the Rule of Law.

So, at the end of the day, I think this amendment is helpful for the reason that I've explained. And, in fact, certain things which we would consider illegal are, in fact, legal under their system because they have not been reformed. That's why I think it's in order, but if we could go to the vote.

Mr. GRAYSON. I'd like to reclaim the remainder of my time.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. GRAYSON. I appreciate the chairman's comments and I find them very helpful. I think that these decisions should be fact-based, and the chairman has offered facts that actually have a direct impact on my view of the situation.

I remain concerned about the provision in this amendment that says that one means of fighting corruption in the Ukraine is to pass legislation that promotes the greater protection of private property. To me that remains a non sequitur and I am concerned about that provision.

I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina if he can explain why the protection of private property somehow reduces corruption the Ukraine.

Mr. DUNCAN. I will have to look that particular section up real quick in comparison to the bill, but——

Chairman ROYCE. I'm going to suggest that time has expired for the gentleman. Because of time constraints I am—are there any other members that seek time on this? If not, I'm going to suggest we go to a vote on the gentleman's amendment.

Hearing no further request for recognition the question occurs on the amendment. All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

Mr. GRAYSON. No.

Chairman ROYCE. In the opinion of the Chair the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to, and we go to Mr. Castro for his amendment. Does the member have an amendment to the desk?

Mr. CASTRO. Yes, number 23.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Castro of Texas. Page 5, strike line 23 through page 6, line 2 and insert the following: (2) supporting Ukrainian efforts to foster greater unity among people and regions of the country, combat anti-Semitism and discrimination, and promote respect for religious freedom.

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278**

**OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS**

Page 5, strike line 23 through page 6, line 2 and insert the following:

(2) supporting Ukrainian efforts to foster greater unity among people and regions of the country, combat anti-Semitism and discrimination, and promote respect for religious freedom;

Chairman ROYCE. The Chair reserves a point of order and we recognize the author to explain the amendment.

Mr. CASTRO. Mr. Chairman, it's a very simple amendment. All I'm adding is two words "and discrimination" into that sentence. That's it.

Chairman ROYCE. The Chair is in support of this amendment. Do any members seek recognition?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes, the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I strongly support my friend in his amendment. Thank you.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you very much.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman from California. Hearing no further requests for recognition the question occurs on the amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

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

Mr. POE. of Texas.

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, number 46.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Mr. Poe, I have Amendment 74.

Mr. POE. I'll take that one.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Poe of Texas. At the end of title I, add the following: Section 110. Report on geopolitical impact of energy exports. (a) Report required. Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of State's Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed, quantitative, and substantive report on the potential short, medium, and long-term impacts of increased United States natural gas and oil exports on Russia's economic and political influence over Ukraine and other European countries.

(b) Definition. In this subsection, the term——

Chairman ROYCE. Without objection the Chair is going to consider the amendment as read and recognize the author to explain the amendment.

[The information referred to follows:]

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278
## OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 110. REPORT ON GEOPOLITICAL IMPACT OF ENERGY EXPORTS.**

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of State's Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed, quantitative, and substantive report on the potential short, medium, and long-term impacts of increased United States natural gas and oil exports on Russia's economic and political influence over Ukraine and other European countries.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

☒

Mr. POE. Thank the chairman. We've had much discussion about energy and the influence that it has had in the region. We disagree on what we should do regarding natural gas exporting.

This simply requires that the State Department use its resources to prepare a study and report back to Congress whether it's a good idea or not for us to make a decision later on whether or not we should export energy to the region. So, basically, the amendment is very simple. Let's have some information given to us by the State Department.

Chairman ROYCE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE. Certainly.

Chairman ROYCE. I support this amendment. There were a number of amendments that Mr. Poe was considering offering. We worked with him on this amendment. This amendment is important, I think, to the Congress and to the administration that we have a strategic understanding of the potential for increased U.S. natural gas and oil exports to reduce Putin's stranglehold over Ukraine and Eastern Europe. And I think it speaks to just that issue. Mr. Engel.

Mr. ENGEL. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to commend Mr. Poe. I support his amendment. I think it's important. I think this is something that is very relevant with the matters of discussion today, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Chairman ROYCE. I yield back to Mr. Poe, unless you want to go to vote.

Mr. SHERMAN. I commend the gentleman for his amendment and the ranking member for her statement.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. Without objection we'll go now to a vote. Hearing no further request for recognition, the question occurs on the amendment. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Right after this, I do.

Chairman ROYCE. Oh, okay.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

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

Recognizing the gentleman from Texas.

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

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Stockman of Texas. Page 10, beginning on line 10, strike "services to Russia" and insert "that promotes democracy and government transparency in Russia."

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278**

**OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN OF TEXAS**

Page 10, beginning on line 10, strike "services to Russia" and insert "that promotes democracy and government transparency in Russia".

☒

Chairman ROYCE. I'm going to recognize the gentleman to explain his amendment.

Mr. STOCKMAN. This is just an amendment which will help facilitate. I think all countries should want this amendment for transparency and to promote democracy. And I'm going to yield to my friend from California briefly.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would just suggest that we've had a very good exchange of views here today. And I appreciate the leadership of the chair. And while I disagree with the bill, I certainly respect everyone's opinion, and respect the leadership of the chair. Thank you very much.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I want to add one other thing in reference to one of our colleagues who mentioned that China does not occupy territory or has invaded. I just want to point out in 1991 this House adopted a resolution that said Tibet is an occupied territory. I thought that would be relevant for the record. I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman ROYCE. All right. So, the language "promotes democracy and government transparency in Russia when doing international broadcasting."

Any other members seek recognition? If not, the question occurs on the amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

Opposed, no.

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

Ms. Gabbard, I believe, is next.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the table.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Ms. Gabbard of Hawaii. Page 8, after line 3, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly): (5) promoting a robust, independent and impartial judiciary, due process, and uniform application of laws.

Page 13, line 5 after "law enforcement" insert "and the judicial system."

Page 13, after line 12, insert the following and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

Chairman ROYCE. The amendment will be considered read, and we recognize the author to explain the amendment.

[The information referred to follows:]

**Amendment to H.R. 4278**

**Offered by Ms. Gabbard of Hawai'i**

PAGE 8, after line 3, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(5) promoting a robust, independent and impartial judiciary, due process, and uniform application of laws.

Page 13, line 5, after "LAW ENFORCEMENT" insert "AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM".

Page 13, after line 12, insert the following and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly)

(b) It shall be the policy of the United States to assist Ukraine to develop a robust, independent and impartial judicial system at national, regional and local levels, which is essential to ensure the rights of all citizens are respected, and maintain appropriate checks and balances between the co-equal branches of government.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

There's been a lot of conversation today and in previous days about anti-corruption efforts, our intent to offer assistance in bringing stability back to Ukraine in a variety of ways. This amendment highlights our intent to offer assistance in a necessary way, I believe, in forming a robust independent, impartial judicial system.

There are a lot of things that we can do to try to assist Ukraine in reforming their government, banking, energy in sector arenas but without an ability for them to hold people accountable, and for the people of Ukraine to feel a sense of confidence in their judicial system, and that there is a Rule of Law, then I'm afraid that these reforms will not be meeting their direct intent. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. And I do think that one of the things we often miss is the importance of an independent judiciary, sort of this concept of the locust effect of what happens when you do not really have enforcement of law, because you have a judiciary and law enforcement that are ineffectual. So, we support enhancing democratic institutions in the Ukraine, and I think this amendment does a lot in that direction.

I think a member here seeks recognition. Mr. Duncan of South Carolina, to speak on this amendment?

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes. I just wanted to applaud the gentlewoman from Hawaii because in countries where even they have the Rule of Law, if they don't have the courts that are necessary, or the non-corrupt courts necessary to prosecute then you see laws being avoided and the continuation of bad practices. I think this is spot on, and I applaud you for going down that trail, and I support the amendment.

Chairman ROYCE. Any other members seeking recognition? If not, the question occurs on the amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

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

We're going to go first to Mr. Salmon of Arizona.

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

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Salmon of Arizona. At the end of title I, add the following: Section 110. Sense of Congress on suspension of all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council. It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work to suspend all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council until Russia ends its aggression against Ukraine, including by removing forces from, and reversing its illegal annexation of, Crimea.

[The information referred to follows:]

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278

## OFFERED BY MR. SALMON OF ARIZONA

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 110. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUSPENSION OF ALL ACTIVITIES AND MEETINGS OF THE NATO-RUSSIA COUNCIL.**

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work to suspend all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council until Russia ends its aggression against Ukraine, including by removing forces from, and reversing its illegal annexation of, Crimea.

Chairman ROYCE. The gentleman is recognized to explain his amendment.

Mr. SALMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's common sense that if Russia is going to practice these renewed aggressions and engage in expansionist activities then NATO's previous mission of Russian containment may need to be reinvigorated if Russia insists on foregoing its opportunity to be in the room.

