

this waste of taxpayer money. It is time for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) to step down as head of this investigation.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTIMEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, although we live in the world's greatest democracy, we also live in a society that, unfortunately, in the name of women's rights permits parents to be stripped of our inherent and sacred right, our right to parent.

H.R. 3682, The Child Custody Protection Act, will protect every parent's right to be a parent. It will prevent every parent from being stripped, deprived, and divested of our profound right to protect our young daughters from abortions and life-altering and life-threatening procedure.

Pro-abortion groups wrongfully claim a right to procure secret abortions for minors. But it is not up to a stranger to determine whether our daughters should have an abortion. The Congress and the American people will take a strong stand against the twisted notion that the Constitution somehow confers upon strangers a right to parent our children.

Together with Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM, our bill will be heard in committees next week and we hope that we can get even more cosponsors for our pro-family protection bill.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, campaign finance reform still is a critical issue confronting this House and needs to be addressed.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight had a particular opportunity to address this issue, to hold hearings, and to come up with some solutions and some facts that were a basis as to how we should proceed in that area.

So far, however, due to lack of leadership in that committee, we have been unable to embark on that process. We have had instead a very partisan hearing process, a fiscally irresponsible process, one that is motivated by personal vindictiveness not only of persons on the majority but also of their staff.

In fact, we have had a tremendous amount of incompetence in those proceedings that have cost the American taxpayers some \$6 million. New committee leadership is needed to restore credibility to that committee and dignity and credibility to this House.

It is a shame, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the majority were unable to take the action that would allow us

to move in that process. It now is incumbent upon the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) as the head of that committee to realize that he can no longer function properly and to move that leadership to another member of that committee.

FREEDOM FROM RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION ACT OF 1998

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 430

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2431) to establish an Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, to provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on International Relations, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3806, modified by the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good

friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, House Resolution 430, is a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2431, The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act of 1998. The admirable purpose of this legislation is to reduce the widespread and ongoing religious persecution taking place, unfortunately, in many places in the world today.

□ 1115

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, which had primary jurisdiction over the legislation.

Because the bill was referred to five committees for their consideration, and three of those committees reported varying versions of the bill, a new bill for the purpose of amendment, H.R. 3806, was introduced last week.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules announced on the House floor on May 7 that the bill, H.R. 3806, would be used as the base text for purposes of amendment. The rule, therefore, makes in order as an original bill for purposes of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3806 as modified by the amendments in Part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule which allows for a broad range of amendments on a very narrowly focused bill. The goal of the bill is to combat religious persecution, and clearly all forms of persecution are to be condemned. But the crafters of this bill, as I stated, created a very focused religion-specific bill to make clear that we are focusing on one particular aspect of unacceptable persecution which must, must be combated.

Thus, the bill was not brought with an amendment, for example, from the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) who offered an amendment which would have expanded the scope of the bill to cover all forms of persecution prohibited by the Geneva Convention. It was felt by the framers of the legislation, however, that this bill, to have an opportunity to be considered and to have an opportunity for passage, should be framed as specifically and narrowly as it has been.

I believe that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), when he moves forward, if he does, with his concept, will get tremendous support on a bipartisan basis. I certainly would be supportive of the effort by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), but I think that it is important to keep in mind what the purpose of this bill is.

It is a very focused, I would maintain, modest and reasonable and, hopefully, achievable piece of legislation to focus on upon that egregious and condemnable practice which occurs all too often in different parts of the world, religious persecution. I would urge my colleagues to support both this fair rule and the underlying bill.

The bill prohibits Federal agencies and U.S. persons from exporting goods to entities engaged in religious persecution. I think that is an important step to demonstrate that we are serious about condemning and opposing that unconscionable practice.

Mr. Speaker, though the bill has been limited in the process of amendment and of discussion, this is a very important piece of legislation that we are dealing with today. I would say it is somewhat of a definitional piece of legislation for this Congress at this particular moment in our history.

I often think about what we have witnessed in the last years and the fact that we are in a transitional moment. I often think about the fact that, while doubtless, we saw an "evil empire," as President Reagan often called it, collapse, I wonder what it is that has won. What is it that has won? And what kind of world is it that we are walking into at this stage in our history?

In a certain sense that is what we are discussing. That is what will be discussed and debated with this particular legislation. We have to decide, ultimately, if what we accept and what we wish to embrace as a society and as a world, as an international community, is ethics as some sort of guide, some sort of factor in human conduct; or whether we are officially going to embrace the law of the jungle, if we are going to simply embrace the concept, as Dostoyevsky said when he pointed out that in his belief, those who say that God does not exist in effect are saying that anything is possible. In other words, if the concept of ethics will have no relevance whatsoever, then we might as well officially proclaim that in this era in which we are living.

So what the framers have done, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and so many others who have worked so tirelessly on this legislation, through this legislation, this very focused legislation, is to say that that particular egregious conduct, religious persecution, torture, being put into a dungeon, into a cage, being tortured or killed because of a human being's religious beliefs and practices is going to be officially, by the United States Congress, condemned today.

Even though there are all sorts of waivers, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) stated earlier, and he will state subsequently, in his legislation for the President, the same President who will be, according to what I am told, standing, in just a few weeks, at Tiananmen Square, being received

officially by the Chinese Government with all the symbolism that that means in the world of diplomacy, that there could be no other place to be received in Beijing except Tiananmen Square.

Even though this bill, as focused as it is, as limited as it is, grants multiple waiver authority to the President of the United States, it is, nonetheless, a very important piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation that is going to be watched. What we do today is going to be watched throughout the world and, most especially, by those who languish in dungeons and in caves and who are tortured and oppressed because of their religious views and practices.

So I would urge my colleagues to not only support this fair rule, but the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend the framers of the legislation. I have great admiration for all of them: the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), of course, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), who is here, my dear friend on the other side of the aisle and to whom I have yielded the customary 30 minutes on this rule, a tireless champion, as well, for human rights and human decency throughout this world.

I thank them all for their hard work on this legislation and other similar pieces of legislation that have dignified this Congress in the past.

So I would urge my colleagues to support the rule. I know that we have the distinguished presence here of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN) who will be speaking on the rule, also, by the way, an extraordinary fighter for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time and his very, very kind words.

Mr. Speaker, this is a structured rule. It will allow debate on H.R. 2431, which is called the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act. As my colleague has described, this rule will provide 1 hour of general debate that will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule self-executes two amendments. In addition, it makes in order four amendments which may be offered on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, religious freedom is one of the most fundamental rights of Americans. It is enshrined in the first amendment to the Constitution. It is a foundation of the American government. It is more than just an American right. The right to freedom of religion is recognized by international law, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Unfortunately, the brutal suppression of religious expression is all too common beyond the borders of the United States. In my travels and in the travels of many of the sponsors of the bill, especially the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), we have witnessed firsthand the extraordinary intolerance against people who chose to practice their faith outside the officially approved religions.

In Romania, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I saw churches that were burned down, people that were thrown in prison, Bibles by the thousands that were shredded into toilet paper under the official government policy of repression.

In northern Uganda, I saw Catholic girls who were mutilated for no other reason than their faith. Their ears and their noses were cut off. I visited them in the hospitals. It goes on in so many countries in the world that practice this brutality.

But when I and my fellow House Members would return to the United States from these countries, there was little we could do about the horror we saw. We did not have the legal tools necessary to stop it.

The bill before us today is such a tool. The bill was introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who, as I have said before, I have accompanied on many international trips to investigate human rights abuses.

His bill establishes the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring to identify and report on religious persecution. If the Secretary of State determines persecution exists, then a series of sanctions take effect, including a prohibition on exports and U.S. foreign aid.

Because of the importance of religious freedom to our Nation, it seems fair that our government express this in our foreign policy. While we cannot dictate the internal policies of other countries, we can direct the State Department and our foreign assistance programs to deny support for countries and individuals that repress religious freedom contrary to basic American values.

President Clinton has already taken an important step towards universal freedom of religious expression by establishing a Commission on Religious Liberty to advise the State Department. However, I believe we can do more.

I regret that we are taking up this bill under such a restrictive rule. I would prefer that we would have more of an open rule, but I strongly support this bill to express U.S. outrage over the religious persecution in other countries and to help stop the brutality.

Reluctantly, I do support this rule so that we can proceed with the consideration of a bill that I consider a most important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), my distinguished colleague and friend.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), my colleague from Miami, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), I also rise in strong support of H.R. 2431, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act of 1998. I especially commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations for their leadership and for their dedication in bringing forward such a critical piece of legislation.

Jose Marti, the man who liberated my homeland of Cuba from tyranny, said, "To witness a crime in silence is to be an accomplice of that crime."

Today, my colleagues and I are making a statement to the world that the United States will not stand by silently. We will bear witness to the thousands of our fellow human beings who are tortured and, indeed, even murdered for exercising their fundamental right to religious freedom.

Today, we will give a voice to those whose cries for freedom and justice have been equaled by violent and repressive regimes that seek to destroy that which is so precious to us as children of God.

□ 1130

This bill will help ensure that practicing one's faith will not become a death sentence, as it has been, unfortunately, for so many men, women and children throughout the world.

When we speak of religious persecution, we need to fully recognize that in many countries this does not mean simple harassment, but it refers to unthinkable, monstrous acts, ranging from imprisonment, forced slavery, torture, starvation and murder. These acts, endorsed, and in many cases imposed, by extremist, repressive regimes, have gone unpunished for too long.

As we reflect on this issue today, we ask that you think of people like the 18 year old girl from Laos who was arrested by government forces and is currently sitting in a squalid prison cell. And what is her crime? Teaching Bible classes to neighborhood children. Or think about the student from Tibet who did nothing but record traditional music from Tibet, and, for this offense, he was sentenced to 18 years.

I ask you to picture the father who was shot in the streets of Iran because he was not in the mosque at prayer time. There are many prisoners in my native homeland of Cuba who are in jail because they dared to hold religious meetings at their homes, and there are evangelical Christians and

Jehovahs' Witnesses routinely harassed in Cuba.

These are just a few examples of the grim destiny that so many of our global brothers and sisters face at the hands of those who hold no respect for religious beliefs and no respect for human life.

Religious persecution following the Cold War has not diminished. Sadly, it has only persisted, and has now reached new heights. H.R. 2431 will provide a permanent mechanism for the United States to investigate religious persecution and ensure that these cases receive high priority at the State Department.

By creating an Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring within the State Department, we will help to develop a mechanism that will help to strengthen and improve our methods of addressing religious freedom and persecution throughout the world. If and when a country is identified in engaging in widespread and ongoing acts of persecution, the United States would terminate non-humanitarian U.S. foreign aid and require U.S. opposition to loans to such regimes from taxpayer supported international agencies. It bans the export of torture and other crime control related supplies to offending countries, and it bans visas to known persecutors.

This bill furthers U.S. interests by ensuring that U.S. funds do not go to pariah states which engage in practices that run contrary to our values and our beliefs and which violate basic human dignity. Through this bill, we will finally shine light into the eyes of those who seek to oppress and destroy lives, and we will hold them responsible for their cruel acts.

Pope John Paul II has said,

Religious persecution is an intolerable and unjustifiable violation of the most fundamental human freedom, that of practicing one's faith openly, which for human beings is their reason for living.

Let us not stand idly by while thousands continue to suffer. Let us make these rogue regimes accountable for their crimes against humanity. Let us render strong support for H.R. 2431.

I once again congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his tenacity, dedication, and never-wavering focus on the issue of religious persecution worldwide. I regret the bill has been changed as it has moved through the committee process, but it definitely is still a powerful weapon to foster international religious freedom. We are truly blessed in this house to have a man of vision like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) guiding our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by joining my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) in praising the work of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). There is not a person in this body more respected on issues related to hunger and protecting the rights of people who have been persecuted around the world for whatever reason than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). I want to associate myself with comments that have been made in praise of the gentleman by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. Speaker, I am rising in opposition to the rule on this bill. I rise in opposition to the rule because the Committee on Rules ruled that an amendment that I attempted to offer on the floor was not in order. I think the Committee on Rules should have made my amendment in order.

There is not a person in this house or in our country, I believe, who would not find offensive and abhorrent the abduction, enslavement, killing, imprisonment, rape, crucifixion or any forms of torture, which this bill condemns and sanctions. This bill condemns and sanctions those forms of torture, but it does it only when the victims are tortured because of religious beliefs.

The amendment that I sought to offer would have expanded this bill to offer the same kind of protections for those persecuted because of race, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion.

This bill sets up two new categories in the law, a category 1 and a category 2, for people who have been enslaved or killed for religious persecution, and, by doing so, implies that somehow religious persecution is more abhorrent than persecution for other reasons, such as race or political belief or nationality or group membership.

The very example that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) referred to about the President going to China and standing in Tiananmen Square, imagine, if you would, that the tanks in Tiananmen Square had just rolled right over the protesters there. Nothing in this bill would address that issue, because those protesters were there for political reasons, not for religious reasons.

So I rise to say all forms of persecution, whether they are for religious reasons, whether they are for racial reasons, whether they are for nationality reasons, whether they are because people are standing up for their political beliefs, most often in defense of democracy, all forms of persecution should be covered under this bill. And the Committee on Rules has decided that it will not allow an amendment to be debated on this floor, to be considered and voted on on this floor, that would expand the coverage of this bill to those other forms of persecution. By doing so, it is implying to the world that somehow religious persecution should be given extra protection and heightened priority.

Mr. Speaker, we should provide special protections against all forms of persecution.

Some people would have you believe that we are paying less attention to religious persecution in the world than we are to the other kinds of persecution that I have made reference to, but let me suggest that that is simply not the case.

The United States has 78,000 refugee slots allocated for 1998. Twenty-five thousand of those funded slots are allocated to those Bosnians who are Muslim. Religious reasons. Twenty-one thousand of those slots are allocated to religious minorities from the former Soviet Union. So 59 percent of our refugee allocation is set aside for victims of religious persecution in one way or another. Does that mean that we are treating religious persecution in some lesser fashion? I think not.

The only thing I would say to this body is that this bill ought to be broader, and everybody keeps telling me, "Well, you ought to go and introduce a separate bill."

My response to that is, we have a bill on the floor. If everybody thinks this is a good idea to expand the protections in this bill to victims of persecution based on race, nationality, group membership or political opinion, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) indicated everybody does, then put it in this bill, and let us vote it up or down. Because it is not in the bill and the amendment has not been made in order, I oppose this rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) has said. I think we have to recognize that we have a coalition of interests opposing us that, in effect, want there to be absolutely no sanctions on any sort of conduct anywhere in the world, and that the law of the world should be if there is a buck to be made anywhere, no matter what the conditions, no matter under what the circumstances, no matter if it is dealing in or contributing to the most horrendous conduct conceivable, that that is acceptable. That is the coalition against us.

The message that we will send out today to that coalition, to the world and to those who are imprisoned, is that we will not be defeated, and that we are going to continue to make progress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my dear friend, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a leader in human rights throughout the world.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman, and I appreciate the comments the gentleman made about my very good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). I second those, and completely agree.

Passing this bill will say to the world that the United States will no longer remain silent while people of faith are being tortured—because that is what this bill covers—enslaved, abducted and killed for their religious beliefs. Passing the bill will shatter the silence.

There are troubling things taking place all over the world. In the past decade in Sudan alone, 1.5 million Christians and Muslims and Animists have been killed for their faith. Starvation is that government's weapon of choice, liberally spiced with high altitude bombing in the villages, and mass murders. And there is slavery, the selling into slavery in Sudan of young Sudanese boys and girls.

In China, Catholic priests and bishops are imprisoned today, as we now speak, some for decades, simply for offering holy communion. Protestant pastors are thrown in jail for having house church services, and Muslims suffer persecution, as do Buddhist monks and nuns in Tibet.

In Tibet, where I have been, China's government has systematically destroyed up to 4,000 to 6,000 monasteries, and the government tightly controls all of the existing monasteries.

Many around the world are enduring hardships simply because they practice their faith. They endure mostly in silence and away from the public spotlight and with little hope of improvement. This bill would apply to all faiths, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Christian, Buddhist and all others.

This bill is moderate, it is balanced, and this bill gives the President total waiver authority, meaning that if the President does not want this bill to go into effect, it will not go into effect.

Finally, the bill, I think, will send a message to help so many people. It is a bipartisan effort, Republicans and Democratic Members alike, with 131 cosponsors.

I will tell Members, on three different occasions I personally have looked into the eyes of young boys in southern Sudanese refugee villages who have lost their moms and dads and had nobody to care for them.

□ 1145

I have seen the monasteries that are plundered in Tibet and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I have been to Beijing Prison No. 1 in China.

Cardinal O'Connor of New York wrote a letter yesterday where he said, "The Freedom From Religious Persecution Act could begin the desperately needed process of ending the legitimizing of such persecution. In my judgment," Cardinal O'Connor said, "its passage would be an act of historic proportions."

Catholic Archbishop Theodore McCarrick, who just returned from China said, and I quote from a letter yesterday, "The bill represents a modest step that reflects the growing awareness that this vital human rights

issue has too often been overlooked, and a growing conviction that the core American values, including religious liberty, must play a proper role in foreign policy."

Other supporters of the bill, and there are so many, are the International Campaign for Tibet, the Christian Coalition, the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference, the Family Research Council, the National Jewish Coalition, the Anti-Defamation League, the Religious Action Center for Reformed Judaism, the Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, the American Family Association, Prison Fellowship Ministries, the Union of Orthodox Congregations of America, the Salvation Army, the Catholic Alliance, B'Nai B'rith, and many, many others. This bill is also supported by so many others that we will put their names in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill hopefully becomes law, America will reaffirm for the world that we still honor those words that Jefferson penned where he said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men women are created equal, endowed by their Creator, by God, with life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

These words by Jefferson were not just for Virginians, they were not only for Americans, but they were for people around the world. Passage of the bill will reaffirm the words of President Reagan where he said, "We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a lucky few, but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings."

The last two points. If this bill were to fail, can we imagine what the prison wardens would say to those who are imprisoned in Sudan today, those who are in the ghost houses? What that would say would be that nobody cares. On the other hand, when this Congress passes this bill, and those in Yei and Torit and little villages in southern Sudan and those in little villages in China, as they tune into their crystal radio sets and listen, they will know that the people's House, the United States Government, the United States Congress has stood on behalf of those who are persecuted. And it will send a message, as Natan Sharansky said when he was in the old Soviet Perm 35 and he heard that the Congress stood for him; it will send a message that we stand for the least of these and we stand with them boldly, whereby those words of Jefferson hold true for everybody around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge and plead that everyone support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2431, the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act. Passing this bill will say to the world that the United States will no longer remain silent while people of faith around the world are being tortured, enslaved, abducted and killed for their religious beliefs. For too long the U.S. has remained silent on this issue—passing H.R. 2431 helps shatter that silence.

There are troubling things taking place in the world. In just the past decade, the government of Sudan has killed or allowed to starve over a million of its own people. The fallen—mostly Christians, Animists and some Muslims in southern Sudan—are victims of a religious war. Starvation is that government's weapon of choice, liberally spiced with high-altitude bombing, mass murder and even selling Sudanese boys and girls as slaves.

In China, Catholic priests and bishops are in prison—some for decades, simply for practicing their faith. Protestant pastors are thrown in jail just for holding house church services. Muslims suffer persecution, as do Buddhist monks and nuns.

In Tibet, the Chinese government has systematically destroyed up to five thousand Buddhist monasteries. The monasteries still standing have a cadre of Chinese police to monitor what goes on. The government tightly controls the activities of the monks and nuns and even pictures of the Dalai Lama are forbidden.

In Pakistan, Ahmadi Muslims and Christians are victimized by the ominously named "blasphemy" law under which those who speak against the prophet Mohammed can be given the death sentence. Just last week, as we prepared to debate this bill, one of Pakistan's leading Catholic bishops, Bishop John Joseph committed suicide to protest a death sentence handed down to Christian Ayub Masih. Bishop Joseph reportedly said just before putting a shot through his head "It is no longer possible for my people to live in Pakistan."

Many around the world are enduring hardships simply because they practice their faith. They endure mostly in silence and away from the public spotlight and with little hope for a brighter tomorrow. The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act is for them. It would apply to people of all faiths—Jew, Muslim, Hindu, Christian, Buddhist and others.

The bill establishes the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring at the State Department—a permanent mechanism to monitor religious persecution overseas. Countries found to be engaged in "widespread and ongoing" persecution which involves abduction, enslavement, killing, imprisonment, forced mass relocation, rape, torture or the imposition of particularly severe fines, would be named and subjected to four punitive actions. These actions are:

- (1) A ban on non-humanitarian foreign aid;
- (2) A ban on visas to individuals known to be responsible for persecution;
- (3) A ban on U.S. support for loans by international financial institutions to offending countries, and
- (4) Two narrowly-targeted export bans which ban the sale of items used for torture to offending countries and the direct export of goods to entities responsible for persecution.

The bill is moderate and balanced. It provides the President with the authority to waive the sanctions when national security interests would be served or if waiving the sanctions would "promote the objectives of the act."

Finally, the bill imposes sanctions on the government of Sudan until it ceases its massive campaign of religious persecution—the same sanctions that were imposed on the government of South Africa in the 1980's for its immoral apartheid policy.

When America speaks out, it makes a difference. Just ask noted Russian Jewish dissident Natan Sharansky, who languished for

years in Soviet gulags as a prisoner of conscience. He sent a letter to a group of religious leaders gathered to talk about this bill, "When the West stood up for its most basic values and spoke up for persecuted Soviet Jewish communities, Soviet chains around churches and political dissidents began to shatter."

This bill has broad bipartisan support—over 131 cosponsors. It is supported by a broad coalition of religious and civic groups.

For example, Wei Jingsheng, one of China's most well known and well respected political dissidents, supports H.R. 2431. I quote from his recent letter:

I have personally witnessed the oppression and exploitation of religious groups and individuals that occurs today in China. The true situation may be difficult for Americans to imagine, and it is difficult for the Chinese people to imagine. If I did not see it myself, even I would not imagine the shameful and despicable means the Communists use against religious believers . . . I feel that if a government such as China which for such a long time totally denied the rights of freedom of religion to its citizens cannot receive sanction, then it is completely unjust. I urge the friends of human rights to support this effort.

I submit Wei's entire letter for the record. He knows that pressure works—he's out of jail today because the U.S. pressed for his release.

Cardinal O'Connor of New York says, and I quote,

The Freedom from Religious Prosecution Act could begin the desperately needed process of ending the legitimizing of such persecution. In my judgment, its passage would be an act of historic proportions.

