



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 2017

No. 3

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 o'clock and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of Heaven and Earth, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You know our capabilities as a nation. You know our limitations better than we know ourselves. You see clearly the needs of our day and the steps that must be taken.

For the Members of the people's House, be a gentle light. Lead them forth day by day along the path of consistency and integrity, that the knots of contradiction would be unraveled and together Your people will walk with clarity of vision, determination of purpose, and a new depth of human understanding.

Bless all the people of our Nation, especially those in most need of Your mercy.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

READING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 5(a) of House Resolution 5, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for the reading of the Constitution.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, for the fourth time in the history of the House of Representatives, we will read aloud on the floor of the House the full text of the U.S. Constitution.

It is our hope that this reading will help demonstrate to the American people that the House of Representatives is dedicated to the Constitution and the system it establishes for limited government and the protection of individual liberty. We also hope that it will inspire many more Americans to read the Constitution themselves.

The text we will read today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness to all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up to be recognized on a first-come, first-served basis. I will recognize Members based on this guidance. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order in order to ensure bipartisanism and balance. Additionally, because of his long-term leadership on civil rights issues, I will recognize the gentleman from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, to read the Thirteenth Amendment.

I want to thank the Members of both parties for their participation in this historic event. I will begin by reading the preamble to the Constitution:

"We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common

defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Article I, section 1: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. "No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

"The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. "The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty-thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H101

Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. "When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

"The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Section 3:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. "The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. "The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided."

"The Senate shall chuse their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two thirds of the Members present."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

□ 1015

Mr. LOUDERMILK. "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend

further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment, according to law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Section 4:

"The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chusing Senators."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Section 5:

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member."

"Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. "Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Section 6:

"The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. "No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. Section 7:

"All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. "Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. "If after such reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. "But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. "If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. "Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be re-passed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to

the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM: Section 8:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. ". . . to borrow money on the credit of the United States;

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

"To establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. ". . . to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

"To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

"To establish post offices and post roads; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. ". . . to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. ". . . to constitute tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

"To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. ". . . to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. ". . . to provide and maintain a navy;

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. ". . . to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. ". . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. ". . . and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Section 9:

"The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

"No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. "No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

"No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. "No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in

consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state."

□ 1030

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Section 10:

"No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. "No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws: and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and controul of the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Article II, section 1:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, be elected as follows:"

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of

trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. “The Congress may determine the time of chusing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. “No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. “The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. “Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:—‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.’”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Section 2:

“The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. “He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. “. . . but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. “The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Section 3:

“He shall from time to time give the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. “. . . he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. “. . . he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Section 4:

“The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Article III, section 1:

“The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington and the majority conference chairman (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Section 2:

“The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising

under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;—to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;—to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. “. . . to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;—to controversies between two or more States,—between citizens of different States,—between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA. “In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. “The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Section 3:

“Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. “The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Article IV, section 1.

“Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Section 2: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

"A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

Mr. FASO. Section 3:

"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Section 4:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Article V:

"The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

□ 1045

Mr. MOOLENAAR. ". . . or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one

thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Article VI:

"All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Article VII:

"The ratification of the conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. "Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the States present the seventeenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth in witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. George Washington, President and deputy from Virginia.

Delaware: George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom.

Maryland: James McHenry, Daniel of St Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll.

Virginia: John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina: William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson.

South Carolina: John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler.

Georgia: William Few, Abraham Baldwin.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. New Hampshire: John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman.

Massachusetts: Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King.

Connecticut: William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman.

New York: Alexander Hamilton.

New Jersey: William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton.

Pennsylvania: Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris.

Amendment I:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Amendment II:

"A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Amendment III:

"No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Amendment IV:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Amendment V:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. ". . . nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against

himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Amendment VI:

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Amendment VII:

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Amendment VIII:

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Amendment IX:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Amendment X:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Amendment XI:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Amendment XII:

"The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and

in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. ". . . the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—the person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. ". . . the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. "The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. ". . . a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Amendment XIII, section 1:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

Section 2:

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Amendment XIV, section 1:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE. ". . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Section 2:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. "But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the Members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Section 3:

"No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. ". . . or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. Section 4:

"The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Section 5:

"The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

Amendment XV, section 1:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Section 2:

"The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Amendment XVI:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Amendment XVII:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. ". . . provided, that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct."

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

Amendment XIX:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Amendment XX, section 1:

"The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin."

Section 2:

"The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day."

Section 3:

"If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Section 4:

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them."

Section 5:

"Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article."

Section 6:

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

Amendment XXI, section 1:

"The 18th Article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

Section 2:

"The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited."

Section 3:

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Amendment XXII, section 1:

"No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term."

Section 2:

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Amendment XXIII, section 1:

"The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as Congress may direct:

"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment."

Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Amendment XXIV, section 1:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay poll tax or other tax."

Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Amendment XXV, section 1:

"In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President."

Section 2:

"Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress."

Section 3:

"Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President."

Section 4:

"Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President."

"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office until the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office."

"Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Amendment XXVI, section 1:

"The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age."

Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Amendment XXVII:

"No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the reading of the Constitution. I would like to thank all of the Members who participated.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to revise and extend remarks and insert omitted material in the RECORD during the reading of the Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at noon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LAKE TRAVIS CAVALIERS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2016 Lake Travis Cavaliers on winning their sixth State championship in Texas. I am proud to say that the L.T. takeover of class 6A high school football is complete.

The Lake Travis Cavaliers, led by their head football coach, Hank Carter,

defeated The Woodlands in grand fashion by a score of 41-13. Coach Carter has assembled a great coaching staff and built Lake Travis into one of the best high school football programs in the State of Texas. I look forward to seeing what the program will continue to accomplish in the coming seasons under Coach Carter's leadership.

I would also like to congratulate senior quarterback Charlie Brewer who was the Texas Associated Press Sports Editors' high school player of the year. Charlie led the offense to a big win and finished the season with a record-breaking 75 percent completions. I wish Charlie and the rest of the seniors the best of luck in their future endeavors.

This season will go down in the history books for Lake Travis High School. Great job to Coach Carter and the 2016 team.

Mr. Speaker, Texas is the greatest football State in America, and because Lake Travis High School is the greatest team in Texas, it most certainly must be the greatest high school team in the country, if not the world if you ask me.

Go Cavaliers. In God We Trust.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act works, but the majority of Republicans want to make America sick again. Republicans have voted more than 60 times to roll back the historic progress that has been made to expand health care to 20 million-plus Americans and to improve coverage for those who already have it. At every turn, they have undermined the law at the expense of American families and now are setting the path for full repeal.

2.6 million Texans stand to lose healthcare coverage, including 20,000 in our district. Fifty thousand of my constituents would gain coverage if Texas would have expanded Medicaid along with more than 1 million Texans. Texas stands to lose \$62 billion in Federal funding for Medicaid, CHIP, and financial assistance for marketplace coverage if the new President and Congress repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Making America sick again is not the solution. Let's don't have a repeal until we have a replacement.

THE LEGACY OF PRESIDENT OBAMA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in an Associated Press article titled, "As Obama accomplished goals, the Democratic party floundered," the disastrous statistics of the Obama legacy were revealed.

The Associated Press analyzed:

There's one number you will almost never hear: more than 1,030 seats. That's the number of spots in State legislatures, Governor's mansions, and Congress lost by Democrats during Obama's Presidency. It is a statistic that reveals an unexpected twist of the Obama years.

The Associated Press went on to say:

The defeats have all but wiped out a generation of young Democrats, leaving the party with limited power in statehouses and a thin bench to challenge an ascendant GOP majority eager to undo many of the President's policies . . . but, say experts, Obama's tenure has marked the greatest number of losses under any President in decades.

When it comes time to the battle of programs, American families overwhelmingly choose limited government and expanded freedom over the alternative: Big Government and lesser freedom. This is clear with the failing of ObamaCare destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations to our colleague Congressman TED POE on his remission under treatment of cancer. God bless TED POE.

OPPOSITION TO GOP AGENDA TO REPEAL THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of the GOP agenda which will repeal the Affordable Care Act and cause 30 million Americans to lose healthcare coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Republicans to please examine the harm that this will do. Because of the Affordable Care Act, the uninsured rate in Texas has fallen by 28 percent and still has the largest number of uninsured Americans, allowing 1.7 million Texans to gain coverage.

While Texas did not expand Medicaid, the State still benefits from many other reforms brought by the Affordable Care Act. For instance, Sean, a Ph.D. candidate in economic development at the University of Texas at Dallas and his wife, Jamie, relied on the Affordable Care Act when their son was born prematurely and with a heart defect that required surgery and a transfer to another Dallas hospital. Sean was reassured that, with his family's ACA marketplace plan, his newborn son would not be denied coverage for lifesaving treatment.

It is unconscionable to me that the GOP refuses to look at what works and what needs improvement in this law instead of a full repeal as the only option. This will deeply harm American families.

ENDING THE REGULATION NATION

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the problem of excessive government.

The United States of America, the land of the free and the brave, a country created to provide everyone an equal opportunity to survive and thrive, has now become the regulation Nation.

In my travels across the great State of Minnesota, I have met and talked with people from all walks of life: farmers and manufacturers, teachers and entrepreneurs, community bankers and credit unions, and they are all crying out for relief from the excessive, overly burdensome, and duplicative regulation that is stifling growth and stealing opportunity.

For the past 8 years, opportunity in America has been under attack by regulations and unelected regulators from Washington. If every American is to have the opportunity to pursue the American Dream, this must end. That is why policy reforms such as the REINS Act are so important.

Under this vital legislation, any major rules from a Federal agency will require congressional approval. This is a great step to end the regulation Nation. We in the people's House must continue to work together to make life easier for the American people, not more difficult.

In the 115th Congress, we must—and we will—work with the incoming administration to roll back excessive and unnecessary regulation so that American families and businesses not only survive but can once again thrive.

DON'T REPEAL THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Americans today have better health coverage and health care, thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

The ACA has expanded and protected coverage for millions of Americans. More than 20 million previously uninsured Americans have newfound health security, including 95 percent of America's children.

I just want to mention two of my constituents who tweeted me within the last day or so about the ACA. One is from Laurence Harbor. It said: "The ACA provided additional health care for my autistic son who had aged out on my employer's health plan. Attempts in the interim to find a healthcare plan for him were thwarted by insurance companies that did not want to cover him."

Another one of my constituents from Marlboro, New Jersey, said: The "ACA helped me to stay on my parent's healthcare for 3 years after college, which was a huge relief in a tough job market."

There are so many cases, Mr. Speaker. I could go on all afternoon. The bottom line is the Affordable Care Act is

also controlling costs for millions of Americans. Premium growth has slowed over the last 6 years, compared to the years before the ACA.

Mr. Speaker, if Republicans proceed with repealing the ACA, they will make America sick again. They will rip health care away from 30 million people and raise premiums for millions of others.

Repealing the ACA will move us from true care to total chaos. Republicans are blinded to the success of the Affordable Care Act. Repealing the Affordable Care Act is not logical, it is ideological, and I would strongly urge my Republican colleagues to start looking at this practically rather than ideologically.

REMEMBERING RONNIE HAWKINS

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend, constituent, and tremendous public servant in North Carolina, Cleveland County Commissioner Ronnie Hawkins.

Ronnie passed away right before Christmas, after a lengthy illness, but it wasn't one that slowed him. Throughout his illness, Ronnie displayed the same passion for helping others he showed throughout his career of public service.

A native of Cleveland County, Ronnie was an Army veteran and devoted husband to his wife, Libby. He was a respected and compassionate funeral director, comforting families in their time of need and grief. He took the same type of caring and compassionate approach to his service as one of Cleveland County's longest-serving elected officials, serving 16 years on the Cleveland County Commission, as well as 12 years on the Kings Mountain School Board. He never forgot who was actually his boss at home: his constituents.

Ronnie was a dear friend, and I extend my thoughts and prayers to his wife, Libby, his family, and his friends.

FEDERAL WORKERS

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to defend jobs.

In my region, Federal workers at Olympic National Park, which brings millions of visitors to our area, help that park run smoothly. They provide needed health services and care for our veterans at local VA facilities. Federal workers serve our Nation and help our sailors and submariners be safe through their work at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, which has been operating for 125 years.

We should have admiration and respect for the work they do. I don't think that this Chamber did right by them this week. That is because the

House approved a rule that would allow any Member to add an amendment to spending bills to cut Federal jobs and lower the pay of workers.

These workers shouldn't be unfairly singled out on the House floor. This is not the way to do business. Having worked in the private sector, you would never see a successful employer treat their employees with the disrespect that Congress treats the Federal workforce.

It is time to tell everyone at that shipyard, at the park, at the VA, and all Federal workers in my region and throughout this country that Congress respects and honors the work that they do. It is time to do away with this rule.

SMART BORDER ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have traveled to the southern border dozens of times over the years, and the problem is always the same. The people who defend our border—really, defend our country—do the best they can with what they have got, but they are outmanned, outgunned, and outfinanced by the drug cartels and the people coming across from the other side.

The continued failure to protect our border threatens our national security and the sovereignty of America. The reality is that the majority of the southern border territory is controlled by someone other than the United States. Why? Because there is no workable plan. Also, there is no moral will by this administration to protect our border.

My bill, the SMART Border Act, outlines a robust border protection strategy that includes achieving operational control of the border within 1 year, provides smart border technology, and mandates more boots on the ground, including 10,000 National Guard troops at the request of the four border State Governors.

Mr. Speaker, we must have the moral will to protect our borders. All types of people are crossing the border into the United States illegally—the good, the bad, and the ugly—and those days need to end. No one should come into America without America's permission.

And that is just the way it is.

ACA AND WOMEN

(Ms. DELBENE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, House and Senate leaders are working on a dangerous plan to dismantle the Affordable Care Act and strip more than 20 million Americans of their health insurance. And if they succeed, it will have devastating consequences for our constituents, particularly women.

Repealing the ACA means allowing insurance companies to charge women more, simply for being a woman; endangering access to care for 65 million women with preexisting conditions; and stripping more than 55 million women of free preventative care, like birth control and cancer screenings.

It is easy to forget how broken the system was before the Affordable Care Act. But make no mistake: dismantling it now means being a woman will once again be treated as a preexisting condition. It will mean fewer options, less access, and higher costs for tens of millions of women.

We should be building on the progress we have made, not turning back the clock. Women deserve better.

□ 1215

MEDIA SHOULDN'T DECIDE WHAT IS FAKE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you may have heard about this new phenomenon called fake news. Fake news usually consists of false and made-up stories. Actually, it is not new and it has been around as long as there have been media.

What is new is that a few liberal media organizations are going to label news stories suspect if they feel the stories are not true. This should be of great concern to anyone who believes in free speech.

It works this way: nearly half of all Americans get information from Facebook. Facebook has now decided to let liberal media like ABC News and the Associated Press determine whether news is fake or not. This represents the liberal mindset that the media know better than the American people what is good for them.

A better idea is to trust the American people and let them determine what is real news and what is not. The American people will learn to discern the good from the bad if the media stops telling them what to think.

SAVING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Affordable Care Act, a law that has made a real difference in the lives of Minnesotans and Americans.

After 7 years of attacking the ACA, Republicans still have not come up with a plan to replace this law. Instead, they plan to work with President-elect Donald Trump to repeal the law and destroy the progress we have made.

Repealing the ACA would leave tens of millions of Americans uninsured.

Repealing the ACA would let insurance companies deny coverage to more than 2 million Minnesotans with preexisting conditions. Repealing the ACA would eliminate free, high-quality preventive health care for hundreds of thousands of families in my district. Make no mistake, Republicans' ACA repeal plans would turn back the clock, leaving millions of Americans just one illness away from bankruptcy.

For the sake of Minnesotans and all Americans who have benefited from this law, join me in fighting to save the Affordable Care Act.

SUPPORT THE REINS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as the House is set to begin debate on H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act, commonly referred to as the REINS Act, as a cosponsor of this bill, I rise to express my strong support for its passage.

This bill requires that any Federal regulation with a significant economic impact be subject to an up-or-down vote in both Chambers of Congress. Currently, the President has the power to implement regulations over executive agencies on a broad basis with little congressional consent.

The balance of power in Washington has often shifted increasingly toward the executive branch. This enables executive agencies to create regulations that Congress would never have approved. The pace and volume of Federal regulations and rules are increasing. In 2016 alone, the Obama administration broke all records in printing more than 97,000 pages and by issuing more than 3,800 rules and regulations in the Federal Register.

Unfortunately, the bureaucracy has been empowered to create punitive regulations rather than promoting collaborative efforts with States, businesses, and the average citizen. Mr. Speaker, I encourage each of my colleagues to think of the American people and vote "yes" on the REINS Act.

REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, a little over a month ago, I attended the funeral of Javon Wilson. Javon was the grandson of my good friend, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, and he was just 15 years old when he was shot and killed in Chicago.

At the funeral, Javon's best friend remembered their talks. "We were going to be the ones that never died . . . if we get shot, we were never going to die," he said.

No child should grow up in a world where gun violence is so common that this talk seems normal.

This week, we turn the page to a new Congress. There is no reason that commonsense measures like universal background checks, making gun trafficking a Federal crime, and reinstating the ban on military-style assault weapons should fall victim to partisan gridlock.

Together, we have the opportunity to save lives and make our communities safer. This is a priority for me and my constituents, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make progress on reducing gun violence and building a safer future for all our children.

SUPPORTING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as the 115th Congress kicks off this week, I remain committed to supporting our Nation's veterans. We made some good progress last year, but there is still much more work to be done.

While our military spends over 6 months preparing soldiers for assignment, we only spend 5 days preparing them to reintegrate to civilian life. I will be making it a priority to ensure veterans have a robust transition and support system for returning home.

We also must bring greater accountability and transparency to the VA. If a VA employee fails to do their duty to care for our Nation's heroes, they should be swiftly terminated. We need to turn around the culture of mediocrity at the agency. I look forward to working with Chairman ROE and my colleagues on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs this year to stand up for our men and women in uniform.

COOL SCIENCE TOPICS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue a series of 1-minute speeches on cool science topics. Today I recognize the work of scientists working in the McMurdo Dry Valleys of Antarctica to develop geological metal maps. Researchers developed a three-dimensional electronic mapping system that is being used to detect large precious metal deposits in the United States.

With funding from NSF, researchers mapped out the Nokomis deposit in northern Minnesota, which is estimated to contain 10 billion pounds of copper, 3.1 billion pounds of nickel, 4 million ounces of platinum, 9 million ounces of palladium, and 2 million ounces of gold. The value of these metal deposits will more than pay for the science investment to develop this technology.

Congress should support research that furthers the understanding of our

incredible universe, including the ground beneath our feet.

HONORING THE LIFE OF A. WARREN KULP

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of A. Warren Kulp, Jr., better known as Sonny, who passed away on New Year's Eve in West Palm Beach at the age of 81.

Sonny's life was the American Dream personified. After graduating from Hilltown High School in Pennsylvania in 1953, he worked as a self-employed dairy farmer for most of his life. He also earned his real estate license and worked as the head of the real estate department for 8 years in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. After moving to Florida with his wife, Judy, he worked at the Palm Beach Kennel Club until his retirement in 2007.

Outside of work, Sonny pursued many different interests. He was a loyal, lifelong Republican and served as an officer and committee chairman for the Pennridge Republican Club in Pennsylvania. He was a consummate grassroots advocate and always could be relied upon for sound advice on both politics and sports.

Mr. Speaker, our thoughts and prayers are with Judy and the Kulp family and the entire community as they mourn his passing today. He will be greatly missed.

REPEALING THE ACA IS UNACCEPTABLE

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the majority's efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and make America sick again.

It is atrocious that Republicans intend to repeal ObamaCare without any plan for replacement. It is barbaric to take health care away from 30 million Americans. It is cruel and disgraceful to go back to the dark times when there were annual and lifetime limits on care for all Americans. It is gutless to repeal the law that protected breast cancer survivors like me and up to 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions. It is fraudulent to tell the American people that we can keep popular provisions like that one without any mechanism to share risk to keep health care affordable.

It is greedy to give insurance and drug companies billions of dollars in tax breaks but cut funding for Medicaid expansion. It is heartless to take away free preventive services like cancer screenings from 55 million Americans, particularly seniors and people with disabilities in Medicare. It is inde-

fensible to roll back the \$23.5 billion in prescription drug savings realized by seniors on Medicare in the donut hole.

It is past time—long past time—that my Republican colleagues understand from A to Z that repeal is unacceptable and a disaster waiting to happen.

LET'S GET TO WORK ON OBAMACARE

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people gave my party control of the entire Congress and the White House because of the promise-breaking, job-killing bill known as ObamaCare, the craziest thing in the whole world, according to President Bill Clinton. On November 8, we were ordered to repeal ObamaCare, and that is just what we are going to do.

Fearmongers on the other side are telling Americans they will lose their health insurance like that. That will only happen if we follow their example and pass a bill that becomes law before we have the time to read it. House Republicans will take time to listen to doctors, nurses, hospitals, patients, the American people to give them the health care they deserve at a lower cost, higher quality with the doctor of their choice. We have our orders. It is time to go to work.

PROTECTING THE ACA

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is not a matter of politics. It is a matter of life or death for the people back home. In the San Diego region, repeal of the ACA would mean nearly 300,000 people could lose access to health care.

I heard from one constituent just this week who was diagnosed with an autoimmune disease where the rheumatoid arthritis is not just attacking her joints, but her organs as well. She needs a double lung transplant to stay alive. Her 7-year-old son, she writes me, tells her, "Mommy, I'm scared. I hope you get your new balloons soon." She lives with the anxiety and the fear of how the repeal of the ACA may affect her treatment every day because of her preexisting condition.

I implore my Republican colleagues to remember the people that this decision will impact. The effect of this repeal has much more important consequences than politics. Let's not be responsible for any child who sees a mother suffer or even lose her life without the treatment she needs.

OUR NEW ADMINISTRATION WILL SUPPORT ISRAEL

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my extreme disappointment in the Obama administration's betrayal of Israel. The administration's destructive decision to undercut Israel has given leverage to anti-Israel boycotters and anti-Semites across the world.

This act screamed of personal vengeance and hostility, directly harmed American interests, and undermined peace in the Middle East. It was a cowardly and foolish parting shot for an administration that flagrantly ignores serious global challenges—Syria, Aleppo, ISIS, Iran, China, Russia, and the list goes on.

By abstaining from the vote to censure Israel, President Obama vetoed the U.S.-Israel alliance and violated the faith of the American people. I look forward to a new day, to a new administration that will support Israel and refuse to abandon our allies on the world stage.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. McEACHIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation that often in this body there are people who would suggest to us that their actions are motivated and guided by an adherence to the Judeo-Christian ethic.

Mr. Speaker, in Jesus' first sermon, He said, among other things, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me to bring good news to the poor." We have done that with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, the notion of taking away the Affordable Care Act by repealing it, I would suggest to this body, is antithetical to those Judeo-Christian values. More than 20 million Americans of all socioeconomic backgrounds have benefited from this act.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that reason will prevail and that while we may tweak the Affordable Care Act, it will not be repealed.

□ 1230

TWO-STATE SOLUTION IN ISRAEL

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be taking up a resolution that is designed to reflect our discontent with the resolution of the United Nations. I am totally in favor of expressing our discontent. I think we ought to cut our funds to the U.N. until such time as Resolution 2334 is repealed.

But the resolution today, at four different places, refers to our push in the United States for a two-state solution in Israel. Look, Hebron is in what was the promised land. David ruled from there for the first 7 years he was King

over Israel. Hebron is part of the two-state solution going to the Palestinians. How did the Palestinians deserve the land that was given as the promised land 1,600 years before Muhammad even existed?

