Law. The conflicting emotions I feel for this bill are borne out of the tragedy that lead to it's introduction.

If I can take a moment now to relate to all the Members listening to this debate, the tragedy that beset Aimee Willard in June of 1996. At the age of 22, Aimee had already established herself as one of the most well-liked and successful students at George Mason University. Not only was Aimee a superb athlete, excelling at both Soccer and Lacrosse, but she had also distinguished herself in the academic arena. Therefore, there can be no doubt that Aimee was returning to her home in Brookhaven, Pennsylvania with nothing but the highest expectations for her future.

In June, 1996, Arthur Bomar made sure Aimee would never have the opportunity to enjoy the future she had worked so hard to prepare for. Bomar, who had been released in 1990 from a Nevada State Prison after serving only 12 years of a Life sentence for murder, spent late May and early June looking for another victim. This predator identified, stalked, kidnaped, raped, and finally murdered Aimee Willard; exacting on her his horrific blood-lust in a manner no human being should ever have to endure. It is my sincere belief that when he brutally attacked Aimee, Arthur Bomar divested himself of any shred of humanity he had left.

The real tragedy of what happened to Aimee in June of 1996, is that the terrible circumstances of her murder are by no means unique. When H.R. 894 passes the House today, we will be one step closer to preventing more than 800 murders, 3,500 rapes, and 9,600 sexual assaults annually. I would like to thank Representative SALMON and Senator SANTORUM for leading the congressional effort to enact the ''No Second Chances'' law. I would also like to personally recognize the efforts of president Alan Merten, and the entire George Mason University, faculty, staff and students, for their tireless efforts to see that no other community has to endure the pain and loss they have suffered.

With that, I urge all my colleagues to support the passage of Aimee's law.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R., 894, ''Aimee's Law.'' This bill addresses some of the worst crimes in our society. And it is incumbent upon us to deliberate the merits of this bill carefully and to ensure that we take into account the rights of all stakeholders in this process.

''Aimee's Law'' is premised on the belief that anyone convicted of murder, rape, or a dangerous sexual offense should be sentenced to death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

This law provides that whenever someone convicted of murder, rape, or a dangerous sexual offense is released from prison and commits another such offense in another state, the state from which the offender was released will be liable for the cost of apprehension, prosecution, incarceration, and the victim's damages (i.e., up to $100,000 for each victim).

The Attorney General is also directed to pay these costs and damages from the federal law enforcement assistance funds to the state of origin. The costs and damage provisions, which are paid out of federal law enforcement assistance funds, are designed to leverage states into passing tougher sentences regarding these crimes or risk losing federal funds.

I have concerns that this bill is premised on a ''Sense of Congress'' that anyone convicted of these crimes should be sentenced to death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

Before taking such drastic actions, I believe that we need to better define the criminal offenses of which one may be convicted. I suggest that we work to narrow the definition of which crimes trigger punishment.

However, I realize, as do most Americans that prevention is the best strategy and if this type of law would provide the appropriate disincentive for potential murders or rapists, I must also recognize this benefit.

As expressed in the Subcommittee Crime hearings, this law, under the definition of Dangerous Sexual Offense in H.R. 894, does not require any age difference between victim and offender on which to base an assumption of predation.

Consequently, unlike other laws that make no such distinction, there is more potential for this bill to have an impact on the sexual abuse of American children.

As a parent, I sympathize with proponents of this bill that want adequate punishment against those convicted of sexual assault, rape or murder. I cannot however support the death penalty aspect of the bill without the simultaneous effort to improve the discriminatory and unjust implementation of the death penalty.

I agree that we must all work to prevent the killing of our youth and like other Members, I am growing weary of having to debate on bills named after murdered children. I do not enjoy hearing of another murdered child because of the failure of our laws to effectively punish repeat offenders.

As a mother, a member of Congress and founder of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I cannot in good faith support the maintenance of laws that create loopholes for sexual predators.