Archbishop Theodore McCarrick says,

The bill represents a modest step that reflects growing awareness that this vital human rights issue has too often been overlooked, and a growing conviction that core American values—including respect for religious liberty—must play proper roles in shaping the U.S. foreign policy agenda.

Both letters are submitted for the RECORD.

Other supporters of the bill include: the International Campaign for Tibet, the Christian Coalition, the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Conference, the Family Research Council, the National Jewish Coalition, the Anti-Defamation League, the Religious Action Center for Reformed Judaism, the Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, the American Family Association, Prison Fellowship Ministries, the Union of Orthodox Congregations of America, the Salvation Army, the Catholic Alliance and B'Nai B'rith.

The bill is also supported by a number of groups representing ethnic groups suffering persecution like the American Coptic Association, the Cardinal Kung Foundation, the Free Vietnam Alliance, the Pakistani-American Association, the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam and Southern Sudanese in America.

And there are many, many more. A total list of supporters is submitted for the RECORD. All have worked tirelessly to pass this bill and I thank them for their efforts.

When H.R. 2431 becomes law, America will reaffirm for all the world that we still honor those ringing words in the Declaration of Independence that, "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men [and women] are created equal * * * endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among

these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

These words by Thomas Jefferson are not for America alone, but for people everywhere. And passage of this bill will reaffirm the words of President Ronald Reagan, spoken on a different occasion, when he said, "We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a lucky few, but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings."

I urge you to vote for H.R. 2431. It will help people of faith everywhere.

ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2431

American Baptist Evangelicals
 American Coptic Association
 American Copts of California
 American Family Association
 Anti-Defamation League
 Assyrian Academic Alliance
 Assyrian National Congress
 Assyrian National Foundation
 B'Nai B'rith
 Campus Crusade for Christ
 Cardinal Kung Foundation
 Catholic Alliance
 Christian Coalition
 Christian Legal Society
 Christian Reformed Church
 Christian Solidarity International
 Concerned Women for America
 Empower America
 Ethics and Public Policy Center
 Evangelical Free Church of America
 Evangelicals for Social Action
 Family Research Council
 Focus on the Family
 Freedom House's Puebla Program
 Institute on Religion and Democracy
 International Campaign for Tibet
 International Christian Concern
 International Fellowship of Christians and Jews
 Iranian Christian International
 National Association of Evangelicals
 National Jewish Coalition
 National Religious Broadcasters
 Open Doors with Brother Andrew
 Prison Fellowship Ministries
 Religious Action Center for Reformed Judaism
 The Rutherford Institute
 The Salvation Army
 Seventh Day Adventist Church
 Southern Baptist Convention
 U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America
 Voice of the Martyrs
 World Evangelical Fellowship-Religious Liberty Commission
 THE COALITION FOR THE DEFENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS UNDER ISLAMIZATION
 Advocates International
 Agape International
 American Coptic Association
 American Coptic Union
 Asian Christian Ministries
 Assyrian International News Agency
 Assyrian National Congress
 Assyrian Political Review
 Bangladesh Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary
 Bet-Nahrain
 Canadian Coptic Association
 Christian Amnesty
 Christian Copts of California
 Christian Voice of Pakistan
 Coptic American Friendship Association
 Coalition Committee of Experts
 Coming Home USA
 CREED
 Egyptian Relief Agency

Eritrean Academic Committee
 Federation of Hindu Associations
 Foundation for Faith in Search of Understanding
 Freedom USA
 Institute on Religion and Democracy
 Indo-American Kashmir Forum
 International AWAZ
 International Christian Concern
 Iranian Christians International
 HIS
 Jubilee Campaign
 Law and Liberty Trust
 Lebanese Organization of New York
 MECHRIC
 Middle East Research Center
 National Interreligious Task Force
 New Sudan Foundation
 Operation Nehemiah for South Sudan
 Open Doors-Netherlands
 Pakistani-American Association
 Pakistani Apostolate
 Persecution Relief
 Research and Education Foundation
 South Lebanese Christian Association
 Southern Sudanese in America
 Southern Sudan Resource Center
 Society of St. Stephen
 The Trinitarians Religious Freedom Program
 Toronto Coptic Association
 Wake-up Coalition
 World Evangelical Fellowship-Religious Liberty Commission
 World Lebanese Organization
 World Maronite Union
 Zwemer Institute of Muslim Studies

CHRISTIAN LEGAL SOCIETY,
 Annandale, VA, May 11, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH, RICHARD GEPHARDT,
 DICK ARMEY, and DAVID BONIOR,
 U.S. Congress,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, CONGRESSMEN GEPHARDT, ARMEY, AND BONIOR: We take great heart from recent House actions in support of a growing, nationwide movement of conscience against religious persecution.

We are deeply grateful for the stunning 31-5 House International Relations Committee vote in favor of the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act. We are further grateful for the House Leadership's scheduling of a floor vote on this Act on May 14. We note as well Senate Leadership commitments to ensure 105th Congress consideration of anti-persecution legislation. These developments are critical steps towards achieving the imperative goal of ending today's widespread and ongoing persecutions of vulnerable communities of faith.

Because further Congressional action remains to be taken, we believe it useful to set out our view of the elements necessary for effective legislation.

In so doing we again endorse the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act, in the strongest terms, and reiterate our intent to work for its rapid passage. The Act's prospects in the House result from efforts of a broad coalition of religious groups and such House leaders as Representatives Wolf, Bertram, Gilman, Gjedenson, Hall, Pelosi, Chris Smith and Majority Leader Arme. We believe that these efforts will produce historic legislation, and for the following reasons:

The Act's baseline sanction of withdrawing non-humanitarian foreign aid from persecuting regimes is both limited and meaningful—and will be a powerful tool to end the threats of murder, torture, rape, starvation and enslavement now faced by millions of believers.

The Act's limited but targeted focus on hard-core persecution ensures that its reach will not exceed its grasp.

The Act's waiver provisions fully allow the President to maintain non-humanitarian aid

to persecution regimes while also creating real accountability on his part if he chooses to do so.

The Act's small, distinguished and independent office will have no policy-making authority—thus leading to fact-based, less politicized findings of whether and where religious persecution actually occurs.

The Act's application of the South Africa sanctions against Sudan will ensure that we treat genocide with no less resolve than was brought to bear against apartheid.

The Act's moderate reform of immigration practices, in a manner fully consistent with existing immigration law, will help secure traditional American protection for victims of religious persecution.

Because various provisions of the Act may be the subject of amendments on the House floor, we believe it useful to set forth our views on a number of important matters.

Sudan: This is a regime responsible for wholesale torture, rape, starvation, murder and enslavement of religious communities. Thus, the Act's Sudan provision reflects a central moral premise of our movement—the need for full parity in America's resistance to South African apartheid and Sudanese genocide. We urge the House to restore the most effective sanction against this regime: a ban on imports from the Sudan.

Immigration Reform: Given America's establishment as a haven for victims of religious persecution, today's often-hostile treatment of religious asylum claimants is deeply troublesome. Yet, despite statutory provisions barring the summary exclusion of some classes of asylum applicants, the Act maintains the Immigration Service's right to summarily exclude religious asylum applicants without full hearings. The Act's modest reforms represent minimal progress in a critical area of concern. We will fight hard to restore them.

Non-Humanitarian Foreign Aid: The Act's response to regimes engaged in "widespread and ongoing" acts of hard-core religious persecution—ending their non-humanitarian taxpayer subsidies—qualifies as a "sanction" only by stretching the meaning of that term. We believe it axiomatic that no taxpayer subsidies should go towards such regimes, and therefore strongly oppose the removal of Export-Import Bank subsidies from the Act's reach. Further, because Presidential waivers can restore those subsidies, and because some hard-core persecutors will be largely unaffected by the Act without withdrawal of Export-Import Bank subsidies, we strongly believe that the Act will not have its necessary effectiveness without this vital feature.

The Freedom From Religious Persecution Act is moderate in its responses to persecution but serious about putting those responses into effect. It will make the President accountable if he exercises his broad authority to waive its sanctions. By its targeted focus on hard-core persecution it offers real protection to vulnerable believers. It will deal evenhandedly with all persecuting regimes, whether strong or weak. It is modeled on the Jackson-Vanik law, which helped bring freedom to people of all faiths in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. It puts America on the right side of history and ensures that the world will not see us as the Swiss are now seen to be—a country willing to abet evil in the pursuit of expedient goals and short-term financial gain.

Prayerfully and with full determination, we intend to work for the Act's overwhelming adoption by the House, and for Congressional enactment of effective legislation. We remain at your pleasure in our continuing effort to realize this long-needed and historic outcome.

Respectfully,
 John Ackerly, President, International Campaign for Tibet; The Right Rev-

erend Keith Ackerman, The Episcopal Church, Bishop of Quincy; William Armstrong, Former U.S. Senator (1979-1990); Gary L. Bauer, President, Family Research Council; William J. Bennett, Co-Director, Empower America; Dr. Bill Bright, President, Campus Crusade for Christ; Charles Colson, Chairman of the Board, Prison Fellowship Ministries; Michael Cromartie, Senior Fellow, Ethics and Public Policy Center; Nathan J. Diament, Director, Institute for Public Affairs, The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregation of America; Bishop Alex D. Dickson, Director, Institute for Christian Leadership, and Vice President, American Anglican Council; Dr. James Dobson, President, Focus on the Family; Rev. John C. Eby, National Coordinator, American Baptist Evangelicals; Sam Elisha, Director, Special Ministries Division, HIS International, Inc.; David H. Engelhard, General Secretary, Christian Reformed Church of North America; Edward L. Foggs, General Secretary, Leadership Council, Church of God; Deacon Keith A. Fournier, Catholic Alliance; Abraham H. Foxman, National Director, Anti-Defamation League; Jim Geist, Executive Director, Interfaith Alliance for Christian Human Rights; Chris Gersten, President, Institute for Religious Values; Dr. Scott M. Gibson, President, American Baptist Evangelicals; Dr. Os Guinness, Senior Fellow, The Trinity Forum; E. Brandt Gustavson, President, National Religious Broadcasters; Michael Horowitz, Director, Project for International Religious Freedom, Hudson Institute; Clyde M. Hughes, General Overseer, International Pentecostal Church of Christ; Charles ****, Research Director, American Anti-Slavery Group; James Jacobson, President, Christian Freedom International; The Right Reverend Stephen H. Jecko, The Episcopal Church, Bishop of Florida; D. James Kennedy, Ph. D., Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church; Ed Koch, Former Mayor of New York City, New York; Diane Knippers, Institute on Religion and Democracy; Bishop Richard W. Kohl, Evangelical Congregational Church; Shawley F. Koras, President, American Coptic Association; Dr. Beverly LaHaye, Chairman, Concerned Women for America; Dr. Richard Land, President and CEO, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, Southern Baptist Convention; Dr. Duane Litfin, President, Wheaton College; Michael McConnell, Presidential Professor, University of Utah College of Law; Steven T. McFarland, Director, Center for Law and Religious Freedom, Christian Legal Society; Michael Medved, Film Critic, Radio Host; Rev. Dr. Peter Moore, Dean and President, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry; Father Richard Neuhaus, Editor-in-Chief, First Things Journal, Institute on Religion and Public Life; Michael Novak, George Frederick Jewett Chair, in Religion and Public Policy, American Enterprise Institute; Marvin Olasky, Editor, World Magazine; The Very Rev. Keith Roderick, Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights Under Islamization; Rabbi David Saperstein, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Nina Shea, Director, Center for Religious Freedom, Freedom House; Ronald J. Sider, President, Evangelicals for Social Action; Steven L. Snyder, President, International

Christian Concern; Jack Stone, General Secretary, Headquarters Operations Officer, Church of the Nazarene; Randy Tate, Executive Director, Christian Coalition; Jim Wallis, Editor-in-Chief, Sojourners Magazine; The Right Reverend William C. Wantland, The Episcopal Church, Bishop of Eau Claire; Commissioner Robert A. Watson, National Commander, The Salvation Army; Tom White, The Voice of the Martyrs.

WEI JINGSHENG FOUNDATION,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

To All Members of the House of Representatives:

I have recently heard that you will soon consider the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act that is sponsored by my friend Congressman Frank Wolf. I want to express the great interest I have for this effort to sanction the Chinese communist authorities for their denial of the basic right of freedom of religion.

I strongly believe that the freedom of religious beliefs is one important component of man's fundamental human rights. The Chinese communist leadership continues to trample on freedom of religion as it tramples on the basic rights of all Chinese people. I have personally witnessed the oppression and exploitation of religious groups and individuals that occurs today in China. The true situation may be difficult for Americans to imagine, and it is difficult for the Chinese people to imagine. If I did not see myself, even I would not imagine the shameful and despicable means the Communists use against religious believers.

I feel that if a government such as China which has for such a long time totally denied the rights of freedom of religion to its citizens cannot receive sanction, then it is completely unjust. I urge the friends of human rights to support this effort.

Respectfully,

WEI JINGSHENG.

CARDINAL'S OFFICE,
New York, NY, May 12, 1998.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: Be assured of my strong support for the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act and my firm hope that the House of Representatives will vote in favor of it overwhelmingly.

I have been following the tragic course of religious persecution with close attention for many years. No religious body can assume itself to be exempt. The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act could begin the desperately needed process of ending the legitimizing of such persecution. In my judgment, its passage would be an act of courage of historic proportions.

I am deeply grateful for your personal role.
Faithfully,

Cardinal O'CONNOR,
Archbishop of New York.

INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN
FOR TIBET,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1998.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GILMAN: It has come to my attention that some House Members are using a May 11 New York Times column by Anthony Lewis to advance the position that the Dalai Lama opposes "The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act," scheduled for a vote in the House tomorrow.

It is the custom of the Dalai Lama not to take a position on specific U.S. legislation.

However, he has been aware for many months of Frank Wolf's particular efforts to advance the issue of religious freedom in the Congress. In February of this year the Dalai Lama sent a message, which I enclose, to a Washington meeting on religious persecution which focused on strategies to advance the Wolf bill. I also enclose remarks he made this morning at the Wisconsin state legislature, the column mentioned above, and a letter to the editor from Rabbi David Saperstein taking issue with Mr. Lewis' "misassessment."

It would be unfortunate if the efforts of the International Campaign for Tibet, Students for Free Tibet and other U.S. Tibet support groups to bring attention to the fact of religious persecution in Tibet and to gain Congressional support for Mr. Wolf's bill were eclipsed by a misrepresentation of the Dalai Lama's views in the final hours of debate.

I hope you will share this information with your colleagues should the need arise.

Sincerely,

MARY BETH MARKEY,
Director of Government Relations.

MESSAGE OF THE DALAI LAMA

All religions teach compassion and aim to alleviate suffering. It is therefore no surprise that Christian men and women in the United States have taken on a campaign to end the suffering of those persecuted around the world for their religious faith. As a Tibetan and a monk, I am deeply gratified by the efforts you are undertaking to draw attention to China's policies in my country which are increasingly focused on the eradication of the Tibetan Buddhist culture.

While many people remember Mao Tse-tung's terrible admonition that "religion is poison," few people understand that this remains China's policy on religion to this day, nor do they understand the insidious nature of that government's involvement in religion practice in China and Tibet. For example, in my country, monasteries and temples are under the purview of the Religious Affairs Bureau (a local government body), the local Communist Party Committee, Party work teams, and branches of police stations set up under the Public Security Bureau. Since 1959, almost every monastery has been overseen by a Democratic Management Committee (DMC) which manages the monastery's affairs including religious affairs, study, security and finances. These DMCs have supplanted the traditional role of abbot in guiding the religious and administrative functioning of the monastery.

The Tibetan people are deeply religious and suffer great cruelties for their faith. From the Buddhist point of view, this suffering is in itself a kind of teaching and benefits the spiritual growth of the individual. I know that suffering is of special significance in the Christian faith as Jesus himself took on the suffering of mankind. Your campaign to end religious persecution bears witness to the suffering of others, challenging devout men and women to recommit to the teachings of their faith, which includes the development of compassion, not just to friends, but to everyone. Again, I commend you for your compassionate work for peace in Tibet and in the world.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 1998.
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER: I am writing to renew our support for the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act (H.R. 2431), which passed the House International Relations Committee by an overwhelmingly 35-1 vote.

The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act rightly links U.S. aid to a country's performance on religious liberty, a linkage that the U.S. Catholic bishops have long urged for the full range of fundamental human rights. This bill represents a modest step that reflects growing awareness that this vital human rights issue has too often been overlooked, and a growing conviction that core American values—including respect for religious liberty—must play proper roles in shaping the U.S. foreign policy agenda.

The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act, as revised, covers persecution against believers of all faiths in all countries. The bill provides appropriate responses to the most egregious forms of religious persecution involving widespread killing, torture, enslavement, forced relocation and the like. It ends military aid, sales and financing to some of the world's most brutal regimes that, in many cases, also violate the full range of fundamental human rights. The bill also ends most other forms of U.S. assistance, while exempting humanitarian and development aid to avoid indirect harm to those whom the bill seeks to help. It does not impose embargoes, but rather imposes modest, highly-targeted sanctions against specific governmental entities directly involved in egregious persecution.

In addition, the revised bill provides ample waivers for national security reasons and for cases where the president deems sanctions counter-productive. Finally, the revised bill contains other helpful features, such as improved training for asylum and foreign service officers.

As pastors of a universal Church we are all too familiar with the human face of religious persecution. That is why we respectfully urge you to support H.R. 2431 as a modest but valuable step toward relieving the plight of those who suffer solely for their faith.

Sincerely yours,
THEODORE E. MCCARRICK,
Archbishop of Newark,
Chairman, International Policy Committee.

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER
OF REFORM JUDAISM,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, which represent 1.5 million Reform Jews and 1,800 Reform rabbis in North America, I write to express support for the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act of 1997 (H.R. 2431) and to urge you to vote for its passage when the full House considers the bill on Thursday, May 12.

We have been horrified by stories of religious minorities suffering brutal persecution at the hands of governments and local authorities. Tibetans are ruthlessly punished by the Chinese for simply owning a picture of their spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama; the Islamic government in Sudan commits atrocities against its Christian population including torture, rape and murder; and in Egypt, the Coptic Christian minority has been the target of Islamic fundamentalist violence. We cannot turn our back against innocent people whose sole "crime" is the expression of their deepest religious beliefs. Having so often been the victim of persecution, it is our duty and obligation as part of the Jewish community to not only speak out against the persecution of other religious groups around the world, but to take affirmative steps to prevent such persecution in the future.

The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act (H.R. 2431) works to protect people of all religions from persecution on the basis of their faith. The coalition supporting it is broad and unified, spanning the political

spectrum. The bill is not, nor does it purport to be, a solution to all violations of religious liberty around the world. It does, however, offer a serious important and modest tool for combating the most blatant forms of religious persecution and helping to improve the situation of millions who suffer simply because of their faith.

As committed as we are to combating religious persecution, the legislation as it was originally introduced was problematic for some of us. However, the bill coming to the House floor is substantially different from when it was introduced in September, 1997. The current version of the bill now addresses some of our most pressing concerns by: broadening the coverage of the bill to include all religious groups in all countries; moving the monitoring office from the White House to the State Department; providing a presidential waiver for sanctions when they would endanger the persecuted group; ending U.S. military aid, military sales and military financing to some of the world's most brutal regimes; broadening the exemption for humanitarian and development aid; and restoring some vital procedural safeguards for those seeking asylum from persecution on account of their religion, safeguards that we urge also be restored for those claiming persecution on grounds of race nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

We urge you to support this bill and to oppose any major changes to the legislation when it comes to the floor on May 14th; in particular, to oppose efforts to change the definition of persecution, to eliminate the automatic sanctions requirement, or to weaken the refugee and asylum provisions.

I hope you will help pass legislation which represents a modest and long overdue effort to address vital human rights concerns.

Sincerely,

RABBI DAVID SAPERSTEIN.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE,
New York, NY, March 19, 1998.

Hon. FRANK WOLF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: On behalf of the Anti-Defamation League, we commend your longstanding efforts on behalf of persecuted peoples and your leadership in introducing legislation that has already sparked action to raise the diplomatic profile of the issue internationally.

Enactment of the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act will strengthen our nation's hand in dealing with countries which torture and oppress individuals on the basis of their faith. It would codify the kind of increased reporting and training of U.S. personnel that will be critical to monitoring and addressing this horrific problem.

We welcome recent modifications in the legislation which take into consideration both the safety of victims on the ground and the disparate circumstances in which persecution may occur. While the mechanism created by the bill was always designed to protect all persecuted peoples, the language now makes clearer that it is inclusive of all faiths. Also, the bill seeks to safeguard protections already in place for victims of all human rights abuses.

ADL supports addressing all forms of oppression with equal vigor, but also recognizes the value of spotlighting problems such as religious persecution which is a bellwether for how countries behave on other fronts. We view this legislation as an important tool to make religious freedom a more prominent factor in U.S. diplomacy. As the bill moves forward, we are open to exploring further refinements that may ensure that U.S. policy will alleviate the suffering of vic-

tims in the most forceful and effective manner possible.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. BERKOWITZ,
National Chairman.
ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN,
National Director.

THE SALVATION ARMY,
Alexandria, VA, March 10, 1998.

Re Freedom from Religious Persecution Act
(H.R. 2431).

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
241 Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR FRANK: I urge you to support the captioned bill.

The Salvation Army serves in 103 countries around the world. We see enough evidence of documented religious persecution to know it is important for the United States to take a moral stand, which hopefully can bring some relief to those who are suffering because of their beliefs.

You have many matters that require thought, prayer, and action. I urge you to consider supporting this legislation.

May God bless you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. WATSON,
National Commander.

FOOD & ALLIED SERVICE TRADES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1998.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: I am writing to express my support for H.R. 2431, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act of 1998. This bill would improve the monitoring of religious persecution and provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution.

Sadly, people of faith continue to be tormented in many countries. By simply exercising their beliefs they risk bodily harm, prison, and sometimes death. Your bill reaffirms the idea that this country stands in support of basic human rights and human dignity and that our national interest transcends narrow economic advantage. It places the United States on the side of the oppressed, not the oppressors.

You are to be commended for your leadership on this issue, and I hope this bill receives favorable consideration by the House.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY L. FIEDLER,
President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The Chair would remind the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) he has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that I am very proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2431, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act. The Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, of which I am privileged to serve as chairman, has held extensive hearings on the subject of religious persecution, including hearings on the rising tide of persecution of Christians, and the rising tide of world-

wide anti-semitism. We have heard riveting and revolting first-person account testimony of the torture of Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns, of atrocities against Muslims in Bosnia and East Turkistan, and of Baha'i in Iran.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, not just to talk about the problem of religious persecution—talk is often cheap—but to do something about it. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a hero of the human rights movement, has clearly shown us the way.