We all know the history of NATO. It was created as an alliance of allies to counter Warsaw Pact countries led by expansionist Russia. But since the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, NATO was expanded to include several of the former Warsaw Pact countries. And while security remains key in the mission, in recent years the focus has shifted to the fight against terrorism and against global destabilization.

In 1997, NATO countries signed the NATO-Russia Founding Act which provided the formal basis for bilateral cooperation with the goal of easing Moscow's concerns about NATO's expansion being a threat. Five years later in 2002, the NATO-Russia Council (NRC) was established.

My amendment is very simple. All it will do is call on NATO to suspend all former NRC, NATO-Russia Council, activities until Russia stops its aggression against Ukraine, removes its troops from Crimea, and reverses its annexation of the sovereign territory.

It is important to note that this does not cease dialogue. And, in fact, follows the example of NATO's actions after Russia invaded Georgia in 2008. At that time, all formal activities were suspended for a period.

I understand that engagement is still critical, and we have to have dialogue. There is an avenue for that continued dialogue at the United Nations. But as the President has began escalating sanctions and looking for all the tools in the toolbox, I think that this would be a good addition. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. So, if I understand the gentleman, the language is to work for, or work toward suspension. I notice the NATO Secretary General Rasmussen raised the possibility of suspending the NATO-Russia Council saying, "It can no longer be business as usual with Russia." I agree with that. I think Russia must understand that aggression will not extend its influence but will, instead, lead to economic and political isolation. That's the sense of the amendment.

Do any other members seek recognition? Mr. Grayson.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a mistake. What the NATO-Russia Council actually does is, among other things, make it less likely that we go to war against Russia. And I think that that is still a valid goal regardless of what Russia has done in the Crimea. I think most members of this committee would agree that we should try to avoid war with Russia.

In addition to that, the NATO-Russia Council serves many purposes that are in our direct strategic interest as a country. For instance, through the NATO-Russia Council we have obtained logistical support for our war in Afghanistan from the Russians. Because of the NATO-Russia Council, the Russians have provided us with logistical support for that war which, apparently, will continue at least through the end of this year.

Secondly, through the NATO-Russia Council we have joined with the Russians to fight terrorism. Up to this point, the Russians have a very positive and helpful record with regard to fighting terrorism. They have been the victim of terrorism just as the United States has been the victim of terrorism.

The way that we accomplish that cooperation is through the NATO-Russia Council. Withdrawing from the NATO-Russia Council or forbidding Russia to participate in the NATO-Russia Council will actually, in a sense, promote terrorism.

In addition to that, the NATO-Russia Council has served to help prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons in other countries. Obviously, we need the Russian's cooperation if we're going to have any hope of preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. That cooperation comes through the NATO-Russia Council. If we disband the NATO-Russia Council we are, in effect, making it more likely that Iran will obtain a nuclear weapon.

Therefore, for these reasons and among all the other things that the NATO-Russia Council accomplishes that are in our direct strategic advantage, I don't think that we should withdraw from the NATO-Russia Council. I don't think that we should attempt to disband it. I don't think that we should do anything to harm the productive accomplishments of that Council. I yield my time.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, may I respond?

Mr. GRAYSON. I'll yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SALMON. Thank you very much. There is nothing in the language that says that we would disband it. It says it suspends it for a time until they pull back from their hostile invasion of Crimea. It doesn't say that it would be disbanded, or that it would be done away with. It would be suspended.

The President has talked about a lot of red lines. I'm trying to make that line just a little bit redder.

Mr. GRAYSON. I'll reclaim my time. At this point, it is equally likely that the Russians will withdraw from their so called hostile invasion of Crimea, and that the United States will withdraw from its so called hostile invasion of Texas in the 1840s. It's not going to happen.

If we pass this amendment and, in fact, we do suspend all activities and meetings that take place of the NATO-Russia Council we are, in effect, disbanding the Council. That's the reality of the situation. The reality of the situation is that doing this hurts ourselves, hurts our strategic interests, hurts our role in the region and throughout the world. That's a bad thing to do.

Mr. SALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. Yes, I'll yield.

Chairman ROYCE. Let me recognize Mr. Keating first, and then we'll go to Mr. Sherman. Oh, the gentleman still has time. Yes, absolutely. So you've yielded——

Mr. GRAYSON. I'll yield to Mr. Keating, I think. No? Mr. Sherman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, no. I have my own amendment pending. That's all.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. The gentleman will be recognized.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think we could achieve the purpose of this amendment by stopping it at the word "Council" and eliminating the words "until Russia ends its aggression against the Ukraine." Then you would simply say, "suspend our involvement in this Council." And I think we need to do that for an appropriate amount of time. Obviously, if Russia withdraws from Ukraine I'd be the first to want to visit the Council, but to say that we are going to suspend our activity really forever goes beyond what we ought to do given the importance of the Council.

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentleman yield? Yes, Mr. Sherman, I had marked up a suggested amendment here just before we went to you thinking about doing exactly that, because I think if we just go to the issue of the meeting of the Foreign Ministers which is the Council and we drop the other reference, I think it's much more likely that we're going to have unanimous consent of this body behind this resolution.

And I'm going to suggest that at this time to the gentleman from Arizona that you look at taking the sentence, "It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work to suspend all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council," and then that's the end of the amendment.

Mr. SALMON. Yes, that sounds great.

Chairman ROYCE. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman—well, I'm not sure whose time it is right now, Mr. Chairman, but may I address that?

Chairman ROYCE. Reclaiming my time, I recognize the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Grayson.

Mr. GRAYSON. All right. With all due respect, and I appreciate the chairman's efforts to make something good out of this effort by the gentleman from Arizona, it sounds to me like the amendment that's being offered suspends all activities, would suspend all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council forever. And, in effect, disband it.

If the chairman were to offer an amendment that would do so for a limited period of time, a limited defined period of time, then I think that that, in fact, would be constructive. But to go from "will suspend the activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council until Russia withdraws from Crimea" to "will suspend the activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council forever" does not seem to me to be a step in the right direction. In fact, respectfully, maybe a step in the wrong direction. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Sherman.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would say the word "suspend" means you suspend for a while. This is a sense of Congress. I would think that we would allow the gentleman, give him his unanimous consent to change his amendment, and then if people want to vote for it——

Chairman ROYCE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, I will, to the chair.

Chairman ROYCE. The word "temporarily suspend" would probably satisfy the members of the committee.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. GRAYSON. I find that it would satisfy me. However, the grammar police might be upset because of the split infinitive.

Chairman ROYCE. That is true. However, for government work I think it's close enough, Mr. Grayson. If it secures the support of the members of this committee, and I think this is the one way to do it, so I'm going to ask Mr. Salmon for unanimous consent that the Salmon amendment be read as follows: "It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work to temporarily suspend all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council."

[The information referred to follows:]

SECOND-DEGREE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE TO THE

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278**

**OFFERED BY MR. SALMON OF ARIZONA**

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 110. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUSPENSION OF ALL ACTIVITIES AND MEETINGS OF THE NATO-RUSSIA COUNCIL.**

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work to temporarily suspend all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council. ~~until Russia ends its aggression against Ukraine, including by removing forces from, and reversing its illegal annexation of, Crimea.~~

☒

Mr. SALMON. I would support that.

Chairman ROYCE. All right. Any other members seeking—yes, the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me just note that this is exactly the opposite direction that we should be going in, no matter even if we change the wording.

The bottom line is, if we are going to—if we have major differences with a country as powerful as Russia, which we have to admit has its interest, and we have our interest, and there are people, other people in this game, as well, around the world who would like to see countries that, what was the Soviet Union but now Russia and the United States when they have a problem, it would be a good thing for us to talk things out.

What we have here is an example also of what we're doing internationally when you have the G–8 now has removed Russia from the G–8, now it's going to be called the G–7.

Mr. Chairman, this is the type of vehicle that we should be promoting. We should be promoting discussion between the top leaders of various powerful countries to see if we can overcome differences rather than suspending talks at a time when we need to be talking to one another.

Look, Russia helps us in Afghanistan. They have since 9/11 played a very positive role in helping us supply our troops. We need that cooperation. We need cooperation when it comes to—if we would have had a higher level of cooperation we probably could have averted the bombing at the Boston marathon. We need to cooperate where we can, and when we have differences we need to talk it out. And to kick Russia out of the G–8 and not to have a discussion among these top leaders goes against—is exactly the wrong direction to go.

Mr. SALMON. Would the gentleman yield——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. What it does is give them the idea what we want is a hostile situation. We're rushing in to a reigniting of the Cold War when we didn't talk to one another. We should be, instead, suggesting that we all sit down and see if we can work things out at a table rather than simply cutting off all discussion with someone.

Mr. SALMON. Would my good friend from California yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I certainly will.

Mr. SALMON. Thank you very much.