Every 19 seconds a girl or woman is raped, every 70 seconds a child is molested and every 70 seconds a child or adult is murdered.

Yet, despite these horrific statistics, the average time served in prison for rape is 5 years and the average time served in prison for molesting a child is less than 4 years.

We cannot tolerate the perpetuation of violent crimes against women and children any longer! This bill provides States the financial incentive to enact effective legislation that will keep repeat violent offenders behind bars. However, I am concerned that my State of Texas may not be eligible for such funds.

We cannot allow states to continue to act irresponsibly in the prosecution of sexual predators. We all need to work together to help spare families the needless tragedy of having to put to rest their children because the state failed to effectively prosecute a sexual predator.

I am horrified by the story of Aimee Willard, for which this law is named. I hope that no family will ever have to suffer through such a tragedy again, but unfortunately I know that this is not true. I support the enhanced sentencing to keep killers off the street, especially the life without parole provision.

I ask that my colleague put aside their politics and think about the children and families that have been affected because of a lack of adequate enforcement of the laws. Our children need protection now, let's work on this legislation to overcome the concerns expressed and pass the bill so it can be signed by the President.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 894, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SENSE OF CONGRESS STRONGLY OBJECTING TO EFFORT TO EXPEL HOLY SEE FROM UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 253) expressing the sense of the Congress strongly objecting to any effort to expel the Holy See from the United Nations as a state participant by removing its status as a Permanent Observer.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 253

Whereas the Holy See is the governing authority of the sovereign state of Vatican City;

Whereas the Holy See has an internationally recognized legal personality that allows it to enter into treaties as the juridical equal of a state and to send and receive diplomatic representatives;

Whereas the diplomatic history of the Holy See began over 1,600 years ago, during the 4th century A.D., and the Holy See currently has formal diplomatic relations with 169 nations, including the United States, and maintains 179 permanent diplomatic missions abroad;

Whereas, although the Holy See was an active participant in a wide range of United Nations activities since 1946 and was eligible to become a member state of the United Nations, it chose instead to become a nonmember state with Permanent Observer status over 35 years ago, in 1964;

Whereas, unlike the governments of other geographically small countries such as Monaco, Nauru, San Marino, and Liechtenstein, the Holy See does not possess a vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Whereas, according to a July 1998 assessment by the United States Department of State, ''[t]he United States values the Holy See's significant contributions to international peace and human rights'';

Whereas during the past year certain organizations that oppose the views of the Holy See regarding the sanctity of human life and the value of the family as the basic unit of society have initiated an organized effort to pressure the United Nations to remove the Permanent Observer status of the Holy See; and

Whereas the removal of the Holy See's Permanent Observer status would constitute an expulsion of the Holy See from the United Nations as a state participant: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress—

(1) commends the Holy See for its strong commitment to fundamental human rights,

including the protection of innocent human life both before and after birth, during its 36 years as a Permanent Observer at the United Nations;

(2) strongly objects to any effort to expel the Holy See from the United Nations as a state participant by removing its status as a nonmember state Permanent Observer;

(3) believes that any degradation of the status accorded to the Holy See at the United Nations would seriously damage the credibility of the United Nations by demonstrating that its rules of participation are manipulable for ideological reasons rather than being rooted in neutral principles and objective facts of sovereignty; and

(4) expresses the concern that any such degradation of the status accorded to the Holy See would seriously damage relations between the United Nations and member states that find in the Holy See a moral and ethical presence with which they can work effectively in pursuing humanitarian approaches to international problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 253.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member of this body will join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 253, which I introduced last February along with 37 other cosponsors.

This resolution puts the Congress on record as being strongly against the current anti-Catholic effort to expel the Holy See from the United Nations by depriving it of the Permanent Observer status that it has held for 35 years. The proponents of this effort make no secret of the fact that what really irritates them about the Holy See is its consistent position regarding the sanctity of life and family.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy See is more than entitled to this status that it holds at the United Nations. It is the governing body of the sovereign State of Vatican City. It has an internationally-recognized legal personality that allows it to enter into treaties and to send and to receive diplomatic representatives.