During the course of the legislative process, the gentleman from Virginia worked closely with a broad coalition of evangelical Christians, Jewish organizations, the United States Catholic Conference, and the International Campaign for Tibet, in order to improve the bill. It has truly been, I say to my colleagues, a work in progress. We worked very hard to incorporate meaningful reforms and language that were suggested by the administration. As a matter of fact, I offered the amendments during markup in full committee that makes it very clear that it is the Secretary of State and not the director who makes the final call. That was a recommendation that came from the White House, and I think the bottom line is that it probably improves the bill.

We also made it very clear—and I offer this as well, because there was some ambiguity, although never at all is the intent of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF)—that this bill applies to everyone, Christians, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, religious believers of every and any faith, and I think it is important that that be underscored this morning.

Let me repeat, we not only focused on persecuted Christians, but also on persecuted Muslims. For example, the bill contains a specific finding suggested by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) with respect to the Uighur, an overwhelmingly Muslim ethnic group in the formerly independent Republic of East Turkistan, who are now severely persecuted by the Communist Government of China.

The bill also makes crystal-clear that in affording heightened protection for members of religious communities whose situation is particularly compelling, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act will not sacrifice any of the protections currently afforded to victims of other forms of persecution, whether it be on religious grounds or for any other reason. There is no hierarchy of human rights. That is an absolutely bogus contention. Every time we pass a human rights bill, we are saying we want to focus on that, we want to advance the bill to protect a persecuted or somehow disadvantaged group of individuals around the world.

I truly believe that we finely tuned and carefully calibrated the sanctions in this bill, and I would remind Members and ask them to read the bill. We

are not talking about discrimination, as bad as that is; we are talking about persecution. We are talking about people who have severely suffered for their faith.

We also have a waiver. The waiver states, and there are two waivers, that if the national security interests of the United States justify a waiver, the President has that option, or if such a waiver will substantially promote the purposes of this act, so there are two good waivers contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do ask Members to support the rule, and I hope they will support the underlying bill when it comes up on the floor.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, last weekend in Marietta, Ohio I had a chance to talk with the newly appointed Chinese ambassador, and I raised with him the issue of Christians and others of religious faith who are imprisoned in China. He denied that that was the case. Following that exchange, a young student attending Ohio University came to me and thanked me for raising the issue, saying that he had been a part of the Tiananmen Square student uprising, and he could attest to the fact that China imprisons people of faith.

It is almost impossible for us to imagine a place where worship and fellowship is illegal, but The New York Times has reported and others have substantiated that for people who live in China and other oppressive countries, religious persecution is a constant reality.

The Chinese Government likes to claim that it allows religious pursuits and only arrests Christians who are troublemakers. But what they do not say is that the so-called churches they point to, the State-sanctioned churches, are actually under the control of the Communist Party. China prohibits Christians from worshipping in any churches except those they deem patriotic ones, that submit to the Communist Party's religious domination, registration, regulation, control of clerical appointments, and censorship reached to the pulpit and to the altar, like forbidding the Second Coming of Jesus Christ.

China is by no means the only country that denies religious liberty. The Government of Sudan, for instance, uses tactics such as slavery, forced conversion, starvation, torture and the kidnapping of children against Christians and even Muslims they do not agree with.

All of this is why I urge support for the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act. This act seeks to use America's leverage as the world's only superpower to pressure oppressive countries into allowing more religious freedom. If we do not act, who will? If not now, when?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of The Freedom From Religious Persecution Act. This bill clearly puts America on the side of religious liberty. Why should America give economic aid to countries that oppress and persecute people just because of their religion? The thought that a country can have widespread government-tolerated, and in some cases, government-sponsored religious oppression and still receive U.S. aid is an absolute travesty. While this bill will stop non-essential aid to offending governments, it does allow continued humanitarian and agricultural aid, so it will not hurt the people it aims to help, and it gives the President broad authority to grant a waiver if sanctions are deemed counterproductive. Clearly, this is a very balanced and a flexible bill.

Many of our forefathers came to America to escape the same kind of religious intolerance this bill will help to stop. So of all of the free Nations of the world, we should have the strongest policy of supporting religious freedom. I urge my colleagues to support this very important measure.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say in closing that this is a good bill, it is an important piece of legislation. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has provided great vision and direction in this, and along with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), they have given it great support and direction. I urge support of the rule and of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and others, and especially the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) who worked so hard on this legislation, so diligently.

In the last weeks we have witnessed a series of diplomatic gestures which served as blank checks of acceptance for the actions of tyrants and thugs. The U.N. Human Rights Commission failed to take up a resolution on China completely. The U.N. Human Rights Commission voted down a resolution condemning the tyranny in Cuba, despite an increase in repression there in recent months.

The President, as I mentioned before, is going to be received officially in the next weeks when he goes to Communist China at Tiananmen Square. There can be no clearer message to the Chinese people of what that means in terms of acquiescence to the conduct of that regime, of brutality, and of inhumanity.

□ 1200

This very week the First Lady is going to stay in the same hotel in Geneva as the Cuban tyrant. Is there no other hotel that could have been chosen by the Government of the United States in Switzerland? What kind of message does that send to the ongoing repression that is being suffered at this point by the Cuban people?

I remember Dr. Veguilla, a constituent of mine now, who was expelled from Cuba because he was an evangelical; and he still is an evangelical minister. Because of his religion and his activities in Cuba, he was placed by the Cuban dictatorship in a cell with a bear as a form of tyranny.

It is to the Dr. Veguillas of the world who, today we say, we remember you, the United States of America stands with you and the conduct of brutal regimes made up of thugs will not only not be acquiesced, but will be condemned by the people's House, in representation of the sovereign people of the United States of America.

I would urge passage of this rule and passage of the underlying legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 430 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2431.

□ 1201

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2431) to establish an Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, to provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. As we begin today's historic debate, Mr. Chairman, on the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his outstanding work in drawing attention to the problems of religious persecution around the world, and for introducing this legislation to permanently enlist the United States in the fight against persecution.

The tireless efforts of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) on behalf of persecuted religious believers has been an inspiration to all of us and a blessing for followers of all faiths.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, for his unwavering support of human rights around the world and for his diligent efforts on behalf of this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt that the results of the passage of H.R. 2431, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act, is going to be felt around the world. That is what is intended. While reaffirming our Nation's commitment to the vital protection of religious rights, it also sends a long overdue signal to repressive governments that their repulsive behavior is no longer going to be overlooked. We are not just going to talk about it.

Persecuted Christians in Sudan, in China, North Korea, Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and other nations will be encouraged in their struggle to freely practice their religion when they learn that world opinion is awakening to their plight. They will take comfort from the knowledge that at least our Nation will stop providing economic assistance and taking other actions to prop up the very governments that have been oppressing them.

I am aware that H.R. 2431 has been criticized as a "sanctions bill" by those who are concerned about making a profit by trading with tyrants, and that it has become fashionable in some circles to disparage economic sanctions as retrograde and being ineffective and, indeed, even as being isolationist.

Those who espouse that view conveniently forget that economic sanctions contributed significantly to our Nation's triumph in the Cold War, and that the bipartisan policy we followed for nearly 50 years of resisting communism around the world was the most internationalist policy our Nation ever followed.

Sanctions helped bring about the end of apartheid, and the threat of U.S. sanctions is today one of the most important tools we have in the combatting of international drug trafficking, and to discourage the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to please bear in mind that the purpose of this bill is not to impose sanctions on foreign nations that engage in or condone religious persecution. The main purpose is to encourage countries to stop persecution. The degree to which sanctions are actually imposed under this measure will be the degree to which the bill has failed. The degree to which sanctions are not imposed will be the degree to which it has succeeded.

Our sanctions are targeted to make certain that only oppressive governments will be denied foreign aid and other U.S. benefits, not the innocent people who live under such governments. Humanitarian assistance will never be cut off under this measure.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is intended to make the world a better, more humane place in accordance with the finest moral values and traditions of our Nation. Accordingly, it deserves our full support, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2431.

Mr. Chairman, we all agree that the United States should do more to promote religious freedom around the world. I think everyone in this Chamber wants to do that. I believe that the bill that is before us is brought forward with the very best of intentions. The question is, what is the best way to accomplish our objective? I do not believe this bill, as presently drafted, is the best way. I will oppose it.

I oppose it, really, for three reasons. First of all, I think the bill will do very serious harm to the United States' national interest. The United States' national interest in any country is multifaceted, but this bill forces the President to conduct American foreign policy toward countries on the basis of a single standard, tolerance of religious freedom, as defined in the bill.

The mandatory, automatic sanctions in this bill sharply restrict the President's ability to conduct foreign policy. A determination of religious persecution would automatically trigger all of the sanctions listed in this bill. Even if the President chose to waive the sanctions, such a determination would damage relations with countries of enormous importance to the United States.

The bill will deprive the President of the ability to determine what to condemn and how to condemn it and how to deal with it. We are saying in this bill that there is only one way to deal with this problem; that is to apply sanctions.

Foreign policy is not that simple. In making sanctions decisions, this bill gives the Secretary of State no authority to balance our concern about religious persecution against any other national interest, not our economic stake in a foreign country, not our security interests, not even our interest in promoting other basic human rights.

The Secretary of State has no authority under this bill to exercise judgment about how best to promote religious freedom in any particular country. The Secretary would be compelled to impose sanctions. The sanctions waiver does not mitigate the automatic public censure this bill requires, so the bill gives the President a single tool, sanctions, to promote religious freedom.

On a question of immense complexity in every country, this bill shackles the United States and says, automatic sanctions is the answer. I think it harms our ability to promote religious freedom.

Let me try to give Members some examples of what this bill will do. In Egypt there are, of course, reports of abuse against the Coptic Christians. How would automatic sanctions against Egypt help Coptic Christians whose leaders are opposed to this bill? How would automatic sanctions against Egypt, the first and most important Arab country to make peace with Israel, help the peace process at this moment in time?

Or let us take Saudi Arabia. Christians have been beaten there, services stopped, converts have been beheaded. How would sanctions against Saudi Arabia advance the vital U.S. national interest in the secure flow of oil? How would sanctions promote the goal of containing Saddam Hussein and enforcing U.S. Security Council resolutions against Iraq?

Or Pakistan? Right now we are making every effort, at this moment in time, to persuade Pakistan not to conduct nuclear tests. Automatic sanctions would make that difficult to ask, even much more difficult. If we impose automatic sanctions, what chance do we have that the Pakistanis would pay any attention to us?

Likewise, a similar situation in Indonesia. Catholics are persecuted in East Timor. The State Department says that every single country in Southeast Asia, except Australia and New Zealand, could be sanctioned under this bill.

Would sanctions help the United States address the financial crisis in Indonesia and in Asia today, with the threat that that poses to the entire world's financial system? How would a financial collapse promote religious tolerance?

On and on we can go, in Germany, in Greece, and even in Israel. In Israel, Jehovah's Witnesses have been threatened and attacked, and their meeting hall was firebombed. Is it really in the U.S.'s interest to apply automatic sanctions on our friend and staunch ally, Israel, because of such incidents?

This bill places the question of religious persecution ahead of every other question in American foreign policy, and I think it is going to cause harm to the American national interest.

My second objection is that the bill will harm and not promote efforts to protect religious freedom. This is not some kind of theoretical concern that I am spinning here. We have heard from churches and evangelical groups with tens of thousands of missionaries. We have heard from people like Ned Graham, Billy Graham's son, who heads a major Christian mission in China.

What do these religious leaders say? They do not like the bill. They worry that sanctions will produce a backlash against the persecuted religious community that they are trying to help. The bill will put greater pressure on minority religious communities, and these minority communities will be accused of complicity in American sanctions.

The third reason I oppose this bill is because it creates a damaging hierarchy of human rights violations. What this bill does is it makes religious persecution the top priority of human rights and human immigration policy. This bill says that religious persecution is more important than any other kind of persecution: more important than female infanticide, more important than racial discrimination, more important than press censorship, more important than ethnic cleansing. None of these equally serious rights abuses would be monitored by a special State Department office and punished with its own unique set of sanctions.

It is a mistake, in my view, to establish a hierarchy of human rights violations in U.S. law, and when we state that one form of persecution takes priority over another form of persecution, we invite governments to test our tolerance for other forms of persecution.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I think it is appropriate and important for Congress to address this important issue. I want to say that the sponsors of this bill have been willing to make adjustments on it, and I appreciate that, and I hope they will be willing to make more.

I know it is very, very difficult for any Member to come into this Chamber and vote against this bill, but we need a bill that will not provoke a backlash against persecuted religious communities. We need a bill that will give the President and the Secretary of State the power to balance our interests in reducing religious persecution against the full range of important and even vital national interests, and we need a bill that gives the President the ability to craft an appropriate response to each distinct instance of religious persecution. This is not that bill.

Because it falls short in these key respects, the President's senior advisers will recommend that he veto it, and I urge Members to vote against it.

Congress has before it other legislative proposals designed to promote religious freedom overseas. I am hopeful that we will ultimately be able to agree on a bill that has strong bipartisan support and the backing of the President, a bill to promote our shared objective of religious freedom, without the damaging consequences of this bill.

□ 1215

I urge a no vote.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me and commend him for his great work on this, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) as well.

Let us focus on exactly what kind of religious persecution this bill seeks to

address. We are not talking about discrimination or harassment, although these are very bad things. This bill punishes only the worst of the worst: governments that engage in widespread, ongoing persecution that includes murder, torture and other particularly shocking forms of persecution. Let us look at what we mean by this.

To my left in the photograph is Palden Gyatso, a Tibetan Buddhist monk. Palden Gyatso testified at one of our subcommittee hearings and told us that the Chinese Government routinely uses electric shock guns, serrated and hooked knives, handcuffs and thumbcuffs treatment and other forms of torture. He showed us some of the torture implements that have been used against himself and other prisoners of conscience in Tibet. Other witnesses at the hearing included Harry Wu and Katherine Ho who corroborated the monk's testimony. Their witness to torture brought tears to my eyes.

On October 10, the second picture, a mob destroyed several Christian churches in Situbondo, Indonesia. At the time, some official sources maintained that this might not be religious persecution, that the churches just might have been random targets. But the slogans that were painted on the church by the people who burned it (the translation is "Jesus Excrement"—and they used a word far worse than that—"Mother Mary Communist") leave no room for doubt.

The third picture, this was a church in which an elderly minister, his wife and two children and a young woman who worked at the church were burned to death. The next picture shows their charred bodies burned almost beyond recognition.

At the funeral of their five victims, the caskets had to be closed because the persecutors had done their work so well.

This next picture, Mr. Chairman, is the last view of Reverend Noor Alam, a Christian clergyman who was murdered in front of his family in Pakistan by a mob who first brought down the walls of his under-construction church building on December 6, 1997, and later killed him by lynching. Lynching has become increasingly common in Pakistan in recent years, as have convictions of Christians and other religious dissenters for blasphemy. The most recent tragedy to result from this spiral of violence was the death of Catholic Bishop John Joseph, who took his own life in public protest after a member of his diocese was sentenced to death for blasphemy. At Bishop Joseph's funeral, the mourners chanted, "End persecution of Christians." The police fired tear gas and bullets that wounded three people, including a young girl.

Picture No. 6 on my left, this picture is of a Sudanese Christian boy in a refugee camp in Kenya. A member of a congressional staff delegation, led by my staff director, Joseph Rees, asked him why he was afraid to return to

Sudan. He said, "Because I want to see." If Members look closely, his eye has been plucked out. The staff member asked who tortured him. He said they did it because of his religious beliefs.

Mr. Chairman, let me speak briefly to two objections raised by the administration in their talking points against the bill. First, they say that by protecting victims of religious persecution in a bill that does not address other human rights violations, we are establishing a so-called hierarchy of human rights. This is a bogus argument and unworthy of those who employ it. The argument clearly ignores some very basic facts about the legislative process. Not every bill can address every subject. By addressing one urgent problem in this bill, we are not denying the existence of other urgent problems that should be addressed by other legislation or by other means.

Under the administration's argument, it would have been wrong to enact the Jackson-Vanik amendment which protected freedom of immigration and had the laudatory consequence of protecting Soviet Jews and others who had been denied right to emigrate. We risked superpower confrontation with the Soviet Union because we believed Soviet Jews mattered and we would never again turn our back on persecuted Jews?

Not even the anti-apartheid sanctions against South Africa in the 1980s, which I supported and voted for would pass the test proposed by the State Department's talking points, because those sanctions were designed to help victims of racial discrimination and racial persecution but did not address freedom of religion or other important human rights. Frankly, if we stuck to the administration's talking points, no important human rights legislation would ever pass because no bill, no matter how good, can do everything.

Next, the administration suggests that it is wrong for Congress to enact what they call "automatic sanctions"—sometimes they call them "one size fits all" sanctions—even against the most brutal governments. But we have to wonder whether whoever wrote those talking points had actually read the bill. The sanctions are not automatic. They will not go into effect if the President waives them, and he can waive them for either national security reasons or because he believes that the waiver will serve the objective of promoting religious freedom.

Let me just remind my colleagues, this is a very generous waiver. The only way we could go further would be to give the President the freedom to do absolutely nothing at all in the face of severe, widespread and ongoing human rights violations and persecution. In evaluating legislation that deals with persecution of any kind, we must always remember that tyrants understand strength. They also understand weakness. Of all the millions of people who are victimized by tyrants around

the world, many are in trouble because they share our values. This bill is designed to help our brothers and sisters around the world who have faith and suffer because of it.

Wei Jingsheng, who also testified before our subcommittee, a great leader of human rights who spent his life in the gulag because of it, said: "If I did not see it myself, even I could not imagine the shameful and despicable means the Communists use against religious believers."

Religious persecution is on the rise. This bill puts us on a track of saying we will no longer look the other way. We will stand up for those brethren who are suffering.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON). He stated the case about as well as one can. The problem that this bill creates for me is that it pits individuals one side on the other, as though some Members are in favor of religious persecution and do not want to do anything about it and other Members really care and they want to do this.

The problem with that argument is that it is not clear what automatic kinds of sanctions really do. We are presently in the midst of automatic sanctions under the nuclear explosions in India. We are very likely to have automatic sanctions against Pakistan. And the question is, how many, what is the ramification of that when we give the President no flexibility to tailor or to craft a response to an event that all of us deplore? There is nobody on this floor that thinks India should have exploded nuclear devices, absolutely none. The question is whether or not the President has the ability to craft.

The bill before us says, on page 21, the President shall instruct the United States executive director of each multilateral development bank and the International Monetary Fund to vote against and use his or her best efforts to deny any loan or other utilization of funds of their respective institutions.

It also talks about the Eximbank.

Now, what we are talking about here? Let us just take Indonesia. We have the largest Muslim country in the world in tremendous chaos. Their currency is in real problems, and the International Monetary Fund has been working with them under our leadership to gradually give them money when they make changes. We have pushed on the issue of corruption. We have pushed on a number of issues. And what we are saying is, we are going to back out of Indonesia and leave it, leave the President no way to deal with that.

I think this is wrong to put the President of the United States in that position. Therefore, I will vote against it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), our majority leader, a staunch advocate of human rights and religious freedom throughout the world.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

I want to personally, if I may, personally thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his work on this legislation and his uncompromising commitment to move it through the House. I would like to appreciate the work of the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

This bill has been examined from every possible angle. It is prepared. It is ready. And while it is assertive on the question of religious liberties and freedom from religious persecution, it is also mindful of and respectful of the affairs of state with respect to matters of less importance in the lives of people, matters such as monetary systems and trade relationships.

It does allow flexibility.

Let me just focus for a moment on the essential purpose of this bill. The purpose of this bill is for this great Nation to stand before the world and say we cannot condone and we will not tolerate nations that persecute people on the basis of their practice of religious faith. That is not only fundamental but I think is absolutely prerequisite to and essential to our observation of all of our liberties.

As we study the religions of the world, in each and every case the religions of the world define, in the hearts and the minds of their practitioners, the fundamentals from which other understandings of rights, liberties, and responsibilities are gathered.

In my own faith, we know beyond a shadow of a doubt that freedom is a right granted to us by God Almighty, our Creator. And from our recognition of that and our desire to honor that, we develop an appreciation of, a respect, a practice of and a requirement for so many other liberties.

I do not want to stand before my colleagues as an economist and say that monetary systems are not important, that systems of trade are not important. Of course, these things are important. But let me ask my colleagues: Would you not allow others to say and would you not endorse all others across the Nation to say what you know and I know we would say in our own heart and for our own life? If you take away from me the right to my faith, can these other things even matter?

Without the right of each and every person on this globe to know they are free, respected, supported and honored to practice their faith, most certainly they will be lost and in the end so will we. So let us stand together in support of this legislation, and with a clear declaration we require for all the peoples of the world the same respect, freedom, and dignity we require for ourselves.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) for yielding the time.

First of all, I want to say that this is a very, very difficult subject because it digs right down into our emotions, our religious beliefs and what is right and what is wrong.

I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I am sure he is a far better Christian than I am. I am sure he really has thought through this thing very carefully. I just come out on a different side of this thing.

I talked a little bit about this last night, so therefore I will not go into all the sort of philosophic background here. I just would like to make a few points.

First of all, there is not anybody that I know of who likes persecution, particularly those people who are being persecuted. The worst kind of persecution, of course, is religious persecution.

□ 1230

And we would all like to have it stopped, period, end of it. The question is how do we get at it?

It seems to me that when we want to help somebody, we should make sure that the people we want to help want to be helped. That is a sort of a basic human axiom. And the research I have done and the contacts I have made, particularly through the National Council of Churches, or through other friends I have had in the world, I have traveled around to different parts of this world and talked not only to business and political, but also religious leaders, not a single religious group wants this.

So I am saying, why are we doing this? Why are we superimposing our feeling of guilt upon people who do not want us to get involved?

Now, there are a lot of horror stories, and I am sure I can give them on either side, but the question is, do we want to put ourselves in a position of sort of being post-colonial arbiters of what is right and what is wrong as far as religion is concerned?

People are scared. Dr. Billy Graham's son is scared for what will happen in China. I know some of the people in Russia are scared of what will happen there. I know people in Sudan are scared. I have talked to somebody who is the titular head of 29 million Muslims in Indonesia; they are scared of what the United States is doing.

There are always horrifying acts. We had one in Waco. Obviously, there was one in Israel when Prime Minister Rabin was shot. But these are fringe religious groups, and no government can control fanatical religions. It is wrong to, therefore, label a government because of those fanatics.