I can't vote for the resolution when we are advocating what Joel 3 says will bring judgment down upon our Nation for trying to partition Israel—can't do it.

WE MUST NOT MAKE AMERICA SICK AGAIN

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to read a letter from my constituent, Mrs. Karen O'Hern, of Alexandria, Virginia: "Congressman BEYER,

"We are a family of four. The company my husband worked for went bankrupt in 2009 after the 2008 financial meltdown—losing income, retirement savings, and health care.

"He now owns a small business and we now get our healthcare insurance through healthcare.gov.

"We need you to defend the ACA. We depend on the availability of this insurance option.

"My son had surgery on December 30 at Fairfax Hospital to remove a brain tumor. His prognosis is good. I cannot imagine how we would manage financially without this health insurance.

"Please be strong on this matter and represent the needs of your constituents.

"I need my Affordable Care Act health insurance.

"Regards, Karen O'Hern."

Mr. Speaker, millions like Karen O'Hern will lose their coverage if the Affordable Care Act is repealed. We must not make America sick again.

WEST VIRGINIANS WANT THEIR VOICE TO BE HEARD

(Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on the REINS Act, which will hold our agencies accountable to the people of America. I am a proud cosponsor of this regulation, this legislation. If a regulation has a high economic cost, then the people, through Congress, have to approve it before it goes into effect.

The REINS Act is one of several bills we will be considering this week to stop business as usual in Washington. We will be saying "no" to the over-regulations of the last 8 years, "no" to the radical anti-coal agenda that has closed coal mines and cost my State of West Virginia thousands of jobs, "no" to a Federal Government that won't even come to West Virginia to hear how their regulations affect us.

West Virginians have had enough. They want change. They want their voice to be heard. They want to work hard and put food on their table.

I am here to stand up for West Virginians: families, miners, and small businesses. I urge my colleagues to support the REINS Act.

OFFERING A 28TH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, we came together this morning to read the United States Constitution and its 27 amendments. I offer a 28th amendment, an amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's disastrous decision in Citizens United:

Section 1. To advance democratic self-government and political equality, and to protect the integrity of government and the electoral process, Congress and the States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

Section 2. Congress and the States shall have power to implement and enforce this article by appropriate legislation, and may distinguish between natural persons and corporations or other artificial entities created by law, including by prohibiting such entities from spending money to influence our elections.

Section 3. Nothing in this article shall be construed to grant Congress or the States the power to abridge freedom of the press.

Mr. Speaker, Citizens United let unlimited money flood into our elections and compromise our democracy. I ask all of my colleagues in this 115th Congress to join our effort to overturn it.

REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WILL BE DETRIMENTAL TO OUR HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS AND MEDICAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Care Act. It is a promise to the American people that we must keep. It guarantees access to affordable, high-quality health care as a right for all Americans. Backing out of this commitment is irresponsible, inexcusable, and reprehensible.

As a Member from a congressional district that houses some of the largest hospitals in the country, health is a crucial issue for my constituents. Under the ACA, millions of Americans now have access to affordable health care through individual marketplaces and Medicaid expansion. Children in New York can remain on their parents' plan through the age of 29. An insurance company cannot discriminate against patients with preexisting conditions.

Repeal will be detrimental to our healthcare systems and medical research community. Without a plan to

replace the ACA, Republicans are openly gambling with the health care of millions, many of whom will be affected, like the elderly and disabled who cannot afford to return to the old system of skyrocketing costs.

I will fight for those Americans who rely on the ACA, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

BENEFITS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the lifesaving impact of the Affordable Care Act.

This week, I have heard from dozens of constituents who have been calling my office and reaching out on social media to tell me their ACA stories.

I heard from one constituent whose mother had two devastating lung diseases. While she had good insurance, unfair lifetime spending caps priced her out of receiving the lifesaving treatment she needed. When the Affordable Care Act passed, we ended the cruel practice of lifetime spending caps. With these new protections, she was able to resume her treatment and stay healthy to spend time with her daughter and granddaughter.

Mr. Speaker, the ACA works. It reduces healthcare costs, enables young people to stay on their parents' insurance, and ensures low-income and struggling families that they can access the care they need.

If Republicans repeal this law without a viable replacement, there will be real consequences to real people. Let me be clear: by repealing the ACA, Republicans would end healthcare coverage for millions of families, put the insurance companies back in charge, and, yes, make America sick again.

I urge my colleagues to consider what is at stake here—real costs, real lives, not just a political football.

Let's do the right thing and protect families' health care.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 26, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 11, OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 22 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 22

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 26) to amend

chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 such amendments 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. 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.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 22, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 11, a resolution regarding United Nations Security Council Reso-

lution 2334. It provides for 1 hour of debate on H. Res. 11, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Additionally, this rule provides for consideration of legislation that I introduced, H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny, or REINS, Act. It makes in order 12 amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs Committees.

Mr. Speaker, the beginning of this new Congress is a time of hope and a time to establish clear priorities and goals. This is a time to show the American people that we, as their elected representatives, will have the courage to stand on principles that made us worthy of their trust. This rule provides for two pieces of legislation that represent our commitment to the integrity and transparency of this institution.

H. Res. 11, introduced by Chairman ROYCE and cosponsored by Ranking Member ENGEL, objects to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. It calls for the resolution's repeal and makes clear that the current administration's failure to veto the U.N. resolution violated longstanding U.S. policy to protect Israel from such counterproductive U.N. resolutions. Importantly, it also provides a foundation for the next administration to take action to counteract the damaging effects of the U.N. Security Council resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 11, yet it shouldn't be necessary. President Obama's refusal to veto the U.N. Security Council's resolution was a radical and dangerous departure from U.S. precedent.

Prior to this most recent Security Council resolution, President Obama has exercised the veto power of the United States on every resolution relating to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His failure to do so this time jeopardizes and undermines our relationship with our strongest ally in the Middle East, and it has the potential to undercut the peace process.

I stood in this Chamber numerous times before and demanded support for Israel, and I am going to do so here again today. I refuse to sit idly by and watch misguided anti-Israel policies take root.

We have to take a stand. The administration's failure to act, to even participate in the vote, was an act of cowardice. It can't be erased, and we must take steps to address it. This resolution is a step in the right direction.

As a new President is sworn in this month, I am hopeful that we, as the House of Representatives, and the United States will reaffirm our support

of Israel and return to policies that strengthen the relationships between our two nations.

Mr. Speaker, as the new Congress starts, we also must look at domestic policies and how to grow our economy. We are going to do that right here in the House by taking the lead on regulatory reform to help lift the burden of an intrusive government by jump-starting the economy.

□ 1245

As part of this effort, I introduced H.R. 26, the REINS Act. This bill was originally authored and introduced by former Congressman Geoff Davis in 2009. Last Congress, now-Senator TODD YOUNG introduced the bill in the House. This Congress, I am proud to carry the torch for this commonsense legislation. I also thank Chairman GOODLATTE and his staff for all of their hard work on this bill.

Article I, section 1 of the United States Constitution grants legislative powers to Congress—we read about that right here on the floor this morning—but, for too long, Congress has ceded that power to the executive branch, which has resulted in an onslaught of regulation. This is a problem that we have seen under the administrations of both parties, and Members on both sides of the aisle should be concerned.

In recent years, this problem has exploded. In 2015 alone, the executive branch issued over 3,000 rules and regulations, and 76 of these regulations were major regulations. Let me explain that. Unelected bureaucrats, without input from the American people or their Representatives in Congress, issued 76 major regulations that would impact our economy by more than \$100 million each in 1 year alone. The consequences of these rules are massive. Even worse, we have seen this administration promote regulations with burdens that far outweigh their benefits. The REINS Act would require Federal agencies to submit major rules to Congress for approval. Under this bill, major rules would have to be accepted by both Chambers and signed by the President to become effective.

This bill restores accountability to the legislative process and ensures that lawmakers, not nameless bureaucrats, are the ones making the laws, just like our Constitution outlines. We have seen the harm that can come from an out-of-control regulatory regime. Right now, hardworking Americans across the country are paying the price. In fact, on average, each U.S. household is bearing an annual economic weight of \$15,000 in regulatory burdens. The oppressive costs of regulation, coupled with the impact on jobs, demand action.

One regulation, put forth by the Environmental Protection Agency in 2015, would have cost my home State of Georgia over 11,000 jobs; and we are all familiar with the waters of the United States rule, which, essentially, as-

serted authority over all groundwater in the country. If you have been to northeast Georgia, you know that water collects in pools and puddles and streams at certain times of the year. If all of that were to be regulated under this rule, it would be a disaster for not only my district but for all of the country, but that is what this administration has tried to do. That rule has been halted by a court, but were it to go into effect, it would cut farmers, ranchers, Realtors, and small businesses off at the knees.

With the number of major rules this administration has propagated, I could far exceed my time in just illustrating the problems these regulations can create; but, with the REINS Act, we have a chance to carve out a better way in going forward. The American people elected us, in this body, to represent them. The REINS Act allows their voices to be heard more clearly.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter what party is in the executive branch because the legislative branch is the one that makes and accepts the bills, not the unelected bureaucrats. This bill creates a sensible way to move forward with legislative business while better protecting our economy from suffocating regulations that Americans never voted to enact.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak on today's legislation, I want to take a moment to express my continued deep concern and uneasiness about the Russian hacking in order to influence the outcome of the 2016 Presidential election and the deeply troublesome response from our President-elect.

American democracy was attacked, in 2016, by Russian hackers who sought to tip our Presidential election in favor of Donald Trump. That is not I who is speaking—that is the CIA, the FBI, and 14 other United States intelligence agencies that have reached a clear consensus on this matter. Yet, even in the face of the overwhelming evidence, President-elect Trump has continued to sow seeds of confusion by publicly attacking and trying to discredit our country's intelligence agencies and the brave men and women who risk their lives every day to keep us safe.

Today, intelligence officials are testifying before the Senate on this matter. In one of his most alarming actions yet, President-elect Trump has said that he would rather trust the words of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange—an accused sex offender, who is holed up in the Ecuadorian Embassy in the U.K.—than the consensus of the Directors of the U.S. intelligence agencies. When Speaker RYAN was asked about Julian Assange, he called him a

sycophant for Russia who leaks, steals data, and compromises national security. Yet, America's next President puts more faith in him than in the 16 U.S. intelligence agencies that he will soon oversee.

This is not normal behavior by a President-elect, let alone by a President, and we cannot allow it to become normal. I appeal to my fellow Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats—and especially the Republican leadership—to reach out to the President-elect and ensure that there is a clear understanding about how damaging these statements and actions are to America's credibility, to our national security, and to the morale and responsibilities of our intelligence agencies. I appeal to my colleagues to get him help now.

America faces serious threats across the globe, and we cannot afford to have a Commander in Chief at war with the very intelligence agencies that are responsible for keeping our country safe. Whatever his motivation, President-elect Trump must clearly and unequivocally join Republicans and Democrats who seek answers. We need a bipartisan, independent commission to uncover the truth about Russian hacking, and we need all of our leaders to support it.

It is time Mr. Trump's Twitter side-show comes to an end. It only confirms what many of us feared during the campaign—that he is temperamentally unfit to be President. We must be united in protecting the integrity of our elections against Russians and all foreign influence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get to the underlying bills.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 26, the REINS Act, under a structured process, and for H. Res. 11, a resolution objecting to a recent United Nations Security Council resolution on Israel, under a completely closed process.

Before I get into discussing the merits of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first express some serious concern with the process used to rush this legislation to the floor. The deadline for amendments to be submitted to the Rules Committee was 10 a.m. on Tuesday. That is 2 hours before Members were sworn in and before the 115th Congress officially began. Now, it is true that some of the amendments that were received after the deadline were made in order for consideration on the floor. But, really, is this the way we want to begin the consideration of legislation in this session of Congress? All Members should have had the opportunity to review the legislation and offer thoughtful amendments to the REINS Act. Wouldn't it have been something to have considered this bill under an open process? If you hadn't wanted to have done that, maybe you could have waited a couple of days before you brought it to the floor so that everybody, especially the freshmen,

would have had an opportunity to evaluate it, and maybe they would have had some good ideas that they would have wanted to offer. But, here we are, right out of the gate, limiting the process and prohibiting Members from offering their ideas on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we have a process for reviewing rules promulgated by the executive branch. Congress should—and, indeed, can—examine regulations. Not all regulations are perfect. There are such things as bad regulations, and we should get rid of the ones that don't work. There is no debate on that. We have the ability to override regulations with new laws, and we have reauthorizations, appropriations, spending limitations, oversight hearings, investigations, GAO audits and studies, and the Congressional Review Act, just to name a few. We have a process that can and should work, but, because my Republican friends don't always get what they want, they want to undermine that process.

I don't think my Republican colleagues are really interested in a thoughtful review of these regulations. In fact, I find it hard to believe that this Republican Congress even has the capacity to utilize the process that is outlined in this bill so as to consider the 100 or so regulations—some of which are highly technical and would require experts in specialized fields to analyze—that could come up in any given year; but I guess that is the point. This bill would make it nearly impossible to implement much-needed regulations that ensure consumer health and product safety, environmental protections, workplace safety, and financial protections, just to name a few.

It would be a dream come true for industry and the wealthy, well-connected Republican donor class who, for example, are interested in blocking all attempts to rein in Wall Street, to combat climate change, or to protect workers and their public health. One simply needs to look at the intensive lobbying that has gone into fighting these regulations and supporting antiregulation legislation like the REINS Act—groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Koch brothers, the American Petroleum Institute, just to name a few.

Industry groups already use their seemingly unlimited resources to delay and prevent commonsense regulations from taking effect by tying rules up in court. This bill is just one additional tool for the wealthy and powerful to delay and destroy commonsense consumer protections.

In short, this bill is not about creating jobs, so nobody should be fooled. It is about rewarding special interests, plain and simple. It is about making it more difficult to rein in Wall Street, to control polluters, or to protect workers. But this is in keeping with the philosophy of the Republican majority, so no one should be surprised. I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this effort.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just say a few words about the closed rule on H. Res. 11, the resolution condemning U.S. abstention on Israel at the U.N. Security Council.

The peace and security of the State of Israel are priorities for every Member of Congress. Let us not try to obscure or confuse that truth. I can't think of any Member of this House who doesn't support peace in the Middle East and a safe and secure Israel. We may disagree about how to achieve those goals. Most of us believe that a two-state solution that provides peace, security, and prosperity to all of the peoples of the region—Israeli, Palestinian, and their Arab neighbors—is the best option to securing a just, lasting, and durable peace.

I have always voted in support of economic and military aid for Israel, but this does not mean that I always agree with the policies of a particular government in Tel Aviv. Sometimes I have been critical of the Israeli Government just as I am often critical of my own government and of other governments in the region.

For the past four decades or more, the United States, under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, has strongly opposed the expansion of settlements and the demolition of Palestinian homes. This has been a bipartisan consensus. We oppose the settlements as a violation of basic human rights; we oppose them as creating obstacles to a lasting two-state solution; and we oppose their rapid expansion as potentially creating a reality on the ground that, therefore, closes any possibility of a two-state solution.

Since 1967, under Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama, the United States has voted in favor or has abstained on more than 50 U.N. Security Council resolutions that are critical of Israel, including resolutions on settlements or the demolition of Palestinian homes. Of the more than 30 abstentions that have been cast by the U.S. over nearly five decades, only one was cast by the Obama administration—just one.

H. Res. 11 does not precisely express that fact accurately. It implies that the U.S. always opposes or vetoes such regulations when that is hardly the case, nor does U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 impose a solution on Israel outside of direct bilateral negotiations to end the conflict. Some of us who are strong supporters of Israel have difficulties with some of the wording in H. Res. 11 on a straightforward factual basis.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to allow this House to debate a substitute offered by our colleagues, Congressman DAVID PRICE, Congressman ELIOT ENGEL, who is a cosponsor of H. Res. 11, and Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY. The Price-Engel-Connolly amendment expresses the House's strong support for Israel, a two-state solution, and direct negotia-

tions between the parties to the conflict. It is reasonable and balanced and is very much deserving of debate and this House's attention.

Regrettably, the Republican majority on the House Rules Committee rejected allowing that amendment to be brought before the House and debated. Instead, it decided to begin this new year and this new Congress with yet another closed rule—in fact, the second closed rule this week with no debate, with no thoughtful alternatives, and with no ability of the Members of this body to deliberate such serious issues and choose between alternative proposals—just politics, politics, politics, politics as usual.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and to please send a clear message to House leaders that we would like to be able to debate reasonable alternatives and amendments to bills, like the Price-Engel-Connolly amendment. If we don't start out the year demanding fairness and openness in our debates of important issues then I don't want to even speculate as to what the rest of the year will look like.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my colleague's concerns. I think it is interesting to note, though, that, if he were concerned about a closed rule, there were many of us who were very concerned about a closed voice from America at the U.N. Security Council in not defending Israel.

Also, on the other subject here, when we look at this going forward, there was a substitute that was actually offered in support of a resolution that does take a stand against what happened. It was not even mentioned in the substitute resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1300

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share my strong support for this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater friend to the United States than Israel. Israel is a beacon of hope in a very dangerous part of the world. They are an important economic and military partner of the United States, and they play a critical role when it comes to fighting radical Islamic terrorism.

Given the importance of the U.S.-Israel relationship, I was deeply disappointed to see the United States recently passed a flawed anti-Israel resolution that will only make it more difficult to achieve peace in the Middle East. Even more disappointing was the fact that the United States just stood by and did nothing as it happened. Instead of vetoing the resolution, the United States Ambassador abstained from voting at all.

In other words, the United States turned its back and looked the other way as the U.N. passed a flawed resolution attacking Israel. This represents a

dangerous break in a longstanding and bipartisan policy to protect our sole democratic ally in the region from one-sided resolutions at the U.N.

Let's be clear, this resolution does absolutely nothing to make peace more likely in the region. Instead, it muddies the water and only further complicates what is already a very complex issue.

No solution to the ongoing problems with Israel and the Palestinian Authority is going to come from an international body like the United Nations telling them what to do. Any real solution must come through negotiations between the involved parties.

Honestly, given the many blunders of the Obama administration on the world stage, I guess this most recent action shouldn't be all that surprising. But this action is one of the most irresponsible acts ever by an outgoing President. It will be a dark stain on an already disastrous legacy.

By abstaining and allowing this resolution to pass, the Obama administration has upset decades of bipartisan policy as it relates to Israel and put a pathway to peace even further out of reach. Now is the time to be standing up for Israel, not turning away from them.

It is my hope and my belief that under President-elect Trump the United States will once again stand arm in arm with Israel, and this resolution is an important step in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

I hope that my colleague from Alabama uses some of that passion to convince the President-elect to stop cozying up to Vladimir Putin, who is no friend of democracy, no friend of Israel, and no friend of human rights.

All we are trying to do here, Mr. Speaker, is to have a little democracy on the House floor. People can vote whichever way they want to vote. But the Rules Committee last night, staying true to form, actually denied us the ability to bring to the floor and debate an alternative, which we think is, quite frankly, more appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order H. Res. 23, the David Price-Eliot Engel-Gerry Connolly resolution, to provide an alternative viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution again was blocked by the Rules Committee, right along party line. Republicans said "no" to an open debate, even though it complies with all the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss the proposal, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there is a legitimate debate to be had concerning U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 and the United States' decision to abstain, but H. Res. 11 does not engage on those issues. Instead, it misrepresents the motives of the Obama administration as it made the tough decision to abstain, and it distorts the content of the U.N. Security Council resolution, apparently for political purposes. In fact, H. Res. 11 runs a real risk of undermining the credibility of the United States Congress as a proactive force working toward a two-state solution.

As we enter a period of great geopolitical uncertainty, that principle has never been more important. In the face of new threats to democracy and stability, we must join together to reaffirm the most fundamental tenets of our foreign policy, including our strong and unwavering support for Israel. But we must also demonstrate to the world that we are still committed to diplomacy that defends human rights and promotes peace.

In an effort to make that unifying affirmation, I, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONNOLLY offered an amendment in the Rules Committee yesterday in the nature of a substitute for H. Res. 11. Our substitute was intended to put forward clear, consensus language that omitted the flaws of the underlying legislation and reaffirmed America's longstanding commitment to Israel and to peace in the region.

Our alternative didn't attempt to solve all the region's problems. We didn't pass judgment on recent events at the United Nations. In fact, those of us working on this resolution have varying views on that question. Nor did our resolution include politically charged attacks on the foreign policy priorities of the other party.

Instead, our resolution is carefully designed to allow a broad, bipartisan consensus to speak in one voice in support of a two-state solution as the most credible pathway to peace.

Unfortunately, this substitute amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee, which instead moved forward with the closed rule we have before us. The alternative resolution has now been introduced separately as H. Res. 23, and it is available for cosponsorship.

Today, however, we don't have that before us because of this rule.

Members don't have the opportunity to vote on this or any other resolution that accurately affirms both our vital relationship with Israel and the longstanding bipartisan consensus that supports a viable two-state solution. Instead, we are presented with an ex-

treme resolution that badly distorts the history—and we have heard that again here this morning—and that recklessly maligns U.S. diplomacy, all to embarrass the Obama administration for political gain. It is not worthy of this body.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and "no" on the underlying resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a bright young member of the Rules Committee who today is offering the rule on two very important issues that face this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I rise in support of the work that the Rules Committee did for the right reason and I will yield the right results.

The American people spoke on November 8, and they asked for change, a change from business as usual. Mr. Speaker, that does mean you can look at geopolitical facts and draw a conclusion as opposed to geopolitical facts and ignore things that happen in the world, and that is exactly what we are doing here today.

The American people no longer want unelected bureaucrats promulgating rules. They no longer want Washington to be so important in their lives. They want and need to be able to have an opportunity to make their own decisions and to work well within the law. They have spoken; and they want what I believe the Republican House, the Republican Senate, and a Republican President will bring to the country. It is called accountability.

The REINS Act, sponsored by Mr. COLLINS today, addresses many of the issues that I just discussed. The legislation requires that a joint resolution must be approved and must be passed by both Chambers of Congress and signed by the President before any major new rule or regulation is promulgated by the executive branch before it can take place. These are rules written by the Congress, rules then associated and determined by the executive, but with the intent of Congress to make sure that the American people are not further harmed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have just heard an opportunity to discuss what was—this discussion that we are having about Israel and the administration. The bottom line is that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative ED ROYCE, came before the committee yesterday and said he really did not take issue with what they were doing. He would not support it because it did not address the problem that occurred when the Obama administration, for political purposes, hung the people of Israel and the State of Israel out for the world to condemn and take

advantage of. It bypassed years and years of American foreign policy. It stunned not only Members of Congress, but it also stunned people who recognize that Israel is in a fight for their life.

Mr. Speaker, we did not, based upon the determination of the Rules Committee, make in order the bill that they had asked for. They can bring it to the floor today, and we are not going to make it available because it does not even discuss the basic facts. That is, the President of the United States unilaterally allowed the State of Israel, who is a dear friend of the United States, to be hung out in the political and the economic world and the world of foreign affairs to be tarnished and taken advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to say that we were appalled by what our government did and we are going to stand up and call it for what it is. America should always be a trusted friend to Israel, and we are doing exactly that here today.

Mr. Speaker, I predict an overwhelming vote that will take place today to enunciate what we believe is correct and also what was wrong.

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

The distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said that the American people don't want business as usual. Yet, here we are on this opening week and what we see is business as usual, more Putin-like, closed rules coming to the floor. The 113th and the 114th Congresses were the two most closed Congresses in the history of the United States. Here we are beginning the new session with, again, this closed process.

The Speaker, on opening day, made a promise to uphold the rights of the minority.

Well, you know what?