I think that right now is the most appropriate time to isolate Russia. They have been increasingly with the activities in Georgia, now the activities in Crimea, they are emboldened by our weakness. And our standing in the world has diminished greatly over the last several years, and lots of red lines have been drawn. And every time a red line is crossed we draw a new red line. And I think that the international community has lost incredible respect for the United States and our standing needs to be bolstered. And we've got to draw a line that actually means something sometime, somehow, somewhere.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay, well let me reclaim my time and let me just say that I've heard the word "Georgia" over and over again. And I will have to say, I sat here in this room and I sat and listened to the reports on what had happened in Georgia, and we have this invasion, Russian invasion of Georgia, never mentioning that the Government of Georgia had initiated the military action 2 days before the Russian retaliation. And that the Georgians had broken a 14-year truce with Russia dealing with Ossetia and Abkhazia which wanted to be—again, people who wanted to be independent and have their self-determination.

Now, we can create this fantasy world where that didn't exist. The Ossetia and Abkhazia, that the Georgians didn't attack and, in fact, Russia had invaded Georgia on its own. And we can ignore the fact that the people of Crimea want their self-determination, and that Russia is being an aggressor, but we need to sit down and talk to them, and talk to each other, and be honest about it, rather than trying to be pushed headlong into another Cold War.

And that's what I see happening here. And believe me, I was a Cold Warrior, but that's when it was the Soviet Union, and that's when communism guided their decision making to try to put an atheist dictatorship in charge of the world. That's not what Russia is today. It's a very powerful country with its interests, but it is not the Soviet Union.

Let's seek peace with these people and seek cooperation, and it will make it a better world. And you do that through talking to somebody at a moment of crisis, not cutting them off and saying screw you. Pardon me.

Chairman ROYCE. I'm going to recognize myself for a moment, because I think we should clarify the operations of the Council. It's essentially a meeting of foreign ministers. It has no practical operation. This is a symbolic action to push back. It is not the case that we do not have conversations with the Foreign Minister from Russia on almost a daily basis now, as do the rest of the European Union. But the point is that we need to symbolically send a message that in terms of being part of that organization, they are suspended for conduct as we continue the dialogue. And the dialogue is certainly going to continue on a daily basis with Russia.

This sends a signal to go back to the Secretary General of NATO, General Rasmussen's comment that "it's not business as usual." And I think we do have to send that signal.

Do any other members seek recognition?

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the chairman yield? I've already claimed 5 minutes of time.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes.

Mr. GRAYSON. But I'm asking for the chairman's time.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. I understand the chairman's point, but I respectfully disagree. You can't have it both ways. Either we're talking to them or we're not talking to them, and we're not talking to them by shutting off our conversation with them.

The fact is that the NATO-Russia Council, the very institution that we're discussing here, is the means by which we have obtained logistical support for our war in Afghanistan from the Russians. That's a fact.

The fact is that this institution is the means by which we cooperate with the Russians to fight terrorism, Islamic and other terrorism around the world. That's a fact. This is the means by which we try to accomplish nonproliferation in the Middle East and elsewhere with the cooperation of the Russians. That's a fact.

Now, we have spent years on this committee, years trying to make sure that we do what we can to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. Either we can work with the Russians the way we have done in the past, or we stop that. If we turn them away, if we push them away, if we won't talk to them, if we disband institutions like the NATO-Russia Council, the inevitable result of that will be that we no longer cooperate with the Russians, that there is, in fact a de facto second Cold War. And the result of that is that we lose the benefit to us that we get from cooperating with the Russians to fight terrorism for nonproliferation and otherwise.

It is simply impossible to give you one example to have any effective institution of economic sanctions against Iran without the cooperation of the Russians. If the Russians do not cooperate with our institution of economic sanctions against Iran, the whole regime collapses. And I'm not talking about the Iranian regime, I'm talking about the institution of our economic sanctions against Iran.

Without those economic sanctions we have no hope of preventing Iran by non-military means of getting a nuclear weapon. So, we have a choice. You can't always have it both ways. You can't have your cake and eat it, too.

Either we talk to the Russians when it's in our own interest, our interest as a country, with our own strategic objectives talk to the Russians and get their cooperation, or we don't. And this amendment puts us in the direction of not talking to them, not getting the cooperation and, therefore, hurting ourselves.

Chairman ROYCE. Reclaiming my time. Well, the first point, of course, would be that we continue those conversations with the Russians. But the second point, the more important point that I wanted to make is that I believe the reason the Russians cooperate with us on nonproliferation is because they perceive that as being in their own self-interest. The reason they cooperate with us on gas in Syria is because that is in their strategic interest. And that's what nations do.

And at the end of the day, we have so many forums in order to continue that conversation that I am convinced the conversation will continue. But at the same time, to temporarily suspend in terms of the G–8, or in terms of this action with NATO, it is warranted that we send some type of signal. And this is, I think, helpful in that regard.

Any other members seek recognition?

Without objection, the Salmon amendment is considered as read. During my earlier UC request we reference here "temporarily suspend" and stopping after NATO-Russia Council into the language.

The question occurs on the amendment. All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

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

Are there any other amendments at the desk?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Keating has an amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, with Ukraine so clearly in the spotlight, we really don't have to—we really should lose sight of the regional pressure from Russia, especially in——

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Keating.

Mr. KEATING. I'm sorry.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will report Mr. Keating's amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Keating of Massachusetts. Page 4, after line 7, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly): (10) to reaffirm the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of other countries in the region, including Moldova and Georgia, and to condemn any Russian Federation political, economic, or military aggression against those countries in the region.

[The information referred to follows:]

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278

## OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 4, after line 7, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(10) to reaffirm the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of other countries in the region, including Moldova and Georgia, and to condemn any Russian Federation political, economic, or military aggression against those countries in the region;

Chairman ROYCE. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I mentioned, Ukraine is clearly in the spotlight. We really can't lose sight of the regional pressure from Russia, especially Moldova and Georgia. And that's the reason Mr. Poe and I have put forward a resolution calling on allies to offer Georgia a membership action plan at the September NATO Summit. And it's also the primary reason why this committee's longstanding support for the European Union's Eastern Partnership exists.

Just as we condemn Russia's illegal activities in Ukraine, we must also condemn Russia's aggression, threats, and political and economic pressure on Georgia and Moldova. In Georgia, Russian troops are forcing communities apart by building illegal fences along the administrative boundary line. In Moldova, Russia has threatened to cut off trade and gas supplies if the government moves ahead with an Association Agreement with European Union, exactly the same thing they did in Ukraine.

At the moment, Russian propaganda is fanning the flames of separate extensions in Transnistria. We must make clear to the Russians that their efforts to Balkanize Eastern Europe will not stand, and that any further acts of aggression in the region will also bring sanctions.

This amendment does that. It also states clearly and unequivocally that the United States will continue to stand not just with Ukraine, but with Georgia and Moldova. And with that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does—so this suggests that if the people of Abkhazia and Ossetia who were put under Georgian—in the same category of Georgia by Josef Stalin and he, of course, separated them from the other Abkhazia and Ossetia which remain part of Russia, that if those people determine, let's say 90 percent of them voted to become—they'd rather be part of Ossetia and Abkhazia, and not part of Georgia, that your amendment would be that we should not support their right of self-determination. And that Georgia should have the right to come in with armed force and keep them as part of Georgia. Is that right?

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield for a response?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Clearly, as I stated in my remarks on the overall piece of legislation, that there's legal means to do this internationally and through existing constitutions. What this provides a sense of is when those illegal acts occur, such as they did occur in Crimea, and that's simply what this states. The distinction I'd make with your remarks is the difference between illegal actions and legal actions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right. So, do you believe the Georgian breaking of the truce with Russia and going—sending their troops into Abkhazia and Ossetia, which provoked—which at that time resulted in the retaliation, which we call an invasion of Georgia, that you would say that that was illegal or legal on part of Georgia sending their troops in and breaking the truce?

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield back?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes, sure.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you. In fact, the occupation by Russia in Abkhazia and South——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Ossetia and Abkhazia.

Mr. KEATING. Yes. That occupation is, indeed, illegal.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, I was referring to what caused that situation to arise was that there was a truce between the—Abkhazia and Ossetia were trying to win their independence. They are friends of Russia, they want to be part of Russia. They don't like the Georgians, they're a different religion. They're a different group of people. And in order to prevent violence from happening there was a cease fire in that area, and the Georgians broke that cease fire and sent their troops in 2 days before the "Russian invasion of Georgia."

Would you say then that the Georgians were violating law or they were in accordance to the law when they sent their troops in?

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield back?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. With all due respect, I think the statute of limitations on Josef Stalin has already passed. I think that this clearly deals with the actions that are happening right now, and that have happened in the recent weeks where Russia illegal aggression——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think it comes down—I'm reclaiming my time, and I'd just say that it does come down with an honest disagreement of whether or not people have a right of self-determination. And our Declaration of Independence makes it very clear that that's one of the essential elements of what our country was supposed to be about, is that people have a right through the consent of the government, and a right to rebel if their consent is not being adhered to, that we do believe in the right of self-determination.