We must be sure that as we reach out to the rest of the world, we are attuned to what they need, what they want,

what are those things which are so important to them, not just how we approach it. Because it is those people that we will affect.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to very briefly respond.

A large number of national and international religious groups support this legislation, including the B'nai B'rith, National Association of Evangelicals, the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Conference, the Anti-Defamation League, the Southern Baptist Convention on Ethics and Religious Liberty, the National Jewish Coalition, the International Campaign for Tibet, the Religious Action Center for Reformed Judaism, the Union of Orthodox Congregations of America, Campus Crusade for Christ, the Seventh Day Adventist Church, the Salvation Army, National Religious Broadcasters, and I can go on and on. But large numbers of religious bodies wholeheartedly embrace this legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure those people the gentleman just referred to feel very deeply about this, but I want to say in response to that that I have not had a single letter from anybody other than Washington or New York who has espoused this. None from overseas.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from Wei Jingsheng, who spent 17 years in prison, who was earlier with us today. He said, "I strongly believe that the freedom of religious belief is one important component of man's fundamental human rights." And he goes on to say, "The true situation may be difficult for Americans to imagine, and it is difficult for the Chinese to imagine. If I did not see it myself, a man in prison for 17 years, I would not imagine the shameful and despicable means."

Many of these groups around the world all support this bill, but they are afraid to come forward because if they do, they may very well be killed. We get communication daily from groups in all these countries that say they support what we are doing, but they are afraid to come forward publicly.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for his passionate advocacy for the persecuted and for bringing this to our attention.

I have had the opportunity to participate in the debate in the committee on this most important issue. I do think this bill is important for all of us in dealing with these tragedies.

I stand before my colleagues in support of this legislation, knowing that religious persecution is a problem in

this world. And we always have to remind ourselves why the United States of America was created. How did it get its roots? Why did people come to the United States? And let us always be respectful to all religions and all faiths and all beliefs in the world.

Nearly 2 years ago I cosponsored House Resolution 515, condemning persecution of Christians worldwide. Since that time I have been closely involved in trying to craft better policies for us to address religious persecution worldwide. I wholeheartedly support the attention that this bill has brought to the issue and a number of its provisions, particularly in training our foreign service and immigration officers.

Still, we have more progress to make to reach our goal of the most effective, comprehensive legislation possible. We must address, report on and respond to religious persecution not only at its most violent stage of rape, murder and torture as defined in this bill, but before it escalates to such terrible levels.

We must also have more tools to address persecution rather than sanctions only in an all-or-nothing approach policy for all countries in the world. Sometimes the means will be diplomatic, sometimes economic, but let us look at all the foreign policy tools to bring about changes in the world and end religious Christian persecution in the world that does exist.

Support the Wolf legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH).

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I first want to stand and show strong support for the chairman, and I believe that this particular sponsor, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FRANK WOLF), is doing something that all America wants him to do. He is saying that all policy in America has to have a heart and all policy has to have a conscience.

This bill says that all constructive engagement, as the President likes to say, will keep in mind the religious freedom of all people.

Now, earlier today several speakers have said this takes away all the latitude from the President. This bill is drafted in a way that the moment his administration makes a recommendation that there is gross, very strong religious persecution in a country and there should be sanctions, he can immediately say no to the sanctions.

It just simply says that he has to stop being silent. It simply says that we as a Nation will declare that religious persecution, that persecution of any kind, is wrong; that this is an America that stands for freedom, for liberty, and for religious liberty. These are the things America stands for.

Now, the President calls for constructive engagement, and yet he is silent on harvesting livers and corneas from religious and political prisoners in China. Is this constructive engagement? He was silent on the Tibetan

monks being tortured and murdered because of their faith. He has been silent on the Government of Sudan intensifying attacks upon Christians and tribal faiths.

I guess if that is the policy, we need this bill, because although it does not do a whole lot toward making the President do anything, it does make him break his silence on all of the things that are going on in the world. Whether it be in China, whether it be in Pakistan, if America does not stand for freedom, if America does not stand for the worker and the family all over the world, then what is America?

I say today that this bill does one thing: It says America has a conscience and America has a heart, and I think we should pass it today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

I appreciate the many changes that its sponsors have made to prevent it from having the devastating impact it would have had in its original form on our trade and security interests and on our ability to provide the leadership the world needs to prevent the very persecution the bill seeks to punish.

I oppose the bill because it is fundamentally flawed. It would force the United States to treat government-sponsored or -permitted persecution, that is, killing, imprisonment, enslavement, forced mass relocation, rape, torture and the confiscation of property differently if these crimes were committed against people for their religious beliefs than if these crimes were committed against people for their political beliefs or for ethnic cleansing. That is just not right.

American foreign policy has always opposed religious persecution, political oppression, ethnic cleansing policies. It is profoundly unwise to adopt a policy that implies that government-supported persecution is more acceptable if used for political oppression and ethnic cleansing than for religious persecution. This is what this bill would do.

This bill sets up a very bureaucratic mechanism that encourages an automatic sanctions process without any consideration as to whether or not the sanctions would hurt American interests or have any effect on the sanctioned country. Most seriously, it discourages the broader range of diplomatic and multilateral actions that would have a far greater impact.

Furthermore, government-sponsored persecution should provoke a far more comprehensive response than this bill envisions. Under current law we have the full range of diplomatic tools at our disposal, even recalling our ambassador and working to mobilize multilateral sanctions, always more effective a multilateral response than a single-nation response.

I appreciate how deeply troubled my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), is by religious persecution,

but I oppose setting up a separate bureaucracy, a rigid process to identify and respond to religious persecution as opposed to a comprehensive response to such violations of human rights for political and ethnic origin as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor and to express my gratitude to him for giving us this opportunity today to speak out for American values.

It is interesting for me to hear some of our colleagues, who have always opposed any initiatives that we have on this floor on human rights in every aspect, political, freedom of the press, religious, to come to the floor now and say, oh, no, we cannot support this because it is only about religion and it creates a hierarchy. They were not there for us when we had the full array.

We have an opportunity today with this religious persecution act to begin to address the full array, and it is an opportunity that I believe we must take.

My colleagues have said no one likes religious persecution. Of course we do not, and I would stipulate that every person in this body is viscerally and intellectually opposed to religious persecution. But the business community is once again weighing in and saying, oh, this bill does not go far enough in terms of protecting human rights throughout the world. If this was not such a serious matter, that would almost be laughable. It is pathetic.

But, Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to say that what this bill does is give recognition to the persecution of people on the basis of their religious faith. What it does not do is tie the President's hands. Indeed, it gives the President more leverage. It gives him more leverage because he can then say to a country that this is what the Congress has said: I can exercise a waiver if I see that it would be beneficial to the cause and in our national interest. But the persecuting country must demonstrate that use of the waiver would be beneficial.

So I believe that this is appropriate. I think the Committee on International Relations did an excellent job in modifying the legislation so that it would have the support of many more people here who were concerned about the Presidential discretion.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate this bill today, I am sad to report that in China the Catholic bishop, elderly and frail Bishop Zeng Jingmu, 78 years old, who is the unofficial bishop of Yuijiang, a diocese among the poorest in China, was at the top of the list of the jailed Catholics in China.

Perhaps my colleagues saw recently on May 10 the news in the paper that he had been released. Did my colleagues know that he was imprisoned for his Catholic beliefs? Maybe not, but, oh, there was great celebration when this was released. But released he was not; he was assigned to house arrest.

An elderly Catholic bishop whose health is failing, who had been assigned to 3 years in a reform-through-labor camp, was, in order to get some kudos from the Clinton administration, freed from the labor camp and put under house arrest.

The problems are severe. This legislation is modest and moderate. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for giving us the opportunity to vote our conscience today. I urge my colleagues to support the Wolf legislation.

□ 1245

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 11¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while I salute the intention of the authors of this legislation, I rise to strongly oppose this bill, freighted as it is with unintended consequences.

This legislation would put our foreign policy and our trade policy on auto pilot to be dictated by an unelected bureaucrat in the bowels of the State Department. It would insert America into a surprising range of domestic policy disputes in Muslim nations where Shiites suppress Shunites, or vice versa, in Germany, in France, in Greece, in Turkey, Mexico, even in Egypt and Israel.

But most importantly, Mr. Chairman, if we are to pursue the dubious course of using clumsy, unilateral trade sanctions indiscriminately to change the domestic policies of our trading partners, why is it that under this bill we would restrict our ability to export to offending nations but not their ability to export to the United States?

This bill would increase our trade deficit. And in the end, the only human rights that this legislation is certain to affect is the right of many American workers to earn a living. Vote it down.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3806, the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act.

Like every American, I am committed to continued U.S. leadership on religious freedom. But, I am deeply concerned that this bill—however well intentioned—could backfire badly.

In addition, I am deeply worried that a one size-fits-all strategy, based on using unilateral U.S. sanctions to promote Christianity and reli-

gious freedom, could put American interests and security at risk.

If implemented, this legislation could impose U.S. sanctions over such longstanding allies as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey, Great Britain, Mexico, Greece and Germany.

This bill could also oblige us to impose U.S. economic sanctions on the world's key emerging powers—China and Russia.

U.S. sanctions could be profoundly destabilizing from the standpoint of ensuring continued global peace.

Scenario 1: Should the United States impose economic sanctions of Saudi Arabia—a key ally—because it has put down a riot by Iranian Shiites who are on pilgrimage to the holy sites of Mecca?

Scenario 2: Should the United States sanction Israel, because it has imprisoned Hamas terrorists who engage in violence against the innocent in the name of Islamic fundamentalism?

As Members of Congress, we need to look long and hard before we push America into each and every religious conflict through unilateral economic sanctions, which history shows can backfire on American interests.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could join in a colloquy with the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

I am wondering if it is the understanding of the gentleman that under this bill there is no general prohibition of exports to a country which is deemed to contain responsible entities who are committing religious persecutions, as defined by the director of the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, but rather, the ban on export covers only those to the responsible entities themselves?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EWING. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) is correct. Under this bill, exports of items other than persecution facilitating products are prohibited from being exported only to the responsible entities themselves, such as prisons or slave labor camps, as the case may be, and not to the country generally. Furthermore, under this act, "responsible entities" are to be defined as narrowly as possible.

Mr. EWING. So, then, if I understand the gentleman, if a farmer exports grain to a country that the director of the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring deems to contain responsible entities engaged in religious persecution, and exports that grain to other parties either governmental or private that are not deemed by the Director to be responsible entities, the farmer has not violated this act?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would further yield, that is absolutely correct. Under this act, there is no blanket prohibition on exports but only exports to the responsible entities engaged in persecution.

Furthermore, I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) that if a farmer or exporter exports grain to a country deemed to contain responsible entities engaged in religious persecution but sends the grain to a party other than a responsible entity, the gulag, that farmer or exporter has not violated this act even if the grain eventually reaches the responsible entity itself.

Mr. EWING. So there is no provision in this act that would punish the farmer or exporter if the product exported eventually reached a responsible entity?

Mr. WOLF. That is correct. There is no requirement that the exporter know or be responsible for the ultimate end user of his product, but only that the exporter does not export to those found by the director to be responsible entities engaged in religious persecution.

Mr. EWING. And is it the understanding of the gentleman that under this act there is no prohibition on P.L. 480, GSM, or other commodity-related aid from the United States Government to other nations under this act?

Mr. WOLF. Yes. Under the definition of "United States assistance" in this act, any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is barred. However, this definition of "United States assistance" explicitly carves out an exemption for "assistance which involves the provision of food, including the monetization of food."

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman for answering my questions.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2431.

This bill, The Freedom From Religious Persecution Act, is a well-intentioned piece of legislation but it is sadly misguided. I think like every Member of this body, I share the belief that every individual, wherever they are in the world, ought to be able to practice their faith freely without fear of harassment or persecution. And if I believed for one minute that this bill would enhance that right, I would use every tool at my disposal to ensure its passage. But the sad fact is it will not. In fact, it may do the opposite.

The problem of this bill is the problem that is at the core of all sanctions legislation. It allows Members of Congress to feel like they are taking actions to solve the legitimate foreign policy problem, without taking any responsibility for the long-term consequences of their actions or the unintended impacts of this legislation.

My greatest fear is that this bill will actually lessen tolerance for religious freedom abroad. Let me explain why I say that. Today there are a large number of faith-based organizations performing missionary work abroad, organizations such as East Gates Ministries, working in China to distribute Bibles and provide religious training to

the Chinese people. These people that work for these organizations, empowered by their faith, work daily under very harsh and dangerous conditions, subjecting themselves to the scrutiny and the whims of their host governments.

A bill such as The Freedom From Religious Persecution Act could seriously jeopardize their ability to continue performing missionary activities abroad. Imagine for a moment that they were a foreign government or a representative. All of a sudden they are singled out for condemnation and automatic economic sanctions by the United States because of their actions, even because of actions that are beyond their control, towards Christians, Jews, Muslims or any other religious sect.

In many nations the response is not going to be to openly embrace the criticism levied but to respond in more predictable ways, to rally around the flag, embrace their nationalistic roots, retaliate against those who antagonize them.

In fact, we are seeing this in India today. And by the way, if we had given away all of our sanctions on religious persecution in India, we would not have anything today to deal with the nuclear proliferation problem.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to have the courage to vote no on this bill. Do not place the work of those who do missionary work abroad in jeopardy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) senior member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It has been said that the opposite of love is not hate but indifference. And unfortunately, American indifference to religious persecution lends our tacit, if indirect, support and approval of some of the most awful abuses of human rights, particularly abuses of a right we sometimes take for granted, which of course is the freedom of religion.

As a senior member of the House Committee on International Relations, I have heard a great deal of testimony about the persecution of individuals abroad, persecution based solely on religious beliefs.

In committee we heard about the atrocities committed by the Chinese Government against Tibetan Buddhists. We heard eye-witness testimony of frightened, weak, and near starving Tibetans who traveled hundreds of miles, often barefoot with nothing but the shirt on their back, over the cold and often deadly Himalayan Mountains into India to seek relief.

Most Americans would be shocked to learn that Christians in the Sudan are actually sold into slavery on a daily basis. Those Buddhist monks and others that I mentioned, the Chinese Government rapes, tortures, and murders

them. The execution of religious minorities in Iran is almost commonplace.

The business community is concerned how economic sanctions will hurt American businesses abroad. And as chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I take a back seat to no one in supporting American business. But as Americans who live under the protection of the first amendment, we must make it clear that the almighty dollar does not and will not take precedence over American values and morals, the beliefs upon which this great Nation was founded.

Religion is a very personal matter to me, and I am proud to be part of this exercise today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

(Mr. DOOLEY Of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, we all rise today in opposition of religious persecution. There is not one Member of this House that does not abhor the religious persecution that we find all too often, far too frequently in many parts of the world.

But I guess where there is a fundamental difference is whether or not we are going to be most effective in turning back religious persecution by taking actions which further isolate some of the countries which are the worst perpetrators of that act.

Many of us contend that by engaging both economically, socially and culturally, we are going to be far more effective in ensuring that the citizens of the countries throughout the world will not be subject to the degree of religious persecution that now persists.

I rise in opposition to this bill today because I sincerely believe that we will be shutting the door on perhaps the greatest opportunity we have in order to improve the plight of people throughout the various countries of the world.

I think when I look at the issues of sanctions, that is what brings me to the greatest concern. Because I think all too often we have seen the implementation of sanctions that in fact have actually worked to the detriment of the very people that we are trying to help. And I am also very concerned that when we also take actions that are going to impose economic sanctions that are focused primarily on preventing the exportation of goods which are produced by working men and women of the United States, it is going to be our citizens who are going to be paying a good portion of the economic cost of this legislation.

We need to be diligent in our efforts to ensure that we are going to eliminate religious persecution, but let us not tie the hands of the administration, let us not tie the hands of our President. Let us not empower a director of this new department with the

sole responsibility of making a determination on which people are being persecuted and which portion or entity of the government is responsible for that entity.

I very much believe that this is a measure that once again will not advance the interests of freedom and religious freedom throughout the world, and I rise in opposition.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this legislation.

I want to first of all commend my friends the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for their very hard work on this bill. This is a very moderate and reasoned and sensible approach to a problem that is, unfortunately, growing very rapidly around the world.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor, and I am also pleased that such a wide array of religious organizations have endorsed this bill.

Many immigrants came to our country over 200 years ago to practice religion as they chose and be free from religious persecution. And if we just look above the Speaker's rostrum, we see the words "in God we trust." This serves as a reminder of how important religion has been and is to this Nation.

Religious freedom is one of the most basic of all human rights, one of the most basic human rights that any individual can have. This legislation does not apply to simply one religion or just one religion, it applies to them all. No matter what a person's faith or beliefs, people around the world should be able to worship as they wish, free from fear of abduction and enslavement, imprisonment, murder, rape, torture and so forth. And believe me, that is occurring around this world, those types of things, even as we speak.

I first became interested in this after reading a portion of Nina Shea's recent book called "The Lion's Den." In that book Nina Shea said this, quote:

Millions of American Christians pray in their churches each week, oblivious to the fact that Christians in many parts of the world suffer brutal torture, arrest, imprisonment, and even death, their homes and communities laid waste, for no other reason than that they are Christians. The shocking untold story of our time is that more Christians have died in this century simply for being Christians than in the first 19 centuries after the birth of Christ.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is deplorable. In addition, I read a recent interview by Michael Horowitz, a leader in speaking out against this persecution.

□ 1300

Mr. Horowitz, who happens to be Jewish, says in a recent interview, "I am speaking out on behalf of persecuted Christians precisely because I am a Jew in the most deeply rooted sense. I see eerie parallels," Mr. Horowitz said, "between the way the elites of the world are dealing with Christians who have become the scapegoats of choice for thug regimes around the world and the way the elites dealt with the Jews when Hitler came to power."

"Another parallel is the tongue-tied silence of the Christian community in the face of persecution. A similar silence was evident in the years leading to the Holocaust. Silence, anybody's silence in the face of persecution, is deadly. So for me," Mr. Horowitz said, "sparking our campaign for awareness in action is the most important thing I expect to do. What thugs did to Jews, they are now doing to Christians. Christians are become the Jews of the 21st Century."

All faiths, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, people from all walks of life have joined in support of this very important bill. This is good legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that some Members are supporting this bill out of frustration with what they perceive as the apparent lack of progress on foreign religious persecution issues.

I would like to share with the body comments made in an editorial opinion by Samuel Berger, the President's National Security Advisor. Mr. Berger says what I believe is something critical that we need to pay attention to. He says that, "Moreover, the more the United States is perceived as making unilateral, peremptory judgments on the performance of other countries, the less we will be able to work with those countries, including on issues of religious freedom."

Mr. Chairman, I have had the good fortune, along with many Members in this body, to travel to a significant number of countries in the world. In each delegation that I participated in, be it in China or in Africa or elsewhere, we have raised the subject of religious persecution.

I traveled to China with the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the template of our remarks to all of the Chinese interlocutors had to do with religious persecution in China.

I traveled to China with the Speaker of the House. In each instance when we met, ranging all the way from the prime minister to the president to various persons that we were interlocutors with, each time, the subject of religious persecution was among our highest priorities, including those that we share with the concerns for the rule of law.

I traveled to China with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), one of the most respected Members of this body. In each instance, the gen-

tleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and myself and others traveling with us raised subjects of religious persecution.

So long as we are not making those peremptory judgments, so long as we are not acting unilaterally, we have been able to make some progress. With reference to this administration, it needs to be clear that there is more that can be done, but a lot has been done.

Last year, the President imposed sanctions on Sudan because of the persistent and severe persecution of Christians and others by the Government of Sudan. Religious persecution refugees, more than any other category of refugees, we are granting them asylum here in the United States.

The President sent 20,000 United States troops, and most of us in this body backed that effort, to Bosnia to keep the peace to help end religion-based conflict. Secretary of State Albright and other U.S. officials have raised religious persecution in numerous meetings with foreign officials, quiet and sometimes not so quiet.

Diplomacy has reaped dividends. Religious prisoners have been released in China. Christian Orthodox classes have been permitted in Turkey. I have seen evidence of substantial change in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, places where, we formerly knew them as of the Soviet Union.

The Secretary of State has also instructed all United States embassies to upgrade their reporting and advocacy on this issue. Later, I will introduce an amendment that will discuss what we might do to enhance the activities of our embassies with reference to advocacy on the issue of religious persecution.

In Austria and in Greece, United States embassies have succeeded in easing restrictions on religious practices. I, for one, have witnessed and talked with embassy officials in each of those countries and seen the evidence of their work.

The State Departments human rights reports now devote more attention to religious freedom. Procedures for reviewing asylum cases have been modified to increase sensitivity to religious persecution.

In January, the Secretary of State established a new assistant secretary-level coordinator position for issues relating to religious persecution. In essence, that is what this legislation is trying to do at, yet, another level.

I urge the administration to fill that position soon, and it would then allow that we are doing parallel activity with what the administration has done.

At the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the United States has led the successful effort to create a special repertoire on religious intolerance. I can go on and on and on; I shall not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

We need a bill that will not promote a backlash against persecuted religious communities. We need a bill that will

enable the President and the Secretary of State to balance our interests in reducing religious persecution against the full range of important and even vital national interests.

We need a bill that gives the President of the United States the ability to craft an appropriate response to each distinct instance of religious persecution. This is not that bill.

Some of us, in an amendment that I offer, will be trying to make it a little bit better. But this bill falls short in key respects. Specifically, the President's senior advisors intend to recommend that he veto it. I urge Members to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), a good friend and colleague.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support today of the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act.

I would like to start my time by going back to the beginning of our Nation, correspondence between the Hebrew Newport congregation and a letter written to our first President, George Washington.

It says "Deprived as we hitherto have been of the invaluable rights of pre-citizens, we now, with a deep sense of gratitude to the Almighty Disposer of all events, behold a government erected by the majesty of the people, a government which to bigotry gives no sanction, to persecution no assistance, but generously affording to all liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship, deeming everyone of whatever nation, tongue, or language equal parts of the great government."

George Washington's response to the Hebrew Congregation at Newport, Rhode Island, "The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation; for, happily, the government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

This is what we are trying to do today, to say that our Nation, which was founded on the cornerstone of the freedom of conscience, of religious liberty, that we will give no assistance to those who persecute people of faith.

Today I would like to share a little of my own experience that I bring to this debate, for I lived in a Communist country in 1986 and 1987, in Budapest, Hungary.

I saw during that time, before the collapse of communism, what happens when religious freedoms are deprived. I met with ministers who had been in prison for practicing their faith. I saw the refugees who had fled their countries into the West with the hopes and the dream of having the freedom to practice their faith, to capture the dream that we cherish in this land of freedom.