That means that the minority ought to be able to be heard on the House floor, that we ought to be able to bring amendments and substitutes to the floor. Yet, we get rejected time and time again.

This is not the way the most deliberative body in the world should be run. This is not the way Congress should be run. By closing down this process the way the majority does, it does a great disservice to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this rule, which was pushed through the Rules Committee as a closed rule and did not make in order an amendment, which I support, offered by my colleagues, Mr. PRICE, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. ENGEL.

Their amendment, like H. Res. 11, objects to the U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, which I believe was an unfair and one-sided resolution that placed undue blame upon the State of Israel for the impasse on peace negotiations.

Like the Obama administration, I am frustrated by the lack of progress in recent years toward achieving a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian crisis. However, I do not believe that the resolution passed by the Security Council contributes in any way to positively moving this process along.

Let's not mistake the fact that the Palestinian Government, which currently includes the terrorist faction Hamas, has done little to support peace negotiations. By refusing to publicly recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, condoning terrorist activity and pursuing unilateral actions at international institutions in violation of the Oslo Accords, the Palestinians have continuously placed roadblocks to achieving peace.

Let me be clear, the ongoing settlement activity sanctioned by the Israeli Government is also counterproductive to the peace process. If the Israeli Government wants to remain a beacon of freedom and democracy in the Middle East, they must recommit themselves to achieving a peaceful two-state solution where a Jewish Israel exists peacefully with the Palestinian state.

With the events of recent years, I am extremely fearful that the two-state solution is, if not dead, in critical condition. There are those within both the Israeli and Palestinian Governments who are actively working to ensure its demise. I think, as Members of Congress who strongly support Israel, we should be doing everything we can to convey to both the Israelis and the Palestinians that we will not stand by and watch them torpedo the hope of a peaceful solution to this crisis.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule governing these pieces of legislation and, in particular, the underlying legislation, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny, or REINS Act, H.R. 26.

Mr. Speaker, during the first two terms that I have served in this Congress, the most common question posed to me by my constituents in central and eastern Kentucky is: What is the biggest surprise that you have confronted as a Member of Congress?

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, the biggest surprise that I have discovered as a Member of Congress is that Congress is no longer in charge. Regrettably, unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the executive branch run the country.

□ 1315

Most of the laws that are enacted in this country at the Federal level come out of unelected bureaucrats in administrative agencies in the executive branch. Members of Congress, even though we are elected by the American people to be the lawmaking branch under Article I of the Constitution, we can't stop it. We can't stop these rules and regulations.

So I am proud to have consistently supported the REINS Act because it reasserts the powers of this body and this Congress under Article I of the Constitution, which provides: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be invested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

What does this mean?

The most important word in Article I of the Constitution is that first substantive word, "all," implying that none of the legislative powers should be in any other branch of the Federal Government, and it certainly shouldn't be exercised by the executive branch. We know this as the nondelegation doctrine, the principle that Congress may not and should not delegate its administrative power to administrative agencies.

The nondelegation doctrine forces a politically accountable Congress to make policy choices rather than leave this to unelected administrative officials. Yet what we have seen over the last several decades, and especially over the last 8 years, has been the rise of an unaccountable, out-of-control administrative state. Over time, legislative powers that are vested exclusively in Congress by the Constitution have been increasingly and unconstitutionally claimed, assumed, and exercised by the executive branch.

Now unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats decide how you work, what goods and services you can buy and sell, and what you can do with your own property, all without accountability at the ballot box. So this state of affairs is fundamentally in conflict with the foundational, constitutional principle that Congress alone possesses the Federal legislative power.

Look, this has enormous economic consequences. It is costly to our economy, and I don't have to go into that. The estimates are \$1.8 trillion in costs to the American economy. But the bigger issue is that none of these rules from these agencies have been approved—let alone, even considered—by Congress, even though they have a profound impact on the economy. So the measure we are considering today would simply require those regulations with the greatest economic impact to be approved by both Houses of Congress prior to their implementation.

This has two positive outcomes. First, obviously, it has the effect of blocking costly rules. Secondly, and more importantly, it will no longer allow Members of Congress to delegate their constitutional responsibility to the executive branch.

I will conclude, I heard my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, make the argument that Congress is not even interested in these regulations and we are not capable of seriously reviewing these rules. This is about making sure that experts with specialized expertise in the executive branch review and promulgate these rules. But what are we doing here if

that is true? We should turn out the lights, lock the door and leave, and give the keys of the government to the executive branch.

We had a Democratic administration over the last 8 years. We have a Republican administration coming. This is not about Republicans and Democrats. This is not a partisan issue. This is about the integrity of the institution of Congress. Let's stand up for the Congress and pass the REINS Act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his steadfast commitment to ensuring global peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and H. Res. 11, which is a flawed and misguided effort as currently written. Let me be clear: H. Res. 11 would undermine longstanding and bipartisan U.S. policy on a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This resolution is deeply flawed because it does not accurately portray U.S. policy on Israeli settlements. What is worse, this resolution completely mischaracterizes the United Nations Security Council resolution and the United States' abstention vote.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee shamefully rejected an alternative introduced by Congressman PRICE, Congressman CONNOLLY, and Congressman ENGEL, which reflects current U.S. policy that would have reaffirmed our commitment to a negotiated and peaceful two-state solution. This is the only pathway to peace and security. It is appalling—but really, it is not surprising—that Republicans pushed through a closed rule and hurried this to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the lack of a debate is a disgrace. But you know what? There are some of us here who are not going to be gagged. There are some of us here who are going to speak our mind, and there are some of us here who are going to put forth our views. That is our constitutional responsibility. We have the right to debate, whether you agree or disagree. It is really, really a very sad day for our democracy when bills like this come to the floor with rules like this which don't allow debate. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad that the gentlewoman just got a chance to debate herself on the floor and to use that freedom of speech. That is what this floor is for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding.

I rise today to support this rule and to express my strong disapproval of President Obama and his administration's refusal to veto the anti-Israel resolution adopted by the United Na-

tions Security Council on December 23, 2016.

Since its establishment, Israel has worked tirelessly to forge peace with its neighbors. They have sought neither violence nor conflict. In fact, the territories discussed in the misguided U.N. resolution were areas Israel gained in self-defense during the 1967 Six-Day War. These areas include the Old City, with the Temple Mount and Western Wall, areas that, thousands of years ago, were the origin of the Israeli culture, heritage, and religion.

Israel did not seek to take this land. Rather, when threatened by their Arab neighbors in 1967, they were forced to act in self-defense and repel these attacks. Since that time, Israel has successfully reached peaceful agreements with many of the Arab countries who, at that time, sought to wipe them off the map.

Israel is the only thriving democracy in the Middle East who practices and protects human rights regardless of ethnicity, gender, religion, or citizenship. Additionally, the State of Israel has been committed to implementing initiatives to promote economic growth in the region, including creating opportunities for Palestinians and others. Israel is a shining example of taking care of those who are around them, even as they face constant threat of violence and terrorist attacks.

I have been appalled over what has taken place under the direction of President Obama and Secretary Kerry and others within the administration. In response, I also introduced a resolution condemning these intolerable actions. By failing to direct the United States to veto the one-sided, anti-Israel U.N. Security Council resolution, the President turned his back on Israel and, as a result, turned his back on America.

The anti-Israel resolution adopted by the U.N. Security Council threatens peace and stability in the Middle East. It will most likely incentivize further violence and radical boycotts.

While President Obama and Secretary Kerry's long list of foreign policy failures has been well-documented over the years, none to date have been this deliberate and calculated. That is why I have come to the floor to support Chairman ROYCE's bipartisan resolution.

As Republicans and Democrats alike have expressed their contempt for the President's lack of action, I look forward to working with my colleagues and President-elect Trump in correcting President Obama's anti-Israeli tactics as we work to form a stronger bond with Israel and as we work to promote peace in the Middle East.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to Mr. ROSS, my friend, I agree with just

about every single thing you say about the great State of Israel, but I disagree with you about this resolution. Let me explain why.

Israel is a Jewish democratic state. It has been our strong ally. We have supported it through thick and thin, most recently with a \$38 billion appropriation for their security over the next 10 years. I supported that. But this question that we face fundamentally comes down to whether we are going to support a two-state solution or move toward a one-state solution.

The bottom line here is that settlement activity, every settlement that is made—600,000 settlers living in the West Bank and Jerusalem—makes it ever-more difficult to achieve that two-state solution.

President Obama, in his abstention on that veto, was acknowledging what has been the policy of this country. Ronald Reagan was opposed to settlements. You know, you get a family that settles anywhere, but in the West Bank, they put down roots. They are good people. They have a belief that the West Bank belongs Biblically to Israel. That is their view. Many politicians, including Netanyahu, appear to be embracing that. That is not the international position. It is not the unified position in Israel. Many folks in Israel think the settlements are a threat to the possibility of achieving the secure borders and the security of Israel and the maintenance of it as a democratic Jewish state.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue. With 600,000 settlers, with 4.5 million Palestinians in the West Bank and also living in the State of Israel and 6.5 million Jewish members of the State of Israel, the demographics, long term, are going to reach a tipping point where there could be more Arab voters than there are Jewish voters, and then the State of Israel will have to make the decision Jewish or democratic. I want the State of Israel to continue to be that Jewish and democratic state that it is, and that is why I oppose this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, nothing unites Indiana's Sixth Congressional District quite like the simple phrase, "we must stand with Israel." Throughout most of my rural district that has far more Christian churches than synagogues, Hoosiers are united in their support of the Jewish state.

Hoosiers, myself included, were deeply distressed when the Obama administration stood silent as our great ally was demonized by the U.N. Israel is our most important friend in the region, and among America's best partners in the world. President Obama's silence and defection from Israel was unconscionable, and he has made our ally less safe and peace less likely.

I am eager to vote today to send a strong signal to the world that the

American people reject the U.N.'s one-sided, shortsighted U.N. Security Council resolution, and the American people stand united with Israel. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Israel is a special place in a troubled and storied landscape, sacred ground for three of the world's major regions.

Israel's security is important to me and the people I represent. The Jewish homeland is the only democracy in this broader region of continuing conflict. I abhor the terrorist acts. Israel's security merits our support, which is why the Obama administration, with Congress' approval, just awarded an unprecedented amount of military aid over the next 10 years.

But, unfortunately, Israel's future is being threatened by its own actions as well as by its adversaries. For years, reckless settlement expansion has been opposed by the United States and the rest of the world. They are confiscating Palestinian land in a way that is not just contrary to longstanding American policy, but is often illegal under Israeli law.

It looks like the incoming Trump administration is reconsidering 50 years of bipartisan policy, urged on by the extremist views of his proposed Ambassador whose position on settlement expansion is on the fringe of even Israeli politics.

H. Res. 11 sends the wrong signal to the incoming President, to Israeli politicians, and especially to the Israeli people. It drives a wedge between Israel and the majority of Americans, including the majority of Jewish Americans. It weakens that special relationship and furthers the isolation of Israel, in evidence as the resolution was approved unanimously by the other 14 countries. Israel will become more vulnerable and, candidly, it will likely embolden forces that are hostile to the Jewish state.

Instead of this resolution, we should reject the rule and support the resolution I cosponsored with Mr. PRICE that reaffirms our commitment to the longstanding American policy in support of a two-state solution and to help secure Israel's future as a stable, democratic, peaceful state.

□ 1330

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support the REINS Act and the rule that brings it to us, but I want to underscore the point made earlier by Mr. BARR.

The REINS Act says that any regulation—that is, an act with the force of law—adopted by the executive branch and costs more than \$100 million must then be approved by Congress to take effect.

As necessary as this bill is in the current environment, I am afraid it has got it completely backwards. Under the Constitution read on this floor today, it is not the role of the executive branch to make law and for the legislative branch then to approve or veto it. Quite the contrary, making law is the singular prerogative of the legislative branch; the executive then approves or vetoes that law.

The REINS Act is necessary solely because for years Congress has improperly ceded its lawmaking powers to the executive, and it is time we restored the proper role of the legislative branch to make law and for the executive branch to faithfully execute it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, for his leadership and for managing this rule.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the closed rule for H. Res. 11.

Ranking Member ENGEL, Mr. PRICE, and I have submitted an amendment to H. Res. 11 when it came before the Rules Committee. Our amendment offered a balanced approach and strongly reaffirmed longstanding, bipartisan principles that undergird U.S. policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We introduced that amendment as a reasonable alternative that would allow all of us to convene the broadest possible bipartisan coalition here in the House.

Personally, I believe the U.S. should have vetoed the U.N. Security Council resolution, and, notably, our resolution supported the U.S. veto of any one-sided or anti-Israel U.N. Security Council resolution or any resolution that seeks to impose a resolution to the conflict.

Our resolution also condemned boycott and divestment campaigns and sanctions that target Israel, and it reiterated support for a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution that reaffirms Israel's right to exist as a democratic, Jewish state. We all agree that there can be no substitute for direct bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. As we transition into a new administration and begin this new Congress, we should resist temptations to rewrite U.S. policy on the peace process in a misguided attempt to further drive a wedge where none should exist.

The point of H. Res. 11 seems to be to bash Obama on the way out, and the fact that there are distortions on history and fact seem not to bother us. On this point, I would note that H. Res. 11 mentions settlements but makes no attempt to reaffirm longstanding U.S. opposition to those very settlements. It is more important now than ever that Congress maintain its consistent, bipartisan policy toward the conflict. We believe the carefully constructed language in our resolution did just that, but we were not allowed the op-

portunity by the Rules Committee to bring it before the floor for a vote.

So I urge my colleagues, especially my Democratic colleagues, to vote "no" on H. Res. 11 and the rule and to support and cosponsor H. Res. 23, a much more bipartisan and balanced approach.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), who is a great new Member.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the current administration has literally undermined peace with their shameful failure to veto U.N. Resolution 2334.

Condemning Israel is condemning the most peaceful country in the Middle East, and it is done simply to appease Palestinians—a group that has been historically defined by their responsibility for terror—and this does not bring us one step closer to peace.

I can tell you that after defending freedom in the U.S., I chose to volunteer alongside the Israeli Defense Forces because our countries do share the uncommon ideals of freedom, democracy, and mutual respect for all people. During my time with the IDF, I did learn at the tables of Israeli families just how much each one of them truly desire peace.

By failing to veto this hateful U.N. resolution, the administration has sent a terrible message. We must counter this underhanded condemnation of Israel with a unanimous show of support today for H. Res. 11.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this House contains many friends of Israel, Republican and Democratic. Indeed, as long as I've been here, I have never found an enemy of Israel in this House. Certainly that friendship was very apparent when only a few weeks ago President Obama approved giving Israel \$38 billion of American tax money in military assistance. But like the Knesset in Jerusalem, we sometimes do disagree about what the best way is to ensure peace and security, and lively debate is important to that.

Unfortunately, this rule is about stifling Knesset-style debate. It restricts and denies any amendment and any alternative. This strict limitation on debate and this surprise presentation of today's measure with no public hearing and little warning show how fearful our Republican colleagues are of a legitimate discussion of this troubling issue. This is a horrible way to make critical foreign policy. It is only a step above doing it by tweets, which seems to be the approach of the day.

Today's resolution, which purports to support Israeli security, actually undermines that security. It favors going it alone with the current Israeli Government in defiance of our other allies and the 14 countries that unanimously voted for this Security Council measure.

Isolation—more and more isolation—is not the way to protect Israel. Those who demonstrate their friendship with Israel by following Mr. Netanyahu on one right turn after another are boxing in America and Israel. He is moving us further and further to the extremes so that we eventually go off a cliff into chaos. As Tom Friedman noted in urging a negotiated two-state settlement: “A West Bank on fire would become a recruitment tool for ISIS and Iran.”

Vote for peace. Reject this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), who is another freshman that we welcome to the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying REINS Act because I was sent to Congress to help hard-working Hoosiers create jobs, keep jobs, and raise wages. As a small-business owner myself, I understand how difficult it is to build a business in today's economy, and I want the Hoosiers of Indiana's Ninth Congressional District to have control over their futures without fear of unaccountable government bureaucrats with political agendas creating regulations to restrict their pursuit of success.

I believe the REINS Act will ensure the constituents in Indiana's Ninth District will not only have a voice, but also a choice in the laws that govern this great Nation. Hardworking Hoosiers are shining examples of what Americans can do with the freedom to make their own economic decisions, and I don't want unelected bureaucrats in Washington impeding the job-creating growth of Indiana's and America's businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), who is another new face that is looking forward to making a difference here.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying legislation. Today the Federal Government's rules exceed 97,000 pages—the most in American history. So we ask ourselves: Do we really need 20 pages of rules governing vending machines? Could we cover fuel standards in less than 578 pages? Would the Union crumble if we didn't have 61 pages of regulations on residential dehumidifiers?

Each of these rules has compliance costs that exceed \$100 million.

In my home State of Florida, we passed a version of the REINS Act. The result has been repeal or replacement of over 4,000 job-killing regulations. We can only make America great again if we make Americans free again—free from the tyranny of unelected Wash-

ington bureaucrats huddled in windowless cubicles dictating to Americans how they should live their lives, build their businesses, and protect their own property. Voters sent us here to drain the swamp, but with so many regulations, we would be lucky to get permission to mop up a puddle.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to address you and my privilege to be recognized by the gentleman from Georgia.

I wanted to address this rule, and I share some of the sentiment that came from the gentleman from Massachusetts. I like to have open rules. I like to have open debates. I would like to have more than one debate on what we might do with this resolution that is before us. I would like to have a debate on the one-state solution versus the two-state solution because I believe that the two-state solution has run its course and we need to pack up our tools, ship those off to the side, and start all over again with a new look.

I believe we needed to have a resolution that refreshes this in such a way that it completely rejected Resolution 2334, that vote that took place in the United Nations and said to the Trump administration: Let's start this fresh with a new look rather than a direction of being bound by implication to a two-state solution.

But that is not what we have ahead of us. What we have ahead of us is a resolution that has come to the floor under a closed rule that sends a lot of a good and right message to the rest of the world that America and the United States Congress reject what happened in the United Nations the other day and that decision to abstain from that vote. On the other hand, we really don't have the focus here to take on the rest of this issue. I am hopeful that we will.

I will be introducing a resolution later today that addresses the two-state resolution in a way I would like to have done it with a resolution here.

As I said to the gentleman from California, it is not my intent to blow up his bill or his initiative. I want to see the best success we can on what is going on here today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, the problem with this U.N. resolution is not simply that it criticizes Israeli actions; it is that it is fundamentally one-sided. It is anti-Israel, and that is a departure from longstanding, bipartisan U.S. policy.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 does not address the Palestinian Authority's failure to end incitement of hatred. Frankly, they encourage it. The violence that we see against Israeli civilians comes from the encouragement of PA officials. It doesn't address the Palestinian Authority's continued payments. An incentive payment in their budget—over \$300 million a year—is paid to those who would carry out attacks against Israeli civilians. The more mayhem you create, the longer the term you have in prison, the larger the stipend. That comes right out of the budget of the Palestinian Authority.

The U.N. resolution did not call upon Palestinian leadership to fulfill their obligations towards negotiations. The Middle East Summit is planned next month. So, first, the administration abstains on this, and next month in France there is real concern that another damaging Security Council resolution should follow.

That is why this dangerous policy must be rejected, hopefully unanimously, by this House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule. It is not fair. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that Mr. PRICE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONNOLLY can bring up their alternative to H. Res. 11.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, finally, that I am deeply concerned that the institution of Congress has been undermined time and time again by this tendency to be overly restrictive and outright closed. We are supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, but the problem is we don't deliberate very much. Everything that is brought to this floor tends to be a press release substituting for legislation.

□ 1345

There is no bipartisanship. There is none. There is no working together. There is none. And that is unfortunate. I think one of the messages of this last election for the American people was they want to see things happen here. Not just whatever the Republicans want or whatever the Democrats want, they want us to see us working together.

I served here as a staffer during a time when there was collegiality, when Republicans and Democrats came together and passed appropriations bills and authorization bills and passed major reform bills. That doesn't happen anymore.

On the issue of regulatory reform, I think you can actually get a consensus on regulatory reform. There is nobody in this House that thinks the regulatory process is perfect. The problem is, when you bring a bill to the floor that is so one-sided, that is poorly written, that is impractical, we can't support it.

On the issue of Israel, we could have come to a consensus, I think, and spoken with one voice to show our unwavering support for the State of Israel. But instead, we have a bill that comes to the floor that is politically charged—I think that is very clear, based on the tone of some of the speeches here today—but also has factual errors in it.

The frustration level has grown to the point where some of us in the minority have taken to protesting. We had a sit-in in response to the fact that we couldn't get legislation to the floor that said if you are on a terrorist list, you can't fly, then you can't buy a gun, and a bill that called for universal background checks.

We thought we had a promise to be able to bring some of this to the floor. My friends could have voted against it. But we were told, no, you don't even have the right to debate these bills.

I am going to say to my colleagues sincerely that, unless things change, you are going to see the discord, the anger, and the frustration build on this side of the aisle, and you are going to see it build throughout the country.

There is a reason why people hold Congress in such disdain. It is because they see this place not as an institution where we can solve problems but as a place where it is all about obstruction or "my way or the highway."

This is a lousy way to start the new year. Please vote "no" on the previous question and vote "no" on this rule.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is amazing to me some of the stuff that I have just heard, Mr. Speaker, just in the last few minutes. And I appreciate my friend across the aisle, but the debate that we have been having here is amazing. So that is something I want to talk about, but also something that came up, just to take a few steps down the road.

It had been mentioned many times here on the floor today that a unanimous vote by the Security Council in some way implies that it was right or that it was proper. I am sorry, the groupthink of the United Nations Security Council on this issue was wrong.

The one that was left silent was the beacon of freedom to the world, the United States, and instead of engaging, instead of working as we have in the past abstained or voted against, there have been times when we actually, as my friend said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, worked together. When that did happen in the past, there were times in which Israel and the U.S. worked together to soften or change, and we had, at that point in time, something that—not liked, but something that could be lived with. In this case, it was nothing Israel said. This is bad. America turned its back.

Where was the voice? It was silent. Where was the voice? We voted absent.

That is not what the leader of the free world should do. That is not what the leader of the free world should do to his closest ally in the Middle East. That is why we are talking about this.

There are other things we can discuss today. There are other discussions on two-state solutions on another case on the settlement, but the bottom line here is that it goes deeper than the other issues. The deeper part here is that we simply sat silent while the world mocked and criticized our strongest ally, Mr. Speaker.

So don't talk to me about working together. I get it. But where was the working together on this? It was absent. A unanimous vote, especially of the United Nations Security Council, using that as your justification, I think we need to talk.

But also, Mr. Speaker, when we come to the end, regulatory environment, the REINS Act is simply saying: Congress, do what Congress is supposed to do. Congress, work as the voice of the American people. Work for the voice of helping companies start and create jobs. Work with the American people to relegate them forward instead of moving backward.

The REINS Act simply says: let's do our job here. Not the ones who are closed off from input but the folks who are elected to come to this place, to come to these hallowed halls and debate what we are talking about today: debate the regulatory environment, debate the environment. When we do that, then that is what we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

I oppose this rule because it makes in order H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act, which is a radical measure that could make it impossible to promulgate safety regulations to protect the public.

I oppose this rule because it would effectively shut down the entire U.S. regulatory system, amending in one fell swoop every bedrock existing regulatory statute.

The legislation is clearly designed to stop all regulation dead in its tracks—no matter the threat to health, safety or the economy.

It would neuter the current system's reliance on science, expertise, and public participation in developing regulations.

H.R. 26 would reshape the regulatory system to work as it did in the 19th Century, before the abuses of the robber barons led Congress to create a modern and more efficient system to protect public health and safety.