Right now what we're hearing is that is not the case, not just from you, but from—as part of the general debate here. Mr. Grayson and I obviously plead that that should play a role in America's decision making around the world when people feel that they are subjugated and if they want to, again, assert their right of independence, or to be part of another country.

That's, I think, part of the American experience. I'm sorry that that doesn't seem to be a principle in which we are making our determinations now. And this is not—I don't see this as just some matter of obviously Russian aggression, nor do I see that it was American aggression upon Serbia when we went and bombed Serbia in order to insure that the Kosovars had the right to independence from Serbia. So, then again, that's a matter of consistency, but if you'd like to retort to that, please feel free.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Thank the gentleman. I'll try and stay within the 38 seconds we have left and simply state that Russia has committed to withdraw its troops from Georgia, and they have not done that. And when it comes to the U.S., the U.S. also has a constitution. We're a country where there is a Rule of Law. And my amendment as the overall legislation deals with the illegal actions of Russia in that region, specifically Ukraine, but also the impending actions, and the threatening actions with Moldova and Georgia. And that's as clearly as I could state it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes, thank you.

Mr. KEATING. I am out of time. I'll yield my second back.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Could I go to Mr. Sherman of California.

Mr. SHERMAN. I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment, because I think that this resolution, this bill should be narrowly tailored to meet the immediate needs of the Ukraine. The actions in Georgia are decades old, the actions in Moldova decades before that. And, in any case, Georgia is not the Ukraine; Moldova is not the Ukraine.

And I have argued in this room that we should not put controversial energy policy into this resolution. And I think we have been successful in having only the minimal and the most least controversial statements about energy.

There are those who would say that IMF reform should be in this bill, and I—you know, that's an important cause, but it adds controversy. The IMF reform would have some applicability to the Ukraine, but it's not immediate targeted, focused on today's situation in the Ukraine. And as a news flash, a note was handed to me that Senator Reid has announced that he may remove the controversial IMF provisions from the Senate bill on the Ukraine. So, we ought to focus this on the Ukraine. We'll have plenty of time in the weeks to come to focus on Moldova and Georgia.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will yield.

Mr. KEATING. Thank the gentleman for yielding.

If you look at this bill so far, we're dealing with the internal politics of Russia, we're dealing with Iran, we're dealing with some energy issues. It's not that narrow. In fact, the issues that deal directly with Moldova and Georgia that I referenced in this amendment is much more narrow, in my opinion, than the other issues that are already in this resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Had the individual provisions been subject to a separate vote, an amendment process, I might have taken the same position. But we're going to have a separate vote on whether to offend the principle of focusing on the Ukraine, and I would like to keep it as focused as possible, much as I commend the gentleman for offering the amendment. And he does make a good point.

As to the issue of transfers of population, and whether the government to be established in the Ukraine or any part of it should reflect those who live there now, or those who lived there before Josef Stalin moved populations, I think that we have to institute governments to provide for governing those people who live in particular areas now.

Obviously, the movements of population committed by Hitler and Stalin were wrong, and yet we moved an awful lot of Germans out of East Prussia, out of Silesia and created a new Poland on a substantial portion of German territory.

The 1940s and prior to that populations were moved wrongfully, and whether it is today's Poland, whether it is the United States built entirely on conquered on territory of the Native Americans, or whether it was the decision of Joshua to dispossess the Canaanites and lead to the creation of the State of Judea, those movements of population that occurred before or in the aftermath of World War II should not—we shouldn't be trying to undo that.

Those in my district I think recognize that California was built on territory taken from the Native Americans by the Spaniards and the Mexicans, and then taken by the United States. We're not intending to leave. So, let's—we can talk about how the population in parts of the Ukraine is the result of Stalin's work, but those who live in any part of the Ukraine, including the Crimea, have a right to live there, and a right to vote there even if the presence of their ancestors there is a result of a crime of Josef Stalin.

And, once again, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his amendment, and my opposition is modest and reluctant.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Grayson, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am concerned that we are over-extending ourselves as a country by trying to guarantee the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Moldova and Georgia. I am in support of the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Moldova and Georgia, but I don't even believe that we should be giving lip service to goals that we simply cannot control or attain ourselves.

I heard some criticism earlier of red lines being crossed. Maybe we should be more selective in the lines that we do draw, whether they're red or otherwise.

In 2008, NATO promised that Georgia would one day be admitted into NATO. Moldova is already part of a sister organization of NATO. The fundamental purpose of NATO is to guarantee the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of its members. If, in fact, NATO were to extend itself to Moldova and to Georgia given the fact that there are Russian troops occupying parts of both countries without the permission of the formal central government in both countries, again, for the purpose the Russians say, and I think this is to a large degree valid, of self-determination of those areas, as the Congressman from California has already pointed out. In fact, what we'd be doing is possibly blundering into war against Russia in much the same way that World War I occurred through a web of alliances on both sides causing one country after another, after another to say yes, fine, I'll join in on that war.

In this case there is a slope. It's a slippery slope, and we start down that slope when we do things like reaffirming the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of countries when we can't guarantee the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of those countries without going to war.

And although I understand the impulse to say good things, to try to say things that give us all a warm and fuzzy feeling that we're on the side of righteous and goodness, in this case it's a real danger. So, I would say that the bill is better off without this amendment for the reasons that the gentleman from California and the other gentleman from California on the other side of the aisle have both expressed. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. We have two other measures to consider and votes at about 1:30, so we need to keep moving. I'm going to ask the question on the amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed say no.

And the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. Duncan has an amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes. I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute to Amendment 46.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment offered by Mr. Duncan of South Carolina to H.R. 4278. In Section 2(8)—Following "increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency," insert "in Ukraine, which could be enhanced by advances in new energy technologies."

[The information referred to follows:]

AMENDMENT BY MR. DUNCAN
TO HR 4278

IN SECTION 2(8) – Following "increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency," insert "in Ukraine, which could be enhanced by advances in new energy technologies".

Chairman ROYCE. The gentleman is recognized to explain his amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN. I want to thank the minority for their work on this in conjunction with us. I believe the language is palatable to both sides, and with that I will just yield back and call the question.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and the language here is, following "increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency," insert "in Ukraine, which could be enhanced by advances in new energy technologies."

And with that explanation, any other member seek time? Hearing no further request for recognition, the question occurs on the amendment.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

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

Mr. Meeks of New York.

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

Chairman ROYCE. The clerk will read the amendment.

Ms. MARTER. Amendment to H.R. 4278 offered by Mr. Meeks of New York. Page 18, after line 2, insert the following: Section blank. United States leadership in the International Monetary Fund.

Chairman ROYCE. The Chair reserves a point of order that we consider the amendment as read.

[The information referred to follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4278**

**OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS OF NEW YORK**

Page 18, after line 2, insert the following:

**SEC. ___. UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND.**

(a) UNITED STATES QUOTA FOR INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT.—

(1) APPROPRIATION.—There are appropriated, for an increase in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund, the dollar equivalent of 40,871,800,000 Special Drawing Rights, to remain available until expended.

(2) COST ESTIMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisos under the heading "UNITED STATES QUOTA, INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND" under the heading "INTERNATIONAL MONETARY PROGRAMS" under the heading "INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS" in title XIV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1916), the costs of the amounts appropriated under such headings and by paragraph (1) shall be estimated on a present value basis, excluding administrative costs and any incidental effects on governmental receipts or outlays.

(B) DISCOUNT RATE.—The discount rate for a present value calculation under subparagraph (A) shall be the appropriate interest rate on marketable Treasury securities.

(3) ADJUSTMENTS UNDER SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)) shall not apply to amounts appropriated by paragraph (1).

(b) LOANS TO INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT.—

(1) RESCISSION.—Of amounts appropriated under the heading "LOANS TO INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND" under the heading "INTERNATIONAL MONETARY PROGRAMS" under the heading "INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS" in title XIV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1916) that are available for obligation, the dollar equivalent of 40,871,800,000 Special Drawing Rights is rescinded effective—

(A) on the date on which the rollback of the credit arrangement of the United States in the New Arrangements to Borrow of the International Monetary Fund takes effect; but

(B) not earlier than the increase in the quota of the United States authorized by section 72 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286 et seq.), as added by subsection (c)(2).

(2) COST ESTIMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the second through fourth provisos under the heading "LOANS TO INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND" under the heading "INTERNATIONAL MONETARY PROGRAMS" under the heading "INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS" in title XIV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1916), the costs of the amounts appropriated under such headings and rescinded by paragraph (1) shall be estimated on a present value basis, excluding administrative costs and any incidental effects on governmental receipts or outlays.

(B) DISCOUNT RATE.—The discount rate for a present value calculation under subparagraph (A) shall be the appropriate interest rate on marketable Treasury securities.

(3) ADJUSTMENTS UNDER SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)) shall not apply to amounts rescinded by paragraph (1).