Then I saw in my lifetime, and we have seen in our lifetime, the modern-day miracle of Jericho where we saw the walls of communism collapse. We have to ask ourselves why. If you go to Poland, it was the church, the Catholic church that led the descent.

In Czechoslovakia and Romania, it was the Protestant church which allowed the people of faith and courage and conviction to rise up and to stand for their God-given rights which brought about as much as anything that we ever did in the West with military containment. It was the force of the religious convictions and conscience that brought about the renewal and the reform and the collapse of a brutal and evil system.

Today we are trying to say we should have the same policy, that we stand with the persecuted, that we stand for the same cornerstone in our country of religious liberty. From that, we will have greater economic freedom, greater trade, greater democracy across the world. We will have greater stability with our allies. This is the cornerstone of our Nation, to stand with those to have the freedom of conscience and faith.

I ask all of my colleagues that we follow the words of our founder George Washington, that we give to bigotry no sanction, to persecution, no assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and all the other Members of this House and this body who have worked to fight against the persecution of people of faith throughout the world.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, because I believe that we can no longer ignore the cruelty of some government authorities around the world that has been directed towards people whose only crime is faith in God.

We must not forget that there are those who are suffering in other countries; people are being tortured, enslaved, and killed for their beliefs. This bill will send a clear and resounding message that the United States does not support this violation of human rights and religious freedom.

Abraham Lincoln, the President who is probably best noted for his work to free those who were enslaved and mistreated, once said, "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and under a just God, cannot long retain it."

If enacted into law, this bill will impose immediate sanctions on those countries that have mistreated and

abused Christians and people of other faiths, time and time again.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 30 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining portion of my time.

Mr. Chairman, last night, I listened to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) who, on both sides of the aisle, is respected, not only in this arena, but for his evenhanded approach to trying to develop bipartisan efforts.

Last night, he spoke agonizingly, as I do now, about this particular legislation. We would want to dispel the notion that there are any among the 435 of us who would stand and say we favor religious persecution anywhere in the world. We do not. And that is all of the Republicans and all of the Democrats and all of those on the committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in 1984, on one of several human rights trips to Romania, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), and myself pushed for the release of persecuted Christians and, in particular, Father Calcu.

For over a decade, during both the Carter and the Reagan administrations, Father Calcu endured unspeakable tortured beatings, solitary confinement in coffins that were vertical. Yet, the world, the State Department, everybody said, Ceausescu, the dictator in Romania was somehow a good guy, we need to work with him.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) said it well. Hate is not the opposite of love; indifference is. This bill ends our indifference, our bipartisan indifference towards religious persecution.

□ 1315

Religious persecution has been and it is today the orphan of human rights. We need to stand strong. This is against religious persecution, things like torture. I urge support for this bill, hopefully in a very bipartisan way.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 2431, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act. This bill would reassert the position that the United States is a defender of personal liberty, including the liberty to choose and practice one's religion.

The Freedom From Religious Persecution Act makes significant changes in U.S. policy that will help identify and terminate discrimination against religions around the world. The bill calls for the creation of the office of Religious Persecution Monitoring within the State Department. This office will make an annual report on the existence and extent of religious persecution around the world.

This report will be the basis for punitive sanctions against countries who take part in or allow religious persecution. Some may say

that the United States should not interfere in others' business. Yet the United States has always stood for personal liberties and unalienable rights. For us to stand by and be mute while thousands of people are discriminated against or killed for their faith, would be unacceptable.

Did you know that in China, a 76 year-old Protestant leader was sentenced to 15 years in prison for merely passing out bibles? And in Iran, some religious groups are denied the right to organize and worship and have no legal rights. Worst of all, in Sudan, government soldiers have systematically enslaved and murdered thousands of people because they are Christians.

I know the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act will not end suffering throughout the world. But it will put the United States on record as a nation that is concerned with the fundamental right of people to follow their faith. I am pleased to be able to support legislation that will make a real difference in the lives of those who aren't free to practice their own religion.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, persecution for one's religious beliefs is wrong. It should not be permitted anywhere, and this bill, the "Freedom from Religious Persecution Act," has the important and laudable goal of intending to reduce and eliminate the widespread and ongoing religious persecution taking place throughout the world today. The United States, as a world leader, should do what we can to eradicate this human rights abuse. This Nation was founded on principles of religious freedom, and we have thriving faith communities today because of our commitment to those principles. Persecution is reprehensible, and we need to pursue all appropriate ways to stop it.

The bill seeks to achieve its objective by increasing the priority attached in U.S. foreign policy to the problem of religious persecution. The bill would impose sanctions on foreign governments that carry out or condone serious religious persecution. Also, the bill would seek to increase the refugee and asylum protections available to victims of religious persecution.

While I want to end religious persecution globally, there are defects in this bill that do not permit me to support the measure as reported to the House. The bill's automatic sanctions, which include restrictions on exports and foreign assistance would be counterproductive. Further, these measures will tie the President's hands in areas of foreign policy where the executive has traditionally had discretion in the exercise of his constitutional duties and powers to promote the full range of U.S. interests—including national security, economic prosperity, and respect for all human rights.

Our laws and policies already give significant weight to human rights, and I would support strict and severe sanctions against repressive governments under current law. Further, it is unlikely that the imposition of sanctions, as provided in this bill, would have much effect on governments that are of a mind to persecute people on account of their faith.

Such automatic sanctions risk strengthening the grip of those who permit or undertake religious intolerance in their countries. Sanctions may trigger reprisals against victims as well as an end to American engagement with offending governments. Furthermore, by establishing

sanctions and preferential treatment for those fleeing religious persecution alone, the bill would signal to the world that this Nation believes in an inappropriate hierarchy of human rights violations. What about our efforts toward universal respect for all civil and political rights? Severe and violent acts of persecution on ethnic, racial, or political grounds, for example, would not invoke these sanctions or bring about procedural advantages in the immigration context.

Although some religious organizations have expressed their support for the measure, others have stated that this bill would do more harm than good for the very people it seeks to protect. Clearly, we need to foster religious tolerance and respect for all human rights around the world. But we must do it in a proper fashion that helps, not hurts those that deserve our help.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to announce that I will vote for the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act. I am compelled, however, to express some deep concerns that I have with this legislation.

Religious persecution around the world is intolerable. All people should have the freedom to express their faith without fear of retribution. Tragically, the persecution of religious communities has claimed the lives of millions of people in this century, and today continues unchecked in many countries. Clearly, steps must be taken to stop this dangerous trend and I commend the authors of this bill for raising awareness in Congress about religious persecution.

Although I strongly support the spirit of this bill, I have some questions about the legislation that we are voting on today.

My first concern is that this bill could possibly bring harm to those who suffer from religious persecution, if the government in question chooses to blame religious groups for the imposition of U.S. sanctions. We surely would not want to endanger the safety and well-being of the very people we are trying to protect.

Additionally, I am troubled that this bill establishes a "hierarchy of human rights". If passed, religious persecution—as important as it may be—would be seen as a higher priority than other human rights—such as racial discrimination, violations of women's rights, and the suppression of free speech.

Instead of establishing a new office at the White House, I wonder if it wouldn't be more efficient to leave the issue of religious freedom to be dealt with in the State Department's human rights bureau. Religious persecution is an unforgivable crime around the globe, but our efforts to combat it must not be allowed to damage our fight for other critical human rights.

I will vote in favor of this bill today, because it sends a strong message against intolerable religious persecution. But I hope when the bill is considered in the Senate, and then in conference, we can roll up our sleeves to draft a better bill, that will work not only to end these unforgivable practices, but to help those who are oppressed all around the world.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support of H.R. 2431, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act. It is high time that Congress take decisive steps to stop foreign governments from jailing, torturing or killing people, just because of their religious beliefs. We must also

hold accountable those nations which are aware that religious bigotry is occurring within their borders, but do nothing of consequence to stop this injustice.

This legislation would require our government to stop giving non-humanitarian foreign aid to nations that persecute people for their religious beliefs. It would also require American executives who sit on the board of international banking institutions to oppose the issuance of loans to countries that practice or support religious persecution.

The Government of Sudan is one particular big offender in this regard. Sudan's main political party, the National Islamic Front, is responsible for the deaths of an estimated 1.3 million Christians and others who failed to recognize Islam as their faith.

Of course, Sudan is not the only nation with blood on its hands. The People's Republic of China has a history of imprisoning and killing citizens who refuse to register with one of the state's official religions, institutions where worship is organized and controlled by the government.

Some countries which practice or facilitate religious persecution, such as Pakistan, may even be allies of America when it comes to national security issues. But we still have an obligation as Americans to defend freedom. Just as America fought the spread of Communism during the Cold War, today, the United States must pour its heart and soul into stopping religious persecution. One good step towards this goal is by Congress passing the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act.

Mr. NADLER, Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act.

This bill is vitally important to combat the violent religious persecution that is tragically occurring in many nations across the world.

We need more effective tools to end the threats of murder, torture, rape, starvation, and enslavement now faced by millions of people of faith. I believe this bill would strengthen the United States' ability to promote human rights and effectively confront regimes that are abusive to religious minorities in their countries.

However, the United States must do more to become a safe haven for those fleeing persecution. Our current expedited removal procedures for asylum seekers are inhumane, dangerous, and morally offensive.

Asylum seekers ought to have a fair hearing before an immigration judge before they are sent back to a country where they may be threatened, beaten, or even killed.

Unfortunately, the provisions in this bill that would have made our immigration policy slightly more humane were removed from the legislation. I think we are making a big mistake. In fact, the provisions that would have protected asylum seekers fleeing religious persecution should have been expanded to aid those seeking asylum based on racial persecution, ethnicity, membership in a social group, or political opinion.

Our nation must never turn its back on those fleeing persecution. It is offensive to our American tradition, our cultural heritage, and the very nature of our republic.

This legislation does, however, for the first time require the GAO to conduct a study of airport deportations, so that we may gather data about the abuses that may be occurring in our immigration practices. What is happening to the people we turn away? How many

people are we sending to their deaths? We need this information, and I am hopeful that once we have it we can revisit our immigration policy and end the shameful practice of turning away those who are seeking asylum from persecution.

Let me reiterate that I strongly support this legislation, I only wish it were stronger. I urge my colleagues to take an important step to protect human rights worldwide and vote for this legislation.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, the right to religious freedom should be a fundamental right that every citizen enjoys.

Indeed, our nation was founded on this premise.

Yet sadly, there are nations where being a Muslim, a Jew, a Christian, or any of a number of other religions, can cause you great harm.

It's difficult for many of us who live in a nation where everyone can worship as he and she chooses without fear of persecution to even imagine the possibility of being thrown in jail or being killed because of whom you pray to.

This brutal suppression of religious freedom, of course, is reprehensible.

And President Clinton has made securing religious freedom for people of all faiths a priority in our foreign policy.

The State Department has expanded coverage of religious freedom in its annual human rights report.

And the Administration has created an Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad.

In addition, the Secretary of State will be creating a senior-level coordinator responsible for integrating religious freedom into our foreign policy.

These stepped-up actions by the Clinton Administration will help us in persuading governments to prevent limitations on religious freedom.

Our current law already provides an adequate basis for us to impose sanctions on foreign governments when we need to take tough action.

So the question is: do we continue our policy of being quietly effective, using the wide range of tools in our foreign policy toolbox to get things done—or do we engage in a policy of ranting and raving that may backfire, causing more harm than good.

Public condemnation of governments that do not provide religious freedom often is appropriate.

Our President has not been shy about using the bully pulpit to criticize governments that don't do right by their citizens.

But this bill would make condemnation automatic—a situation not always appropriate that very well might put religious prisoners and their families in further jeopardy.

It also may jeopardize our efforts in other political and economic arenas that we use to improve relations that will result in tolerance for religious diversity.

That is the wrong approach.

We should be bold in our actions without jeopardizing our foreign policy and our broad global interests.

That's why our current policy is the best route to achieving the means that all of us here want to achieve.

You can be sure that some may use this bill in the Fall campaign to position those who are against it as being against religious freedom.

Chances are that the 30-second sound bites and the direct mail pieces that say "voted against the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act" already are in the works.

It is sad that some will seek political gain on an issue so delicate, but that is the state of politics in this day and age.

Make no mistake: no one who opposes this bill believes that killing, enslaving, or jailing those who practice their faith is just.

We abhor it.

But we believe there's a smarter way to put an end to these practices.

America is the greatest nation in the world because of our leadership in foreign affairs and the bridges we have built nations around the world.

We decry religious persecution whenever we see it.

While this legislation is good intentioned, it handcuffs our ability to have the flexibility we need to end religious persecution.

Let's not put our best efforts to stop religious persecution at risk with an ill-advised policy that is blind to policies that are effective on a nation-to-nation and case-to-case business.

Allow our diplomats to work effectively to allow religious freedom around the world.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

I cannot condone any government that abuses the rights of its citizens whether it is for abuses in the category of human rights, democracy, freedom of speech, press. Likewise religious persecution is equally as important. This is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Today people all over the world are still persecuted for their beliefs. Many are living in constant terror and some even fear for their lives.

Christians, Muslims, Jews, and many others are singled out. Even in places like Germany, China, the North of Ireland, and the Sudan people are being persecuted for their religion.

In China officials crack down on unregistered Protestant house church members simply for practicing their religious beliefs. The situation in Sudan remains intolerable. In May the Popular Defense Force of the National Islamic Front (NIF) regime raided several villages, burning homes, schools, and two churches. Furthermore, it was reported that children of the black Africans in Sudan are being enslaved and forced to change their cultural identity and become Arabic-speaking Muslims. The Christian Solidarity International (CSI) estimates that there are tens of thousands of chattel slaves still in bondage in the borderlands between northern and southern Sudan.

Sudan has often been described as one million miles of suffering. A million southern Sudanese deaths over the past decade, executions of political opponents, the thousands of slaves that are branded like cattle to show ownership combined with the capture of some 3,000 ['95 & '96] children by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) aided by the al-Bashir government did not go unheeded.

Violations of religious freedom in this world are innumerable. Hopefully, we will be able to live in a world where people can practice their religion peacefully without any threat or fear. Once again, I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2431, the "Freedom

From Religious Persecution Act of 1997." As Americans, we too often take for granted the freedoms we enjoy to practice our faith and live according to our moral, ethical and spiritual beliefs. What we must not forget is that all over the world, people are being persecuted on the basis of their religious beliefs, and I believe we have an obligation to do what we can to protect them.

It seems that every day we are greeted with horrifying accounts of religious persecution, involving forced relocation, enslavement, rape, starvation, torture and even murder. Perhaps most disturbing is that these atrocities are sanctioned by and carried out under the orders of foreign governments and local authorities. It is clearly not enough to simply urge these brutal regimes to grant their citizens the same religious liberties that are enjoyed in this country, and I believe that this legislation represents a necessary step in our efforts to combat the terrible reality of religious persecution.

H.R. 2431 is a moderate and reasoned response to a serious situation. This legislation will link U.S. aid to a country's performance on religious liberty and focuses on the most egregious forms of persecution against all religious groups. It does not impose embargoes, as some of my colleagues have sought to argue, but rather provides for moderate, targeted sanctions against specific governmental entities which have direct involvement in religious persecution. In addition, the bill permits waivers for national security reasons and in situations where sanctions are deemed by the president to be counter-productive.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this important legislation, and I will take great pride in casting my vote in favor of its passage. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the religious freedom of all of our brothers and sisters around the world by voting yes on H.R. 2431.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank my friend and colleague FRANK WOLF for his consistent and strong leadership in bringing this vital issue in front of the Congress, and for his determination to focus attention on one of the most critical human rights crises of our day, religious persecution. He has been a voice crying in the wilderness for many years, speaking out for Tibetans in China, Christians in Sudan, and Bahai's in Iran, and I am proud of the work we have done together on these and other important human rights issues. I also want to thank the leadership of the House International Relations Committee—specifically Mr. GILMAN and Mr. SMITH—for shepherding this bill through the legislative process and for their commitment to human rights.

As co-chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I have spent many hours in hearings and briefings receiving testimony from persons all over the world who have suffered from the most serious kinds of persecution. In fact, the Caucus was founded in 1983 after I returned from a trip to the former Soviet Union, where I witnessed the harsh religious persecution practiced by that regime. I have met people who have been imprisoned, tortured, raped and who have lost loved ones as a result of religious intolerance. Today, the House has an opportunity to say to the torturers, rapists and murderers "The United States is not going to stand by and allow you to terrorize people who are engaged

in the peaceful practice of their religious beliefs." I call on all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

There has been a great deal of talk about what H.R. 2431 does and does not do. Once you cut through all of the hyperbole, it is clear that this is a reasonable and modest approach to a very serious issue. No government on this planet should receive U.S. assistance if they are engaged in the type of gross violations of human rights that are specified in this bill. No government should fail to take action against those who perpetrate these abuses, and continue to receive the benefit of U.S. foreign aid. In these times of fiscal constraint, America's foreign assistance programs have been cut to the bone. Every year, worthy projects and applicants go unfunded due to a lack of funds. In this climate, it is morally and fiscally reprehensible to allow abusive or grossly negligent regimes to receive aid. H.R. 2431 remedies this situation without punishing the innocent victims because it only cuts off non-humanitarian aid. This is an even-handed and compassionate response to the abuse of human rights.

I urge all Members to vote for this bill and send our support to those who suffer for their faith in silence and obscurity around the world.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3806, modified by the amendments printed in part 1 of House Report 105-534, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Freedom From Religious Persecution Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Governments have a primary responsibility to promote, encourage, and protect respect for the fundamental and internationally recognized right to freedom of religion.

(2)(A) Since its inception, the United States Government has rested upon certain founding principles. One of those principles is that all people have the inalienable right to worship freely, which demands that religion be protected from unnecessary government intervention. The Founding Fathers of the United States incorporated that principle in the Declaration of Independence, which states that mankind has the inalienable right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness", and in the United States Constitution, the first amendment to which states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof". Therefore, in accordance with this belief in the inalienable right of freedom of religion for all people, as expressed by the Declaration of Independence, and the belief that religion should be protected from government interference, as expressed by the United States Constitution, the Congress opposes international religious persecution and believes that the policies of the United States Government and its relations with foreign governments should be consistent with the commitment to this principle.

(B) Numerous international agreements and covenants also identify mankind's inherent right to freedom of religion. These include the following:

(i) Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance".

(ii) Article 18 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights declares that "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion . . ." and further delineates the privileges under this right.

(iii) The Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion and Belief, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on November 25, 1981, declares that "religion or belief, for anyone who professes either, is one of the fundamental elements in his conception of life . . ." and that "freedom of religion and belief should also contribute to the attainment of the goals of world peace, social justice and friendship among peoples and to the elimination of ideologies or practices of colonialism and racial discrimination".

(iv) The Concluding Document of the Third Follow-Up Meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe commits states to "ensure in their laws and regulations and in their application the full and effective exercise of the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief".

(3) Persecution of religious believers, particularly Roman Catholic and evangelical Protestant Christians, in Communist countries persists and in some cases is increasing.

(4) In many countries and regions thereof, governments dominated by extremist movements persecute non-Muslims and religious converts from Islam using means such as "blasphemy" and "apostasy" laws, and such movements seek to corrupt a historically tolerant Islamic faith and culture through the persecution of Baha'is, Christians, and other religious minorities.

(5) The extremist Government of Sudan is waging a self-described religious war against Christians, other non-Muslims, and moderate Muslims by using torture, starvation, enslavement, and murder.

(6) In Tibet, where Tibetan Buddhism is inextricably linked to the Tibetan identity, the Government of the People's Republic of China has intensified its control over the Tibetan people by interfering in the selection of the Panchen Lama, propagandizing against the religious authority of the Dalai Lama, restricting religious study and traditional religious practices, and increasing the persecution of monks and nuns.

(7) In Xinjiang Autonomous Region of China, formerly the independent republic of East Turkistan, where the Muslim religion is inextricably linked to the dominant Uyghur culture, the Government of the People's Republic of China has intensified its control over the Uyghur people by systematically repressing religious authority, restricting religious study and traditional practices, destroying mosques, and increasing the persecution of religious clergy and practitioners.

(8) In countries around the world, Christians, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and other religious believers continue to be persecuted on account of their religious beliefs, practices, and affiliations.

(9) The 104th Congress recognized the facts set forth in this section and stated clearly the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives regarding these matters in approving—

(A) House Resolution 515, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the persecution of Christians worldwide;

(B) S. Con. Res. 71, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the persecution of Christians worldwide;

(C) H. Con. Res. 102, concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i community; and

(D) section 1303 of H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997.

(10) The Department of State, in a report to Congress filed pursuant to House Report 104-863, accompanying the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-208) set forth strong evidence that widespread and ongoing religious persecution is occurring in a number of countries around the world.

(11)(A)(i) In recent years there have been successive terrorist attempts to desecrate and destroy the premises of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Fanar area of Istanbul (Constantinople), Turkey.

(ii) Attempts against the Ecumenical Patriarchate have intensified, including the following:

(I) On September 30, 1996, a hand grenade was thrown into the headquarters of the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchate and exploded, causing damage to the physical structure of the grounds, most notably the Agios Georgios Church.

(II) On May 28, 1994, three powerful bombs were discovered in the living quarters of the Patriarch, and were subsequently defused only minutes before they were set to detonate.

(III) In July and August 1993, the Christian Orthodox cemetery in Yenikoy, near Istanbul, was attacked by vandals and desecrated.

(iii) His All Holiness Patriarch Bartholomew and those associated with the Ecumenical Patriarchate are Turkish citizens and thus must be protected under Turkish law against blatant and unprovoked attacks toward ethnic minorities.

(iv) The Turkish Government arbitrarily closed the Halki Patriarchal School of Theology in 1971.

(v) The Ecumenical Patriarchate is the spiritual center for more than 250,000,000 Orthodox Christians worldwide, including approximately 5,000,000 in the United States.

(vi) It is in the best interest of the United States to prevent further incidents regarding the Ecumenical Patriarchate and in the overall goals of the United States to establish peaceful relations with and among the many important nations of the world that have substantial Orthodox Christian populations.

(B) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(i) the United States should use its influence with the Turkish Government and as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council to suggest that the Turkish Government—

(I) ensure proper protection for the Patriarchate and all of the Orthodox faithful residing in Turkey;

(II) provide for the proper protection and safety of the Ecumenical Patriarch and Patriarchate personnel;

(III) establish conditions that would prevent the recurrence of past terrorist activities and vandalism and other personal threats against the Patriarch;

(IV) establish conditions to ensure that the Patriarchate is free to carry out its religious mission; and

(V) do everything possible to find and punish the perpetrators of any provocative and terrorist acts against the Patriarchate; and

(ii) the Secretary of State should report to the Congress on an annual basis on the status and progress of the concerns expressed in clause (i).