The REINS Act would require both houses of Congress to approve any major rule within a limited period of time in order for it to take effect.

Effectively, this would allow either house of Congress to block rules simply through inaction, even when an existing statute required action.

The legislation would disempower every federal agency, effectively rendering their rule-making activities advisory opinions with no force of law.

Under REINS, even rules to handle emergencies could be in effect for only 90 days absent Congressional approval.

H.R. 26 is so grossly slanted against regulation that it will allow lawsuits to proceed against any regulation Congress could actually manage to approve.

And the latest version of the bill delays its effective date for a year so that any Trump Administration efforts to repeal existing regulations would not get caught up in the REINS Act trap—another indication that the REINS Act would be expected to stop any regulatory action from moving forward (because repealing regulations must be done through regulation, so repeals would in fact trigger REINS.)

In addition to representing an overwhelming threat to the public, H.R. 26 is also bad for business.

The legislation would require businesses to have to lobby Congress for each and every significant regulatory change they wanted—no matter whether those were new regulations, changes in regulation or repeal; no matter whether the regulatory issues involved disputes between different industries; no matter how technical the issues involved.

H.R. 26 would, in fact, make the regulatory system less predictable for industry and would disadvantage any industry that did not have a large political presence.

It is difficult to exaggerate how fundamentally this alarming piece of legislation would change American government and how hard it would make it to protect the public.

This legislative effort is the ultimate giveaway to special interests.

Under H.R. 26, any special interest could simply use its political clout in one chamber of Congress to sideline such vital public protections as limiting the amount of lead in children's products, preventing salmonella contamination in eggs, reducing emissions of toxic air pollutants or banning predatory banking practices.

The REINS Act constitutes the ultimate overreach as well, not only because of the impact it would have, but because Congress already has ample tools to control the regulatory system.

Congress is already vested with the authority to vote to block a specific regulation at any time.

And regulation is permitted only pursuant to statutes that Congress has passed and can amend or repeal.

Under current law, agencies must keep a record of their interactions with industry and other entities interested in the regulatory process and provide a clear record of their decision-making (which often must be able to hold up in court).

Because agencies often take years to review the scientific and technical evidence relevant to a decision, throwing every final decision to Congress would undermine this entire process.

In addition, courts can review regulations and an elaborate public process that can stretch out for years must be followed to issue a regulation.

Instead, under this legislation, Congress would have to make relatively rapid decisions, often behind closed doors, and it would not be legally held to any standard of technical review.

Businesses would no longer have an incentive to cooperate with agencies and provide

arguments and evidence because they could just take their chances with the political process, which they would no doubt try to influence with campaign contributions.

Ultimately, decisions on regulations would be determined solely by political horse-trading among Members of Congress.

Agencies issue 50 to 100 major rules a year dealing with everything from Medicare reimbursement to railroad safety to environmental protection.

But, under H.R. 26, Congress would have 70 legislative days to second-guess each and every decision covered by the Act.

Because failure to take action would kill any safeguard, Congress would be forced to hold hearings in a short time on technical issues—or worse, forgo hearings and race the 70-day clock with even less information and debate.

This body has already allowed backlog to clog the channels of its current docket, and this legislation would require that as many as 100 additional measures come to the floor.

This is not an effort to drain the swamp; this is a divisive and manipulative tactic employed to clog the drain.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this merry-go-round legislative scheme and the irresponsibility of the House majority in wasting time trying to shut down the entire regulatory system (because it cannot win through time-honored, Constitutional legislative processes) entirely disregard the administrative public support efforts in place to protect food safety, air and water quality and to limit the manipulation of our economic system by special interests.

The REINS Act is tantamount to a coup—a right-wing takeover to block future agency actions regardless of public desires.

The exceptional Americans we serve deserve a Congress that does its job and keeps our time-honored institutions functioning.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 22 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration, without intervention of any point of order, in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 23) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives and reaffirming long-standing United States policy in support of a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 23.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair

will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—235

Abraham	Goodlatte	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Allen	Gowdy	Palmer
Amash	Granger	Paulsen
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Perry
Babin	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Bacon	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Poliquin
Barletta	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harris	Reed
Bergman	Hartzler	Reichert
Beutler	Hensarling	Renacci
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Billirakis	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Black	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Blackburn	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Blum	Huizenga	Rokita
Bost	Hultgren	Rooney, Francis
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rooney, Thomas
Brat	Hurd	J.
Bridenstine	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Buchanan	Johnson (GA)	Rothfus
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Budd	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Burgess	Jordan	Rutherford
Byrne	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Calvert	Katko	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sessions
Cheney	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Coffman	Knight	Shuster
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Comer	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Comstock	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Cook	Lance	Smucker
Costello (PA)	Latta	Stefanik
Cramer	Lewis (MN)	Stewart
Crawford	LoBiondo	Stivers
Culberson	Long	Taylor
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Tenney
Davidson	Love	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Thornberry
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Tiberi
Dent	MacArthur	Tipton
DeSantis	Marchant	Trott
DesJarlais	Marino	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Upton
Donovan	Massie	Valadao
Duffy	Mast	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Walden
Dunn	McClintock	Walker
Emmer	McHenry	Walorski
Farenthold	McKinley	Walters, Mimi
Faso	McMorris	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	Meadows	Westerman
Flores	Meehan	Williams
Fortenberry	Messer	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Mitchell	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gaetz	Mullin	Yoder
Gallagher	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Garrett	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Noem	Young (IA)
Gohmert	Nunes	Zeldin

NAYS—188

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Barragan	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan	Capuano
Bera	F.	Carbajal
Beyer	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas

Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pelosi
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Peters
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Peterson
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Ciilline	Jones	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Price (NC)
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Cleaver	Kennedy	Raskin
Clyburn	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Cohen	Kihuen	Richmond
Connolly	Kildee	Rosen
Conyers	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kind	Ruiz
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Langevin	Sánchez
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Lawrence	Schiff
Cummings	Lee	Schneider
Davis (CA)	Levin	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
Delaney	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
DeLauro	Loeback	Shea-Porter
DelBene	Lofgren	Sherman
Demings	Lowenthal	Sinema
DeSaulnier	Lowey	Sires
Deutch	Lujan Grisham,	Slaughter
Dingell	M.	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray	Soto
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Speier
F.	Maloney,	Suozi
Ellison	Carolyn B.	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Eshoo	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Espallat	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Esty	McEachin	Titus
Evans	McGovern	Tonko
Foster	McNerney	Torres
Frankel (FL)	Meeke	Tsongas
Fudge	Meng	Vargas
Gabbard	Moore	Veasey
Garamendi	Moulton	Vela
Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Gottheimer	Nadler	Visclosky
Green, Al	Napolitano	Walz
Green, Gene	Neal	Wasserman
Grijalva	Nolan	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Norcross	Waters, Maxine
Hanabusa	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman
Hastings	O'Rourke	Welch
Heck	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Higgins (NY)	Panetta	Yarmuth
Himes	Pascrell	
Hoyer	Payne	

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Collins (NY)	Mulvaney	Zinke
Davis, Danny	Pompeo	
Galleo	Price, Tom (GA)	

□ 1412

Messrs. NADLER and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 9.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

RECOGNIZING TIM BERRY

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, when we as Members of Congress are first elected, before we are sworn in, before we introduce our first bit of legislation, the first thing we do is begin to hire, to form a team, and much of the success that happens on this floor is a lot of work that is done behind the scenes by our staff. They do a tremendous job for this country in the public service they provide.

I personally count myself blessed to have had Tim Berry as my chief of staff for the whole time I have been in leadership. Today is his last day on our floor. Tim has had 18 years of service in this institution. He has been in other leadership offices. He went into the private sector, but when I got elected majority whip, I asked him if he was willing to come back.

Tim has always demonstrated political wisdom, personal resolve, dedication, but, most importantly, distinct moral clarity.

He has been here in some of the most difficult times in this institution. He was in the office when people were actually shot when an intruder came and took lives in this institution. He has worked on legislation, he has worked on friendships, and he has worked across the aisle. But if there were one thing I would define this man as, it is a family man.

Today, we are lucky to have his wife, Lisa, and daughter, Maevie, in the gallery with us. And to his other children, Ella and Chris, I want to thank you for your sacrifice on loaning your father. For every dinner he has missed, or every phone call he had to take, or maybe that one or two lacrosse games he couldn't coach, I want to thank you.

But to Tim, I want to thank you for your dedication, I want to thank you for your friendship, and I want to wish you the very best on behalf of a very grateful nation and institution. Thank you.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, my colleague, the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for yielding.

I rise to thank and to pay tribute to Tim Berry.

Mr. Speaker, the American public sees us so often when we are confronting one another—disagreeing strenuously sometimes and disagreeing sometimes disagreeably. What they don't see is the staff working with staffs across the aisle in a constructive effort to reach consensus and to move democracy forward. What they don't see is the collegiality that is engendered through the years between staff who have the responsibility of ensuring not only that their Members have full knowledge of what is being considered and their advice and counsel, but also of assuring that there is positive communication across the aisle even when we disagree.

Tim Berry has been one of the most adept, most cordial, most positive, and most effective staffers in effecting that end. We Members sometimes mask how effective our staffs are. I am sure they will lament that from time to time.

Tim Berry, I want you to know—we are very proud—is from Silver Spring, Maryland. He grew up in Silver Spring and grew up in our State. Tim Berry is a proud son of our State. Yes, he is a

Republican; yes, he has been on staff on the other side of the aisle; but he is an American first, who has cared about his country, who has cared about this institution, and who has cared about showing respect and concern for staffs on both sides of the aisle.

I have had a number of chiefs of staff, one of whom is Cory Alexander, now the vice president of UnitedHealth. Cory Alexander and Tim are good friends. They worked together very constructively when Tim was with Tom DeLay. Mr. MCCARTHY is in that office, and I had the privilege of using that office for 4 years. There was never a time when we walked down that hallway that we didn't think of Detective Gibson losing his life and Officer Chestnut losing his life outside that door. Tim Berry was there to serve. Tim Berry served, notwithstanding the dangers that were self-evident.

Lisa is in the gallery and his children who have been mentioned by Leader MCCARTHY. Young people, you can be extraordinarily proud of your dad. I know, Lisa, you are as well. He has made this institution a better institution. He has made the relationship between the parties more positive in times when it was greatly strained.

Tim, thank you. Thank you for your service to the Congress, thank you for your service to the country, and thank you for your service to each and every one of us. God bless you and Godspeed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 187, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—231

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Davidson
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Buck	Denham
Amash	Bucshon	Dent
Amodei	Budd	DeSantis
Arrington	Burgess	DesJarlais
Babin	Byrne	Diaz-Balart
Bacon	Calvert	Donovan
Banks (IN)	Carter (GA)	Duffy
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Chaffetz	Dunn
Bergman	Cheney	Emmer
Beutler	Coffman	Farenthold
Biggs	Cole	Faso
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Ferguson
Bishop (MI)	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Black	Conaway	Flores
Blackburn	Cook	Fortenberry
Blum	Costello (PA)	Franks (AZ)
Bost	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Gaetz
Brat	Culberson	Gallagher
Bridenstine	Curbelo (FL)	

Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Mooleenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenneny
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberti
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross

O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra
Buchanan
Butterfield
Collins (NY)
Gallego

Meeks
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rice (SC)

Richmond
Rush
Velázquez
Walberg
Zinke

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 26.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22 and rule XVIII, 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. 26.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1433

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. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, regulatory reform plays a critical role in ensuring that

our Nation finally achieves a full economic recovery and retains its competitive edge in the global marketplace. Congress must advance pro-growth policies that create jobs and restore economic prosperity for families and businesses across the Nation and make sure that any administration and its regulatory apparatus is held accountable to the American people.

America's small-business owners are suffocating under mountains of endlessly growing, bureaucratic red tape; and the uncertainty about the cost of upcoming regulations discourages employers from hiring new employees and expanding their businesses. Excessive regulation means higher prices, lower wages, fewer jobs, less economic growth, and a less competitive America.

Today, Americans face a burden of over \$3 trillion per year from Federal taxation and regulation. In fact, our Federal regulatory burden is larger than the 2014 gross domestic product of all but the top eight countries in the world. That burden adds up to about \$15,000 per American household—nearly 30 percent of average household income in 2015.

Everyone knows it has been this way for far too long; but the Obama administration, instead of fixing the problem, has known only one response: increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation. The results have painfully demonstrated a simple truth: America cannot tax, spend, and regulate its way to economic recovery, economic growth, and durable prosperity for the American people.

Consider just a few facts that reveal the economic weakness the Obama administration has produced. In the December 2016 jobs report, the number of unemployed workers, workers who can only find part-time jobs, and workers who are now only marginally attached to the labor force stood at 9.3 percent. They number 15 million Americans. America's labor force participation rate remains at lows not seen since the Carter administration, and median household income is still below the level achieved before the financial crisis, which is after the entirety of the Obama administration.

The contrast between America's current condition and the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved as President is particularly stark in that, 4½ years after a recession began in 1981, the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to those of the Obama administration's, had achieved a recovery that created 7.8 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by \$3,091, and real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

To truly fix America's problems, the REINS Act is one of the simplest, clearest, and most powerful measures we can adopt. The level of new major regulation from the Obama administration is without modern precedent. Testimony before the Judiciary Committee during recent Congresses has

plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

The REINS Act responds by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people's representatives in Congress before any new major regulation, which is defined in the bill generally as a rule that has an effect on the economy of at least \$100 million, can be imposed on our economy. It does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle: "no major regulation without representation."

The REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet that Washington's regulatory bureaucrats too often turn. During the 114th, 113th, and 112th Congresses, the REINS Act was passed multiple times by the full House of Representatives, each time with bipartisan support.

I thank Mr. COLLINS of Georgia for reintroducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listened intently to my colleague's opening remarks, and he seemed to try to justify the passage of the REINS Act, which I rise in opposition to, by the way, by saying that it has been the Obama administration's job-killing regulations that have put our economy in its position, which is one that is not good.

Despite trying to convince the American people of that allegation, the American people are aware of the facts. They are aware of the fact that, 8 years ago, when President Obama came into office and under a Republican stewardship that used trickle-down economics as its model, this economy neared that of the Great Depression's. In fact, we call it the period of the Great Recession. This country almost went into a depression, and it went into a Great Recession because of George Bush's and the Republicans' policies of trickle-down economics, which Daddy Bush—George Herbert Walker Bush—once referred to as "voodoo economics," and he was right about that.

Let's look at where we were then and look at where we are now and ask ourselves: Are we not better off now than we were then?

There are not many voices that could say, No, we are not better off now than we were then, because they know, since then, there have been 81 straight months of positive private sector job growth.

They know that over 15.6 million new jobs have been added to our economy by President Obama. They also know that 30 million more people have health insurance and access to the healthcare system now than they did back then. They know that regulations had to ensue from the passage of the

Affordable Care Act in order to enable those 30 million people to have coverage now. That is why they want to introduce this legislation to cut regulations. They want to try to hurt the Affordable Care Act. They also know that regulations had to spring forth from the Dodd-Frank, Wall Street regulation, legislation that was passed in this body. They know that those regulations have protected the finances and the financial security of Americans who are doing far better now than they were 8 years ago when President Obama took office.

The American people know that they are much better off now. They know that bankruptcies have gone down. They know that foreclosures have gone down. They know that they have better jobs. They know that things are better now than they were back then.

You will remember and the American people will remember that on the very day of President Obama's first inauguration, MITCH MCCONNELL and a cabal of Republicans met from both the House and Senate, crying in their beers at a Capitol Hill bar. They embarked on a strategy to—what?—make sure that President Obama would be a first-term President. So they resolved to oppose everything that he proposed, and they certainly did. Despite unprecedented opposition from the Republicans' just saying "no" to everything, the American people know that they are in a better position today than they were at this time 8 years ago when coming into the Obama administration.

The Republicans want to introduce legislation to do away with the rules and the regulations concerning the Affordable Care Act and the Dodd-Frank legislation, which has protected the financial security of Americans over the last 8 years. That is why they come forward with this so-called jobs bill. This regulatory reform bill called the REINS Act is not going to produce or create one single job. What it will do is cut measures to protect the health, safety, and well-being of Americans.

□ 1445

This misguided legislation would amend the Congressional Review Act to require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before any major rule issued by an agency can take effect. In other words, this bill would subject new major rules to nullification by Congress through an unconstitutional legislative veto by one Chamber of Congress.

Following Republican attempts earlier this week to gut ethics and oversight rules that are necessary to police corruption, it is telling that the REINS Act is the next bill that the House would consider in the 115th Congress. Americans should understand what the game plan is of the Republicans. They want the fox to guard the henhouse. That is why the very first act that they

tried to get passed was reform of the House ethics regime. They wanted to neuter it, place it under the control of the Republican-controlled House Ethics Committee, where it would then languish and die like a prune on a vine that was unwatery.

That is the first thing they came up with, and the American people called them on it and wouldn't let them pass it. So they have postponed it. America needs to keep their eyes on this Congress to make sure that they don't follow through with that measure that would install the foxes over the henhouse. What they want to do is install the corporate foxes over America's henhouse with this REINS Act.

The REINS Act is central to the Speaker's so-called Better Way agenda, which is really only a better way for rich, corporate elites to further insulate themselves from public accountability and is emblematic of the same tired and crony-capitalist proposals that have been kicked around by opponents of environmental and public health protections since the 1980s. In fact, in 1983, Chief Justice John Roberts, who was then a counsel to President Reagan, criticized a similar proposal as unwise because it would hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules and would seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies.

In addition to being an unmitigated disaster for public health and safety, proposals like the REINS Act will actually do major harm to regulatory reform attempts, as the late Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in 1981. Then a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, Justice Scalia cautioned: "Those in the Congress seem perversely unaware that the accursed 'unelected officials' downtown are now their unelected officials, presumably seeking to move things in their desired direction; and that every curtailment of desirable agency discretion obstructs (principally) departure from Democrat-produced, pro-regulatory status quo."

Now, it is not often that I quote Justice Scalia, but, ironically, I do so today.

The REINS Act also imposes deadlines for the enactment of a joint resolution approving a major rule that could charitably be referred to as Byzantine. So as not to use too lofty language, I will just declare that this thing is like throwing a monkey wrench in a well-oiled machine.

Under new section 802, the House may only consider a major rule on the second or fourth Thursday of each month. In 2014, for example, there were only 13 such days on the legislative calendar. I think on the legislative calendar for 2017, there are only about 13, maybe 14 or 15, such days where we could consider these major rules on this legislative calendar. I would point out that there are approximately 80 such rules of importance that come through in a typical year.

Furthermore, under new section 801, Congress may only consider such resolutions within 70 legislative days of receiving a major rule. This creates a lot of red tape that threatens to end rule-making as we know it, and that is the exact, precise intent of this Congress. Even if agencies reduce the number of major rules in contemplation of a bill's onerous requirements, Congress would still lack the expertise and policy justifications for refusing to adopt a major rule.

As over 80 of the Nation's leading professors on environmental and administrative law noted in a letter in opposition to a substantively identical version of this bill, without this expertise, any "disapproval is therefore more likely to reflect the political power of special interests, a potential that would be magnified in light of the fast-track process."

Lastly, by flipping the process of agency rulemaking so that Congress can simply void implementation by not acting on a major rule, the REINS Act likely violates the presentment and bicameralism requirements of Article I of the Constitution.

It is my pleasure to oppose this bill. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the REINS Act. I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for taking charge of this bill in the 115th Congress and Judiciary Chairman GOODLATTE for quickly bringing it to the floor.

This week and next, the primary focus of debate here in the House is the stranglehold of regulation on the economy and its intrusion into the everyday lives of Americans. These onerous burdens are well-known to Members of Congress on both sides.

Over the past several years, I have spent countless hours traveling across the nearly 6,600 square miles of my district. I have met with my constituents in their homes, in their workplaces and social halls. They have pleaded with me for release from the regulations that limit their ability to prosper, innovate, and grow.

Unlike the nameless, faceless, ever-growing bureaucracy here in Washington, we have listened to the people's concerns. We have made regulatory reform a priority and the focal point for jump-starting our economy. By placing final approval of major regulations in the hands of Congress, the REINS Act is an important launch point in our efforts to dismantle the administrative state and make government more accountable to the American people.

Our Founders vested in Congress—and Congress alone—the power to write

the laws. Unfortunately, over our history, we have delegated much of that power away. The Founders could not have imagined our current scenario where the complaints of many fall on the deaf ears of an unelected few in Washington.

Thinking over the past 8 years, the REINS Act could have prevented numerous regulations that the American people knew were threats to their very way of life. Perhaps a trillion dollars in costs could have been avoided. I cannot even imagine how many jobs might have been saved or created if we avoided the regulatory barrage brought on by the Obama administration.

For example, we could have prevented the waters of the United States regulation that impacts the farmers near my home in rural Pennsylvania. The FCC's net neutrality rule might have been overturned, a classic rule-making bait and switch where the FCC ignored the mountains of public comment to achieve its own political ends. An unaccountable sum of environmental regulations might have been avoided before destroying large swaths of our industry and imposing huge costs on taxpayers.

Our prime takeaway from these instances and others is that the runaway regulators issued wide-ranging and economy-destroying regulations with complete disregard for the hard-working American citizens whose livelihoods were at stake.

Today we take an important step to reassert the voice of the American people in our government. The REINS Act reestablishes the Congress as the final judge of whether or not any particular regulation actually does what the Congress meant it to do.

Returning this responsibility to the branch of government most attentive and accountable to the people adheres to the principles of our Nation's founding. It is an effort that all elected to Congress should support.

I urge my colleagues to support the REINS Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the eloquence of the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), my friend out of the great city of Memphis.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I can live up to those words, but I certainly appreciate them.

I was the ranking member on this committee, and I was chair at one point. We have had this bill over the years. It is indeed a monkey wrench or a monkey in the wrench, as JOHN MCCAIN might have said. It will mess up the entire system that we have of Congress passing laws, delegating, giving the executive the ability to enact them in ways that make them functional and appropriate and come up with the details that the Congress does not have enough expertise to do.

The other side refers constantly to people that prepare these rules—which take many, many years and have much, much input—as bureaucrats, as

if it is some type of pejorative. Bureaucrats are government employees who have expertise in certain areas and who study an area and become so much more expert than we are on the subject that they can come up with fine-tuned laws that are checked and balanced to make sure that the laws are implemented in the way that Congress intends. If Congress doesn't like it, Congress can pass a bill by both House and Senate to repeal it. We have already got that possibility.

Under this unique approach, either one of the houses of Congress can stop a regulation, a rule from going into effect because both Houses would have to approve a rule and the President would have to sign it before it could go into effect. That gives one House the ability to veto, basically, an executive action.

It is the executive in our system that has the power to veto acts of the legislature and not vice versa. We can pass laws in a bicameral spirit, which is what our Constitution has, when the House and the Senate agree. But neither House, independently, is given any power to veto laws or legislation. This would break that and, I believe, be unconstitutional. That is why I oppose H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017.

Indeed, the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act is most appropriate this year as we start, because in 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, we are, indeed, going to have an executive in need of scrutiny. So I thank the Republicans for naming this bill appropriately because we are, indeed, in the times of an Executive in need of scrutiny.

We need scrutiny over income tax returns that have been hidden from the public that might disclose conflicts of interest or loans from characters that might be considered oligarchs and have some type of an influence over our foreign policy and our domestic.

We need an Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act that deals with these conflicts, with income taxes that haven't been released, with businesses in the District where people could go to hotels and curry favor with the Executive.

Indeed, we do have an Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act, so I appreciate the well-named bill that the Republicans have brought us and the awareness that, through this bill, they have seen that we need some concern about the Executive coming because he certainly needs scrutiny.