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT.—

(1) RESCISSION OF FUNDS.—Section 17(b) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286e–2(b)) is amended in paragraphs (1) and (2) by inserting before the end period the following: "only to the extent that such amounts are not rescinded by an Act of Congress".

(2) ACCEPTANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT; QUOTA INCREASE.—The Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"SEC. 71. ACCEPTANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO THE ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT OF THE FUND.**

"The United States Governor of the Fund may accept the amendments to the Articles of Agreement of the

Fund as proposed in resolution 66–2 of the Board of Governors of the Fund.

"SEC. 72. QUOTA INCREASE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Governor of the Fund may consent to an increase in the quota of the United States in the Fund equivalent to 40,871,800,000 Special Drawing Rights.

"(b) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) shall be effective only to such extent or in such amounts as are appropriated in advance.".

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. I reserve a point of order and recognize the author to explain the amendment.

Mr. MEEKS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Meeks.

Mr. MEEKS. This is an amendment I fully intend on withdrawing. Let me state on the onset given the mood and everything else that you and Mr. Engel have worked on, I know that we don't have jurisdiction, so it's an amendment that I will withdraw.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEEKS. What the amendment that I proposed, I guess partly being frustrated being on the Financial Services Committee, I wish would have jurisdiction, that we would have an opportunity to debate this and talk about this issue in the Financial Services Committee, of which I once was the chair of the International Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee that dealt with and had jurisdiction over the IMF.

I believe that Congress as a whole needs to seriously consider passing the reforms to the IMF as an essential component of a comprehensive assistance package to the Ukraine. These reforms would not cost the United States taxpayers anything additional, they strengthen the IMF's funding base and ability to lead during a financial crisis. And the reforms move funds from one account to another, but they do not change our overall financial commitment and position to the IMF. If we were serious in our intention to support the people of Ukraine, now is a critical time to strengthen the power of the IMF, in my belief.

Christine Legarde, the Managing Director of the IMF, noted in a Wall Street Journal article yesterday that U.S. policy makers from Henry Kissinger to Condoleezza Rice believe that the current IMF reforms are necessary for the United States' strategic interest in the world, and the United States would be steadfast, or should be steadfast in our support for democracy and economic growth, for helping the people of Ukraine. Reforming IMF quotas is a big step toward that gap.

The IMF, I believe, is absolutely vital to our national security because a strong U.S. economy and a strong U.S. global economic leadership is critical to our strength around the world and to our national security. The IMF is also central, too, to provide economic policy to support to U.S. allies and governments whose failure would jeopardize the United States' national security interest, and preventing financial crises makes for more capable partners in the fight against terrorism and the protection of human rights overall.

And, again, just the—what we would not be giving up. We would not be giving up our veto power over the IMF decisions which provides us with a great deal of influence. Implementation of the 2010 IMF reforms preserves the U.S. veto power and our leadership position without increasing our overall financial commitment of the IMF. And failure to pass IMF reform legislation more than 3 years after we helped design the reforms is undermining our international credibility.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do appreciate you withdrawing the amendment because, as you noted, Rule 10 of the House would grant jurisdiction on this to the Financial Services Committee over this issue. So, by withdrawing we expedite the process of passing out the bill.

Without objection the gentleman's amendment is withdrawn.

Hearing no further amendments to this measure the question occurs on agreeing to H.R. 4278, as amended.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the bill, as amended, is agreed to. And without objection 4278, as amended, is ordered favorably reported as a single amendment in the nature of a substitute. Staff is directed to make any technical and conforming changes.

We now move to consideration of our two bipartisan Asia resolutions for today. As your offices were previously notified, the ranking member and I propose to consider en bloc both resolutions and their respective substitute amendments which were sent to your offices last night.

So, without objection the following items will be considered en bloc, H.R. 418 urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Muslim Rohingya people. And then Amendment 97 in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 418 offered by the Chairman on behalf of myself, Mr. Engel, Mr. Chabot, and Ms. Gabbard.

H.R. 494 affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act. And Amendment 94 in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 494 offered by the Chairman. This is on behalf of myself and Mr. Engel.

[The information referred to follows:]

IV

113TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 418

Urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOVEMBER 18, 2013

Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

---

# RESOLUTION

Urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma.

Whereas over 800,000 Rohingya ethnic minority live in Burma, mostly in the western Rakhine state;

Whereas currently, approximately 140,000 Rohingya are internally displaced in central Rakhine state and hundreds of thousands have fled to neighboring countries, including at least 231,000 in Bangladesh, at least 15,000 in Malaysia, and many more in Thailand and Indonesia;

Whereas the Burma Citizenship Law of 1982 has long excluded from approved ethnic groups the Rohingya people, despite many having lived in northern Rakhine state for generations, and has thereby rendered Rohingyas stateless and vulnerable to exploitation and abuse;

Whereas the Rohingya have historically experienced other particularized and severe legal, economic, and social discrimination, including restrictions on travel outside their village of residence, limitations on their access to higher education, and a prohibition from working as civil servants, including as doctors, nurses, or teachers;

Whereas authorities have also required Rohingya to obtain official permission for marriages and have singled out Rohingya in northern Rakhine state for forced labor and arbitrary arrests;

Whereas the Government of Burma has forcefully relocated Rohingya into relief camps, where they lack decent shelter, access to clean water, food, sanitation, health care, the ability to support themselves, or basic education for their children;

Whereas a two-child policy sanctioned solely upon the Rohingya population in the districts of Maungdaw and Buthidaung in northern Rakhine state restricts the rights of women and children, prevents children from obtaining Burmese citizenship, denies Rohingyas access to basic government services, and fosters discrimination against Muslim women by Buddhist nurses and midwives;

Whereas the United States Department of State has regularly expressed since 1999 its particular concern for severe legal, economic, and social discrimination against Burma's Rohingya population in its Country Report for Human Rights Practices;

Whereas the level of persecution, including widespread arbitrary arrest, detention, and extortion of Rohingya and other Muslim communities, has dramatically increased over the past year and a half;

Whereas communal violence has affected both Muslims and Burma's majority Buddhist population, but has overwhelmingly targeted Burma's ethnic Muslim minorities, which altogether comprise less than 5 percent of Burma's population;

Whereas violence targeting Rohingyas in Maungdaw and Sittwe in June and July of 2012 resulted in the deaths of at least 57 Muslims and the destruction of 1,336 Rohingyas homes;

Whereas on October 23, 2012, at least 70 Rohingyas were killed, and the Yan Thei village of the Mrauk-U Township was destroyed;

Whereas violence has also targeted Muslims not of Rohingya ethnicity, including riots in March 2013 in the town of Meiktila that resulted in the death of at least 43 Burmese Muslims, including 20 students and several teachers massacred at an Islamic school, the burning of at least 800 homes and 5 mosques, and the displacement of 12,000 people;

Whereas on October 1, 2013, riots involving more than 700 Buddhists in Thandwe township resulted in the death of 4 Kaman Muslim men and the stabbing death of a 94-year-old Muslim woman;

Whereas over 4,000 religious, public, and private Rohingya structures have been destroyed;

Whereas Rohingyas have experienced and continue to experience further restrictions on their practice of Islam, culture, and language; and

Whereas the violence against ethnic Muslim populations, including the Rohingya and other Muslim groups, is part of a larger troubling pattern of violence against other ethnic and religious minorities in Burma: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on the Government of Burma to end all forms of persecution and discrimination of the Rohingya people and ensure respect for internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma; and

(2) calls on the United States Government and the international community to put consistent pressure on the Government of Burma to take all necessary measures to end the persecution and discrimination of the Rohingya population and to protect the fundamental rights of all ethnic and religious minority groups in Burma.

○

**AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H. RES. 418**

**OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA, MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK, MR. CHABOT OF OHIO, AND MS. GABBARD OF HAWAII**

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas over 800,000 Rohingya ethnic minority live in Burma, mostly in the western Rakhine state;

Whereas currently, approximately 140,000 Rohingya are internally displaced in central Rakhine state and hundreds of thousands have fled to neighboring countries, including at least 231,000 in Bangladesh, at least 15,000 in Malaysia, and many more in Thailand and Indonesia;

Whereas the current Government of Burma, like its predecessors, continues to use the Burma Citizenship Law of 1982 to exclude from approved ethnic groups the Rohingya people, despite many having lived in northern Rakhine state for generations, and has thereby rendered Rohingyas stateless and vulnerable to exploitation and abuse;

Whereas the Rohingya have historically experienced other particularized and severe legal, economic, and social discrimination, including restrictions on travel outside their village of residence, limitations on their access to higher education, and a prohibition from working as civil servants, including as doctors, nurses, or teachers;

Whereas authorities have also required Rohingya to obtain official permission for marriages and have singled out Rohingya in northern Rakhine state for forced labor and arbitrary arrests;

Whereas the Government of Burma has forcefully relocated Rohingya into relief camps, where they lack decent shelter, access to clean water, food, sanitation, health care, the ability to support themselves, or basic education for their children;