(b) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this Act to reduce and eliminate the widespread and ongoing religious persecution taking place throughout the world today.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring established under section 5.

(2) **LEGISLATIVE DAY.**—The term “legislative day” means a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session.

(3) **PERSECUTED COMMUNITY.**—The term “persecuted community” means any religious group or denomination whose members have been found to be subject to category 1 or category 2 persecution in the latest annual report submitted under section 6(a) or in any interim report submitted thereafter under section 6(c) before the next annual report.

(4) **PERSECUTION FACILITATING PRODUCTS.**—The term “persecution facilitating products” means those crime control, detection, torture, and electroshock instruments and equipment (as determined under section 6(n) of the Export Administration Act of 1979) that are directly and substantially used or intended for use in carrying out acts of persecution described in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(5) **CATEGORY 1 PERSECUTION.**—The term “category 1 persecution” means widespread and ongoing persecution of persons on account of their religious beliefs or practices, or membership in or affiliation with a religion or religious group or denomination, whether officially recognized or otherwise, when such persecution—

(A) includes abduction, enslavement, killing, imprisonment, forced mass relocation, rape, crucifixion or other forms of torture, or the systematic imposition of fines or penalties which have the purpose and effect of destroying the economic existence of persons on whom they are imposed; and

(B) is conducted with the involvement or support of government officials or agents, or pursuant to official government policy.

(6) **CATEGORY 2 PERSECUTION.**—The term “category 2 persecution” means widespread and ongoing persecution of persons on account of their religious beliefs or practices, or membership in or affiliation with a religion or religious group or denomination, whether officially recognized or otherwise, when such persecution—

(A) includes abduction, enslavement, killing, imprisonment, forced mass relocation, rape, crucifixion or other forms of torture, or the systematic imposition of fines or penalties which have the purpose and effect of destroying the economic existence of persons on whom they are imposed; and

(B) is not conducted with the involvement or support of government officials or agents, or pursuant to official government policy, but which the government fails to undertake serious and sustained efforts to eliminate, being able to do so.

(7) **RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES.**—The term “responsible entities” means the specific government units, as narrowly defined as practicable, which directly carry out the acts of persecution described in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(8) **SANCTIONED COUNTRY.**—The term “sanctioned country” means a country on which sanctions have been imposed under section 7.

(9) **UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.**—The term “United States assistance” means—

(A) any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including programs

under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of that Act, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation), other than—

(i) assistance under chapter 8 of part I of that Act;

(ii) any other narcotics-related assistance under part I of that Act or under chapter 4 or 5 of part II of that Act, but any such assistance provided under this clause shall be subject to the prior notification procedures applicable to reprogrammings pursuant to section 634A of that Act;

(iii) disaster relief assistance, including any assistance under chapter 9 of part I of that Act;

(iv) antiterrorism assistance under chapter 8 of part II of that Act;

(v) assistance which involves the provision of food (including monetization of food) or medicine;

(vi) assistance for refugees; and

(vii) humanitarian and other development assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations under chapters 1 and 10 of that Act;

(B) sales, or financing on any terms, under the Arms Export Control Act, other than sales or financing provided for narcotics-related purposes following notification in accordance with the prior notification procedures applicable to reprogrammings pursuant to section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and

(C) financing under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

(10) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) any United States citizen or alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence into the United States; and

(B) any corporation, partnership, or other entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION AND SCOPE.

The responsibility of the Secretary of State under section 5(g) to determine whether category 1 or category 2 persecution exists, and to identify persons and communities that are subject to such persecution, extends to—

(1) all foreign countries in which alleged violations of religious freedom have been set forth in the latest annual report of the Department of State on human rights under sections 116(d) and 502(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)); and

(2) such other foreign countries in which, either as a result of referral by an independent human rights group or nongovernmental organization in accordance with section 5(e)(2) or otherwise, the Director has reason to believe category 1 or category 2 persecution may exist.

SEC. 5. OFFICE OF RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION MONITORING.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There shall be established in the Department of State the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Office”).

(b) **APPOINTMENT.**—The head of the Office shall be a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of pay not to exceed the rate of pay in effect for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) **REMOVAL.**—The Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

(d) **BARRED FROM OTHER FEDERAL POSITIONS.**—No person shall serve as Director while serving in any other position in the Federal Government.

(e) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.**—The Director shall do the following:

(1) Consider information regarding the facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom presented in the annual reports of the Department of State on human rights under sections 116(d) and 502(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)).

(2) Make findings of fact on violations of religious freedom based on information—

(A) considered under paragraph (1); or

(B) presented by independent human rights groups, nongovernmental organizations, or other interested parties, at any stage of the process provided in this Act.

When appropriate, the Director may hold public hearings subject to notice at which such groups, organizations, or other interested parties can present testimony and evidence of acts of persecution occurring in countries being examined by the Office.

(3) On the basis of information and findings of fact described in paragraphs (1) and (2), make recommendations to the Secretary of State for consideration by the Secretary in making determinations of countries in which there is category 1 or category 2 persecution under subsection (g), identify the responsible entities within such countries, and prepare and submit the annual report described in section 6.

(4) Maintain the lists of persecution facilitating products, and the responsible entities within countries determined to be engaged in persecution described in paragraph (3), revising the lists in accordance with section 6(c) as additional information becomes available. These lists shall be published in the Federal Register.

(5) In consultation with the Secretary of State, make policy recommendations to the President regarding the policies of the United States Government toward governments which are determined to be engaged in religious persecution.

(6) Report directly to the President and the Secretary of State, and coordinate with the appropriate officials of the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of the Treasury, to ensure that the provisions of this Act are fully and effectively implemented.

(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.**—

(1) **PERSONNEL.**—The Director may appoint such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Office.

(2) **SERVICES OF OTHER AGENCIES.**—The Director may use the personnel, services, and facilities of any other department or agency, on a reimbursable basis, in carrying out the functions of the Office.

(g) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.**—The Secretary of State, in time for inclusion in the annual report described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 6, shall determine with respect to each country described in section 4 whether there is category 1 or category 2 persecution, and shall include in each such determination the communities against which such persecution is directed. Any determination in any interim report described in subsection (c) of section 6 that there is category 1 or category 2 persecution in a country shall be made by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 6. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Director shall submit to the Committees on Foreign Relations, the Judiciary, Appropriations, and Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and to the Committees on International Relations, the Judiciary, Appropriations, and Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS OF ANNUAL REPORT.—The annual report of the Director shall include the following:

(1) DETERMINATION OF RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.—A copy of the determinations of the Secretary of State pursuant to subsection (g) of section 5.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF PERSECUTION FACILITATING PRODUCTS.—With respect to each country in which the Secretary of State has determined that there is either category 1 or category 2 persecution, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall identify and list the items on the list established under section 6(n) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 that are directly and substantially used or intended for use in carrying out acts of religious persecution in such country.

(3) IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES.—With respect to each country in which the Secretary of State has determined that there is category 1 persecution, the Director shall identify and list the responsible entities within that country that are engaged in such persecution. Such entities shall be defined as narrowly as possible.

(4) OTHER REPORTS.—The Director shall include the reports submitted to the Director by the Attorney General under section 9 and by the Secretary of State under section 10.

(c) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Director may submit interim reports to the Congress containing such matters as the Director considers necessary, including revisions to the lists issued under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b). The Director shall submit an interim report in the case of a determination by the Secretary of State under section 5(g), other than in an annual report of the Director, that category 1 or category 2 persecution exists, or in the case of a determination by the Secretary of State under section 11(a) that neither category 1 or category 2 persecution exists.

(d) PERSECUTION IN REGIONS OF A COUNTRY.—In determining whether category 1 or category 2 persecution exists in a country, the Secretary of State shall include such persecution that is limited to one or more regions within the country, and shall indicate such regions in the reports described in this section.

SEC. 7. SANCTIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON EXPORTS RELATING TO RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.—

(1) ACTIONS BY RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—With respect to any country in which—

(A) the Secretary of State finds the occurrence of category 1 persecution, the Director shall so notify the relevant United States departments and agencies, and such departments and agencies shall—

(i) prohibit all exports to the responsible entities identified in the lists issued under subsections (b)(3) and (c) of section 6; and

(ii) prohibit the export to such country of the persecution facilitating products identified in the lists issued under subsections (b)(2) and (c) of section 6; or

(B) the Secretary of State finds the occurrence of category 2 persecution, the Director shall so notify the relevant United States departments and agencies, and such departments and agencies shall prohibit the export to such country of the persecution facilitating products identified in the lists issued under subsections (b)(2) and (c) of section 6.

(2) PROHIBITIONS ON U.S. PERSONS.—(A) With respect to any country in which the Secretary of State finds the occurrence of category 1 persecution, no United States person may—

(i) export any item to the responsible entities identified in the lists issued under subsections (b)(3) and (c) of section 6; and

(ii) export to that country any persecution facilitating products identified in the lists issued under subsections (b)(2) and (c) of section 6.

(B) With respect to any country in which the Secretary of State finds the occurrence of category 2 persecution, no United States person may export to that country any persecution facilitating products identified in the lists issued under subsections (b)(2) and (c) of section 6.

(3) PENALTIES.—Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of paragraph (2) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 16 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 16 (a) and (b)(1)) for violations under that Act.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROHIBITIONS.—The prohibitions on exports under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall take effect with respect to a country 90 days after the date on which—

(A) the country is identified in a report of the Director under section 6 as a country in which category 1 or category 2 persecution exists,

(B) responsible entities are identified in that country in a list issued under subsection (b)(3) or (c) of section 6, or

(C) persecution facilitating products are identified in a list issued under subsection (b)(2) or (c) of section 6, as the case may be.

(b) UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.—

(1) CATEGORY 1 PERSECUTION.—No United States assistance may be provided to the government of any country which the Secretary of State determines is engaged in category 1 persecution, effective 90 days after the date on which the Director submits the report in which the determination is included.

(2) CATEGORY 2 PERSECUTION.—No United States assistance may be provided to the government of any country in which the Secretary of State determines that there is category 2 persecution, effective 1 year after the date on which the Director submits the report in which the determination is included, if the Secretary of State, in the next annual report of the Director under section 6, determines that the country is engaged in category 1 persecution or that category 2 persecution exists in that country.

(c) MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) CATEGORY 1 PERSECUTION.—With respect to any country which the Secretary of State determines is engaged in category 1 persecution, the President shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each multilateral development bank and of the International Monetary Fund to vote against, and use his or her best efforts to deny, any loan or other utilization of the funds of their respective institutions to that country (other than for humanitarian assistance, or for development assistance which directly addresses basic human needs, is not administered by the government of the sanctioned country, and confers no benefit on the government of that country), effective 90 days after the Director submits the report in which the determination is included.

(2) CATEGORY 2 PERSECUTION.—With respect to any country in which the Secretary of State determines there is category 2 persecution, the President shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each multilateral development bank and of the International Monetary Fund to vote against, and use his or her best efforts to deny, any loan or other utilization of the funds of their respective institutions to that country (other than for humanitarian assistance, or for development assistance which directly addresses basic human needs, is not administered by the government of the sanctioned country, and confers no benefit on the government of

that country), effective 1 year after the date on which the Director submits the report in which the determination is included, if the Secretary of State, in the next annual report of the Director under section 6, determines that the country is engaged in category 1 persecution or that category 2 persecution exists in that country.

(3) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—If a country described in paragraph (1) or (2) is granted a loan or other utilization of funds notwithstanding the objection of the United States under this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Congress on the efforts made to deny loans or other utilization of funds to that country, and shall include in the report specific and explicit recommendations designed to ensure that such loans or other utilization of funds are denied to that country in the future.

(4) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term "multilateral development bank" means any of the multilateral development banks as defined in section 1701(c)(4) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(4)).

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROVISIONS.—The effective dates of the sanctions provided in this section are subject to sections 8 and 11.

(e) DULY AUTHORIZED INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—The prohibitions and restrictions of this section shall not apply to the conduct of duly authorized intelligence activities of the United States Government.

(f) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The imposition of sanctions under this section shall not affect any contract that is entered into by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation before the sanctions are imposed, is in force on the date on which the sanctions are imposed, and is enforceable in a court of law on such date.

(g) EFFECT OF WAIVERS.—Any sanction under this section shall not take effect during the period after the President has notified the Congress of a waiver of that sanction under section 8 and before the waiver has taken effect under that section.

SEC. 8. WAIVER OF SANCTIONS.

(a) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (b), the President may waive the imposition of any sanction against a country under section 7 for periods of not more than 12 months each, if the President, for each waiver—

(1) determines—

(A) that the national security interests of the United States justify such a waiver; or

(B) that such a waiver will substantially promote the purposes of this Act as set forth in section 2; and

(2) provides to the Committees on Foreign Relations, Finance, the Judiciary, and Appropriations of the Senate and to the Committees on International Relations, the Judiciary, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a written notification of the President's intention to waive any such sanction.

The notification shall contain an explanation of the reasons why the President considers the waiver to be necessary, the type and amount of goods, services, or assistance to be provided pursuant to the waiver, and the period of time during which such a waiver will be effective. When the President considers it appropriate, the explanation under the preceding sentence, or any part of the explanation, may be submitted in classified form.

(b) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In the case of a waiver under subsection (a)(1)(B), the notification shall contain a detailed statement of the facts particular to the country subject to the waiver which justifies the

President's determination, and of the alternative measures the President intends to implement in order to achieve the objectives of this Act.

(c) **TAKING EFFECT OF WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), a waiver under subsection (a) shall take effect 45 days after its submission to the Congress, or on the day after the 15th legislative day after such submission, whichever is later.

(2) **IN EMERGENCY CONDITIONS.**—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions against a country under subsection (b) or (c) of section 7 to take effect immediately if the President, in the written notification of intention to waive the sanctions, certifies that emergency conditions exist that make an immediate waiver necessary.

(d) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that in order to achieve the objectives of this Act, the waiver authority provided in this section should be used only in extraordinary circumstances.

SEC. 9. MODIFICATION OF IMMIGRATION POLICY.

(a) **INADMISSIBILITY OF CERTAIN PARTICIPANTS IN RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) **PARTICIPANTS IN RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.**—Any alien who carried out or directed the carrying out of category 1 persecution (as defined in section 3 of the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act of 1998) or category 2 persecution (as so defined) is inadmissible.”.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to persecution occurring before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **REFUGEES.**—

(1) **GUIDELINES FOR ADDRESSING BIAS AFFECTING REFUGEES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State shall jointly promulgate and implement guidelines for identifying and addressing improper biases, affecting the treatment of persons who may be eligible for admission into the United States as a refugee based upon a claim of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of religion, on the part of—

(A) immigration officers adjudicating applications for admission as a refugee submitted by such persons and interpreters assisting immigration officers in adjudicating such applications; and

(B) individuals and entities assisting in the identification of such persons and the preparation of such applications.

(2) **ADMISSION PRIORITY.**—For purposes of section 207(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, an individual who is a member of a persecuted community, and is determined by the Attorney General to be a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall be considered a refugee of special humanitarian concern to the United States. In carrying out such section 207(a)(3), applicants for refugee status who are members of a persecuted community shall be given priority status equal to that given to applicants who are members of other specific groups of special concern to the United States. This paragraph shall be construed only to require that members of a persecuted community be accorded equal consideration in determining admissions under section 207(a) of such Act, and shall not be construed to require that any particular individual or group be admitted under that section.

(3) **NO EFFECT ON OTHERS' RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this section, or any amendment made by this section, shall be construed to deny any

applicant for asylum or refugee status (including any applicant who is not a member of a persecuted community but whose claim is based on race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion) any right, privilege, protection, or eligibility otherwise provided by law.

(4) **NO DISPLACEMENT OF OTHER REFUGEES.**—Refugees admitted to the United States as a result of the procedures set forth in this section shall not displace other refugees in need of resettlement who would otherwise have been admitted in accordance with existing law and procedures.

(5) **PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND REVIEW.**—Section 207(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, prior to each annual determination regarding refugee admissions under this subsection, there shall be a period of public review and comment, particularly by appropriate nongovernmental organizations, churches, and other religious communities and organizations, and the general public.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to apply subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to the period of review and comment referred to in subparagraph (A).”.

(c) **ASYLEES.**—

(1) **GUIDELINES FOR ADDRESSING BIAS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall develop and implement guidelines for identifying and addressing improper biases, affecting the treatment of persons who may be eligible for asylum in the United States, based upon a claim of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of religion, on the part of immigration officers carrying out functions under section 208 or 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and interpreters assisting immigration officers in carrying out such functions.

(2) **STUDIES OF EFFECT OF EXPEDITED REMOVAL PROVISIONS ON ASYLUM CLAIMS.**—

(A) **STUDIES.**—

(i) **PARTICIPATION BY UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES.**—The Attorney General shall invite the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to conduct a study, alone or in cooperation with the Comptroller General of the United States (as determined in the discretion of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), to determine whether immigration officers described in clause (ii) are engaging in any of the conduct described in such clause.

(ii) **DUTIES OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, alone or, upon request by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, in cooperation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to determine whether immigration officers performing duties under section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens who may be eligible to be granted asylum are engaging in any of the following conduct:

(I) Improperly encouraging such aliens to withdraw their applications for admission.

(II) Incorrectly failing to refer such aliens for an interview by an asylum officer for a determination of whether they have a credible fear of persecution (within the meaning of section 235(b)(1)(B)(v) of such Act).

(III) Incorrectly removing such aliens to a country where they may be persecuted.

(IV) Detaining such aliens improperly or in inappropriate conditions.

(B) **REPORTS.**—

(i) **PARTICIPATION BY UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES.**—The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees may submit to the committees described in

clause (ii) a report containing the results of a study conducted under subparagraph (A)(i) or, if the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees elected to participate in the study conducted under subparagraph (A)(ii), may submit with the Comptroller General of the United States a report under clause (ii).

(ii) **DUTIES OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**—Not later than September 30, 1999, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report containing the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A)(ii). If the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees requests to participate with the Comptroller General in the preparation and submission of the report, the Comptroller General shall grant the request.

(C) **ACCESS TO PROCEEDINGS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), to facilitate the studies and reports, the Attorney General shall permit the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Comptroller General of the United States to have unrestricted access to all stages of all proceedings conducted under section 235(b).

(ii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Clause (i) shall not apply in cases in which the alien objects to such access, or the Attorney General determines that the security of a particular proceeding would be threatened by such access, so long as any restrictions on the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' access under this subparagraph do not contravene international law.

(D) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1999 to carry out this paragraph not to exceed \$1,000,000 to the Attorney General (for a United States contribution to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for the activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees under this paragraph) and not to exceed \$1,000,000 to the Comptroller General of the United States.

(d) **TRAINING.**—

(1) **TRAINING ON RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.**—The Attorney General shall provide training regarding religious persecution to all immigration officers and immigration judges adjudicating applications for admission as a refugee or asylum applications, including—

(A) country-specific instruction on the practices and beliefs of religious groups, and on the methods of governmental and nongovernmental persecution employed on account of religious practices and beliefs; and

(B) other relevant information contained in the most recent annual report submitted by the Director to the Congress under section 6.

(2) **INSTRUCTION BY NONGOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that the Attorney General, in carrying out paragraph (1)(A), should include in the training under the paragraph, where practicable, instruction by nongovernmental experts on religious persecution.

(3) **TRAINING FOR IMMIGRATION OFFICERS ADJUDICATING REFUGEE APPLICATIONS.**—Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) The Attorney General shall provide training in country conditions, refugee law, and interview techniques, comparable to that provided to full-time adjudicators of applications under section 208, to all immigration officers adjudicating applications for admission as a refugee under this section.”.

(e) REPORTING.—Not later than March 30 of each year, the Attorney General shall provide to the Director, for inclusion in the Director's annual report under section 6(b)(4), a report containing the following:

(1) With respect to the year that is the subject of the report, the number of applicants for asylum or refugee status whose applications were based, in whole or in part, on religious persecution.

(2) In the case of such applications, the number that were proposed to be denied, and the number that were finally denied.

(3) In the case of such applications, the number that were granted.

(4) A description of other developments with respect to the adjudication of applications for asylum or refugee status that were based, in whole or in part, on religious persecution.

(5) A description of the training conducted for immigration officers and immigration judges under subsection (d)(1), including a list of speakers and materials used in such training and the number of immigration officers and immigration judges who received such training.

(6) A description of the development and implementation of anti-bias guidelines under subsections (b)(1) and (c)(1).

SEC. 10. STATE DEPARTMENT HUMAN RIGHTS REPORTS.

(a) ANNUAL HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT.—In preparing the annual reports of the State Department on human rights under sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)), the Secretary of State shall, in the section on religious freedom—

(1) consider the facts and circumstances of the violation of the right to freedom of religion presented by independent human rights groups and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) report on the extent of the violations of the right to freedom of religion, specifically including whether the violations arise from governmental or nongovernmental sources, and whether the violations are encouraged by the government or whether the government fails to exercise satisfactory efforts to control such violations;

(3) report on whether freedom of religion violations occur on a nationwide, regional, or local level; and

(4) identify whether the violations are focused on an entire religion or on certain denominations or sects.

(b) TRAINING.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) institute programs to provide training for chiefs of mission as well as Department of State officials having reporting responsibilities regarding the freedom of religion, which shall include training on—

(A) the fundamental components of the right to freedom of religion, the variation in beliefs of religious groups, and the governmental and nongovernmental methods used in the violation of the right to freedom of religion; and

(B) the identification of independent human rights groups and nongovernmental organizations with expertise in the matters described in subparagraph (A); and

(2) submit to the Director, not later than January 1 of each year, a report describing all training provided to Department of State officials with respect to religious persecution during the preceding 1-year period, including a list of instructors and materials used in such training and the number and rank of individuals who received such training.

SEC. 11. TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) TERMINATION.—The sanctions described in section 7 shall cease to apply with respect to a sanctioned country 45 days, or the day

after the 15th legislative day, whichever is later, after the Director, in an annual report described in section 6(b), does not include a determination by the Secretary of State that the sanctioned country is among those in which category 1 or category 2 persecution continues to exist, or in an interim report under section 6(c), includes a determination by the Secretary of State that neither category 1 nor category 2 persecution exists in such country.

(b) WITHDRAWAL OF FINDING.—Any determination of the Secretary of State under section 5(g) may be withdrawn before taking effect if the Secretary makes a written determination, on the basis of a preponderance of the evidence, that the country substantially eliminated any category 1 or category 2 persecution that existed in that country. The Director shall submit to the Congress each determination under this subsection.