□ 1500

This bill, though, is the worst of corporate special interest because it will give corporate special interests the opportunity to override rules that take effect unless both Houses pass them. It is difficult enough for this House and the Senate to get legislation passed in the days that we often give to legislation, but to have both Houses have to agree, in which case if you can't, it is, in essence, a pocket veto, and it doesn't even have to be scheduled for a

vote because the House would have to positively pass and the Senate positively pass. So if the Speaker doesn't want to do it, the Speaker can pocket veto the regulation. It doesn't even have to be scheduled.

This is not draining the swamp. It will heighten the influence of corporate lobbyists in Congress where they can come to the Speaker and ask that agency rules they don't like that might protect the lives of children because they are regulations dealing with toys that seem to possibly be defective, or automobiles where they need safety devices, or other consumer protections that interfere with business interests—business is good and important, but sometimes businesses do things that are injurious to the public.

To give this opportunity to stop rules and regulations from going into effect that protect the public is wrong. It was suggested maybe it will help the economy, but at what cost? What is one life worth—or several lives—if lives are lost because safety regulations are not approved by this House and the Senate, or one or the other, and then don't go into effect? As I mentioned, this is seriously constitutionally defective.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the ranking member mentioned Justice Scalia. I will mention Chief Justice John Roberts who criticized nearly identical legislation in the 1980s when he was a White House lawyer because it would "hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules" such that it would "seem to impose excessive burdens on regulatory agencies." That was John Roberts.

Some of the underlying facts given were about the economy. No matter what you say, President Obama has been effective on the economy. We saved the housing market. We saved this country from the Great Recession. We brought about recovery. That is not something we should disparage but we should praise. The stock market has gone up to record highs. Unemployment is down. Jobs are up. The automobile industry has been saved.

I ask Members to reject this bill because it is unconstitutional. It will cost lives of American citizens because safety regulations won't be passed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, our Founding Fathers intended for us to have a limited government. If they saw what we have today, they would be appalled. Our government has gotten huge. It is out of control, and an alphabet soup of government agencies and unelected bureaucrats are writing the laws. They call them regulations, but they have the effect of laws.

I am going to disagree with my friend and colleague from Tennessee, any power these agencies have to write regulations was delegated to Congress. We are pulling some of that power back, back to Congress, back to people elected by the people; in fact, to where the Founding Fathers put it in Article I of the Constitution.

That is why I am here today, to support the REINS Act. It says that if an agency enacts a regulation that has an economic impact of more than \$100 million, that has to come back before Congress for a positive vote before it takes effect.

Now, quite frankly, because the Constitution vests all of the legislative power in Congress, I think every single regulation that one of these agencies does should have to come back before Congress, but the REINS Act is a great start.

Throughout President Obama's administration, a flood of regulations has put extreme pressure and burdens on American job creators and American families. Take, for example, the EPA's waters of the U.S. rule. It is a power grab by the EPA attempting to regulate any body of water on a private land basically that is any bigger than a bathtub. It goes way beyond what the Clean Water Act says they can do.

Using its new interpretation of WOTUS, the EPA has full authority to bully land-owning American citizens like Wyoming rancher Andy Johnson who got a permit from the State and local government to build a stock pond so his cattle could have something to drink. Well, guess what, the EPA said, nope. They came in after the fact and said: if you don't take that out, we are going to hit you with \$37,500 a day in fines. Finally, after drawn-out litigation, the EPA was slapped back and Johnson's \$16 million in fines was erased.

This is just one of the many examples of the huge power grab these Federal agencies are doing.

We need people who are elected and answerable to the American people writing the laws, not unelected bureaucrats. That is why we need the REINS Act, and that is why we need to restore the constitutional power granted to this body in Article I. The REINS Act is a great start, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas cites Article I giving the legislative branch authority to make the laws, and no one can argue with that. However, I would point out that Article II, section 3 imposes upon the President, the executive, the obligation to take care that the laws are faithfully executed, and so rulemaking comes up under that authority, that constitutional authority. So what we have is a move by the legislative branch to intrude upon and to indeed regulate. And certainly we have that power to do so.

But is it wise? Is it prudent? Or does it simply positively impact our campaign contributors, the people who put money into our campaigns? Is that the sole reason why we are doing this?

We need to give care and thought into what we are doing here in Congress in this House of Representatives even though one party has all of the power now. They have the majority in the House, they have the majority in the Senate, and they have an incoming President. It doesn't mean they should go off the rails with a philosophy that is not in keeping with where the American people are.

I would point out to them that there is no mandate that they have, even though they do have control of the legislative branch and the executive branch of government and they have held up, what some say actually stolen an appointment for the U.S. Supreme Court that President Obama was placed in a position to make last February upon the untimely demise of Justice Scalia. So since February, the U.S. Supreme Court has had to suffer through politics being played by the legislative branch in not confirming a presidential appointee, and now they have the opportunity to make that appointment under these conditions.

Even though they have played loose and fancy with the protections of the Constitution and with the well-being of the American people and indeed our Republic by playing these political games, I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to stop and think about what they are doing and the ramifications of it. Even though you want to get at the EPA to make it easier for oil companies to pollute our environment without regulations to prevent it from happening, is that good for our Nation? Is it good for our children? Is it good for our elderly? How does it leave us with regard to asthma rates which have continued to skyrocket in this country? Do you want to gut the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform to put us back in the situation where people are losing their homes and banks are being bailed out because they have become too fat to fail? Do we want to put ourselves back in that position again? Well, if we do then we will pass regulations like this one, the so-called REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for all of his leadership on this matter.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 26, the REINS Act, which will restore the constitutional authority of Congress and rein in runaway government.

Mr. Chairman, as we have seen over the last 8 years, our economy has been strangled by Federal regulations which are burying small businesses and families. Federal regulations imposed on

America's job creators and households created a staggering economic burden of almost \$2 trillion in 2014. That is almost \$15,000 per U.S. household, and 11.5 percent of America's real GDP.

But today, the House has an opportunity to cut through the red tape and restore the balance of powers. Economic growth cannot happen from Washington, D.C., it can only come from Main Street. That is why I adamantly oppose unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats issuing their own closed-door regulations in place of congressional regulations. The REINS Act will restore Congress' Article I powers and give a voice back to the American people. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 26.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), currently a member of the Judiciary Committee but soon to move to another committee.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 26, the REINS Act. In a minute, I want to share an experience I had a few months ago which will explain why, aside from the Constitution, I think it is important that we rein in unelected bureaucrats.

When we talk about regulatory reform, it is sometimes hard to understand the impact regulations have on our economy. That is for the simple reason that someone who goes in for a job interview never sits there and is told by the employer: I would love to offer you the job, but I can't because of the crushing regulatory burden coming out of Washington. And that is because the crushing burden of regulations causes the job not to be created in the first place; and, hence, there is no interview for the job.

The experience I had a couple of months ago, I was back home, and I met with the Michigan Restaurant Association. There were 8 or 10 folks sitting around and telling me about the issues that are important to them. They said they were dying because of the EPA, because of the FDA, because of the EEOC, because of the ACA, because of the overtime rule from DOL, and because of the CFPB. I quickly surmised that the restaurant industry is dying, and it is death by acronyms. That is what is happening in this country. That is why we are not creating jobs.

If you come in from the airport, you come across the 14th Street bridge and you enter the city, all you see is cranes. There was never a recession in Washington. Today, there are 277,000 people who write and enforce rules in this country in Washington, D.C., and around the country. That is more than the entire employee base of the VA.

A few minutes ago, my friend from Tennessee said that all of these great

regulations have saved our country. Well, if that had happened, I would have expected a different result on November 8.

A few minutes ago, my friend from Georgia, who I was proud to serve on the Judiciary Committee with, talked about all of the problems with our plan.

□ 1515

I say to my colleague, the next time you pull up in front of your favorite Outback Steakhouse restaurant and it is closed, it is not because the cook quit, it is not because of the cost of beef, and it is not because the restaurant was poorly managed. It is because of death by acronyms. I ask everyone to support H.R. 26. It is time we rein in unelected bureaucrats, follow the Constitution, and create some jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to see my friend, Mr. TROTT, leaving the Judiciary Committee. We have appreciated his being there and we hate to see him go, but the gentleman is going on to bigger and better things.

I would say to the gentleman that it is surprising to me that the Bloomberg Government reports show that of all of the job cut announcements made by industry during the year of 2016—and that was a year, by the way, which was not unlike previous years. Basically, the Obama administration has created about 1.9 million new private sector jobs per year.

I am just startled by this statistic here for the year 2016 as far as the number of job cut announcements by reason. The reason given for government regulation being responsible for the job cut is 1,580. That is out of 1.9 million new jobs created during the entire 2016 year, 1,580 jobs lost due to government regulation. That's almost as many as were lost due to the listeria outbreak, legal trouble, or grain downturn. Government regulation, 1,580 jobs lost out of 1.9 million created.

So this argument that we keep hearing from my friends on the other side of the aisle that there is a strangulation or a stranglehold on job creation by Obama's regulations, nothing could be more false than that.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on our side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 26, the REINS Act. This bill is the beginning of making America great again. That is because it puts Americans back in charge of the laws being imposed upon them.

How does the legislation do that?

Under our Constitution, we have three branches. The executive branch is supposed to enforce the law. The judicial branch is supposed to resolve disputes arising under the law. The legislature—this House and the Senate, the branch directly elected by the people—is supposed to make the law.

Over the last decades, we have seen more and more of the lawmaking in this country migrate to the unelected bureaucrats in the executive branch. Those bureaucrats churn out regulation after regulation that have the full force and effect of law. The problem with this setup is that the people of this country are supposed to consent to laws being imposed upon them. They do that through their elected representatives in Congress. In short, this legislation goes to the heart of what self-rule is all about.

Let me be clear: this legislation does not end regulation. It is the beginning of accountability for regulation. If there is a good regulation that a Member believes makes sense and does not unduly burden jobs and wages, that Member may vote to approve the regulation. If the people that Member represents disagree, they get to hold him or her accountable at the ballot box.

My colleagues across the aisle should not fear taking responsibility for the laws and regulations coming out of Washington, D.C. Over the last 7 years, Washington regulations have hurt many working families. We have seen coal miners and power plant workers lose good jobs. We have seen small, Main Street community banks and credit unions forced into mergers. We have seen farmers worried about puddles on their farms. We have seen people lose their health insurance and their doctors, and we have seen the Little Sisters of the Poor have their religious freedom threatened—all without the consent of the people.

It is time for the people, Mr. Chairman, to put the American people back in charge and not the unelected bureaucrats. Let's take the power away from Washington. Let's restore self-rule. Let's pass this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have just tallied up the number of jobs that would be created by passage of this legislation. I did that by multiplying by eight the figure of 1,580, which is the number of jobs lost due to government regulation in 2016. If I multiply that eight times, I come up with 12,640 jobs. That is how many jobs would be created by this legislation—a paucity.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the REINS Act, legislation that I and many of my colleagues are proud to have cosponsored to help bring expensive and expansive regulations under control.

Over the past several years, major regulations have cost small businesses, States, local government, and individuals billions of dollars and have cost them jobs. So this is a commonsense bill to enhance transparency and give Americans greater say in their government, and I thank Representative COLLINS of Georgia and Chairman GOODLATTE for their leadership on this issue.

By requiring Congress to approve any major regulation with an annual economic impact of \$100 million or more on the economy, the bill opens the process so our constituents—the people—can have their voice heard in the process.

I'm also pleased an amendment I offered last year, which was accepted by this body, is included in the bill's base text, section 801. That provision requires more transparency by forcing agencies to publish the data and justification they are using to issue the rule. It's important the American people have access to the information in which these conclusions are made. Section 801 directs the regulatory bodies to post publicly the data, studies, and analyses that they use to come up with their rules and conclusions so that we can all be on the same page. Transparency.

Too often I hear concerns from Iowans about how overreaching regulations are hurting their farms and businesses and impacting their daily lives. From how our kids are taught, how we manage our personal finances, or even drain the water in our communities, we have seen how regulations and those who craft them have an enormous impact.

I hear from constituents how these regulations are out of touch, don't reflect the basic, fundamental understanding of the important sectors driving our economy or the daily lives of Iowans and all Americans. These regulations, which have the full force of law, are putting Americans out of work and increasing costs for consumers.

The REINS Act is an important, commonsense bill to help address this problem. We must do more. I appreciate Chairman GOODLATTE's commitment to work with me on my Fingerprints bill to ensure further transparency and accountability by naming those who author and write these regulations. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Representative COLLINS of Georgia for prioritizing the REINS Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 2.8 million civil servants out there. Americans who work for the Federal Government go to work every day. They work hard and play by the rules. They have a good, middle class job. Your jobs are at stake, Federal employees.

There are those who say that we have too many Federal employees. Well, the number of Federal employees that we

have now is at the same level as they were in 2004, which was when President Bush was in office. Basically we are at a 47-year low, as far as the number of Federal employees, since 2013.

The Federal regulatory regime, which is just simply Federal workers—Federal civil servants—is not out of control, but your jobs are going to be lost when these Republicans finish doing what they want to do to these regulations.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his fine work on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the REINS Act because it fulfills a promise Congress made to American businessowners to get onerous regulations off the backs of job creators.

It sets a very reasonable standard. If a new regulation has an economic impact of \$100 million or more, it needs to come to Congress for an up-or-down vote. Congress will then have a say. We will debate the merits, and then we will decide.

The Obama administration handed down a record-breaking 600 major new regulations imposing hundreds of billions of dollars in costs on the U.S. economy and millions of hours of compliance busywork on the employers and employees across the country.

All of that excessive red tape places a huge burden on small- and medium-sized businesses that create jobs in New Jersey, the State I represent, and across the Nation. I have toured quite a few businesses, and the consensus is clear: let American workers innovate, build, and create, and not spend time complying with regulations that are impractical and often a waste of time and money.

The REINS Act is constitutional. It does not violate the Chadha doctrine because it does not permit Congress to overturn valid regulations. Also, a joint resolution satisfies the bicameralism and presentment requirements of the Constitution.

The REINS Act will bring an important check against out-of-control Federal regulations and foster stronger economic growth. It is an important start to the agenda of the 115th Congress, and I urge all of our colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO).

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Chairman, I stand here today with an urgent plea to my colleagues. We were elected by the good men and women of the United States who believe in our vision of America and who believe in our dedication to doing whatever it takes to ensure the American Dream is alive and achievable. It is for these reasons the REINS Act must pass.

Federal regulations imposed on American the job creators and households, an estimated \$1.9 trillion burden in 2015.

Who pays that?

The American citizen does. It costs on an average, as Chairman GOODLATTE brought up, \$15,000 per U.S. household.

Could that money be better used to offset the cost of a college education or maybe the staggering cost of health care due to the Affordable Care Act?

Let me give you a real-life illustration from my district. A couple of years ago, a constituent, a dairy farmer, was targeted by an incredibly vague, broad, and costly EPA rule called WOTUS, Waters of the United States. The EPA sued and won this case not due to environmental damage, but due to the vagueness of this rule and the determination in court. It cost my constituent over \$200,000 in fines and court costs for a natural depression in his pasture that the EPA determined could qualify as navigable waters.

The rule states that any water or any land that becomes seasonably wet is affected. I live in Florida. We get 54 inches of rain a year. That is my whole State of Florida.

This is downright outrageous. This is just one example of the many times the EPA has overstepped its authority by enforcing vague regulations unfairly on individuals. The REINS Act will prevent these costly job-killing regulations from going into effect and safeguard against Federal bureaucrats imposing the heaviest burdens on the American economy, and this will increase the livelihood of the American people.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the REINS Act, H.R. 26, for any number of reasons.

I can't help but point out that I have heard my esteemed colleagues in opposition to this bill refer on multiple occasions to the Federal bureaucracy as a well-oiled machine. Mr. Chairman, there are, indeed, well-oiled machines that undergird this institution, but I would submit the Federal bureaucracy is not one of those.

We have heard that the regulatory burden, as it relates to the loss of jobs, is equal to a listeria outbreak. What I would submit is that if we could avoid a listeria outbreak, would we not choose to do just that?

□ 1530

While looking at the loss of jobs as related to Federal regulation, we overstep the argument by avoiding the jobs not created as a result of Federal regulations. Should these things also not be amongst the items that we consider?

A wise man once said that the bureaucracy will continue to expand to meet the expanding needs of the bureaucracy. In 2017, in the United States, indeed, it seems we find ourselves in that very situation.

Arguments that the REINS Act is contrary to the Constitution, I would submit, are actually 180 degrees from the truth. In fact, Article I of the Constitution gives the power to make law to this legislative branch of our government and gives the power to generate revenue, here, as well as spend.

The definition of "law," according to the Oxford Dictionary, is: "The system of rules which a particular country or community recognizes as regulating the actions of its members and which it may enforce by the imposition of penalties."

I will submit that the very regulatory overreach that we consider here today is, in fact, tantamount to law and extraconstitutional in and of itself.

My esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania suggested, and I agree, that the REINS Act is but a good start. The power to spend is Article I. The power to make laws is Article I.

REINS is a rudder on the ship of constitutionality that will right that ship and move it only in the correct direction. Regulations that have the power to take liberty or property rights or the wealth of those earned by their own labor are tantamount to law and, indeed, extraordinary constitutionally as it relates to an executive branch entity, and they should not be exercised.

Mr. Chairman, we hear that the people's House is responsible for this and the people's House is responsible for that. Well, the people's House is to ensure that the people have a voice in the matters of spending and lawmaking that our Founders who laid out Article I of the Constitution envisioned, and currently, that is simply not the case. H.R. 26 is simply a step back towards that right direction of constitutionality.

With that in mind, I strongly support the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just spoke about liberty. My friend from Pennsylvania spoke about self-rule. Today we are talking about bureaucrats, but what we really should be talking about is the effect of this bill on our agencies in Homeland Security and our intelligence agencies, given the unprecedented intrusion by the Russians in our elections and other affairs of this Nation. If we don't stay focused on that

liberty and the foundation for freedom so that another country doesn't interfere with our affairs, we as Members of Congress are ignoring the oath that we just took 2 days ago.

So I would suggest to my friends that I appreciate there can be overregulation, but I would suggest you have to look closely at how this bill affects our ability to protect our liberties and our freedom. I am afraid it affects it badly, in the face of interference that we haven't seen from another country since 1776.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I come from the private sector; so when I come to the House and I listen to the debate going back and forth, I almost feel like I am somebody not from a different planet, but from a different galaxy.

When we talk about overregulation, when we talk about the effects of unelected bureaucrats leveling on the American people \$2 trillion and an impact to the economy, then somebody ought to sit up and listen.

All we are talking about is scrutiny, scrutiny of any piece of legislation, any executive order that comes out that is going to have an impact of \$100 million or more on the economy. Around here, \$100 million sounds like nothing. From where I am from, it is unbelievable that we would even think that \$100 million should be the point that we look at.

What could be more common sense than to look at the heavy burden we are putting on everyday Americans and saying that, somehow, unelected bureaucrats who have never walked in their shoes, who have never done their job, who have never worried about meeting a payroll, who have never had to worry about regulation and taxation that make it impossible for them to compete, these poor, stupid folks just don't get it?

705,687 people in your districts are who you represent. Whether they voted for you or not is not the point. The point is we represent them. Why in the world would Congress cede its power to the executive branch and to unelected bureaucrats to determine what the American people are going to be burdened with? It is just common sense. Why can't we not see what is right in front of us right now?

I invite you to please go home to your districts, walk in those shops, walk in those little towns, talk to those people and find out the two things that really inhibit them from being successful are overtaxation and overregulation. We can handle both those things right here in the people's House.

This is not a Democratic House. This is not a Republican House. This is America's House. We should be looking at things that benefit the American people.

If we truly want to act in a bipartisan way, then let's stop this back-

and-forth debate about what Republicans want, what Democrats want, and let's talk about what is good for the American people. That is who sent us. That is whose responsibility we have on our shoulders. If we can't do that, we ought to go home.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As far as unelected bureaucrats that we have heard people rail against, speaker after speaker today being concerned, those are nothing more than the civil servants that make our government work. They protect our water, protect our air. They protect us, as a matter of fact—the FBI, the law enforcement. These are good people who go to work every day, work hard, like my dad did, for instance. He was a civil servant. I guess you could call him an unelected bureaucrat. He did everything during his job that he needed to do, and he retired with dignity.

There are so many others who work for the post office. They work for TSA, Homeland Security. They are doing nothing but working a job honestly, and they deserve more than to be referred to derisively. We need them.

Mr. Chair, I am in opposition to this legislation. We need real solutions for real problems. In stark contrast, however, the REINS Act attempts to address a nonexistent problem with a very dangerous solution.

We need legislation that creates middle class financial security and opportunity, not legislation that snatches that away.

We need sensible regulations that protect American families from economic ruin and that bring predatory financial practices to an end.

We need workplace safety regulations that ensure hardworking Americans who go to work each day are protected from hazardous environments on the job.

We need strong regulations that protect the safety of the food that we eat and the air that we breathe and the water that we drink.

Unfortunately, H.R. 26 does nothing to advance those critical goals. This explains why more than 150 organizations strongly oppose this legislation, including Americans for Financial Reform; the American Lung Association; Consumers Union; The Humane Society of the United States; the League of Conservation Voters; Public Citizen; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Earthjustice; the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards; the American Public Health Association; the Environmental Defense Action Fund; the Center for American Progress; and the Trust for America's Health. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 26.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

During this debate, my friends on the other side of the aisle have raised quite a few false alarms:

If this bill passes, all important regulation will stop, they say. But that is not true. All regulation that is worthy of Congress' approval will continue;

If this bill passes, expert decision-making will stop because Congress will have the final say on new, major regulations, not Washington bureaucrats. That is not true.

Congress will have the benefit of the best evidence and arguments expert agencies can offer in support of their new regulations. Congress is capable of determining whether that evidence and those arguments are good or not and deciding what finally will become law. That is the job our Founding Fathers entrusted to us in the Constitution. We should not shirk from it.

I will tell you, though, what will stop if this bill becomes law: the endless avalanche of new, major regulations that impose massive, unjustified costs that crush jobs, crush wages, and crush the spirit of America's families and small-business owners. Think about what that will mean to real Americans who have suffered the real burdens of overreaching regulations.

Support the American people and listen to the major organizations across the country, which I include in the RECORD, who support H.R. 26, the REINS Act.

Support the American people. Support the REINS Act.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 26, THE REINS ACT

American Center for Law and Justice, American Commitment, American Energy Alliance, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, Americans for Limited Government, Americans for Prosperity—Key Vote, Americans for Tax Reform, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors, Club for Growth—Key Vote, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Credit Union National Association, Family Business Coalition, FreedomWorks—Key Vote.

Heating Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Heritage Action—Key Vote, Let Freedom Ring, National Association of Electrical Distributors (NAED), National Association of Home Builders, National Center for Policy Analysis, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Taxpayers Union—Key Vote, R Street, SBE Council, Campaign For Liberty.

—
SMALL BUSINESS &
ENTREPRENEURSHIP COUNCIL,
Vienna, VA, January 3, 2017.

Hon. DOUG COLLINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS: Serious regulatory reform is needed to revitalize entrepreneurship, small business growth, our economy, and quality job creation. Therefore, the Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) strongly supports the Regulations from the Executive In Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2017.

U.S. entrepreneurship and startup activity are in a frail state. While economic uncertainty and difficulties accessing capital present barriers to new business formation, excessive government regulation drives uncertainty and creates new obstacles. When the policy ecosystem becomes noxious for startups and small businesses, our entire economy suffers. For existing businesses,

overregulation is driving costs higher and undermining confidence, investment and growth. The system is out-of-control, and common sense tools and solutions are needed to rein in the explosive growth of federal red tape.