Whereas a two-child policy sanctioned solely upon the Rohingya population in the districts of Maungdaw and Buthidaung in northern Rakhine state restricts the rights of women and children, prevents children from obtaining Burmese citizenship, denies Rohingyas access to basic government services, and fosters discrimination against Muslim women by Buddhist nurses and midwives;

Whereas the United States Department of State has regularly expressed since 1999 its particular concern for severe legal, economic, and social discrimination against Burma's Rohingya population in its Country Report for Human Rights Practices;

Whereas the level of persecution, including widespread arbitrary arrest, detention, and extortion of Rohingya and other Muslim communities, has dramatically increased over the past year and a half;

Whereas communal violence has affected both Muslims and Burma's majority Buddhist population, but has overwhelmingly targeted Burma's ethnic Muslim minorities, which altogether comprise less than 5 percent of Burma's population;

Whereas violence targeting Rohingyas in Maungdaw and Sittwe in June and July of 2012 resulted in the deaths of at least 57 Muslims and the destruction of 1,336 Rohingyas homes;

Whereas on October 23, 2012, at least 70 Rohingyas were killed, and the Yan Thei village of the Mrauk-U Township was destroyed;

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights reported possessing credible evidence of the deaths of at least 48 Rohingyas in Du Chee Yar Tan village in Maungdaw Township, Rakhine state in January 2014, and human rights groups reported mass arrests and arbitrary detention of Rohingya in the aftermath of this violence;

Whereas Burmese officials have denied the killings of Rohingyas in Du Chee Yar Tan village in January 2014 and responded to international media coverage of the violence with threats against media outlets, including the Associated Press;

Whereas violence has also targeted Muslims not of Rohingya ethnicity, including riots in March 2013 in the town of Meiktila that resulted in the death of at least 43 Burmese Muslims, including 20 students and several teachers massacred at an Islamic school, the burning of at least 800 homes and 5 mosques, and the displacement of 12,000 people;

Whereas on October 1, 2013, riots involving more than 700 Buddhists in Thandwe township resulted in the death of 4 Kaman Muslim men and the stabbing death of a 94-year-old Muslim woman;

Whereas over 4,000 religious, public, and private Rohingya structures have been destroyed;

Whereas Rohingyas have experienced and continue to experience further restrictions on their practice of Islam, culture, and language;

Whereas the violence against ethnic Muslim populations, including the Rohingya and other Muslim groups, is part of a larger troubling pattern of violence against other ethnic and religious minorities in Burma;

Whereas the Government of Burma expelled Medecins Sans Frontieres from Rakhine state, leaving Rohingya communities and others without access to health care and life-saving treatment for malaria, tuberculosis, and HIV; and

Whereas the Rakhine state threatens to ban all unregistered nongovernmental organizations from operating in Rakhine state, severely limiting the provision of necessary services to Rohingyas and others in need: Now, therefore, be it

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on the Government of Burma to end all forms of persecution and discrimination of the Rohingya people and ensure respect for internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma;

(2) calls on the Government of Burma to recognize the Rohingya as an ethnic group indigenous to Burma, and to work with the Rohingya to resolve their citizenship status;

(3) calls on the United States Government and the international community to put consistent pressure on the Government of Burma to take all necessary measures to end the persecution and discrimination of the Rohingya population and to protect the fundamental rights of all ethnic and religious minority groups in Burma; and

(4) calls on the United States Government to prioritize the removal of state-sanctioned discriminatory policies in its engagement with the Government of Burma.

IV

113TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

# H. RES. 494

Affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 28, 2014

Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MESSER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

# RESOLUTION

Affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act.

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act has been instrumental in maintaining peace, security, and stability in the Taiwan Strait since its enactment in 1979, and it is in the political, international and economic interests of the United States;

Whereas when the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted, it affirmed that the United States decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China was based on the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act states that it is the policy of the United States to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character to maintain the capacity to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act also states that "it is the policy of the United States to preserve and promote extensive, close, and friendly commercial, cultural and other relations between the people on Taiwan, as well as the people on the China mainland";

Whereas the relationship between the United States and Taiwan has been strengthened with—

(1) Taiwan's evolution into a free society and a full-fledged, multi-party democracy;

(2) the development of Taiwan's robust market economy;

(3) Taiwan's determined effort and collaboration with the United States to combat global terrorism, as demonstrated in part by its participation in the Container Security Initiative; and

(4) the leadership role Taiwan has demonstrated in addressing transnational and global challenges, including its active engagement in humanitarian relief measures, public health endeavors, environmental protection initiatives, and financial market stabilization efforts;

Whereas the United States is the third largest trading partner and the largest investor in Taiwan, while Taiwan is the eleventh largest trading partner of the United States and the sixth largest United States agricultural market;

Whereas Taiwan's democracy has deepened with the second peaceful transfer of power from one political party to another after the Presidential election in March 2008; and

Whereas the United States and Taiwan are united in our shared values in fair elections, personal liberty, and free enterprise: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its unwavering commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act as the cornerstone of relations between the United States and Taiwan;

(2) reaffirms its support for Taiwan's democratic institutions;

(3) reaffirms that peace in the Taiwan Strait should be maintained to the benefit of the 23,000,000 free people of Taiwan;

(4) supports the United States commitment to Taiwan's security in accord with the Taiwan Relations Act, including the sale of sophisticated defensive weapons to Taiwan;

(5) reaffirms its commitment to deepen United States-Taiwan trade and investment relations as well as support for Taiwan's inclusion in bilateral and regional trade agreements; and

(6) supports the strong and deepening relationship between the United States and Taiwan.

**AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H. RES. 494**

**OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA**

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act has been instrumental in maintaining peace, security, and stability in the Western Pacific since its enactment in 1979, and it is in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act affirmed that the United States' decision to establish a diplomatic relationship with the People's Republic of China was based on the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act also states that "it is the policy of the United States to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan";

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act also states that "it is the policy of the United States to preserve and promote extensive, close, and friendly commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people on Taiwan, as well as the people on the China mainland and all other peoples of the Western Pacific area";

Whereas the relationship between the United States and Taiwan has been strengthened with—

(1) Taiwan's evolution into a free society and a full-fledged, multi-party democracy;

(2) the development of Taiwan's robust market economy;

(3) Taiwan's determined effort and collaboration with the United States to combat global terrorism, as demonstrated in part by its participation in the Container Security Initiative; and

(4) the leadership role Taiwan has demonstrated in addressing transnational and global challenges, including its active engagement in humanitarian relief measures, public health endeavors, environmental protection initiatives, and financial market stabilization efforts;

Whereas the United States is the third largest trading partner and the largest investor in Taiwan, while Taiwan is the twelfth largest trading partner of the United States and the eighth largest United States agricultural market;

Whereas Taiwan's democracy has deepened with the second peaceful transfer of power from one political party to another after the presidential election in March 2008; and

Whereas the United States and Taiwan are united in our shared values in free elections, personal liberty, and free enterprise: Now, therefore, be it

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its unwavering commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act as the cornerstone of relations between the United States and Taiwan;

(2) reaffirms its support for Taiwan's democratic institutions;

(3) reaffirms that peace in the Taiwan Strait should be maintained to the benefit of the 23,000,000 free people of Taiwan;

(4) supports the United States commitment to Taiwan's security in accord with the Taiwan Relations Act, including the sale of sophisticated weapons of a defensive character to Taiwan, such as F-16 C/Ds and diesel electric submarines;

(5) reaffirms its commitment to deepen United States-Taiwan trade and investment relations as well as support for Taiwan's inclusion in bilateral and regional trade agreements; and

(6) supports the strong and deepening relationship between the United States and Taiwan.

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act enacted on April 10, 1979.".

☒

Chairman ROYCE. I now recognize myself to speak on the en bloc amendments.

H.R. 494 affirms the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act. For 35 years, the Taiwan Relations Act has served as the legal framework governing the important relationship between the United States of America and the Republic of China-Taiwan. Since the Act came into force in 1979, there have been few other pieces of foreign policy legislation as consequential as the TRA. Indeed, it is the steadfast support of the United States Congress that has helped Taiwan become what it is today, a thriving democratic society, and a world leader in high tech innovation.

Today we will consider H.R. 494, affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act. This bipartisan legislation which currently has over 60 co-sponsors reinforces our nation's unwavering support for Taiwan, and for Taiwan's 23 million people. As chairman I led two bipartisan delegations to Taiwan to strengthen our bilateral relationship. Last year I introduced legislation that was signed into law to help Taiwan gain a seat at the International Civil Aviation Organization for the first time since 1976. Two weeks ago we held the first Taiwan hearing in this committee on this issue of the Taiwan Relations Act, and today we will pass this important legislation to reaffirm our support for Taiwan.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute makes technical and clarifying edits to the underlying legislation. The amendment also includes bipartisan language offered by Mr. Connolly of Virginia to strengthen the underlying resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his suggestion, and I will recognize him in a moment to explain the language.