Its diplomatic history stretches back more than 1600 years, a millennium and a half longer than most U.N. Member states have been in existence.

The Holy See currently has formal diplomatic relations with more than 169 nations, including the United States, and it maintains 179 permanent diplomatic missions abroad.

If anything, the Holy See deserves a more permanent role at the United Nations. As our own State Department concluded and I quote, ''the United States values the Holy See's significant contributions to international peace and human rights.'' The Holy See has been an active participant in a wide range of U.N. activities since 1946.

Mr. Speaker, the removal of the Holy See's Permanent Observer status would constitute an absolutely unjustifiable expulsion of the Holy See from the United Nations as a State participant. Just like when there was an anti-Semitic effort some years back to expel Israel, if this anti-Catholicism succeeds, we will take all appropriate actions I am sure in this House, and we and the President and the Senate will to take a second look at our own participation in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this House will join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 253, which I introduced in February of this year along with Mr. HYDE, and which has 37 other bipartisan cosponsors. This resolution puts Congress on record as strongly against the current anti-Catholic effort to expel the Holy See from the United Nations by depriving it of the Permanent Observer status it has held for over 35 years.

The proponents of this effort make no secret of the fact that what really irritates them about the Holy See is its consistent positions concerning the sanction of the family, opposition to efforts to create an international right to abortion. Rather than answer the arguments raised by the Holy See in honest and open debate, these pro-abortion groups want to silence the voice of dissent in the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, this House must take a stand in favor of the free exchange of ideas, and we must also stand against the thinly veiled religious intolerance that lurks behind this effort.

Last year, a number of pro-abortion groups announced what they called the ''See Change'' campaign. This campaign is an attempt to pressure the U.N. into expelling the Holy See as a state participant. Frustrated by the success of the Holy See at cooperating with other delegations to defend the sanctity of life and the integrity of the family against radical proposals at U.N. international conferences, those organizations decided to try a new tack. They are now trying to subvert free discussion by a sovereign state on these topics in the future by depriving the Holy See of its rightful place at the table.

Mr. Speaker, the ''See Change'' proposal is an ideological power play, motivated by pro-abortion and anti-Catholic sentiment. ''See Change'' supporters have attempted to justify their claim that the Holy See does not deserve a seat at the United Nations by comparing the Holy See to EuroDisney and to the Soviet Politburo. I hope and expect that many Members from both sides of the aisle will want to join me in denouncing these offensive remarks—especially in light of the amount of time this House has spent examining far flimsier allegations of anti-Catholicism in the recent past.

In response these vicious insults against the Holy See, more than 1,000 nongovernmental organizations from 44 countries around the world have organized their own, much larger ''Holy See Campaign,'' which opposes the ''See Change'' proposal and supports the longstanding Permanent Observer status of the Holy See at the U.N. This effort is not just Catholic. Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, and Mormon leaders—among others—have also raised their voices in support.

Even those who may disagree with the Holy See on life issues should support H. Con. Res. 253. This resolution is about maintaining the integrity of the United Nations and supporting international pluralism. If ideological preferences are allowed to trump neutral principles of sovereignty—as the See Change activists desire—it will have grave consequences for the U.N. and for the world.

Who might be next on the expulsion list? Israel, or some other nation, with whom someone may disagree.

The Holy See is more than entitled to the status it holds at the United Nations. It is the governing authority of the sovereign state of Vatican City. It has an internationally recognized legal personality that allows it to enter into treaties and to send and receive diplomatic representatives. Its diplomatic history stretches back more than 1,600 years—a millennium and a half longer than most U.N. member states have been in existence. The Holy See currently has formal diplomatic relations with 169 nations, including the United States, and it maintains 179 permanent diplomatic missions abroad.