SEC. 12. SANCTIONS AGAINST SUDAN.

(a) EXTENSION OF SANCTIONS UNDER EXISTING LAW.—Any sanction imposed on Sudan because of a determination that the government of that country has provided support for acts of international terrorism, including—

(1) export controls imposed pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979;

(2) prohibitions on transfers of munitions under section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act;

(3) the prohibition on assistance under section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(4) section 2327(b) of title 10, United States Code;

(5) section 6 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act Amendments, 1978 (22 U.S.C. 286e-11); and

(6) section 527 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998 (as contained in Public Law 105-118);

shall continue in effect after the enactment of this Act until the Secretary of State determines that Sudan has substantially eliminated religious persecution in that country, or the determination that the government of that country has provided support for acts of international terrorism is no longer in effect, whichever occurs later.

(b) ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS ON SUDAN.—Effective 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following sanctions (to the extent not covered under subsection (a)) shall apply with respect to Sudan:

(1) PROHIBITION ON FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN.—

(A) OFFENSE.—Any United States person who knowingly engages in any financial transaction, including any loan or other extension of credit, directly or indirectly, with the Government of Sudan shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this paragraph:

(i) FINANCIAL TRANSACTION.—The term "financial transaction" has the meaning given that term in section 1956(c)(4) of title 18, United States Code.

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

(I) any United States citizen or national;

(II) any alien lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence;

(III) any juridical person organized under the laws of the United States; and

(IV) any person in the United States.

(2) PROHIBITIONS ON UNITED STATES EXPORTS TO SUDAN.—

(A) PROHIBITION ON COMPUTER EXPORTS.—No computers, computer software, or goods or technology intended to manufacture or serv-

ice computers may be exported to or for use of the Government of Sudan.

(B) REGULATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—The Secretary of Commerce may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subparagraph (A).

(C) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates this paragraph shall be subject to the penalties provided in section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2410) for violations under that Act.

(3) PROHIBITION ON NEW INVESTMENT IN SUDAN.—

(A) PROHIBITION.—No United States person may, directly or through another person, make any new investment in Sudan that is not prohibited by paragraph (1).

(B) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subparagraph (A).

(C) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates this paragraph shall be subject to the penalties provided in section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2410) for violations under that Act.

(4) AVIATION RIGHTS.—

(A) AIR TRANSPORTATION RIGHTS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall prohibit any aircraft of a foreign air carrier owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the Government of Sudan or operating pursuant to a contract with the Government of Sudan from engaging in air transportation with respect to the United States, except that such aircraft shall be allowed to land in the event of an emergency for which the safety of an aircraft's crew or passengers is threatened.

(B) TAKEOFFS AND LANDINGS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall prohibit the takeoff and landing in Sudan of any aircraft by an air carrier owned, directly or indirectly, or controlled by a United States person, except that such aircraft shall be allowed to land in the event of an emergency for which the safety of an aircraft's crew or passengers is threatened, or for humanitarian purposes.

(C) TERMINATION OF AIR SERVICE AGREEMENTS.—To carry out subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary of State shall terminate any agreement between the Government of Sudan and the Government of the United States relating to air services between their respective territories.

(D) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the terms "aircraft", "air transportation", and "foreign air carrier" have the meanings given those terms in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code.

(5) PROHIBITION ON PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES TOURISM.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any provision of law may be available to promote United States tourism in Sudan.

(6) GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN BANK ACCOUNTS.—

(A) PROHIBITION.—A United States depository institution may not accept, receive, or hold a deposit account from the Government of Sudan, except for such accounts which may be authorized by the President for diplomatic or consular purposes.

(B) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit annual reports to the Congress on the nature and extent of assets held in the United States by the Government of Sudan.

(C) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term "depository institution" has the meaning given that term in section 19(b)(1) of the Act of December 23, 1913 (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(1)).

(7) PROHIBITION ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT FROM SUDAN.—

(A) PROHIBITION.—No department, agency, or any other entity of the United States Government may enter into a contract for the

procurement of goods or services from parastatal organizations of Sudan, except for items necessary for diplomatic or consular purposes.

(B) DEFINITION.—As used in this paragraph, the term “parastatal organization of Sudan” means a corporation, partnership, or entity owned, controlled, or subsidized by the Government of Sudan.

(8) PROHIBITION ON UNITED STATES APPROPRIATIONS FOR USE AS INVESTMENTS IN OR TRADE SUBSIDIES FOR SUDAN.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any provision of law may be available for any new investment in, or any subsidy for trade with, Sudan, including funding for trade missions in Sudan and for participation in exhibitions and trade fairs in Sudan.

(9) PROHIBITION ON COOPERATION WITH ARMED FORCES OF SUDAN.—No agency or entity of the United States may engage in any form of cooperation, direct or indirect, with the armed forces of Sudan, except for activities which are reasonably necessary to facilitate the collection of necessary intelligence. Each such activity shall be considered as significant anticipated intelligence activity for purposes of section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413).

(10) PROHIBITION ON COOPERATION WITH INTELLIGENCE SERVICES OF SUDAN.—

(A) SANCTION.—No agency or entity of the United States involved in intelligence activities may engage in any form of cooperation, direct or indirect, with the Government of Sudan, except for activities which are reasonably designed to facilitate the collection of necessary intelligence.

(B) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that no agency or entity of the United States involved in intelligence activities may provide any intelligence information to the Government of Sudan which pertains to any internal group within Sudan. Any change in such policy or any provision of intelligence information contrary to this policy shall be considered a significant anticipated intelligence activity for purposes of section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413).

The sanctions described in this subsection shall apply until the Secretary of State determines that Sudan has substantially eliminated religious persecution in that country.

(C) MULTILATERAL EFFORTS TO END RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN SUDAN.—

(1) EFFORTS TO OBTAIN MULTILATERAL MEASURES AGAINST SUDAN.—It is the policy of the United States to seek an international agreement with the other industrialized democracies to bring about an end to religious persecution by the Government of Sudan. The net economic effect of such international agreement should be measurably greater than the net economic effect of the other measures imposed by this section.

(2) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS TO INITIATE MULTILATERAL SANCTIONS AGAINST SUDAN.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President or, at his direction, the Secretary of State should convene an international conference of the industrialized democracies in order to reach an international agreement to bring about an end to religious persecution in Sudan. The international conference should begin promptly and should be concluded not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) PRESIDENTIAL REPORT.—Not less than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report containing—

(A) a description of efforts by the United States to negotiate multilateral measures to bring about an end to religious persecution in Sudan; and

(B) a detailed description of economic and other measures adopted by the other industrialized countries to bring about an end to religious persecution in Sudan, including an assessment of the stringency with which such measures are enforced by those countries.

(4) CONFORMITY OF UNITED STATES MEASURES TO INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT.—If the President successfully concludes an international agreement described in paragraph (2), the President may, after such agreement enters into force with respect to the United States, adjust, modify, or otherwise amend the measures imposed under any provision of this section to conform with such agreement.

(5) PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENT TO ENTER INTO FORCE.—Each agreement submitted to the Congress under this subsection shall enter into force with respect to the United States if—

(A) the President, not less than 30 days before the day on which the President enters into such agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into such agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) after entering into the agreement, the President transmits to the House of Representatives and to the Senate a document containing a copy of the final text of such agreement, together with—

(i) a description of any administrative action proposed to implement such agreement and an explanation as to how the proposed administrative action would change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement of the President's reasons regarding—

(I) how the agreement serves the interest of United States foreign policy; and

(II) why the proposed administrative action is required or appropriate to carry out the agreement; and

(C) a joint resolution approving such agreement has been enacted.

(6) UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL IMPOSITION OF SAME MEASURES AGAINST SUDAN.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to propose that the United Nations Security Council, pursuant to Article 41 of the United Nations Charter, impose measures against Sudan of the same type as are imposed by this section.

(d) ADDITIONAL MEASURES AND REPORTS; RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT.—

(1) UNITED STATES POLICY TO END RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.—It shall be the policy of the United States to impose additional measures against the Government of Sudan if its policy of religious persecution has not ended on or before December 25, 1998.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on or before February 1, 1999, and every 12 months thereafter, a report containing a determination by the Secretary of State of whether the policy of religious persecution by the Government of Sudan has ended.

(3) RECOMMENDATION FOR IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL MEASURES.—If the Secretary of State determines that the policy of religious persecution by the Government of Sudan has not ended, the President shall prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on or before March 1, 1999, and every 12 months thereafter, a report setting forth such recommendations for such additional measures

and actions against the Government of Sudan as will end that government's policy of religious persecution.

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

(1) GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN.—The term “Government of Sudan” includes any agency or instrumentality of the Government of Sudan.

(2) NEW INVESTMENT IN SUDAN.—The term “new investment in Sudan”—

(A) means—

(i) a commitment or contribution of funds or other assets, or

(ii) a loan or other extension of credit, that is made on or after the effective date of this subsection; and

(B) does not include—

(i) the reinvestment of profits generated by a controlled Sudanese entity into that same controlled Sudanese entity, or the investment of such profits in a Sudanese entity;

(ii) contributions of money or other assets where such contributions are necessary to enable a controlled Sudanese entity to operate in an economically sound manner, without expanding its operations; or

(iii) the ownership or control of a share or interest in a Sudanese entity or a controlled Sudanese entity or a debt or equity security issued by the Government of Sudan or a Sudanese entity before the date of the enactment of this Act, or the transfer or acquisition of such a share or interest, or debt or equity security, if any such transfer or acquisition does not result in a payment, contribution of funds or assets, or credit to a Sudanese entity, a controlled Sudanese entity, or the Government of Sudan.

(3) CONTROLLED SUDANESE ENTITY.—The term “controlled Sudanese entity” means—

(A) a corporation, partnership, or other business association or entity organized in Sudan and owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a United States person; or

(B) a branch, office, agency, or sole proprietorship in Sudan of a United States person.

(4) SUDANESE ENTITY.—The term “Sudanese entity” means—

(A) a corporation, partnership, or other business association or entity organized in Sudan; or

(B) a branch, office, agency, or sole proprietorship in Sudan of a person that resides or is organized outside Sudan.

(5) SUDAN.—The term “Sudan” means any area controlled by the Government of Sudan or by any entity allied with the Government of Sudan, and does not include any area in which effective control is exercised by an entity engaged in active resistance to the Government of Sudan.

(f) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may waive the imposition of any sanction against Sudan under paragraph (2) or (8) of subsection (b) of this section for periods of not more than 12 months each, if the President, for each waiver—

(1) determines that the national security interests of the United States justify such a waiver; and

(2) provides to the Committees on Foreign Relations, Finance, the Judiciary, and Appropriations of the Senate and to the Committees on International Relations, the Judiciary, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a written notification of the President's intention to waive any such sanction.

The notification shall contain an explanation of the reasons why the President considers the waiver to be necessary, the type and amount of goods, services, or assistance to be provided pursuant to the waiver, and the period of time during which such a waiver will be effective. When the President considers it appropriate, the explanation under

the preceding sentence, or any part of the explanation, may be submitted in classified form.

(g) DULY AUTHORIZED INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—The prohibitions and restrictions contained in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7) of subsection (b) shall not apply to the conduct of duly authorized intelligence activities of the United States Government.

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR.—The Director shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Each Federal department or agency responsible for carrying out any of the sanctions under section 7 shall issue all necessary regulations to carry out such sanctions within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order unless printed in part 2 of that report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 105-534.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BRADY

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BRADY:

Page 14, line 9, strike "and".

Page 14, line 10, insert "; and transmit a copy of the report to the Commission on International Religious Persecution established under section 14" before the period.

Page 24, line 2 insert ", the Trade and Development Agency, or the Export Import Bank of the United States" after "Corporation".

Insert the following after section 12 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly:

SEC. 13. PROMOTION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF A RELIGIOUS FREEDOM INTERNET SITE.—In order to facilitate access by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and by the public around the world to international documents on the protection of religious freedom, the Director shall establish and maintain an Internet site containing major international documents relating to religious freedom, each annual report submitted under section 6, and any other documentation or references to other sites as deemed appropriate or relevant by the Director.

(b) TRAINING FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS.—Chapter 7 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 708. TRAINING FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS.

"The Secretary of State and the Director of the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring established under section 5 of the

Freedom From Religious Persecution Act of 1998, acting jointly, shall establish as part of the standard training for officers of the Service, including chiefs of mission, instruction in the field of internationally recognized human rights. Such instruction shall include—

"(1) standards for proficiency in the knowledge of international documents and United States policy in human rights, and shall be mandatory for all members of the Service having reporting responsibilities relating to human rights, and for chiefs of mission; and

"(2) instruction on the international right to freedom of religion, the nature, activities, and beliefs of different religions, and the various aspects and manifestations of religious persecution.".

(c) HIGH-LEVEL CONTACTS WITH NGOS.—United States chiefs of mission shall seek out and contact religious nongovernmental organizations to provide high-level meetings with religious nongovernmental organizations where appropriate and beneficial. United States chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers abroad shall seek to meet with imprisoned religious leaders where appropriate and beneficial.

(d) PROGRAMS AND ALLOCATIONS OF FUNDS BY UNITED STATES MISSIONS ABROAD.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) United States diplomatic missions in countries the governments of which engage in or tolerate religious persecution should develop, as part of annual program planning, a strategy to promote the respect of the internationally recognized right to freedom of religion; and

(2) in allocating or recommending the allocation of funds or the recommendation of candidates for programs and grants funded by the United States Government, United States diplomatic missions should give particular consideration to those programs and candidates deemed to assist in the promotion of the right to religious freedom.

(e) EQUAL ACCESS TO UNITED STATES MISSIONS ABROAD FOR CONDUCTING RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to this subsection, the Secretary of State shall permit, on terms no less favorable than that accorded other nongovernmental activities, access to the premises of any United States diplomatic mission or consular post by any United States citizen seeking to conduct an activity for religious purposes.

(2) TIMING AND LOCATION.—The Secretary of State shall make reasonable accommodations with respect to the timing and location of such access in light of—

(A) the number of United States citizens requesting the access (including any particular religious concerns regarding the time of day, date, or physical setting for services);

(B) conflicts with official activities and other nonofficial United States citizen requests;

(C) the availability of openly conducted, organized religious services outside the premises of the mission or post; and

(D) necessary security precautions.

(3) DISCRETIONARY ACCESS FOR FOREIGN NATIONALS.—The Secretary of State may permit access to the premises of a United States diplomatic mission or consular post to foreign nationals for the purpose of attending or participating in religious activities conducted pursuant to this Act.

(f) PRISONER LISTS AND ISSUE BRIEFS ON RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION CONCERNS.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—To encourage involvement with religious persecution concerns at every possible opportunity and by all appropriate representatives of the United States Government, it is the sense of the Congress that officials of the executive branch of the United States Government

should promote increased advocacy on such issues during meetings between executive branch and congressional leaders and foreign dignitaries.

(2) RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION PRISONER LISTS AND ISSUE BRIEFS.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with United States chiefs of mission abroad, regional experts, the Director, and nongovernmental human rights and religious groups, shall prepare and maintain issue briefs on religious freedom, on a country-by-country basis, consisting of lists of persons believed to be imprisoned for their religious faith, together with brief evaluations and critiques of policies of the respective country restricting religious freedom. The Secretary of State shall exercise appropriate discretion regarding the safety and security concerns of prisoners in considering the inclusion of their names on the lists.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State shall provide these religious freedom issue briefs to executive branch and congressional officials and delegations in anticipation of bilateral contacts with foreign leaders, both in the United States and abroad.

(g) ASSISTANCE FOR PROMOTING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(A) In many nations where severe violations of religious freedom occur, there is not sufficient statutory legal protection for religious minorities or there is not sufficient cultural and social understanding of international norms of religious freedom.

(B) Accordingly, in its foreign assistance already being disbursed, the United States should make a priority of promoting and developing legal protections and cultural respect for religious freedom.

(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR INCREASED PROMOTION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS.—Section 116(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting "and the right to free religious belief and practice" after "adherence to civil and political rights".

(h) INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING.—

(1) Section 302(1) of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 is amended by inserting "and of conscience (including freedom of religion)" after "freedom of opinion and expression".

(2) Section 303(a) of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (6);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) promote respect for human rights, including freedom of religion.".

(i) INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES.—Section 102(b) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking "and" after paragraph (10);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(12) promoting respect for and guarantees of religious freedom abroad by interchanges and visits between the United States and other nations of religious leaders, scholars, and religious and legal experts in the field of religious freedom.".

(j) FOREIGN SERVICE AWARDS.—

(1) PERFORMANCE PAY.—Section 405(d) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "Such service in the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, including the right to religious freedom, shall serve as a basis for granting awards under this section.".

(2) FOREIGN SERVICE AWARDS.—Section 614 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 is amended

by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Distinguished, meritorious service in the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, including the right to religious freedom, shall serve as a basis for granting awards under this section."

SEC. 14. COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.**—

(1) **GENERALLY.**—There is established the United States Commission on International Religious Persecution (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(A) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Commission shall be composed of—

(i) the Director; and

(ii) 4 other members, who shall be appointed as follows:

(I) 2 Senators, 1 of whom shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate upon the recommendations of the Majority Leader, and 1 of whom shall be appointed by the Minority Leader.

(III) 2 Members of the House of Representatives, 1 of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives upon the recommendations of the Majority Leader, and 1 of whom shall be appointed by the Minority Leader.

(B) **CHAIR.**—The Commission shall elect one of its members as chair.

(C) **TIME OF APPOINTMENT.**—The appointments required by subparagraph (A) shall be made not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **TERMS.**—The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be 2 years, except that an individual may not serve more than 2 terms.

(4) **QUORUM.**—Three members of the Commission constitute a quorum of the Commission.

(5) **MEETINGS.**—Not more than 15 days after the issuance of an annual report under section 6, the Commission shall convene.

(6) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.**—The Director shall provide to the Commission such staff and administrative services of the Office as may be necessary for the Commission to perform its functions. The Secretary of State shall assist the Director and the Commission by detailing staff resources as needed and as appropriate.

(7) **COMPENSATION.**—

(A) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Members of the Commission shall receive no pay for services performed as such a member, but shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(B) **NO COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.**—Any member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States shall receive no additional compensation for services performed as a member of the Commission.

(b) **DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **In general.**—The Commission shall have as its primary responsibility the consideration of the facts and circumstances of category 1 or category 2 persecution presented in each annual report issued under section 6 and the consideration of United States Government policies to promote religious freedom and prevent religious persecution, and to make appropriate policy recommendations to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress.

(2) **POLICY REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPONSE TO VIOLATIONS.**—The Commission, in evaluating United States Government policies, shall consider and recommend policy options to further enhance the effective-

ness of sanctions related to religious persecution and human rights.

(3) **POLICY REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPONSE TO PROGRESS.**—The Commission shall make and provide an assessment of—

(A) the progress of sanctions imposed under section 7 on a country or responsible entity toward achieving termination of religious persecution, as well as the potential deterrence of religious persecution as a result of this Act in countries on which sanctions have not been imposed under this Act;

(B) diplomatic and other steps the United States has taken or should take to further accomplish the intended objectives of the sanctions, including the promotion of multilateral adoption of comparable measures;

(C) comparable measures undertaken by other countries;

(D) additional policy options to promote the objectives of this Act and an assessment of their potential effectiveness;

(E) any obligations of the United States under international treaties or trade agreements with which sanctions imposed under section 7 have conflicted or proposed policy options under paragraph (2) may conflict;

(F) any retaliation resulting from sanctions imposed under section 7 and the likelihood that a proposed policy option under paragraph (2) will lead to retaliation against United States interests, including agricultural interests; and

(G) the estimated impact from sanctions imposed under section 7 and proposed policy options under paragraph (2) on United States foreign policy, national security, economic, and humanitarian interests, including benefit or harm to United States businesses, agriculture, and consumers, the competitiveness of United States businesses, and the international reputation of the United States as a reliable supplier of products, technology, agricultural commodities, and services.

(4) **EFFECTS ON RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES AND INDIVIDUALS.**—Together with specific policy recommendations provided under paragraphs (2) and (3), the Commission shall also indicate its evaluation of the potential effects of such policies, if implemented, on the religious communities and individuals whose rights are found to be violated in the country in question.

(5) **MONITORING.**—The Commission shall, on an ongoing basis, monitor facts and circumstances of religious persecution, in consultation with independent human rights groups and nongovernmental organizations, including churches and other religious communities, and make such recommendations as may be necessary to the appropriate agencies and officials of the United States Government.

(c) **REPORT OF THE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Commission shall submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its recommendations for changes in United States policy based on its evaluations under subsection (b).

(2) **CLASSIFIED FORM OF REPORT.**—The report may be submitted in classified form, together with a public summary of recommendations.

(3) **INDIVIDUAL OR DISSENTING VIEWS.**—Each member of the Commission may include the individual or dissenting views of the member.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—The Commission shall terminate 8 years after the initial appointment of its members.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 430, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, America has never run from taking a stand on injustice in this world. It is not in our history, it is not in our heart. I know that the right to freedom of religion is under assault, renewed assault, throughout the world. Religious believers in many countries face severe forms of persecution, torture, beatings, rape, slavery and death for their peaceful beliefs.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we take a stand, not simply denounce, but take a stand. So I appreciate the author of this bill, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), in bringing this dialogue and bill to the floor.

The goal of my amendment is simple, to strengthen the impact of the act, to provide more tools to fight religious persecution, to enhance the accountability and heighten a year-round profile in the fight against religious persecution.

Specifically, this amendment provides more tools, among them establishment of a religious freedom Internet site, expanded international broadcasting, publication of religious prisoner lists, training for foreign service officers and equal access to U.S. missions abroad.

The amendment also expands contract sanctity and establishes a five member U.S. Commission on International Religious Persecution, four Members of Congress and the new director, to promote accountability, to evaluate the progress, to tell us how we are doing and what we can do to do it better, to report on efforts to secure multilateral cooperation, to put more pressure on these sanctioned countries and entities, to identify how America is being retaliated against, to assess the impact on American jobs and interests, and make recommendations to Congress on how we can further effectively act to end religious persecution around this globe.

Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). While the gentleman from Texas may be one of the most junior members of our Committee on International Relations, he is one of the most significant, and a key participant in our committee's deliberations on this bill and many other policy initiatives. The gentleman has offered many helpful suggestions along the way, and has demonstrated over and over again his commitment to the struggle against religious persecution, and I deeply, deeply, respect him.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) today makes further positive contribution to

the bill, and enhances the bill, as he pointed out, in a variety of ways.