Taiwan maintains significant bipartisan support in the U.S. Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Let me speak for a moment about H.R. 418 before we go to Mr. Connolly and Mr. Engel. This resolution urges the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the

Rohingya people and respect the human rights of all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma.

The Rohingya Muslim community of Burma are one of the most persecuted minority groups in the world. For over three decades the Government of Burma has systematically denied the Rohingya even the most basic of human rights while subjecting them to unspeakable abuses. According to Burma's 1982 Citizenship Law, the Rohingya are prohibited from holding Burmese citizenship even though they have lived in Burma for generations upon generations.

Since 2012, 140,000 Rohingya and other Muslims have been displaced by violence, hundreds have been killed. On January, 13 unknown assailants entered a village in Rakhine State and killed 48 people while they slept. Sadly, this is what happens when a government refuses to recognize its own people. In fact, a non-governmental organization based in Southeast Asia recently disclosed credible documents detailing the full extent of state involvement in persecuting Rohingyas. Just a few weeks ago the Government of Burma expelled Doctors Without Borders from the country, thus denying once again the most basic of human rights.

The Government of Burma cannot claim progress toward meeting its reform goals if it does not improve the treatment of Rohingya

Muslims and other minority groups. The United States must prioritize the protection of human rights in its engagement with Burma. I urge the State Department to take off the rose-colored glasses and recognize that progress in Burma is, indeed, very limited in this regard.

The bipartisan resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McGovern, calls on the Government of Burma to immediately end the State-sponsored persecution of the Rohingya Muslim people. I am a co-sponsor of this resolution. We cannot embrace diplomatic reconciliation with the Government of Burma while human rights conditions in that country have deteriorated.

I am pleased to offer a bipartisan amendment in the nature of a substitute along with my good friend, Ranking Member Engel, Chairman Steve Chabot of the Asia Subcommittee, and Representative Gabbard of Hawaii who is also a sponsor and a member of the Asia Subcommittee.

This amendment strengthens the underlying resolution by clarifying the legal status of the Rohingya Muslim people under the 1982 Citizenship Law. It brings the resolution up to date by including information regarding the murder of 48 Rohingya earlier this year, and the expulsion of Doctors Without Borders. The amendment is further amended with language calling on the Government of Burma to immediately recognize the Rohingya as an ethnic minority, and to grant them citizenship. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I will now turn to the ranking member to speak on the en bloc measures, and then we will turn to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I strongly support both measures, the H. Res. 418, a resolution introduced, as you mentioned, by Mr. McGovern, the co-chairman of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

The legislation calls on the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and to respect the rights of all minority groups in Burma.

The plight of the Rohingya gets very little attention, and I'm pleased that the committee is addressing the abuses they and other minorities have suffered in Burma. And let me quote something. According to the State Department's 2013 County Reports on Human Rights Practices there were, and I quote, "credible reports of extra judicial killings, rape and sexual violence, arbitrary detentions, and torture and mistreatment in detention, deaths in custody, and systematic denial of due process and fair trial rights overwhelmingly perpetrated against the Rohingya." This is a quote from the State Department's 2013 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

As the Government of Burma transitions from decades-long military rule to a civilian government, it's important to hold them accountable for persistent human rights abuses. The killings, arbitrary detentions, and destruction of homes have caused 140,000 people to be internally displaced, and hundreds of thousands have been forced to flee to neighboring countries, including Thailand, Bangladesh, and Malaysia.

If Burma truly seeks to rejoin the international community then it must abide by the human rights principles of equality and human dignity. I support this resolution and encourage our colleagues to support it, as well.

And, Mr. Chairman, I commend you for introducing H. Res. 494, a resolution that affirms the importance and relevance of the Taiwan Relations Act. And I'm very pleased to be the lead Democratic co-sponsor of that Act.

Next month marks the 35th anniversary of the adoption of the Taiwan Relations Act, which is the cornerstone of the U.S.-Taiwan relationship. The Act has been instrumental in maintaining peace and security across the Taiwan Straits, and in East Asia, and serves as the official basis for friendship and cooperation between the United States and Taiwan.

I've been to Taiwan many times. Taiwan is a flourishing, multiparty democracy of over 20 million people with a vibrant free market economy. Its impressive evolution from authoritarianism to one of the strongest democratic systems in Asia has transformed the U.S.-Taiwan relationship from one based solely on shared interests to one based also on shared values. For many years, I've been a strong supporter of the people of Taiwan, and I will continue to lead efforts in Congress to demonstrate America's support for Taiwan. So, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this markup and I want to thank you again for working with us in a bipartisan way to move these important resolutions forward. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Engel. We recognize Ms. Ros-Lehtinen for such time as she might consume.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. As one of the strongest supporters of Taiwan, I also support and have cosponsored the resolution before us, H. Res. 494, affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act.

With the significant increase in China's defense budget, as well as the continued threats posed by an unhindered North Korean regime, there is no better time to strengthen relations with our democratic ally, Taiwan. It is in our national security interest to support Taiwan, and I think the best way to illustrate that is to also bring H.R. 419, the Taiwan Policy Act, which passed this committee last year to the House floor immediately. And we must stand up for all people who are being suppressed by authoritarian regimes.

H. Res. 418 calls for an end to the persecution of Muslim minorities and respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups. The Muslim minority continues to suffer under the current regime. The continued prosecution and discrimination, as well as the brutal attacks against this minority must stop. And I hope that this resolution will help protect the fundamental rights of all ethnic and religious minorities.

Thank you so much for the time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen. We go now to Mr. Bera of California.

Mr. BERA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to speak in strong support of H. Res. 494, the Taiwan Relations Act. It's incredibly important that we continue to emphasize and strengthen our relationship with our close friend and key trading partner, Taiwan.

In 2013, Taiwan was the United States' 12th largest trading partner. In my home state of California, according to the California Chamber of Commerce, we exported over 6.3 billion in products to Taiwan in 2012, incredibly important. California has the highest amount of exports to Taiwan within the U.S., and Taiwan is the seventh largest importer of California goods and services. They're an incredibly important and valued partner with us.

Taiwan also has a deep cultural connection to the United States. We have a vibrant and flourishing Taiwanese American community with almost half of them living in my home state of California. In fact, the majority of Taiwanese Americans also have college degrees and are making incredibly important contributions to our country. Therefore, I strongly support America's commitment to insure that nothing jeopardizes the security, or social, or economic system of Taiwan's people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. I think Mr. Grayson is seeking recognition.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to in support of the Taiwan resolution. Bismark said that politics is the art of the possible, and I think that foreign affairs should be the same way. It is not possible for us to reverse the Russian absorption of Korea, sorry, Crimea, the Crimea, nor should we try to defeat the aspirations of the Crimeans for self-determination.

On the other hand, and by the same token, we should support and we should continue to support the desire of the Taiwanese to be a free and separate state, not being part of—absorbed by the larger country, it's neighbor, China.

There are 20 million-plus Taiwanese who have a separate culture, in many cases separate language, and certainly a separate history having been occupied by the Japanese for half a century. The Taiwanese are fundamentally different and recognize themselves as fundamentally different from their larger, in fact, 100 times large neighbor. And, therefore, we can and should support their desire for self-determination. We've done so going back to the 1940s, and I think that we should continue to do so.

It is possible for Taiwan to be free and independent. It is possible for us to make that happen, and I think that we should continue to do so.

I yield the balance of my time.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Mr. Sherman of California.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you. I'd like to associate myself with Mr. Bera's comments complete with statistics about the greatest state in the nation, and its relationship with Taiwan. I want to support the bill on Taiwan.

I've had a chance to travel to Taiwan with the chair and some other members of this committee where we met with President Ma, the leaders of the DPP. This is a vibrant democracy that deserves our support.

I'm not sure I agree with the gentleman from Florida as to how separate the culture or language is of Taiwan as compared to China, but what it is clearly different is on the mainland people live in an authoritarian regime, and in Taiwan they have a vibrant democracy that deserves to be respected and helped. And I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Are there any other members seeking recognition? Hearing none, the question occurs on agreeing to the measures considered en bloc.

All those in favor say aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the en bloc items are agreed to. And without objection, H.R. 418, as amended, and H.R. 494, as amended are each ordered favorably reported as a single amendment in the nature of a substitute. The staff is directed to make any technical and conforming changes.