If anything, the Holy See deserves a more prominent role in the U.N. As the State Department has explicitly stated: ''The United States values the Holy See's significant contributions to international peace and human rights.'' The Holy See has been an active participant in a wide range of United Nations activities since 1946 and was eligible to become a full member state of the U.N. But it chose instead to become a nonmember state with Permanent Observer status in 1964. Because of this choice, unlike the governments of other geographically small countries such as Monaco, San Marino, and Liechtenstein, the Holy See does not possess a vote in the U.N. General Assembly.

The removal of the Holy See's Permanent Observer status would constitute an unjustifiable explusion of the Holy See from the United Nations as a state participant. It is the full legal equivalent of a state, and its expulsion would seriously damage the credibility of the United Nations by demonstrating that its rules of participation are manipulable for ideological reasons rather than being rooted in neutral principles and objective facts of sovereignty. It would also seriously damage relations between the United Nations and member states that find in the Holy See a moral and ethical presence with which they can work effectively in pursuing humanitarian approaches to international problems.

The United Nations operates largely by consensus. In the final analysis, the activists behind the ''See Change'' campaign would like to circumvent that process by silencing a voice they oppose. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this shameful eruption of anti-Catholic bigotry, and submit the following communication for the RECORD.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
*Washington, DC, July 11, 2000.*

Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH
*House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I write to express our gratitude for your support for maintaining the Holy See's status as a Permanent Observer at the United Nations, a status it has held since 1964.

The Holy See, a state with formal diplomatic relations with more countries than any other sovereign state, has long been an active and valuable non-voting participant in the work of the United Nations.

Since the United Nations was founded, the Holy See has offered strong moral support for this unique global institution, the ideals for which it stands, and may concrete ways in which it seeks to implement these ideals. The Holy See has not only been a responsible participant in the practical work of the United Nations, it has provided a critical moral voice that has helped ensure that the United Nations remains an effective means of protecting basic human rights, promoting authentic development for the world's poor, and encouraging peaceful resolution to violent conflicts around the world.

It is unfortunate that, despite the strong support the Holy See enjoys in the international community, its status at the United Nations has become a matter of ideological and partisan debate. I hope that the Congressional approval of the resolution you have introduced will reaffirm the strong support for the Holy See's role at the United Nations that it enjoys among the community of nations.

Sincerely yours,
Most Rev. JOSEPH A. FIORENZA,
*Bishop of Glaveston-Houston,*
*President, NCCB/USCC.*

---

ARCHDIOCESE OF BALTIMORE,
*Baltimore, MD, July 11, 2000.*

Hon. CHRIS SMITH,
*Congress of the United States, Cannon Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I have just learned that Resolution 253 will be considered today by the House of Representatives. I write to urge the House Members to vote in support of the Resolution.

The initiative to expel the Holy See from the United Nations is one developed and supported by groups which have nothing to do with member nations of the U.N.

As I am sure you know, the Holy See currently enjoys diplomatic relationships with more than 175 nations. A Resolution by the United States Congress in support of the Holy See's status as Permanent Observer to the United Nations would be an expression of the esteem in which Congress holds the Holy See for its role in promoting world peace, human development and human rights.

With every best wish, I remain.

Sincerely yours,
Cardinal WILLIAM H. KEELER,
*Archbishop of Baltimore.*

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

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Holy See for its contributions to the world community in the areas of peace, human rights, refugees and the underprivileged. I stand in strong support of the right of the Holy See to conduct foreign policy, to send and receive official representatives and to participate in international organizations.

The Holy See is the governing authority of the sovereign State of Vatican City and the central governing authority of the Roman Catholic church.

As an internationally-recognized legal personality, the Holy See enters into treaties as an equal of a state and maintains its right to send and receive diplomatic representatives.

The Holy See currently has formal diplomatic relations with the 169 nations, including the United States and maintains 179 permanent diplomatic missions abroad.

The Holy See is active in international organizations, including the United Nations in New York, the Office of the United Nations in Geneva, the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome, and the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in Paris.

The Holy See has lent its significant moral influence to a number of important international issues, such as international debt relief, nuclear nonproliferation, human rights and ending world hunger.