I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for his work on behalf of this legislation and his very constructive amendment, and I do urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition at this time to the amendment, but I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for attempting to improve this bill. I know that Mr. BRADY has worked diligently, and I compliment him on his efforts.

The gentleman's amendment contains a number of useful provisions. I do not think these provisions have been as carefully examined as we would like, and, in my view, they do not work well within the context of H.R. 2431. So while at this time I withdraw any of those reservations and will not oppose the efforts of the gentleman, I did at least want to register the reservation, in the hopes that we will continue in the effort to improve this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS.)

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY.) I would like to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his important work crafting this important bill to protect fundamental human rights.

I support this bill because it sends a clear message that the United States supports freedom of religion and human rights worldwide. The bill also contains language I offered to stop the religious persecution of Orthodox Christians in Turkey. The Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul, Turkey, is the spiritual center for nearly 300 million Orthodox Christians worldwide, including 5 million in the United States. It has repeatedly been the target of attacks which have resulted in the deaths of its personnel.

The latest act of violence against the Patriarchate came in December 1997, just months after Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to Patriarch Bartholomew. When he accepted the Congressional Gold Medal last year, the Patriarch emphasized that the Orthodox Church: "May be opposed, but opposes no one; may be persecuted, but does not persecute; is fettered, but chains no one; is derived of

her freedom, but does not trample on the freedom of others."

It is incumbent upon us as leaders of the greatest democratic republic in the world, a Nation founded on the free exercise of religion, to ensure that the Patriarchate is free to carry out its non-political religious mission.

My language urges the United States to use its influence with the Turkish government to protect the Patriarch, the Patriarchate personnel, and all Orthodox faithful residing in Turkey. It also requires the administration to reported to Congress annually on the status of its efforts to achieve these goals.

H.R. 2431 states: "Governments have a primary responsibility to promote, encourage and protect respect for the fundamental and internationally recognized right to freedom of religion."

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 2 printed in part 2 of House Report 105-534.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 15, line 4, insert the following after line 4:

(7) In consultation with the Secretary of State, make policy recommendations to the President that would make a priority of promoting and developing legal protections and cultural respect for religious freedom, including by—

(A) ensuring that funds made available for development assistance are used, among other things, to encourage and promote increased adherence to the right to free religious belief and practice;

(B) ensuring that United States international broadcasting is designed to promote respect for human rights, including freedom of religion, among other broadcasting goals; and

(C) ensuring that United States cultural and educational exchanges promote, among other goals, respect for and guarantees of religious freedom abroad, including through interchanges and visits between the United States and other countries of religious leaders, scholars, and religious and legal experts in the field of religious freedom.

(8) Assist the Secretary of State in establishing a program of granting awards to members of the Foreign Service who have provided distinguished, meritorious service in the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, including the right to religious freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 430, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the bill in committee for a number of reasons, none of which have been addressed by the legislative process up to this point.

One of my key concerns is that this bill takes a negative approach to trying to solve a very, very complex issue. That is why I offer this amendment, which would institute positive incentives to promote religious freedom.

The amendment would authorize the director to weigh in on policy decisions that promote and develop legal protections and cultural respect for religious freedom in several United States programs. This does not mean increasing program costs. It does, however, mean that the current programs attempt to do something to alleviate religious persecution.

The Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad has recommended that the Secretary promote a greater awareness of religious freedom in United States development programs in the broadcast of Radio Asia and the other radio services throughout the world, and in our culture and educational exchanges. The amendment follows through on these very productive suggestions.

The amendment would also reinforce United States Embassies' promotion of religious freedom by rewarding diplomats who have made valuable contributions to international human rights efforts, including the right to religious freedom. I hope and expect this amendment to get unanimous support from my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, while I seek to improve the bill, I must continue to point to two of the very serious concerns with the heart of the bill. First, this bill, in my view, will not help those who suffer from religious persecution, and risks harm to the very communities it seeks to protect. Religious minorities in countries likely to be targeted under this bill fear that they will be blamed and they will suffer for the imposition of U.S. sanctions on their countries.

This was the concern raised by Dr. Youssef Boutros-Ghali, a Coptic Christian and Egypt's Minister of Economy, and by Reverend Joseph Pattiasina, the General Secretary of the Communion of Churches in Indonesia, who said the bill will jeopardize the relationship between the Christians and Islam.

Second, the mandatory automatic sanctions, although that has been modified in many respects, restricts the President's ability to manage the full range of United States national interests, including securing peace and security, economic prosperity, and even protection of other human rights.

A determination of religious persecution against any country would automatically trigger a fixed set of assistance and trade sanctions. No other U.S. interest could be considered in a decision of whether or not to impose such sanctions. This bill forces the United States to use a single, inflexible pre-emptory unilateral weapon, sanctions,

to address issues of immense complexity and scope.

Many countries would be exposed to sanctions under this bill, including Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Indonesia, Pakistan and India. As pointed out by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), we have several national security interests in these countries, heightened only more by the events in the world today, the Middle East peace process, secure oil supplies, nonproliferation, and peace and stability in Asia. These countries buy American products. Sanctions mandated by this bill can and will surely harm some of these interests.

While H.R. 24312 is well-intentioned, it is harmful to American national interests and counterproductive to our shared goal of ending religious persecution. My amendment strengthens this bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment, but I ask unanimous consent to claim the time, since nobody seems to be opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the distinguished member of our Committee on International Relations for his amendment. I strongly urge its adoption.

The amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) expands the responsibilities of the director of the new Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring in several ways. The net effect would be to give the director a role in advising the President and the Secretary of State on additional steps that the United States can take to advance religious freedom around the world, including in such areas as international broadcasting and international exchanges in personnel incentives for State Department employees.

Just to respond, and not to get back to general debate, but the gentleman from Florida raised a couple of issues against the bill. I do hope Members will realize that there is a very generous waiver provision, I think perhaps it is too generous, but it does provide for national security concerns. Also under the provisions of the bill, the sanctions can be waived if the President believes that it would substantially promote the purposes of this act.

It is about time we took religious freedom seriously. This legislation does so.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) earlier in the debate talked about the beheadings going on in Saudi Arabia. Usually they occur when some-

body converts from being a Muslim to Christianity.

That is serious stuff. If we are going to look askance and act indifferent or raise our voice with nothing behind it, those beheadings will continue. But we must say very clearly and unambiguously that beheading people is something out of bounds and is truly egregious behavior, and certainly it is violative of all of the UN conventions, including the Declaration on Intolerance on Religion.

□ 1330

And so the stories need to conform, as do others, to these internationally recognized norms, and beheadings certainly are totally out of bounds, as is any other form of torture.

Mr. Chairman, I hope Members will support the bill, and again, I think this is a good amendment and I support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to thank my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 415, noes 3, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

AYES—415

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady

Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham

Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley

Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin

Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers

Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Siskis
Skeen
Skeltan
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Chenoweth Johnson (WI) Paul

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|----------|------------|-------------|
| Bateman | Hefner | Souder |
| Cannon | Lewis (CA) | Torres |
| Fowler | Quinn | Traficant |
| Gonzalez | Riggs | Weldon (PA) |
| Harman | Skaggs | |

□ 1351

Mr. GOODLATTE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part 2 of House Report 105-534.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2 Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 105-534 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

In section (12)(f), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), strike "paragraph (2) or (8) of subsection (b) of".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 430, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes the national security waiver complete. As the bill left the Committee on International Relations regarding Sudan, because of a jurisdictional dispute between the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on International Relations, the waiver authority given to the President did not extend to all of the sanctions in the Sudan provision of the bill. With my amendment, it would do so.

Mr. Chairman, I will take an additional moment to say that if this amendment is adopted, and I am assured by my good friends that it shall be, I will then be very proud to support this bill. I am proud to stand with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), with the chairman of our committee, with many Members on the other side of the aisle, as well.

I suggest that with this amendment there is really no concern sufficient to oppose this bill from the point of view of the President's conduct with foreign affairs, because with this amendment every aspect of the bill that imposes a sanction can, in appropriate circumstances, be waived.

I also would note the kindness, the consideration that I have received from the authors of this bill through a very long process of drafting it, so that the sanctions which deal with the definition of an agency of a foreign nation are defined as narrowly as practicable,

and so that the items regarding the barriers to export of those items that could facilitate persecution are defined to be only those which are specific, and I read, "directly and substantially used or intended for use in carrying out acts of religious persecution in such country."

With these understandings, the bill, it seems to me, remains a powerful statement against religious persecution, and yet does not interfere with the appropriate role of the President of the United States in foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is, if my amendment is accepted, all sanctions provided for in section 12, referred to in section 2, may be waived.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the author of the bill, so that he might perhaps speak to whether my understanding is correct. I am not seeking a colloquy, I am seeking merely to yield 1 minute.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I thank the gentleman very, very much.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am proud to stand with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of our committee.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished member of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores to the bill a feature first suggested to us by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that we had intended to adopt during markup during our committee, but were unable to adopt because of limitations on our committee's jurisdiction.

The gentleman from California rightly points out that if the President is to have authority to waive sanctions imposed on Sudan pursuant to the bill, he should have authority to waive all of those sanctions, and not just some of them. That is the purpose of the amendment. We welcome the improvement to our bill.

We thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for the close attention he has paid to our bill while we were considering it within our committee. I am grateful for his many positive contributions.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Campbell amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, we have worked very constructively with the gentleman from California on this amendment, as well as

on the bill itself. It has been through a very long and arduous process, two full hearings in the full committee last September, a whole series of hearings in my subcommittee on religious persecution, and then the drafting and redrafting. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has been very vital for that. We thank him for that. We appreciate his support for the full bill in final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) claim the time in opposition?

Mr. HAMILTON. I am not opposed to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I ask unanimous consent to control the time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would say, while I do not support the bill, I do think this amendment improves the bill and it would be my intention to support it and vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), very much for his overall leadership throughout the years on so many important international issues. I also thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the Committee on International Relations.

I rise to support the Campbell amendment, as well to support this legislation. In particular, I think it is extremely important to note that the President has already issued a broad range of waivers and sanctions against Sudan, and I think that this particular legislation that the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has gives the President greater flexibility but as well recognizes that we have responsibility to uphold the needs of the people in Sudan. So I do appreciate this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know how committed the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has been to these issues. That is why I join him, along with my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) who has been very studious on these questions. I think when we begin to educate the American people about persecution, as we have seen and heard and as it has been expressed, abduction and enslavement, killing and imprisonment, forced mass relocation, rape, crucifixion or other forms of torture, then we recognize that the legislation is extremely important.

While many of my constituents have raised those concerns because they are

aware of it, there are others likewise who bring to the table questions of whether or not we should be involved and engaged in unilateral sanctions.

I would simply say that I am looking forward to looking at both sides of the issue and have considered certainly the legislation of the Crane-Hamilton bill. But I think this issue is so very important to us as Americans. It is such an abiding issue for me, religious freedom, the lack of religious persecution, that it begs to be answered.

So I rise to be able to lend my support for the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and to add to the supporters, to acknowledge the International Campaign of Tibet, His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Religious Action Center for Reformed Judaism, the Salvation Army, the Anti-defamation League, a noted Chinese dissident, John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, and Jeff Fiedler, President of the Food and Allied Service Trades.

I think we are being begged for a response. We would be certainly remiss. More than that, it would be tragic not to stand up for religious freedom around this world. We must stand up for those to be allowed to express their beliefs. I thank the leadership, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2431, the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act of 1998. Essentially, this bill is an effort to protect one of the most sacred rights that human beings can enjoy, the right to seek out and worship the divine as they may deem fit. All over the world, nations, sovereign powers and totalitarian groups are restricting the religious freedom of others. From Christians to Jews to Muslims to Bahai's, religious persecution, as we stand on the brink of the next millennium, is a widespread as ever. So, in response to the crisis, this bill establishes a new office in the State Department to monitor religious persecution overseas called the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, directs U.S. sanctions against countries and individuals determined to have engaged in religious persecution and provides asylum for religious refugees as determined by a series of guidelines mandated by the bill.

As our history teaches us, many of the founders of this great nation crossed the imposing gulf of the Atlantic Ocean in order to preserve the sanctity of their personal religious choices. Without reservation, they flatly refused to let others dictate for them who they could worship and how that worship should be conducted. Instead of bowing to the suppression of their beliefs, these brave pioneers of a new and enlightened sense of public governance, chose to protect their freedom above all. Well over two centuries later, this same struggle is being fought again by literally millions of people around the globe who simply refuse to betray their most sacred beliefs about God.

In Sudan, in particular, this struggle has taken on genocidically proportions. Some reports estimate that well over one million people have been killed by the Sudanese govern-

ment, both Christians and Muslims, fighting to preserve their most fundamental religious beliefs. In China, millions of "house church" Christians are forced to worship in absolute secrecy in order to prevent the government from interfering in the practice of their worship. In Tibet, Buddhists have been brutalized, their religious leaders jailed, and their most holy of worship places completely desecrated. In Iran, practicing Bahai's have been met with a rash of sudden executions. And most recently, we have learned about the violent terrorism against Christians in both Pakistan and Egypt, while the government of these nations have simply stood back and watched. So now that we know what is happening around us, what are we going to do about these on-going travesties of justice?

For me, the answer is as simple as this, we must take a stand on these important issues of principle. This bill, in my opinion, is a workable solution to these growing threats to religious freedom surging abroad. First of all, the bill does not exclude any religious groups from its protections. Whether you are Christian, Jew, Muslim, Hindu or something else, if you are persecuted because of your religious beliefs, this bill and its provisions will protect you. Furthermore, this bill is in no way mutually exclusive to any protections that may exist in current law for any other persecuted group. If you are persecuted for race, national origin, political affiliation or some other defining characteristic of personhood, existing federal law still addresses these concerns. Religion, I believe, because of the many on-going tragedies of persecution, terrorism and violence that I listed above, definitely deserves some form of special consideration and treatment. Thus, the necessity of creating a new federal sub-agency to be responsible for this volatile issue.

The newly created Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring in the State Department will be headed by a Director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This director should be recognized as an expert in the area of religious persecution and is barred specifically by the language of the bill, from holding any other federal position while serving in this capacity. More importantly though, this office is empowered by the bill to make findings of fact on any potential violations as discovered by the State Department and submit these findings to the Secretary (of State) and President with recommendations for action. This bill, in sum, is a powerful statement to nations of the world, that we will not countenance the rampant disregard of our fellow man's unalienable rights.

As for the bill's remaining provisions, in regard to the sanctions against aid given to countries that violate the religious freedom of their citizens; we should not, we must not, and we can not sit back and enrich governments that either conduct or condone the persecution of citizens on the basis of their religious beliefs. In all of our policy decisions, we need to show our displeasure with this kind of heinous conduct. And finally, the creation of a structured asylum program for religious refugees is a noble objective; an objective some believe is long overdue.

As people all around the world are celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in their own special way, let's do so in ours. Let's support H.R.

2431, and help to ensure the protection of a freedom for others, that we in this nation often take for granted. The freedom to practice and express one's religious beliefs without interference or persecution. Vote for H.R. 2431.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2431) to establish an Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, to provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 430, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 41,

answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—375

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Edwards | Klug |
| Ackerman | Ehlers | Knoellenberg |
| Aderholt | Ehrlich | Kucinich |
| Allen | Emerson | LaFalce |
| Andrews | Engel | LaHood |
| Archer | Ensign | Lampson |
| Army | Eshoo | Lantos |
| Bachus | Etheridge | Largent |
| Baesler | Evans | Latham |
| Baker | Everett | LaTourette |
| Baldacci | Ewing | Lazio |
| Ballenger | Farr | Leach |
| Barcia | Fattah | Lee |
| Barr | Fawell | Levin |
| Barrett (NE) | Filner | Lewis (GA) |
| Barrett (WI) | Foley | Lewis (KY) |
| Bartlett | Forbes | Linder |
| Barton | Ford | Lipinski |
| Bass | Fossella | Livingston |
| Becerra | Fox | LoBiondo |
| Bentsen | Frank (MA) | Lofgren |
| Bereuter | Franks (NJ) | Lowe |
| Berman | Frelinghuysen | Lucas |
| Berry | Frost | Luther |
| Bilbray | Furse | Maloney (CT) |
| Bilirakis | Galleghy | Maloney (NY) |
| Bishop | Ganske | Manton |
| Blagojevich | Gejdenson | Manzullo |
| Bliley | Gekas | Markey |
| Blunt | Gephardt | Martinez |
| Boehlert | Gilchrest | Mascara |
| Boehner | Gillmor | McCarthy (MO) |
| Bono | Gilman | McCarthy (NY) |
| Borski | Goode | McCollum |
| Boswell | Goodlatte | McCrery |
| Boucher | Goodling | McDade |
| Boyd | Gordon | McGovern |
| Brady | Goss | McHale |
| Brown (FL) | Graham | McHugh |
| Brown (OH) | Granger | McInnis |
| Bryant | Green | McIntosh |
| Bunning | Greenwood | McIntyre |
| Burr | Gutierrez | McKeon |
| Burton | Gutknecht | McKinney |
| Buyer | Hall (OH) | McNulty |
| Callahan | Hall (TX) | Meehan |
| Calvert | Hansen | Meek (FL) |
| Camp | Hastert | Meeks (NY) |
| Campbell | Hastings (WA) | Menendez |
| Canady | Hayworth | Metcalf |
| Cannon | Hefley | Mica |
| Capps | Herger | Millender- |
| Cardin | Hill | McDonald |
| Carson | Hilleary | Miller (CA) |
| Castle | Hinche | Miller (FL) |
| Chabot | Hinojosa | Minge |
| Chambliss | Hobson | Moakley |
| Christensen | Hoekstra | Moran (KS) |
| Clayton | Holden | Morella |
| Clement | Hooley | Murtha |
| Clyburn | Horn | Myrick |
| Coble | Hostettler | Nadler |
| Coburn | Hoyer | Neal |
| Collins | Hulshof | Nethercutt |
| Combest | Hunter | Neumann |
| Condit | Hutchinson | Ney |
| Cook | Hyde | Northup |
| Cooksey | Inglis | Norwood |
| Costello | Istook | Nussle |
| Cox | Jackson (IL) | Olver |
| Coyne | Jackson-Lee | Ortiz |
| Cramer | (TX) | Owens |
| Cubin | Jenkins | Oxley |
| Cummings | John | Packard |
| Cunningham | Johnson (WI) | Pallone |
| Danner | Johnson, E.B. | Pappas |
| Davis (FL) | Johnson, Sam | Parker |
| Davis (IL) | Jones | Pascarell |
| Davis (VA) | Kanjorski | Pastor |
| Deal | Kaptur | Paxon |
| DeFazio | Kasich | Payne |
| Delahunt | Kelly | Pease |
| DeLauro | Kennedy (MA) | Pelosi |
| DeLay | Kennedy (RI) | Peterson (MN) |
| Deutsch | Kennelly | Peterson (PA) |
| Diaz-Balart | Kildee | Petri |
| Dixon | Kilpatrick | Pickering |
| Doggett | Kim | Pitts |
| Doolittle | Kind (WI) | Pomeroy |
| Doyle | King (NY) | Porter |
| Dreier | Kingston | Portman |
| Duncan | Klecicka | Poshard |
| Dunn | Klink | Price (NC) |

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Pryce (OH) | Shadegg | Thompson |
| Radanovich | Shaw | Thornberry |
| Rahall | Shays | Thune |
| Ramstad | Sherman | Thurman |
| Redmond | Shimkus | Tiahrt |
| Regula | Shuster | Tierney |
| Reyes | Sisisky | Towns |
| Riley | Skeen | Turner |
| Rivers | Skelton | Upton |
| Rodriguez | Slaughter | Velazquez |
| Roemer | Smith (MI) | Vento |
| Rogan | Smith (NJ) | Visclosky |
| Rogers | Smith (OR) | Walsh |
| Rohrabacher | Smith (TX) | Wamp |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Smith, Linda | Watkins |
| Rothman | Snowbarger | Watts (OK) |
| Roukema | Solomon | Waxman |
| Roybal-Allard | Souder | Weldon (FL) |
| Royce | Spence | Weldon (PA) |
| Rush | Spratt | Weller |
| Ryun | Stabenow | Wexler |
| Sanchez | Stark | Weygand |
| Sandlin | Stearns | White |
| Sawyer | Stenholm | Whitfield |
| Saxton | Strickland | Wicker |
| Scarborough | Stupak | Wise |
| Schaefer, Dan | Sununu | Wolf |
| Schaffer, Bob | Talent | Woolsey |
| Schumer | Tanner | Wynn |
| Scott | Tauzin | Yates |
| Sensenbrenner | Taylor (MS) | Young (AK) |
| Serrano | Taylor (NC) | Young (FL) |
| Sessions | Thomas | |

NAYS—41

| | | |
|------------|---------------|-------------|
| Blumenauer | Gibbons | Pickett |
| Bonilla | Hamilton | Pombo |
| Brown (CA) | Hastings (FL) | Rangel |
| Chenoweth | Hilliard | Sabo |
| Clay | Houghton | Salmon |
| Conyers | Jefferson | Sanford |
| Crane | Johnson (CT) | Smith, Adam |
| Crapo | Kolbe | Snyder |
| DeGette | Matsui | Stokes |
| Dicks | McDermott | Stump |
| Dingell | Mink | Tauscher |
| Dooley | Moran (VA) | Waters |
| English | Oberstar | Watt (NC) |
| Fazio | Paul | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bonior

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| Bateman | Hefner | Riggs |
| Dickey | Lewis (CA) | Sanders |
| Fowler | Mollohan | Skaggs |
| Gonzalez | Obey | Torres |
| Harman | Quinn | Traficant |

□ 1426

Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. CLAY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MINGE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed rollcall vote 155, the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act, H.R. 2431. I am glad it passed. If I had been present, I would have voted yes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2431, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3760

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3760.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 434) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 434

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Small Business, the following Member:

DONNA CHRISTIAN GREEN of the Virgin Islands.

The resolution was aged to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, what the schedule for today and the remainder of the week and for the following week will be.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week. The House will next meet on Monday, May 18, at 12 noon for a pro forma session. There will be no legislative business and no votes on that day.

On Tuesday, May 19, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and at 12 noon for legislative business.

On Tuesday we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices.

We also hope to consider H.R. 512, the new Wildlife Refuge Authorization Act, under an open rule, and begin general debate on H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1999. Time permitting, we will complete consideration of H.R. 3534, the Private Sector Mandates Act.

Members should note that we do not expect any recorded votes before 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 19.

On Wednesday, May 20, and Thursday, May 21, the House will meet at 10