The REINS Act requires that Congress take an up-or-down vote on every new major rule—defined as having an economic impact of \$100 million or more—before such a rule could be enforced. This substantive regulatory reform measure would serve as an important check on the regulatory system, and have a positive effect in terms of how regulation affects small businesses, and therefore, consumers, America's workforce and the economy.

The REINS Act will bring needed accountability to our nation's regulatory system, and SBE Council thanks you for your leadership in spearheading this important legislative effort.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President and CEO.

—
NATIONAL ROOFING
CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 3, 2017.

To All Members of the House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, The National Roofing Contractors Association (NRCA) strongly supports the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act and urges you to support this legislation when it comes to the House floor for a vote.

Established in 1886, NRCA is one of the nation's oldest trade associations and the voice of professional roofing contractors worldwide. NRCA has about 3,500 contractors in all 50 states who are typically small, privately held companies with the average member employing 45 people and attaining sales of about \$4.5 million per year.

The roofing industry has faced an avalanche of new regulations from numerous government agencies in recent years. The cumulative burden of often counterproductive regulations is highly disruptive to entrepreneurs who seek to start or grow businesses that provide high-quality jobs. Most important, federal agencies have failed to work with industry representatives to provide greater flexibility for employers in achieving regulatory goals and minimizing adverse impacts on economic growth and job creation.

NRCA strongly supports regulatory reform to provide small and mid-sized businesses with much-needed relief from burdensome regulations, and the REINS Act is a key component of regulatory relief. It would require Congress to approve, with an up-or-down vote, any new major regulation issued by a federal agency before the regulation would become effective. Under the REINS Act, a major regulation is defined as any rule that is estimated to have an economic impact of at least \$100 million on the private sector; would result in a major increase in costs or prices; and would have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity or U.S. competitiveness.

NRCA believes the REINS Act, by requiring major regulations undergo a vote in Congress to become effective, would substantially increase accountability among federal agencies seeking to issue new regulations. This legislation would help provide employers in the roofing industry with the certainty they need to invest in their businesses and create more jobs.

NRCA supports the REINS Act and urges you to vote for this legislation in the House. If you have any questions or need more in-

formation, please contact NRCA's Washington, D.C., office.

DENNIS CONWAY,
Commercial Roofers Inc., Las Vegas,
NRCA Chairman of the Board.

—
ASSOCIATED BUILDERS
AND CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC), a national construction industry trade association with 70 chapters representing nearly 21,000 chapter members, I am writing in regard to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2017 (H.R. 26) introduced by Rep. Doug Collins (R-GA) as well as the Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017 (H.R. 21) introduced by Rep. Darrell Issa (R-CA).

From 2009 to present, the federal government imposed nearly \$900 billion in regulatory costs on the American people which requires billions of hours of paperwork. Many of these regulations have been or will be imposed on the construction industry. ABC is committed to reforming the broken federal regulatory process and ensuring industry stakeholders' voices are heard and rights are protected. ABC supports increased transparency and opportunities for regulatory oversight by Congress and ultimately, the American people.

The Obama administration issued numerous rulemakings that detrimentally impact the construction industry. In some cases, these regulations are based on conjecture and speculation, lacking foundation in sound scientific analysis. For the construction industry, unjustified and unnecessary regulations translate to higher costs, which are then passed along to the consumer or lead to construction projects being priced out of the market. This chain reaction ultimately results in fewer projects, and hinders businesses' ability to hire and expand.

ABC members understand the value of standards and regulations when they are based on solid evidence, with appropriate consideration paid to implementation costs and input from the business community. Federal agencies must be held accountable for full compliance with existing rulemaking statutes and requirements when promulgating regulations to ensure they are necessary, current and cost-effective for businesses to implement.

ABC opposes unnecessary, burdensome and costly regulations resulting from the efforts of Washington bureaucrats who have little accountability for their actions. H.R. 26 will help to bring greater accountability to the rulemaking process as it would require any executive branch rule or regulation with an annual economic impact of \$100 million or more to come before Congress for an up-or-down vote before being enacted. Moreover, H.R. 21 will further enhance congressional oversight of the overreaching regulations often issued during the final months of a president's term and help to revive the division of powers.

Thank you for your attention on this important matter and we urge the House to pass the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2017 and Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017 when they come to the floor for a vote.

Sincerely,
KRISTEN SWEARINGEN,
Vice President of Legislative
& Political Affairs.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, H.R. 26, the "Regulations from the Executive in Need of

Scrutiny Act of 2017,” otherwise known as the REINS Act, would amend the Congressional Review Act to require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before any major rule issued by an agency can take effect.

Simply put, H.R. 26 would impose unworkable deadlines for the enactment of a major rule under procedures that could charitably be referred to as convoluted.

Under this bill, the House may only consider a resolution for a major rule on the second and fourth Thursday of each month. Keep in mind that typically 80 major rules are promulgated annually. Yet, there may be as little as just 15 days available to consider such measures based on the majority's legislative calendar for the current year.

Furthermore, Congress may only consider such resolutions within 70 legislative days of receiving a major rule. This process would constructively end rulemaking as we know it.

Now, Mr. Chair, the reason why my friends on the other side of the aisle say we need this kind of gumming-the-works legislation—is because they claim regulations stifle economic growth.

For example, they point to the outgoing administration and say that regulations promulgated during its tenure have hurt our Nation's economy.

What they fail to tell the American people is that it was the Republican George Bush's administration's economic policies that caused the Great Recession.

Without question, it was the lack of regulatory controls that facilitated rampant predatory lending, which nearly destroyed our Nation's economy.

It led to millions of home foreclosures and devastated neighborhoods across America. In fact, it nearly caused a global economic meltdown.

Nevertheless, as a consequence of strong regulatory policies implemented by President Obama through such measures as the Dodd-Frank Act, our Nation has recovered to a point where the unemployment has been cut nearly in half to less than 5 percent.

Yet, the REINS Act would reverse these gains by empowering Congress to control and override the rulemaking process, even in the absence of any substantive expertise.

More than 80 of the Nation's leading professors on environmental and administrative law have warned in connection with substantively identical legislation considered in the last Congress, that without this expertise, any congressional disapproval is more likely to reflect the political power of special interests.

Lastly, by upending the process for agency rulemaking so that Congress can simply void major rules through inaction, the REINS Act likely violates the presentment and bicameralism requirements of Article I of the Constitution.

As a leading expert on administrative law states: “The reality is that the act is intended to enable a single House of Congress to control the implementation of the laws through the rulemaking process. Such a scheme transgresses the very idea of separation of powers, under which the Constitution entrusts the writing of the laws to the legislative branch and the implementation of the laws to the executive branch.”

The REINS Act will further encourage corporate giants to hold our country hostage

through a deregulatory, profits-first agenda and facilitate a political influence process rivaling the destructive industrial monopolies from the past century.

In sum, H.R. 26, like the “Midnight Rules Relief Act” we considered yesterday on the House floor, is yet another blatant gift to big business to weaken the critical regulatory protections that ensure the safety of the air we breathe, the cars we drive, the toys we give our children, and the food we eat.

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-conceived bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 26

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 “Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

“Sec.

“801. Congressional review.

“802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.

“803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.

“804. Definitions.

“805. Judicial review.

“806. Exemption for monetary policy.

“807. Effective date of certain rules.

“§ 801. Congressional review

“(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

“(i) a copy of the rule;

“(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

“(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

“(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective

as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

“(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

“(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

“(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

“(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

“(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

“(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

“(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

“(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

“(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

“(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

“(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

“(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

“(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

“(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

“(C) necessary for national security; or

“(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

“(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

“(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

“(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

“(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

“(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

“(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

“(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

“(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

“(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

“(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

“§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

“(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

“(A) bears no preamble;

“(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): ‘Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____’;

“(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): ‘That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____’; and

“(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

“(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

“(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

“(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred

have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House re-

ceives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

“(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

“(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

“(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

“(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

“(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

“§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

“(a) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

“(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion

to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

“(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

“(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

“(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

“(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

“(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

“(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

“(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

“§ 804. Definitions

“For purposes of this chapter:

“(1) The term ‘Federal agency’ means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

“(2) The term ‘major rule’ means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

“(A) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

“(3) The term ‘nonmajor rule’ means any rule that is not a major rule.

“(4) The term ‘rule’ has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

“(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes

for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

“(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

“(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

“(5) The term ‘submission date or publication date’, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

“(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

“(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

“(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

“(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

“§ 805. Judicial review

“(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

“(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

“(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

“§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

“Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

“§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

“Notwithstanding section 801—

“(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

“(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.”

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.”

SEC. 5. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Sections 3 and 4, and the amendments made by such sections, shall take effect beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–1. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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 division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–1.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Subparagraph (A) of section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended to read as follows:

“(A) an annual cost on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

I offer this manager’s amendment to assure that, just as the REINS Act strengthens Congress’ check on rules that impose major new costs on the economy, it does not unduly delay the effectiveness of major new deregulatory actions, those that alleviate regulatory burdens of \$100 million or more.

When first introduced in the 112th Congress, the REINS Act incorporated the definition of major rule in the underlying Congressional Review Act—generally, a rule that has “an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more.”

This was done in the interest of consistency with prior terminology, and it

swept in both actions that imposed costs and actions that lifted costs. But, especially after the regulatory onslaught we have witnessed during the Obama administration, it is time to revise that definition.

We should assure that the REINS Act focuses Congress' highest attention on the rules that hurt the economy the most: those that impose \$100 million or more in costs per year. We should likewise make sure that the REINS Act does not impose additional hurdles in the way of the most important and desperately needed deregulatory actions: those that free the economy of \$100 million or more in annual regulatory burdens. A deregulatory action with that level of economic effect is one that Congress should be encouraging, not slowing down.

This refinement of the REINS Act's major rule definition is also needed to assure consistency with the major Administrative Procedure Act reform legislation the House is due to consider next week, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2017. That measure already modernizes the major rule standard for APA purposes to \$100 million or more in annual costs imposed on the economy. The REINS Act should mirror it.

I urge my colleagues to support this manager's amendment.

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

□ 1545

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, the Goodlatte amendment clarifies that a major rule is any rule with an annual cost on the economy of \$100 million or more adjusted for inflation. This amendment revises the bill's definition for a major rule to include any rule with an annual cost of \$100 million or more as determined by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, also known as OIRA.

I oppose this amendment because it focuses only on the cost of regulatory protections while completely overlooking the monetary benefits of these critical rules. It also strips OIRA's ability to consider the benefits of a rule in connection with a rule's cost. I don't understand the logic of that.

In 2015, The Washington Post's Fact Checker blog criticized cost-only regulatory estimates as misleading, unbalanced, and having serious methodological problems. Robert Weissman, president of Public Citizen, likewise observed in 2015 that ignoring the benefits of regulation is akin to grocery shoppers deciding to buy no groceries simply because groceries cost money. That doesn't make any sense to me.

Even Thomas Donohue, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has stated that "many of these rules we need, they're important for the economy, and we support them," conceding

that the benefits of regulatory protections must be considered hand in hand with their costs.

Indeed, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the Office of Management and Budget regularly has reported to Congress that the benefits of regulations far exceed their costs. During the three hearings on the REINS Act in previous Congresses, we heard from three distinguished witnesses that the benefits of regulation routinely outweigh their costs, according to cost-benefit analysis done by the Office of Management and Budget under administrations of both parties.

For example, in the 112th Congress, Sally Katzen, a former administrator of the OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, testified that "the numbers are striking: according to OMB, the benefits from the regulations issued during the ten-year period"—from fiscal year 1999 through 2009—"ranged from \$128 billion to \$616 billion."

I will repeat. Benefits from regulations ranged from \$128 billion to \$616 billion.

"Therefore, even if one uses OMB's highest estimate of costs and its lowest estimate of benefits, the regulations issued over the past ten years have produced net benefits of \$73 billion to our society."

Those are the words of Sally Katzen. That 10-year timeframe encompasses the Clinton, Bush, and Obama administrations.

We also heard in the 112th Congress from David Goldston, a former Republican House committee chief of staff, who testified that "administrations under both parties have reviewed the aggregate impact of regulations and found their benefits to have exceeded their costs (and not all benefits are quantifiable)."

Their testimony is bolstered by the Office of Management and Budget's 2016 Draft Report to Congress, which notes that estimated annual benefits of major Federal regulations reviewed by OMB over the past decade estimated annual benefits of regulatory protections are between \$269 billion and \$872 billion, while regulatory costs are between \$74 billion and \$110 billion.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, once again, because it focuses only on the cost of regulatory protections while completely overlooking the monetary benefits of these critical rules, and for that reason I oppose my colleague's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time only to urge my colleagues to support this important amendment and not lose the opportunity to benefit from deregulatory reforms that will grow our economy and save America's economy hundreds of millions of dollars. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-1.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Section 801(a)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, is amended by inserting after "the Federal agency promulgating such rule" the following: "shall satisfy the requirements of section 808 and".

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, is amended by adding at the end the following (and amending the table of sections accordingly):

"§ 808. Regulatory cut-go requirement

"In making any new rule, the agency making the rule shall identify a rule or rules that may be amended or repealed to completely offset any annual costs of the new rule to the United States economy. Before the new rule may take effect, the agency shall make each such repeal or amendment. In making such an amendment or repeal, the agency shall comply with the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5, but the agency may consolidate proceedings under subchapter with proceedings on the new rule."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his help on this amendment as well. It is an amendment designed to take an already very good bill and make it just a little better.

A good friend of mine, former Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels, used to say "you'd be amazed how much government you'll never miss" when talking about reducing the size of government bureaucracy.

So much of government's excess is created by unelected officials who wield enormous influence over our everyday lives. Last year, Federal agencies issued 18 rules and regulations for every one law that passed Congress. That is a grand total of 3,853 regulations in 2016 alone. In 2015, Federal regulations cost the American economy nearly \$1.9 trillion—T, trillion dollars—in lost growth and productivity.

Think about that for a second. A \$1.9 trillion tax, a government burden on the American people. That means lost jobs, stagnant wages, and decreasing benefits for workers.

My amendment looks to help change all that. Very simply, my amendment requires every agency issuing a new rule to first identify, then repeal or amend at least one existing rule to offset any annual costs the new rule would have on the U.S. economy. This isn't some new radical idea. President-

elect Trump announced his administration will implement a new practice that for every new regulation, two would have to be repealed.

Governments in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and the Netherlands have all implemented similar versions of one-in/one-out when addressing new rules and regulations. In fact, in Canada, bureaucrats used the new direction to find and cut more red tape than was even required by the law. My amendment gives the new administration that same flexibility.

Mr. Chair, it is past time we stop bureaucratic abuse and shift the balance of power from government back to the people, where it belongs. That can start today by passing the REINS Act and putting our government on a path to reduce the amount of red tape that our businesses and the American people deal with every day.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I oppose the gentleman's amendment, which would require that agencies offset the cost of new rules, no matter how critical or mundane these protections may be, prior to promulgating new rules. This proposal, also referred to as "regulatory cut-go," appears as title 2 of H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act, or the SCRUB Act, that was introduced in the previous Congress.

In the context of a veto threat of that bill, the Obama administration cautioned that this requirement would make the process of retrospective regulatory review less productive and, in the process, create needless regulatory and legal uncertainty, and that it would increase costs for businesses and for States, local and tribal governments, and it would also impede commonsense protections for the American public.

By enacting Federal statutes, tasking agencies with responsibilities, Congress authorizes agencies to carry out matters that are too complex, routine, or technical for Congress itself to administer. We must ensure that agencies have the proper flexibility to issue new protections without encumbering other regulations with political obstructions. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), my good friend and the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for offering this amendment, and I rise in support of it.

The cumulative burden of Federal regulation will surely be reduced by the REINS Act, but that burden has two elements: the burden being added by new regulations and the burden already there.

This amendment adds a useful provision to the REINS Act to address the elimination of unnecessary burdens already in the Code of Federal Regulations. It does so, moreover, in a manner that parallels President-elect Trump's promise to pursue a policy of one-in/two-out when it comes to new regulatory actions by his administration.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is long past time to stop the runaway train of the Federal regulatory bureaucracy. I urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-1.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 801(a)(1)(A)(iv), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike "and" at the end.

In section 801(a)(1)(A)(v), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Insert after section 801(a)(1)(A)(v), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

(vi) recognizing that climate change is real and caused by human activity, an accounting of the greenhouse gas emission impacts associated with the rule; and

(vii) an analysis of the impacts of the rule on low-income communities and on rural communities.

In section 804(2)(B), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike "and" at the end.

In section 804(2)(C), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Insert after section 804(2)(C), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

"(D) an increase of 25,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions per year or more; or

"(E) a potential increased risk to low income or rural communities for—

"(i) cancer;

"(ii) birth defects;

"(iii) kidney disease;

"(iv) respiratory illness; or

"(v) cardiovascular illness."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, for years my Republican friends have been trying to convince everyone that Federal agencies are scary and unpopular. In reality, Americans support Federal rules that protect them from injuries, diseases, and death. They always have and they always will. The people we represent don't want those rules to go away. They want stronger rules to protect their jobs, their pay, their health, and their fair treatment in the workplace.

Let's remember that it takes years to finalize most rules. Before an agency makes a rule, it considers science, costs, benefits, public stakeholder input, and public comments. Republicans have invented stories about surprise regulations that appear out of nowhere. These stories sound interesting until you realize they were invented to help their corporate friends get where they want. We know where this will lead us. Big banks got away with robbing us and creating a major recession because they weren't regulated strongly enough. Republicans think the answer is making it harder to regulate them.

If this bill passes, it won't be the nameless, faceless, unelected corporate CEOs who feel the pain. It will be the Americans from big cities and small towns who need Federal standards to keep their environment clean, to keep their workplace safe, and to make sure the products they buy won't hurt their families.

My Democratic colleagues are offering amendments today that exempt certain kinds of rules from the unrealistic burdens this bill creates. I support these amendments.

My amendment is a little different. It is not nearly enough to save this terrible bill, but it takes a big step in the right direction. It acknowledges that doing nothing carries a major cost.

□ 1600

It acknowledges human-caused climate change and requires agencies that propose regulations to report on how a rule impacts greenhouse gas emissions. If we require reporting a rule's costs, we should also report its impacts to our planet and to our way of life.

It also requires an analysis of a rule's impacts on low-income and rural communities. My Republican friends are deeply concerned about whether new regulations make big business and Wall Street investors happy. I think it is time we assess the impacts of regulations on the urban poor, the rural poor, or on coastal Native American tribes already fleeing the impacts of climate change, or the farmers in the West and South struggling to cope with drought, flooding, and extreme weather.

Finally, my amendment requires congressional approval of any regulation that would increase carbon pollution by 25,000 metric tons or more, or could increase cancer, birth defects, kidney disease, or cardiovascular or respiratory illness.

If House Republicans are so eager to rewrite the regulatory process, they should be willing to cast recorded votes allowing the release of tens of thousands of metric tons of pollution into our air. They should publicly vote to increase the rates of these terrible diseases among their constituents.

Passing this amendment is the very least we can do to make sure the bill doesn't put Americans at risk of injury and death.

I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment renders congressional findings on climate change and requires that agencies report to Congress on greenhouse gas impacts associated with a rule. It also requires agencies to report on a rule's effect on low-income and rural communities.

Further, the amendment expands the definition of major rule to include rules that allow increases of carbon emissions by more than 25,000 metric tons per year or that might increase the risk of certain diseases in rural or low-income communities.

I oppose this amendment.

The REINS Act is not designed to address one or two subjects of regulation with heightened scrutiny but not others. It is to restore accountability to the people's elected representatives in Congress for the largest regulatory decisions, whatever subject is involved.

Further, and consistent with that, the addition of congressional findings in one policy area—climate change—but no other, has no place in the REINS Act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that the REINS Act is one sweeping piece of legislation that does not take into account public health, does not take into account clean air, clean water, and the effects of constituents and the American people, the environment, or the cost attended with increased illnesses. With that sweeping deregulation process that is being proposed by the majority, we have an exposure on issues of public health, clean air, clean water, and the regulations that are in place to protect the public health and the well-being of the American people.

My amendment just requires that, if these sweeping changes are to occur, Members of this body take the votes

that would release additional metric tons into the atmosphere that would promote and increase the levels of disease in this country that is harmful to the American people. It is one of disclosure and accountability if the Members, indeed, are the ones that want to make the final decision.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-1.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

"(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that will result in reduced incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease in children."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes an important exemption to the REINS Act to ensure that policies that protect children from cancer, premature death, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease are not delayed or denied.

For example, the Clean Air Act, which has been in place for over 40 years, and has improved our health and protected all Americans from harmful toxic air pollution, such as ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and particle pollution, often requires updates based upon the best science, especially when it comes to our kids.

Toxic pollutants, such as ozone, which is a major component of smog, are linked to asthma, lung, and heart

disease and result in thousands of deaths every year and up to 1 million missed days of school. Our kids are particularly susceptible to this type of pollution because their lungs are still developing. On average, they take deeper breaths and are more likely to spend long periods outdoors, placing them at higher risk.

The American Lung Association states that inhaling smog pollution is like getting a sunburn on your lungs, and often results in immediate breathing trouble.

I remember very well back in the early seventies, when I was a little girl, what the air was like in my hometown in Tampa. We had a lot of industrial users at the port of Tampa, a lot of industrial plants. I have seen the progress over time that the Clean Air Act has brought to this country. We are not like other countries in the world. We are stronger, and we are better, and we are healthier because of the Clean Air Act.

So let's not go backwards. Let's not throw a roadblock like the REINS Act into the mix here. But we do have to be careful because there still are many communities in America that continue to suffer, and they are often the underserved, economically distressed communities.

Studies have shown that working class communities often bear the brunt of environmental pollution because the only homes they can afford are often located near industrial sites. According to the NAACP, 78 percent of African Americans live within 30 miles of an industrial power plant, and 71 percent of African Americans live in counties that violate Federal air pollution standards.

In addition to that, a study by the Environmental Defense Fund found that our Latino neighbors are three times more likely to die from asthma, often for those same reasons.

Let's not go backwards. Because here, what the REINS Act does is it really complicates the American system of checks and balances. Let's not go backwards. Because it is not only our families and neighbors that would suffer. It is also our economy that would suffer as well.

This type of regulatory scheme of mirrors and false promises would create great uncertainty for many of our businesses. The Clean Air Act is one example. These clean air protections in the United States have a great track record. We have grown as a country. The economic growth has tripled. Our economic base has more than tripled. Clean air protections and environmental protections go hand-in-hand with economic growth.

Since 1970, we have cut harmful air pollution by 70 percent, while our economy has grown like gang busters. I know many of you are probably going to have your eyes on the Tampa Bay area Monday night when we have the college football championship in Tampa with Alabama versus Clemson. I

want you to take a look at our clean skies, the clean air. I wish we could all be there, but I think we are going to be back here in Washington, D.C. But just know, it hasn't always been that way. When you see the beautiful sunset across Tampa Bay with clear skies, that has been because of the Clean Air Act.

But if you bring a regulatory scheme, like the REINS Act, that says you have to come back to Congress for every single little new policy that is based on updates and new science, that is going to complicate everyone's lives. I worry at the outset of this new Congress, because the first bill passed yesterday was one that short-circuited public participation, and now this bill today appears to be a late Christmas gift to corporate polluters who put profits over people. We are better than that. You can prove me wrong, though, by supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts from the bill any rule reducing the incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, and respiratory diseases in children. But do not be fooled. This amendment is not about reducing these maladies. It is about transferring the power to decide how best to do so from elected representatives to unaccountable bureaucrats.