The Holy See is party to a number of important international treaties and organizations and conventions, including the protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, the Convention against All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

We commend the Holy See for its role in promoting international peace and stability and its efforts on behalf of refugees and the poor. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 253.

Frankly, I wish this bill had been referred to the Committee on International Relations so that the committee could take its normal deliberative process over this legislation. We found out from the Republican leadership at 10 p.m. last night this bill would be voted today, but I do vote and do urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 253.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 253, a concurrent resolution which objects to efforts to expel the Holy See from the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to any efforts to expel the Holy See from the United Nations as a state participant by removing the Holy See's Permanent Observer status in the United Nations for a number of reasons.

Simply stated, to expel the Holy See from the U.N. would seriously damage the credibility of the United Nations and would erode the principles that are embodied in that international body.

The Holy See is a governing authority of the State of Vatican City and has an internationally recognized legal personality which allows it to enter into treaties as the juridical equal of a State and to receive and send diplomatic representatives. Not only does the Holy See have every right to be represented in the U.N., but the absence of the Holy See in the U.N. would diminish that international body.

Our own State Department recognized the importance of the Holy See's contributions and has commended the Holy See's many significant contributions to international peace and human rights. I join in that praise and much deserved recognition.

The Holy See has been an active member of the U.N. since 1946 and chose to become a nonmember State with Permanent Observer status in 1964. Although the Holy See does not possess a vote in the General Assembly of the U.N., it has played an important diplomatic role and has been a source for the promotion of diplomacy over a conflict for decades.

However, I do object to the introduction of family planning language in this resolution. I regret its unnecessary inclusion in this resolution dilutes the widespread respect and support of its other worthy diplomatic and moral role of the Holy See. Nevertheless, because of the importance of the principles of human rights and diplomacy that have been championed by the Holy See over the many years, I support this resolution with the reservation that I voice concern of the inclusion of the unnecessary family planning language.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to vote for H. Con. Res. 253.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 253.

It is outrageous that the United Nations would even consider expelling the Holy See from the United Nations as a state participant by removing its status as a Permanent Observer.

As the Resolution reflects and history has clearly shown, the Holy See has served as a vehicle for peace, cooperation, and mutual understanding among nations. Since 1946, the Holy See has demonstrated its commitment to the principles on which the United Nations was founded, maintaining its position as an honest broker and objective independent party by choosing to become a nonmember state with Permanent Observer status in 1964.

The Holy See has been sought out throughout the decades to facilitate discussions, to build a bridge, between conflicting parties—having these see each other as human beings rather than as political adversaries. What appeared to be insurmountable obstacles were overcome through the intercession of the Holy See and its dedication to the idea of a global family of nations.

The Holy See exemplifies the essence of the United Nations Charter and mission. To expel it from this international body would be to undermine the very foundation of the United Nations damaging this body's credibility and image of neutrality.

Such degradation of the Holy See would be considered an affront, not only to its status as a State, but would be interpreted as a veiled attack on the moral and ethical principles it represents.

I ask my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 253. This bill may very well be unconstitutional, is inappropriate, and is counter to the fundamentals I have supported since coming to Congress.

The writers of the Constitution understood the importance of the separation of church and state. While religion plays an important role in our society, ''Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion.'' This resolution recognizes the establishment of the government of a religious institution, the Roman Catholic Church, as a sovereign state. Thus this bill is unconstitutional and should not have even appeared on the floor of the House.

This bill is also grossly inappropriate. The Majority party has consistently refused to pay our dues to the United Nations and has even called for its dissolution, while at the same time trying to tell the UN how to operate. this bill opposes a movement not to remove the Vatican from the United Nations but merely to put the Catholic Church in the same position that all the other non-governmental organizations have in the UN. This movement, if successful, would simply remove voting privileges from the Vatican, a right not enjoyed by any other non-governmental UN member today.