And that concludes our business for today. I want to thank Ranking Member Engel and all of the committee members for their contribution and assistance with today's markup, and this committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:36 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

# APPENDIX

---

## 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 25, 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:** Tuesday, March 25, 2014

**TIME:** 10:00 a.m.

**MARKUP OF:** H.R. 4278, Ukraine Support Act.;

H. Res. 494, Affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act.; and

H. Res. 418, Urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma.

**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.*

# COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP

**Day** *Tuesday* **Date** *03/25/14* **Room** *2172*

**Starting Time** *10:06 a.m.* **Ending Time** *1:36 p.m.*

**Recesses** *0* (__ to __) (__ to __) (__ to __) (__ to __) (__ to __) (__ to __)

---

**Presiding Member(s)**

*Edward R. Royce, Chairman*
*Rep. Rohrabacher, Rep. Ros-Lehtinen*

---

*Check all of the following that apply:*

**Open Session** ☑
**Executive (closed) Session** ☐
**Televised** ☑

**Electronically Recorded (taped)** ☑
**Stenographic Record** ☑

---

**BILLS FOR MARKUP:** *(Include bill number(s) and title(s) of legislation.)*

*H.R. 4278*
*H. Res. 494*
*H. Res. 418*

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**
*See Attendance Sheet.*

---

**NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**
*None.*

---

**STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD:** *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*
*SFR - Engel*

---

**ACTIONS TAKEN DURING THE MARKUP:** *(Attach copies of legislation and amendments.)*
*See Markup Summary.*

---

**RECORDED VOTES TAKEN (FOR MARKUP):** *(Attach final vote tally sheet listing each member.)*

| Subject | Yeas | Nays | Present | Not Voting |
|---|---|---|---|---|

---

**TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE** ______
**or**
**TIME ADJOURNED** *1:36 p.m.*

Douglas C. Anderson

**Doug Anderson, General Counsel**

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

*FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP*

| PRESENT | MEMBER |
|---|---|
| X | Edward R. Royce, CA |
| X | Christopher H. Smith, NJ |
| X | Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, FL |
| X | Dana Rohrabacher, CA |
| X | Steve Chabot, OH |
| | Joe Wilson, SC |
| | Michael T. McCaul, TX |
| | Ted Poe, TX |
| | Matt Salmon, AZ |
| X | 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 |

| PRESENT | MEMBER |
|---|---|
| X | Eliot L. Engel, NY |
| | Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, AS |
| X | Brad Sherman, CA |
| X | Gregory W. Meeks, NY |
| X | Albio Sires, NJ |
| X | Gerald E. Connolly, VA |
| X | Theodore E. Deutch, FL |
| | Brian Higgins, NY |
| | Karen Bass, CA |
| X | William Keating, MA |
| X | David Cicilline, RI |
| X | Alan Grayson, FL |
| X | Juan Vargas, CA |
| X | 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 |

**3/25/14 Foreign Affairs Committee Markup Summary**

The Chair called up the following measures for consideration by the Committee.

H.R. 4278 (Royce), "Ukraine Support Act."

1. Rep. Royce offered the Manager's Amendment, Royce 96 (previously provided to Members of the Committee), agreed to by voice vote.
2. Rep. Royce offered five amendments to be considered *en bloc*:
   a) Grayson 232
   b) Keating 27
   c) Keating 28
   d) Lowenthal 23
   e) Messer 120
3. Rep. Connolly offered an amendment, Connolly 98, agreed to by voice vote.
4. Rep. Duncan offered an amendment, Duncan 46, withdrawn.
5. Rep. Duncan offered an amendment, Duncan 45, agreed to by voice vote.
6. Rep. Castro offered an amendment, Castro 23, agreed to by voice vote.
7. Rep. Poe offered an amendment, Poe 74, agreed to by voice vote
8. Rep. Stockman offered an amendment, Stockman 14, agreed to by voice vote.
9. Rep. Gabbard offered an amendment, Gabbard 1, agreed to by voice vote.
10. Rep. Salmon offered an amendment, Salmon 40;
    10a) Chairman Royce offered a second-degree amendment to Salmon 40, adopted by unanimous consent;

    Salmon 40, as amended by the Royce second-degree amendment, was agreed to by voice vote.
11. Rep. Keating offered an amendment, Keating 26, not agreed to by voice vote.
12. Rep. Duncan offered an amendment, Duncan 46 Revised, agreed to by voice vote
13. Rep. Meeks offered an amendment, Meeks 26, withdrawn.

The following measures and amendments in the nature of a substitute (also previously provided to Members of the Committee) were considered *en bloc* and agreed to by voice vote:

H.Res. 418 (McGovern), "Urging the Government of Burma to end the persecution of the Rohingya people and respect internationally recognized human rights for all ethnic and religious minority groups within Burma."

Royce 97, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.Res. 418; and

H.Res. 494 (Royce), "Affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act."

Royce 94, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.Res 494.

H.R. 4278, (as amended); H.Res. 418, (as amended); and H.Res. 494, (as amended), were ordered favorably reported to the House by unanimous consent.

The Committee adjourned.

**Insert for the Record**
*Submitted by Ranking Member Eliot L. Engel*

*Huffington Post*
"Crimea is not Kosovo"
By David L. Phillips
March 10, 2014
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-l-phillips/crimea-is-not-kosovo_b_4936365.html

**By David L. Phillips**

Russia is pointing to the "Kosovo precedent" as justification for its actions in Crimea. This is a false argument. There are fundamental legal and political differences between the internationally sanctioned process, which culminated in Kosovo's independence, and Russia's land-grab in Crimea. Kosovo's independence is based on international law; Russia's annexation of Crimea is not.

Yugoslavia's 1974 constitution established Kosovo as an autonomous province with the same rights as Yugoslavia's republics, which included the right to secession. Kosovars exercised their constitutional right to secede in a 1992 referendum. Ethnic Albanians comprised about 95 percent of the population. Almost all eligible voters cast their ballots in favor of independence.

Slobodan Milosevic cracked down, declaring a state of emergency and imposing martial law in Kosovo. By virtue of atrocities against Kosovo's ethnic Albanian super-majority, Serbia lost its legitimacy and moral authority to govern.

As a result, NATO intervened to stop the slaughter of Albanians in 1999. After Serbian forces withdrew, the UN Security Council (UNSC) adopted Resolution 1244 that established an interim UN administration in Kosovo. It also required a plebiscite to determine Kosovo's future political status in accordance with the will of its people.

While UNSCR 1244 affirmed "the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY)," the FRY was reduced to a rump state consisting only of Serbia and Montenegro. When Montenegrins voted to secede, leaving only Serbia, the FRY ceased to exist and so did Kosovo's legal obligations.

Between adoption of UNSCR 1244 and Kosovo's declaration of independence on February 17, 2008, Kosovo worked for 9 years to satisfy international criteria needed for recognition. It ran the gauntlet set out by the UN's policy, "standards before status."

The international community created a Contact Group, which included Russia. After two years of international mediation, the UN Special Envoy on Kosovo's Status, Martti Ahtisaari, submitted his final report to the UN Secretary General recommending independence for Kosovo.

Since Kosovo's declaration of independence, 110 countries have recognized Kosovo as a sovereign state and established diplomatic relations. More countries would have recognized Kosovo, but for Russia's heavy-handed diplomacy. The process of gaining international recognition is ongoing.

Russia's attempt to draw parallels between Kosovo and Crimea is convoluted. Kosovo's situation was unique (*sui generis*).

Yugoslavia collapsed, liberating Kosovo from legal claims by Belgrade. Ukraine was recognized by the international community within its current borders, including Crimea, after the Soviet Union ceased to exist in 1991.

The scope and scale of human rights abuses against Albanians in Kosovo was egregious. No pattern of human rights abuses exists in Crimea.

Crimea's population is diverse, including ethnic Russians, Ukrainians, and Tartars. When NATO intervened, Kosovo was more than 95 percent ethnic Albanian.

Kosovo's political leaders endorsed an extensive package of minority rights for ethnic Serbs and promised autonomy for communities where Kosovo Serbs lived. Crimea's regional parliament makes no such assurance. Muslim Turkic Tartars have a well-grounded fear of expulsions and ethnic cleansing, given their history of persecution by Russia.

Kosovo's independence ensued after a long process of international mediation, under management by the UN, which enforced strict criteria. Crimea's annexation is being engineered by a foreign power -- Russia.

NATO, a multilateral alliance, intervened so that Kosovars could realize their dream of independence. Masked Special Forces from Russia are creating conditions to justify Crimea's annexation by Russia.

An international Contact Group facilitated Kosovo's path to independence. There is no international support for Crimea's referendum, or its annexation by Russia. To address the Crimea crisis, Moscow has rejected a contact group comprised of Russia, Ukraine, Britain, France, and the United States.

Kosovo welcomed the UN's engagement. Russian-backed thugs in Crimea physically threatened the UN special representative and expelled a delegation led by the OSCE's High Commissioner on National Minorities.

The process by which Kosovo attained independence was an affirmation of international order. Russia's naked land-grab in Crimea is a violation of international norms. The UN Charter enshrines "peaceful and good neighborly relations" between States.

Russia would be well advised to abandon its provocative policy toward Ukraine. It may achieve short-term objectives, but risks becoming a pariah with contempt for international law.

*Mr. Phillips is Director of the Program on Peace-building and Rights at Columbia University's Institute for the Study of Human Rights. He served the Clinton, Bush, and Obama administrations as senior adviser and foreign affairs expert. Phillips is author of "Liberating Kosovo: Coercive Diplomacy and U.S. Intervention".*