For example, government could substantially reduce teenage mortality by barring teenage drivers off the road. Of course, there would be a substantial cost to that policy, and there are surely less burdensome ways to achieve the same reductions in mortality. The right decision requires a delicate balancing of interest. Agencies can provide valuable expertise, but, when there is a lot at stake, the ultimate decision on how best to strike that balance is properly made by elected officials accountable to the people.

That is the intuition behind the REINS Act and the fundamental point that is lost on those who oppose it.

Reducing the incidence of mortality and serious disease is a goal that all Members share. This bill does not frustrate that goal. It merely ensures that elected representatives decide how best to achieve that policy so that our Republic remains a government by the people as the Constitution designed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, of course, this legislative body has all the power to go back to policymaking after an administrative agency makes a determination, but we are not micromanagers. We are legislators. And I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Castor amendment to protect children's health.

If you won't create an exception for children's health, I wonder, you are not willing to really recognize the fundamental constitutional basis of this government. It is one that relies on checks and balances as the basis of our government.

I urge my colleagues then to also support the Castor amendment but oppose the REINS Act in the end.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-1.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, the following:

"(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule relating to the protection of the public health or safety."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 26 would exempt rules concerning public health or safety from the burdensome requirements of this legislation.

Simply put, when a rule is necessary to protect the health and safety of the public, it is critical that the rule be put into effect without unnecessary delay.

If this legislation is enacted without this amendment, it will create an untenable regulatory environment that will make it nearly impossible for agencies to safeguard the public welfare.

This legislation could bring to a grinding halt critical rulemaking such

as rules relating to the transportation of hazardous materials by the Department of Transportation, clean air regulations by the EPA, and worker-protection standards by OSHA.

For example, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration implemented an economically significant rule that, by May 2018, all new vehicles must have rearview cameras. This regulation will help drivers have better visibility behind their car, greatly reducing the likelihood of backover crashes which largely involves small children.

But under the REINS Act, this rule would require a joint congressional resolution with an unrealistic timeline for implementation. For every year this rule would be delayed, the Traffic Safety Administration estimates that there would be, on average, 15,000 injuries and 267 fatalities resulting from backover crashes.

Proponents of this legislation may argue that H.R. 26 contains an emergency exemption which allows a major rule to temporarily take effect following an executive order stating that there is an imminent threat to public health and safety. Even when the threat is not imminent, the danger to the public health and welfare may be great and the fundamental responsibility to protect the public remains.

□ 1615

This legislation would substantially hinder the ability of agencies to fulfill this obligation, placing Americans at greater risk for the benefit of powerful corporate interests. In its present form, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards and the alliance of more than 150 consumer, labor, faith, and other public interest groups predict that, by allowing Congress to even veto uncontroversial rules that protect public health and safety, the REINS Act "would make the dysfunction and obstructionism that plague our political process even worse."

In echoing this sentiment, the American Sustainable Business Council, which represents over 200,000 businesses, opposes H.R. 26 because it would recklessly place the burden of proof on the taxpayers in order to protect themselves on environmental, health, and safety issues and would shift responsibility away from powerful corporate interests.

While my amendment will not cure all that ails this legislation—and there is a lot—it will address one of its most glaring flaws and preserve the ability of agencies to protect public health and safety. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts from the bill any rule pertaining to health or public safety.

Health and public safety regulations done properly serve important goals, and the bill does nothing to frustrate the effective achievement of those goals; but Federal health and public safety regulations constitute an immense part of total Federal regulation and have been the source of many of the most abusive, unnecessarily expensive, and job- and wage-destroying regulations. To remove these areas of regulation from the bill would severely weaken the bill's important reforms to lower cumulative regulatory costs and increase the accountability of our regulatory system and the Congress to the people, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just made an assertion that, in fact, nothing in this legislation does anything to frustrate the goals of protecting health and safety; but, of course, it does. It prevents the implementation of rules which, in fact, protect public health and safety.

If my amendment were to pass, that statement would be true—it would do nothing to frustrate it—but without this amendment, it prevents the implementation of a rule that would, in fact, protect public health and safety. It is a reasonable exemption that will ensure that we protect the well-being and the health of our constituents. I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-1.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

"(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that would provide for a reduction in the amount of lead in public drinking water."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from H.R. 26, the REINS Act, rules issued to reduce the amount of lead in public drinking water.

The ingestion of lead, of course, causes serious harmful effects on human health, even at low exposure levels. That is why the Environmental Protection Agency has set the maximum contaminant level for this toxic metal in drinking water at zero.

According to the EPA, young children, infants, and fetuses are particularly vulnerable to lead because the physical and behavioral effects of lead occur at lower exposure levels in children than in adults. The Agency reports that, in children, low levels of exposure have been linked to damage to the central and peripheral nervous systems, learning disabilities, shorter stature, impaired hearing, and the impaired formation and function of blood cells.

Take, for example, the Flint water crisis, which I have a little experience with, which was a preventable public health disaster. While much blame for the Flint water crisis lies with unelected officials who prioritize saving money over saving lives, the presence of lead in drinking water is, unfortunately, not unique to Flint. In fact, the drinking water of, potentially, millions of Americans may be contaminated by lead.

My amendment highlights one of the most problematic aspects of H.R. 26: that it could slow down or completely block urgent rulemakings that protect health and safety. This is because Members simply lack the requisite scientific or technical knowledge to independently assess the bona fides of most regulations, which are often the product of extensive research and analysis by agencies as well as input from effective entities and the public.

As a result, Members would have to make their own determinations based on their own—usually inexperienced—views and limited information. Worse yet, some may be persuaded to disapprove of a rule in response to a wide-ranging influence exerted by outside special interests that favor profits over safety.

My amendment simply preserves current law with respect to regulations that are designed to prevent the contamination of drinking water by lead. Accordingly, I sincerely urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reforms regulations that would reduce the amount of lead in public drinking water.

But, like other amendments, this amendment is not so much about achieving a particular health or safety result. It is about taking the decision on how best to do that away from elected Representatives and handing it down to unaccountable bureaucrats. Agencies can provide valuable expertise, but when there is a lot at stake, the ultimate decision on how best to strike that balance is properly made by elected officials who are accountable to the people. This is the intuition behind the REINS Act, and the fundamental point is lost on its opponents.

Preventing dangerous levels of lead in our drinking water is a goal all Members share. This bill does not frustrate that goal. It merely ensures that elected Representatives decide how best to achieve that policy so that our Republic remains a government by the people, as the Constitution designed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Protecting the health and safety of our citizens is one of the core responsibilities of our government and Congress, and we trust much of its authority to Federal agencies to implement this obligation. This amendment simply preserves current law with respect to regulations that are designed to prevent the contamination of drinking water by lead.

As the Obama administration has observed, in the context of a veto threat to a substantively identical version of this bill in the last Congress, the REINS Act would delay and, in most cases, thwart the implementation of statutory mandates and the execution of duly enacted laws, create business uncertainty, undermine much-needed protections of the American public, and cause unnecessary confusion. Unfortunately, as I noted in my opening statement, the REINS Act would delay and, worse yet, possibly stop major rules from going into effect that are needed to protect the public's health, safety, and well-being, including those that require us to keep lead from drinking water.

Safety regulations are typically the product of a transparent and accountable process that includes extensive investigation, analysis, and input from

the public and private sectors. It is no answer to say that H.R. 26 contains a limited emergency exception. That provision is insufficient. It merely allows a major rule to temporarily take effect for 90 days without its having congressional approval.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, just to reiterate what our position is, it is about time that we in D.C.—in Congress—take our responsibility back from unelected bureaucrats and make these decisions. We have seen, over the past 8 years, what overburdensome regulation has done to this country as far as crushing jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlemanwoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) to present her amendment in her absence.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert after “means any rule” the following: “(other than a special rule)”.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: “, and includes any special rule”.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, the following:

“(6) The term ‘special rule’ means any rule that pertains to the safety of any products specifically designed to be used or consumed by a child under the age of 2 years (including cribs, car seats, and infant formula).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Jackson Lee amendment exempts from this bill’s onerous requirements the congressional approval requirement of any proposed rule that is made to ensure the safety of products

that are used or consumed by children under the age of 2.

This amendment should pass for obvious reasons. If protecting public health and safety means anything, it surely must include the protection of our children. Because of the special vulnerability of young children, any regulation affecting their health and safety must not be delayed. Unfortunately, if this bill passes as written without this amendment, that is exactly what will happen. The young children will be vulnerable to products that are unsafe and that could hurt them. For this reason, SHEILA JACKSON LEE has offered this amendment, which I support.

An example is a regulation that is meant to protect a child from death or injury from contaminated formula. Such a rule would be impeded—or the promulgation of such a rule and the enactment of that rule would be impeded—by this administration.

This amendment would declare that, in that case, the rule would not apply. It would be exempted from this legislation. Toxic chemicals, dangerous toys, or deadly falls from unsafe products could be avoided. Therefore, this amendment would protect children under those circumstances. Those kinds of rules need to be implemented promptly to save lives.

For that reason, the Jackson Lee amendment deserves your support. I hope that you can support it out of your heart.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act’s reforms regulations intended to protect young children and infants from harm.

Child safety is a goal all Members share, but to shield bureaucrats who write child safety regulations from accountability to Congress is no way to guarantee a child’s safety. The only thing that would guarantee is less careful decisionmaking and more insulation of faceless bureaucrats from the public.

The Constitution entrusts to Congress the authority to protect children—and all citizens—from harmful products flowing in interstate commerce. The public should be able to trust Congress—and we should trust ourselves—to make sure that Washington bureaucrats make the right decisions to protect child safety when we delegate legislative authority to regulatory agencies.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the faceless, nameless, deadly bu-

reaucrats out here who mean the public harm, those are our relatives. Those are our mothers, our fathers, who work for the Federal Government. They are the civil servants that serve us. They are not nameless and faceless people of bad will and bad intent. They are good people who go to work every day and try to protect us and protect our children.

All we are asking for with this amendment is for there to be a carve-out to protect the most vulnerable among us, our children.

This legislation is based on the faulty premise that the cost of regulations outweigh the benefits. What is the cost of a benefit when it comes to the health, safety, and well-being of a child?

The people who promulgate these rules mean to protect these children, and this amendment goes to that ability of the regulators to do that. Sometimes regulation is good.

Even though a couple of jobs might go away because of the regulation, isn’t it worth the health, safety, and well-being of our children that a couple of jobs could not reach fruition? Everything is not a cost-benefit analysis. Sometimes there is some humanity in the mix that we have to consider.

I urge my colleagues to think about it one more time and be in favor of the very reasonable Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the REINS Act doesn’t prevent the bureaucracy, the agencies, from making recommendations and suggestions to Congress. It simply says Congress will have the last word and not a handful of bureaucrats, and many of them don’t even have experience in these areas.

I urge my colleagues to not support this amendment but to support the REINS Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I offer an amendment to H.R. 26.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after “means any rule” the following: “(other than a special rule)”.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: “, and includes any special rule”.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

“(6) The term ‘special rule’ means any rule that pertains to improving employment, retention, and earnings of workforce participants, especially those participants with significant barriers to employment.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 26, which would exempt from the bill rules that improve the employment retention and wages of workforce participants, especially those with significant barriers to employment. Since one of the justifications, or the main justification, for this underlying legislation is to promote job growth from corporate titans at the expense, by the way, of health and safety of Americans, at least, we could exempt from the bill rules that improve the employment, retention, and wages of workforce participants, especially those with significant barriers to employment.

When President Obama took office in 2009, he inherited the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. This economic quagmire was created by misguided Republican policies that put profits ahead of people, resulting in reckless decisions on Wall Street that cost millions of Americans their homes and jobs. In other words, the Great Recession was caused by the collapse of the financial markets due to an unreliability and instability of the predatory lending market, which had taken hold. There was so much paper out there on Wall Street that was worthless because it was based on these homes that people couldn't pay the notes for, and all of that was caused by deregulation, lack of regulation.

Now we have a period with Dodd-Frank coming into play and the financial markets improving, the protection and economic security of American families increasing, being strengthened.

Now, at the beginning of this Congress, we get legislation to gut the Dodd-Frank regulation and other regulations that would protect people from excesses of the corporate community. I am just asking, in this amendment, that we don't let it apply in the case of situations where the bill improves employment retention or wages or workforce participants, especially those with barriers to employment.

So, according to leading economic indicators, private-sector businesses have created more than 15.6 million new jobs. The unemployment rate has dropped to well below 5 percent to the

lowest point in nearly a decade, and incomes are rising faster, while the poverty rate has dropped to the lowest point since 1968. This has all occurred during an administration that is proenvironment, proclean energy, and proworkplace safety.

In fact, during this time, our Nation has doubled our production of clean energy and reduced our carbon emissions faster than any other advanced nation. And the price of gas is down to roughly \$2 a barrel, despite all of these cumbersome and oppressive regulations by the Obama administration that the other side complains about.

Notwithstanding this progress that has been made, there is still much work to be done for the millions of Americans who remain out of work, underemployed, or have not seen significant wage growth postrecession.

Congress should be working tirelessly across party lines to find solutions to persistent unemployment and stagnant wages, such as a public investment agenda that will increase productivity and domestic output while turning the page on our historic underinvestment in our Nation's roads, bridges, and educational institutions.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, this bill, the REINS Act, is not a jobs bill. It is a legislative hacksaw to the critical public health and safety protections that ensure our Nation's air is clean, our water is pure, and our workplace vehicles, homes, and consumer products are safe.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures regulations that attempt to improve employment, retention, and earnings, particularly for those with significant barriers to employment.

The danger in the amendment is the strong incentive it gives agencies to manipulate their analysis of a major regulation's jobs and wages impacts. Far too often, agencies will be tempted to shade the analysis to skirt the bill's congressional approval requirement.

In addition, regulations alleged to create new job prospects often do so by destroying real, existing jobs and creating new, hoped-for jobs associated with regulatory compliance. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Clean Air Act rules have shut down existing power plants all over the country, throwing myriads of workers out of work. EPA and OMB attempt to justify that with claims that more new green jobs have been created as a result.

In the end, this is just another way in which government picks the jobs winners and the jobs losers, and there is no guarantee that all of the new green jobs will ever actually exist.

The REINS Act is not intended to force any particular outcome. It does not choose between clean air and dirty air. It does not choose between new jobs and old jobs.

Instead, the REINS Act chooses between two ways of making laws. It chooses the way the Framers intended in which accountability for laws with major economic impact rests with Congress. It rejects the way Washington has operated for too long in which there is no accountability because decisions are made by unelected agency officials.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115-1.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert after “means any rule” the following: “(other than a special rule)”.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: “, and includes any special rule”.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, the following:

“(6) The term ‘special rule’ means any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from the bill any regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety. In other words, my amendment would allow the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or the NRC to continue to issue rules under the current system, thereby making it easier to protect Americans from potential nuclear disaster.

The underlying legislation, the REINS Act, would grind the gears of rulemaking to a halt by requiring all major rules to be affirmatively approved in advance by Congress. A regulation would be blocked from being implemented if even one Chamber declines to pass an approval resolution. The goal of this legislation, quite simply, is to stop the regulatory process in its tracks, regardless of the impact on public health and safety.

One example that highlights the risks and dangers of this legislation is

the subject of this amendment: Nuclear power.

The world watched in horror when an earthquake and resulting tsunami devastated the area around Fukushima, Japan, a few years ago. That disaster then caused its own disaster—the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant. The meltdown led to the release of radioactive isotopes, the creation of a 20-kilometer exclusion zone around the power plant, and the displacement, consequently, of 156,000 people. Just last month, seaborne radiation from Fukushima was even detected on the West Coast of the United States.

The same year as the Fukushima meltdown, Virginia was struck by a relatively rare but strong earthquake, felt up and down the eastern seaboard. While the region was spared a similar disaster, the earthquake required a nuclear power plant near the epicenter to go offline as a precaution and served as a wake-up call that our nuclear reactors needed additional safety protocols.

For me, this concern hits close to home. A nuclear power plant, Indian Point, which has suffered numerous malfunctions in recent years, lies just less than 40 miles away from my New York City district, about 30 miles away from the city. Twenty million people live within a 50-mile radius around the plant, the same radius used by the NRC as the basis for the evacuation zone recommended after the Fukushima disaster.

□ 1645

Indian Point also sits near two earthquake fault lines and, according to the NRC, is the most likely nuclear power plant in the country to experience core damage because of an earthquake.

Because of the catastrophes that can result from disasters, be they natural or manmade at nuclear power plants, prevention of meltdowns is absolutely vital. Since Fukushima, the NRC has issued new rules designed to upgrade power plants to withstand severe events like earthquakes, and to have enough backup power so as to avoid a meltdown for a significant length of time.

The NRC must retain the ability to issue new regulations to safeguard the health and well-being of all Americans. However, this bill is intentionally designed so that new and important regulations, including those to prevent a nuclear power plant meltdown which could affect millions of American, will likely never be put in place, thwarted by either chamber of Congress.

Congress delegates authority to executive agencies because we do not have the expertise or time to craft all technical regulations ourselves. We should defer to the engineers and scientists at the NRC who determine, after careful study, that a particular regulation is critical to our safety and to the safe operation of a nuclear power plant. This bill, however, would all too easily allow Members of Congress to sub-

stitute their own judgment or, most likely, the wishes of a narrow group of special interests.

This week we began a new Congress. Later this month we will have a new administration, all controlled by Republicans. Between this bill and the Midnight Rules bill we passed yesterday, they have chosen to make their first order of business the dismantling and destruction of the regulatory process, regardless of the impact on public health and safety. This gives us a good idea of the priorities we should expect to see in the next 2 years.

The least we can do is to try to ensure that the antiregulatory agenda of the Republicans does not have devastating consequences such as a nuclear meltdown. I urge my colleagues to support the Nadler amendment to exempt nuclear safety regulations from the onerous requirements of the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures all regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety standards. REINS Act supporters believe in nuclear safety. We want to guarantee that regulatory decisions that pertain to nuclear reactor safety are the best decisions that can be made.

That is precisely why I oppose the amendment. By its terms, the amendment shields from the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures not only major regulations that would raise nuclear reactor safety standards, but also regulations that would lower them.

All major regulations pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards, whether they raise or lower standards, should fall within the REINS Act. That way agencies with authority over nuclear reactor safety would know that Congress must approve their major regulations before they go into effect.

That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. It is a solution that everyone should support because it makes Congress more accountable and ensures agencies will write better rules. All Americans will be safer for it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, nuclear meltdowns are a tremendous danger to the life and safety of millions of Americans. The Congressional Review Act provides if the NRC makes such a regulation, Congress can say no. That is appropriate. But to say Congress has to approve any regulation in advance, when there may be thousands of regu-

lations or hundreds of regulations from different agencies, they may not get to it. We may not have time to study it, and lives are at stake. It does not make sense. That is why this amendment at least cuts out nuclear meltdown regulations, nuclear safety regulations, to say Congress can veto them if they don't agree. But the agency should be able to promulgate it in the absence of congressional veto.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, once again, this administration has proven how thousands of regulations have crushed jobs for the middle class people in this country. The REINS Act does designate and allows and wants agencies to make decisions as far as what they think the law should be and send it to Congress.

We do have the time. We have the resources and the knowledge. That is why we have full committees. That is why we have subcommittees and we have experts come in and testify. Yet, we still need to get back—that the 535 Members of Congress, the House and the Senate, make the final decision and not a handful of unelected bureaucrats.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115-1.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 10 as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

"(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule intended to ensure the safety of natural gas or hazardous materials pipelines or prevent, mitigate, or reduce the impact of spills from such pipeline."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman

from California (Mr. McNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, recent pipeline incidents have raised serious concerns about the condition of the Nation's pipelines that threaten the safety and health of American citizens. This amendment will ensure that any rule intended to guarantee the safety of natural gas or hazardous material pipelines is not considered a major rule under this bill and would, therefore, be easier to create.

Pipeline safety is a bipartisan issue. Congress has shown that issuing regulations related to pipelines is a priority, as evident with the enactment of the PIPES Act last year.

However, the bill before us today, H.R. 26, contradicts this historic precedent and would have the effect of delaying or preventing any rule on pipeline safety from going forward. Pipeline accidents cause major property damage, serious injuries or deaths, and harms the environment.

There are approximately 2.9 million miles of pipeline in the United States. They travel through rural and urban areas, Republican and Democratic districts, coastlines, inland areas. Everyone is impacted. Quality control measures, new infrastructure, and oversight are paramount.

Unfortunately, we have seen the devastating impact of pipeline incidents throughout the country, including several accidents and spills in California in recent years, such as the spill in Santa Barbara that released more than 100,000 gallons of crude oil.

We have also seen how liquid spills can devastate the people and economies in places like Michigan, and the irreplaceable natural resources like the Yellowstone River in Montana, or the precious coastline of Santa Barbara. Additionally, these explosions and spills cause shortages and price increases that impact Americans far from the site of the accident.

A Colonial Pipeline accident this past September in Alabama leaked roughly 8,000 barrels of gasoline and saw prices increase by up to 31 cents a gallon in metropolitan areas in the Southeastern States.

I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we want effective and efficient government. But, in reality, pipeline safety regulations are already subject to duplicative and time-consuming analyses, including a rigorous risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis required by the pipeline safety statute. These already duplicative review requirements are among the top reasons why the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration increasingly lags behind the congressional mandate to issue rules that protect Americans from dangerous pipeline incidents.

In fact, this was the subject of a great deal of discussion when the En-

ergy and Commerce Committee marked up the pipeline safety reauthorization bill last year. I worked with Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE to address this issue, as both sides of the aisle agreed that the duplicative reviews currently required are already slowing down these critical safety laws to a degree that is frustrating and dangerous.

While we make progress in the PIPES Act, I believe we can and should do more. The last thing we need is one more layer of bureaucracy to further slow down implementation of these critical protections for public health, safety, and the environment. We should work together to prevent spills and work to minimize impacts when spills or other incidents do occur. This includes automatic shut-off valves, leak detection, and technologies to reduce clogging and rupture.

A vote for this amendment is a vote for the safety of the public and the environment. It is a vote to protect the land and water that are threatened by oil spills. It is a vote for industry that wants certainty and clarity and doesn't want to—or benefit from—wait years for rules to be finalized. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reform regulations that concern natural gas or hazardous materials pipeline safety or the prevention of pipeline spills and their adverse impacts.

We all support pipeline safety and the prevention of harm from pipeline spills, but there is no assurance that the amendment would guarantee the achievement of those goals. On the contrary, the amendment would shield from congressional accountability procedures, regulations, that actually threaten to decrease safety. They also would shield from the bill's congressional approval requirements new, ideologically driven regulations intended to impede America's access to new sources of cheap, clean, and plentiful natural gas.

The legislative body is the legislative body. We are trying to have oversight over the bureaucracy. The House and the Senate is not a bureaucracy. It is a legislative body, according to the Constitution that represents the people of the United States. Therefore, the House and the Senate and the President should have the last say in whether something becomes law or not.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, my opponent is right. It is the duty of Con-

gress to provide rules and to provide guidelines and for the agencies to go into the details in creating these rules.

I know that the other side is opposed to the rules. They have been touting about regulations, but poor regulations reduces jobs, too. It creates monopolies. It creates pollution. But that is not what we are talking about.

What we are talking about is public safety. I think what we need to do is look at what is going to benefit the public safety and what is going to protect people, lives, property, and the environment. That is what this amendment does. It is simple. It exempts pipeline safety from H.R. 26.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, what better group, such as the Committee on Energy and Commerce or other committees here, the full committees, the subcommittees, would be looking out and should be looking out for the public safety and the welfare than the 535 Members of Congress?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115-1.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Section 804(4) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended in subparagraph (B), by striking "or" at the end.