And finally, this bill ''commends the Holy See for its strong commitment to fundamental human rights, including the protection of innocent human life both before and after birth.'' (emphasis added) I cannot vote for a bill that contains such language as I believe that it is a fundamental human right that a woman have the right to decide what happens to her body. I have fought for many years to ensure a woman's right to choose and I will not vote for any bill that suggests that a woman choosing to have an abortion is a person who violates human rights.

For these reasons I urge my fellow members of Congress to vote against this inappropriate campaign check written to make the Republican Party seem even more anti-choice.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer thoughts regarding House Concurrent Resolution 253, which objects to any effort to expel the Holy See from the United Nations. First and foremost, I believe that it is a serious matter that this body is taking the historic position of public debate of the status of any non-governmental organization or nation who may or may not be participants in the governing processes of the United Nations.

Because of our nation's status as the world's sole super power, we should be mindful that the policies and actions of the United States government are not viewed favorably by many people nor their governments who are also members of the United Nation's participant based on their stance on one issue, even if I might personally disagree with their position, would be a move in the wrong direction for this nation and the global community housed under the banner of the United Nations.

Personally, I see the participation of the Holy See in the United Nations to be an acknowledgement of past world history. Since the fourth century, the Holy See has participated in diplomatic missions. For over sixteen hundred years this body has been part of world history, and in 1929, the Vatican City State came into existence with the Lateran Treaty between the Holy See and Italy. The Holy See represents not just Vatican City, but the global membership of the first Christian Church.

In September 1997, the United States reaffirmed the view that our government sees the unique position held by the Holy See in global matters as being appropriate by appointing a former member of this body Corinne ''Lindy'' Claiborne Boggs to be the U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See.

Therefore, I would ask that my fellow members of this body remember that as we uphold the principles of democracy, one of the most important tenants of our system of government is that we do agree to disagree in a civil and organized manner. To try to silence decent through threat, or sensor, or expulsion is not the way to reach our goal of a broader more inclusive society. If our position is valid, then it will weather the test of time and we will be victorious in moving this nation and this world to broader understanding of freedom, democracy and liberty.

I encourage each of my colleagues to consider carefully their vote on this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 253.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1145

## INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4528) to establish an undergraduate grant program of the Department of State to assist students of limited financial means from the United States to pursue studies at foreign institutions of higher education, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4528

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''International Academic Opportunity Act of 2000''.

**SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.**

It is the purpose of this Act to establish an undergraduate grant program for students of limited financial means from the United States to enable such students to study at institutions of higher education in foreign countries. Such foreign study is intended to broaden the outlook and better prepare such students of demonstrated financial need to assume significant roles in the increasingly global economy.

**SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN STUDY BY AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS OF LIMITED FINANCIAL MEANS.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations and under the authorities of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, the Secretary of State shall establish and carry out a program in each fiscal year to award grants of up to $5,000, to individuals who meet the requirements of subsection (b), toward the cost of 1 academic year of undergraduate study at an institution of higher education in a foreign country. Grants under this Act shall be known as the ''Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarships''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An individual referred to in subsection (a) is an individual who—

(1) is a student in good standing at an institution of higher education in the United States (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965);

(2) has been accepted for an academic year of study at an institution of higher education outside the United States (as defined by section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965);

(3) is receiving any need-based student assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

(4) is a citizen or national of the United States.

(c) APPLICATION AND SELECTION.—

(1) Grant application and selection shall be carried out through accredited institutions of higher education in the United States or combination of such institutions under such procedures as are established by the Secretary of State.

(2) In considering applications for grants under this section, priority consideration shall be given to applicants who are receiving Federal Pell Grants under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

**SEC. 4. REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

The Secretary of State shall report annually to the Congress concerning the grant program established under this Act. Each such report shall include the following information for the preceding year:

(1) The number of participants.

(2) The institutions of higher education in the United States that participants attended.

(3) The institutions of higher education outside the United States participants attended during their year of study abroad.

(4) The areas of study of participants.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this Act.

**SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

This Act shall take effect October 1, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within