Section 804(4) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or".

Section 804(4) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) any rule that pertains to workplace health and safety made by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration or the Mine Safety and Health Administration that is necessary to prevent or reduce the incidence of traumatic injury, cancer or irreversible lung disease."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from coverage under the REINS Act any rule which pertains to workplace health and safety made by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, or the Mine Safety and Health Administration, MSHA, that is necessary to prevent or reduce the incidence of traumatic injury, cancer or irreversible lung disease.

I am offering the amendment because we should not be creating obstacles to the protection of life and limb. We should be concerned about repealing such workplace rules. Actually, this concern is not theoretical. There was a report from the chairman of the Freedom Caucus that actually calls for the repeal of multiple safety and health rules.

□ 1700

One OSHA rule, for example, will reduce slip, trip, and fall hazards, which are actually a leading cause of worker deaths and lost workday injuries. We found that this rule had not been updated since 1971, and OSHA has calculated that over 10 years the rule will prevent nearly 300 worker deaths and more than 58,000 lost-time injuries. The net benefit, cash benefit, of the rule is projected to be over \$3 billion over 10 years.

Another rule at risk is the modernization of OSHA's beryllium exposure limit, a 70-year-old standard that was obsolete even before it was issued. Workers who inhaled beryllium can develop debilitating, incurable, and frequently fatal illnesses. One known as chronic beryllium disease also increased lung cancer.

In the 1940s, workers at the Atomic Energy Commission plants were contracting acute beryllium poisoning. To deal with the problem, two scientists agreed to set the exposure limit at 2 micrograms per cubic meter of air while sitting in the back of a taxicab on their way to a meeting. This discredited standard is often called the taxicab standard because there was no data to support it, and there is now significant scientific evidence that show that it has failed to protect workers.

One cost of keeping the so-called taxicab standard is estimated at the loss of nearly 100 lives a year. So we need to make sure that this rule is updated. It is in final stages after 18 years of development. The finalized rule is expected to come out soon. Other rules involve mine safety and other safety and health concerns.

The REINS Act would make it harder to protect workers' health and safety. The bill would create more bureaucracy by requiring that any major rule receive bicameral resolution of support within 70 legislative days prior to the rule taking effect.

This bill even provides for a reach back to consider rules issued last spring. Under this bill, a single House

of Congress could block a rule. That raises significant constitutional concerns. By allowing a one-House veto, the bill violates the presentment clause of the Constitution of the United States.

My amendment ensures essential workplace safety protections are not jeopardized by this flawed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures any workplace safety rules issued by OSHA or the Mine Safety and Health Administration to reduce traumatic injury, cancer, or lung disease.

But please do not be fooled. This amendment is not about reducing these maladies. It is about transferring the power to decide how best to do so from elected Representatives, being House Members and Senators, to unaccountable bureaucrats.

Arriving at the right decision requires a delicate balancing of interests. Agencies can provide valuable expertise, but when there is a lot at stake, the ultimate decision on how best to strike that balance is properly made by elected officials accountable to the people. That is the intuition behind the REINS Act and the fundamental point that is lost on its opponents.

Preventing workplace injury is a goal all Members share. This bill does not frustrate that goal. It merely ensures that elected Representatives make the final call about major decisions so that our Republic remains a government by the people as the Constitution's Framers designed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which really is a life-or-death question before the Chamber.

On February 7, 2010, a bunch of workers who were at a natural gas plant construction site early in the morning lost their lives in a horrific explosion because there was a natural gas blow where they intentionally put natural gas through the pipe that was being installed as a way of cleaning it. This is a practice which the pipe suppliers, Siemens, GE, and others have issued serious warning is an unsafe practice. Unfortunately, it wasn't followed that day, so six men lost their lives. One of them was Ronnie Crabb, who was a dear friend of mine.

It never should have happened because, again, in the private sector, the

workplace standard was there, but there was no workplace standard in OSHA, which is now, again, trapped in the Chemical Safety Board and the regulatory process.

This bill is just going to do nothing but, again, add additional obstacles so that preventive measures that OSHA is really about—it is about compliance, not retribution. There was a \$16 million fine imposed after the fact. The company, the contractor, went out of business and paid just a fraction of it. That is not the way to protect workers' lives. Let's allow a healthy regulatory process with private sector input so that people like Ronnie Crabb won't lose their lives in the future.

Mr. Chairman, again, I strongly support the Scott amendment.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-1.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, is amended by adding at the end the following (and conforming the table of sections accordingly):

"§ 808. Review of rules currently in effect

"(a) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the 9 years following, each agency shall designate not less than 10 percent of eligible rules made by that agency for review, and shall submit a report including each such eligible rule in the same manner as a report under section 801(a)(1). Section 801, section 802, and section 803 shall apply to each such rule, subject to subsection (c) of this section. No eligible rule previously designated may be designated again.

"(b) SUNSET FOR ELIGIBLE RULES NOT EXTENDED.—Beginning after the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this section, if Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of approval for that eligible rule, that eligible rule shall not continue in effect.

"(c) CONSOLIDATION; SEVERABILITY.—In applying sections 801, 802, and 803 to eligible rules under this section, the following shall apply:

"(1) The words 'take effect' shall be read as 'continue in effect'.

“(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), a single joint resolution of approval shall apply to all eligible rules in a report designated for a year, and the matter after the resolving clause of that joint resolution is as follows: ‘That Congress approves the rules submitted by the ____ for the year ____.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).”

“(3) It shall be in order to consider any amendment that provides for specific conditions on which the approval of a particular eligible rule included in the joint resolution is contingent.

“(4) A member of either House may move that a separate joint resolution be required for a specified rule.

“(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘eligible rule’ means a rule that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this section.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to say that I have been a long and strong supporter of the REINS Act. I want to compliment Congressman Geoff Davis of Kentucky for introducing and crafting that legislation. While he was doing that, I was drafting a bill that I named the Sunset Act, and I looked at this from the broad scope of this, that we have a lot of regulations that exist and have existed for decades. Some of them are burdensome and some of them are not.

The effect of the REINS Act, which I certainly will support on a final passage, hopefully with the King amendment adopted in it, but the REINS Act de facto simply grandfathers in existing regulations. So it is only prospective. It addresses the major regulations going forward, but not those that we are stuck with, such as the Waters of the United States, the Clean Power Plan, the overtime rule, the fiduciary rule, the net neutrality rule, the Dodd-Frank rules, and, heaven forbid, the ObamaCare rules if we should fail to repeal ObamaCare.

So what the King amendment does is it directs and allows the agencies and the executive branch of government to send a minimum of 10 percent of their regulations to the Congress each year for the duration of a decade encompassing a full 100 percent of all the regulations in place at the time of passage and enactment of the underlying legislation.

That gives Congress, then, authority and a vote over all of this. It gives us an ability to amend that legislation. We can pass them all en banc, we can amend them accordingly, or we can do what our Founding Fathers envisioned we should do. That is the essence of this.

By the way, President-elect Trump has made some strong pledges on dramatically reducing regulation in the United States. He doesn't have the tools without the King amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the King amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, which establishes an idiosyncratic process establishing an automatic sunset of public health and safety protections. It requires that agencies conduct an annual review of current rules to designate 10 percent of its existing rules to be eliminated within 10 years of the bill's enactment unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval for eligible bills.

Now, I understand to the listening public that sounds kind of complicated, but the bottom line is they want to do away—my friends on the other side of the aisle—with net neutrality, which is something that a Federal agency requires. So if you want the Internet, which we all built and paid for through the Federal Government through our taxes and then we turned it over to the private sector, but we still have a public interest in the net being neutral so that all traffic flows equally over the Web without some being slower than others according to how much you can afford to pay. That is not fair.

So this King amendment is a part of a regulatory scheme proposed by this legislation, the REINS Act, which is going to hurt Americans. It is going to hurt the health, safety, and well-being of the people when you are not able to have clean water, clean food, edible food, safe products, clean air, and clean water. These are the things that the REINS Act gets at. It doesn't want Americans to be healthy. It doesn't want the Internet to be neutral. Why? Because corporate America and Wall Street put people in office to do their bidding. That is what the REINS Act is all about. This King amendment will make it worse.

Under current law, Federal agencies already conduct an extensive retrospective review process of existing rules and have already saved taxpayers billions of dollars in cost savings. Since 2011, the Obama administration has made a durable commitment to ensuring retrospective review of existing regulatory protections. Under Executive Orders 13563 and 13610, the administration has required that of agencies.

According to Howard Shelanski, the administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs under the Obama administration, the Obama administration's retrospective review initiative has achieved an estimated \$37 billion in cost savings, reduced paperwork, and other benefits for Americans over the past 5 years.

Furthermore, as the Obama administration has stated in the context of a veto threat of a similarly draconian antiregulatory proposal in a previous Congress, “It is important that retrospective review efforts not unnecessarily constrain an agency's ability to provide a timely response to critical public health or safety issues, or constrain its ability to implement new statutory provisions.” That is what the King amendment would do.

In fact, because agencies are already committed to a thorough review process to identify and eliminate regulatory burdens, it may be impossible for agencies to make additional cuts without severely affecting public health and safety.

Lastly, while the majority has repeatedly noted that H.R. 26 is forward-looking legislation, this amendment would make the bill apply retroactively to protections and safeguards that exist at the bill's date of enactment, a bald attempt to gut protections adopted by the Obama administration, including net neutrality.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 427—REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015—REP. YOUNG, R-IN, AND 171 COSPONSORS

The Administration is committed to ensuring that regulations are smart and effective, and tailored to further statutory goals in the most cost-effective and efficient manner. Accordingly, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015, which would impose an unprecedented requirement that a joint resolution of approval be enacted by the Congress before any major rule of an Executive Branch agency could have force or effect. This radical departure from the longstanding separation of powers between the Executive and Legislative branches would delay and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly-enacted laws, create business uncertainty, undermine much-needed protections of the American public, and cause unnecessary confusion.

There is no justification for such an unprecedented requirement. When a Federal agency promulgates a major rule, it must already adhere to the particular requirements of the statute that it is implementing and to the constraints imposed by other Federal statutes and the Constitution. Indeed, in many cases, the Congress has mandated that the agency issue the particular rule. The agency must also comply with the rule-making requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551 et seq.). When an agency issues a major rule, it must perform analyses of benefits and costs, analyses that are typically required by one or more statutes (such as the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and the Paperwork Reduction Act) as well as by Executive Orders 12866 and 13563.

In addition, this Administration has already taken numerous steps to reduce regulatory costs and to ensure that all major regulations are designed to maximize net benefits to society. Executive Order 13563 requires careful cost-benefit analysis, public participation, harmonization of rulemaking across agencies, flexible regulatory approaches, and a regulatory retrospective review. In addition, Executive Order 13610 further institutionalizes retrospective review by requiring agencies to report regularly on the ways in which they are identifying and reducing the burden of existing regulations. Finally, agency rules are subject to the jurisdiction of Federal courts.

Moreover, for the past 19 years, the Congress itself has had the opportunity, under the Congressional Review Act of 1996, to review on an individual basis the rules—both major and non-major—that Federal agencies have issued.

By replacing this well-established framework with a blanket requirement of Congressional approval, H.R. 427 would throw all major regulations into a months-long limbo, fostering uncertainty and impeding business investment that is vital to economic growth. Maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches is essential to ensuring that the Nation's regulatory system effectively protects public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.

If the President were presented with H.R. 427, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire as to how much time may be remaining for each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has half a minute remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I fully support Congressman KING's amendment. It improves the viability of the REINS Act and makes sure that the responsibility of legislation is in the hands of our legislators.

Let me just ask this simple question. My good friend on the other side says that we should let the agencies and departments regulate and make rules. Let me ask this: How has it been going in the last 20 years in this country?

We are \$20 trillion in debt, and 20 million people are out of work or underemployed.

Are we going to continue to let bureaucrats make these decisions that crush jobs?

No, I don't think so. It is our responsibility in the House and it is our responsibility in the Senate. We can hear from those individuals, as I have repeatedly said here, in those agencies. We need to make the final decision because just look at the track record over the last 20, 30 years of unelected bureaucrats making these rules, laws, and regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we can't blame a \$20 trillion deficit or debt on nameless, faceless bureaucrats. We can blame a lot of that debt on the George Bush administration and the legislators who voted for tax cuts for the wealthy that were not paid for and funded two wars that were not paid for. That is what we can blame that \$20 trillion debt on.

□ 1715

Again, if you are in favor of net neutrality, you should oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would say that yes, we can blame a lot of debt and deficit on a burden of regulations. We can blame it because there is a huge cost to our executive branch of government. That cost, much of it, the unnecessary component, all that goes against our debt and deficit.

We saw, as Barack Obama came in as President, we had a \$10 trillion debt, which he was very critical of throughout his campaign in 2007 and 2008. Now, as he leaves office here, thankfully, in a couple of weeks, it is a \$20 trillion debt, and we can start to ratchet this thing back down.

Looking at the Obama administration and their reports on the costs of regulation, they come up with this number reported to the Heritage Foundation that the annual cost of regulations to the United States, according to the Obama administration, is \$108 billion, Mr. Chairman. So that is what we are looking at here for costs.

But I want to get at the real meat of this. Article I of the Constitution says Congress shall make all law. Yet, we have the courts making laws across the street, and we have regulations coming at us at a rate of—and I expressed to the gentleman from Georgia—ten-to-one. For every law we passed in the 114th Congress, there were at least 10 regulations that were poured over our head, and we are sitting in a place where we don't have the tools to undo them.

Now we have a President that is ready, and he wants to undo these regulations. If we make him march through the Administrative Procedure Act, it is heavy, it is burdensome, and it is time-consuming. But the King amendment gives the tools for the next President of the United States to work with Congress to trim this regulatory burden down. And the most important part is, it makes all of us in the House and the Senate accountable then for all of the regulations.

The APA was allowed to dish off this legislative responsibility to the executive branch. Congress took a pass. They ducked their responsibility of being accountable for all legislation and found a way to be producing less than 10 percent of the legislation that exists even in a given year.

The King amendment says that over the period of a decade, 10 percent a year at a minimum, Congress will have to review all the regulations. The people from across America—we the people—will weigh in on that regulation. And then an even better part is not only will we be accountable here in Congress—and we should be—but when the nameless, faceless bureaucrats are across the desk from our constituents and they refuse to listen to our constituents, there is going to be a little bug in the back of their ear that is going to be saying to them: You know what? This constituent that may be losing their business over this regulation, the next stop they make is going to be with their Congressman. These regulations that we promulgated are going to be subject then to being repealed by the United States Congress, as they should be.

Support the King amendment. It puts the authority back into the hands of Article I, we the people.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 22, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 11

Whereas the United States has long supported a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security;

Whereas since 1993, the United States has facilitated direct, bilateral negotiations between both parties toward achieving a two-state solution and ending all outstanding claims;

Whereas it is the long-standing policy of the United States that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only come through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties;

Whereas it is the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto United Nations Security Council resolutions dictating additional binding parameters on the peace process;

Whereas it is the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto one-sided or anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas the United States has stood in the minority internationally over successive Administrations in defending Israel in international forums, including vetoing one-sided

resolutions in 2011, 2006, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, 1997, and 1995 before the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas the United States recently signed a new Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Israel regarding security assistance, consistent with longstanding support for Israel among successive Administrations and congresses and representing an important United States commitment toward Israel's qualitative military edge;

Whereas on November 29, 2016, the House of Representatives unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 165, expressing the sense of Congress and reaffirming longstanding United States policy in support of a direct bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions imposing a solution to the conflict;

Whereas on December 23, 2016, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations disregarded House Concurrent Resolution 165 and departed from longstanding United States policy by abstaining and permitting United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be adopted under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter;

Whereas the United States' abstention on United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contradicts the Oslo Accords and its associated process that is predicated on resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict between the parties through direct negotiations;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 claims that "the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace";

Whereas by referring to the "4 June 1967 lines" as the basis for negotiations, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively states that the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are "occupied territory" thereby equating these sites with outposts in the West Bank that the Israeli government has deemed illegal;

Whereas passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively lends legitimacy to efforts by the Palestinian Authority to impose its own solution through international organizations and through unjustified boycotts or divestment campaigns against Israel by calling "upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967", and will require the United States and Israel to take effective action to counteract the potential harmful impact of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334;

Whereas UNSCR 2334 did not directly call upon Palestinian leadership to fulfill their obligations toward negotiations or mention that part of the eventual Palestinian state is currently controlled by Hamas, a designated terrorist organization; and

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 both sought to impose or unduly influence solutions to final status issues, and is biased against Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermined the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final status issues, or are one-sided

and anti-Israel, reversing decades of bipartisan agreement;

(B) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermines the prospect of Israelis and Palestinians resuming productive, direct negotiations;

(C) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contributes to the politically motivated acts of boycott, divestment from, and sanctions against Israel and represents a concerted effort to extract concessions from Israel outside of direct negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians, which must be actively rejected;

(D) any future measures taken in international or outside organizations, including the United Nations Security Council or at the Paris conference on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict scheduled for January 15, 2017, to impose an agreement, or parameters for an agreement including the recognition of a Palestinian state, will set back the cause of peace, harm the security of Israel, run counter to the enduring bipartisan consensus on strengthening the United States-Israel relationship, and weaken support for such organizations;

(E) a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will come only through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties resulting in a Jewish, democratic state living side-by-side next to a demilitarized Palestinian state in peace and security;

(F) the United States should work to facilitate serious, direct negotiations between the parties without preconditions toward a sustainable peace agreement; and

(G) the United States Government should oppose and veto future United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final status issues, or are one-sided and anti-Israel; and

(2) the House of Representatives opposes United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and will work to strengthen the United States-Israel relationship, and calls for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that—

(A) it is no longer one-sided and anti-Israel; and

(B) it allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the esteemed Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read you a quote:

"Peace is hard work. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations—if it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now. Ultimately, it is the

Israelis and the Palestinians who must live side by side."

That was President Obama in 2011, and he was right.

I am stunned at what happened last month. This government—our government—abandoned our ally, Israel, when she needed us the most. Do not be fooled. This U.N. Security Council resolution was not about settlements, and it certainly was not about peace. It was about one thing and one thing only: Israel's right to exist as a Jewish, democratic state.

These types of one-sided efforts are designed to isolate and delegitimize Israel. They do not advance peace. They make it more elusive.

The cornerstone of our special relationship with Israel has always been right here in Congress. This institution, the heart of our democracy, has stood by the Jewish state through thick and thin. We were there for her when rockets rained down on Tel Aviv. We were there for her by passing historic legislation to combat the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement. And we have been there for her by ensuring Israel has the tools to defend herself against those who seek her destruction.

In every one of those instances, Republicans and Democrats worked together to get these things done. That is because our historic alliance with Israel transcends party labels and partisan bickering. We see that bipartisanship right here on the House floor today in condemning this anti-Israel resolution.

I want to thank our Chairman ED ROYCE, Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, and all of our Members on both sides of the aisle for speaking out on this issue and for helping assemble this legislation. It sends a powerful message, and it turns a page.

It is time to repair the damage done by this misguided hit job at the U.N. It is time to rebuild our partnership with Israel and reaffirm our commitment to her security. It is time to show all of our allies that, regardless of the shameful events of last week, the United States remains a force for good.

I ask the whole House to support this resolution on behalf of the American people.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (DAVID PRICE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, and I thank the Speaker for his words.

I want to start by thanking Chairman ED ROYCE, who authored this resolution. I am proud to be the lead Democratic cosponsor and glad to say that more than 30 Democrats representing a

broad cross-section of our party have signed on as cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation.

ED ROYCE and I have worked together for the past 4 years, and we believe that foreign policy should be bipartisan and that partisanship should stop at the water's edge. Frankly, this is what we are doing today. We are condemning what happened because we think it is unfair and unjust.

I want to also mention that I join with my friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) in authoring an amendment to this resolution that wasn't accepted which emphasizes a two-state solution. I want to thank Mr. PRICE for his hard work on that approach, and I support it. We talk in this resolution about a two-state solution as well.

Mr. Speaker, throughout its entire history, the State of Israel has never gotten a fair shake from the United Nations. Year after year after year, member states manipulate the U.N. to bully our ally, Israel, to pile on with one-sided resolutions, placing all of the blame for the ongoing conflict on Israel.

We saw a resolution like this come before the Security Council a few weeks ago, and today the House of Representatives will go on record saying that that U.N. resolution is wrong, plain and simple. And frankly, we should not have voted for that.

The Security Council resolution is highly critical of Israel yet asks nothing directly of the Palestinians. That is biased, that is unfair, and that is not balanced. Again, we should have opposed it. We should have vetoed it.

The language about Jerusalem is not new but it remains deeply offensive to Jews, whose holiest site lies on the Temple Mount in East Jerusalem. The Kotel, the Holy Western Wall, is simply nonoccupied territory. And it is offensive to hear that.

So in the measure the House is considering today, we repudiate this flawed Security Council resolution. And at the same time, we will say once again that we support a two-state solution, that the only way to reach that goal is through direct negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and that this shameful Security Council resolution put that goal further out of reach.

Mr. Speaker, the international community faces the longest suppressing issues: mass killings in South Sudan, a crisis in Yemen, a humanitarian disaster in Syria, Russia's illegal occupation of the Ukraine, and North Korea's nuclear weapons program. Yet, rather than deal with those critical problems, the member states of the U.N. have chosen instead to use the international body to embarrass Israel. It is outrageous. This House Resolution that I am cosponsoring with Mr. ROYCE rightfully says that it is outrageous.

I think it was a mistake for the current administration to abstain on this vote in the U.N. I have been very clear about that, but I want to be fair. Be-

fore anyone turns this into another attack on President Obama, we should be aware of the history of this issue.

This is the first time in 8 years the Obama administration has allowed a resolution, opposed by Israel, to go forward. The George Bush administration allowed it to happen 6 times; the Clinton administration, 3 times; the first Bush administration, 6 times; and the Reagan administration, 10 times, including voting for one strongly condemning Israel for its "premeditated and unprecedented attack of aggression" when it wisely destroyed Iraq's nuclear weapons reactor in 1981.

But regardless of that history, it doesn't justify these latest abstentions. My mother used to say that two wrongs don't make a right. And she was right. It was wrong then, and it is wrong now.

I think allowing governments to bully Israel and the U.N. is a mistake, no matter who is in power. Instead, let's focus on what we should be doing when it comes to advancing the two-state solution.

This resolution calls for us to get back to the policy that many of us support: one, standing with Israel and the United Nations; two, stopping one-sided resolutions; and three, supporting direct negotiations as the only way to move toward a two-state solution.

This resolution says all that. Every one in this Congress should be voting for it because it is balanced. I am pleased to support this resolution, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to begin by thanking the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). I thank him for working with me in a bipartisan manner not just on this resolution but on the one that we worked on late last year—a unanimous vote by this body directing the administration not to take the steps that the administration has taken.

I appreciate the leader and the Speaker as well working with us to ensure this resolution was brought quickly to the floor of this House.

Today, we put Congress on record objecting to the recent U.N. Security Council resolution that hurt our ally, that hurt Israel, and I believe that puts an enduring peace further out of reach.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, the United States has long recognized that a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only come about through direct bilateral negotiations between these two parties, and that is why it is longstanding U.S. policy to veto the many one-sided, the many anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council that violate that principle.

But just the other week, the Obama administration broke with this long-

standing U.S. policy by failing to veto U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. This dangerous resolution effectively states that the Jewish quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are, in the words of the resolution, "occupied territory." Why would we not veto that?

It also lends legitimacy to efforts by the Palestinian Authority to put pressure on Israel through the U.N. rather than to go through the process of engaging in direct negotiations, and it puts wind in the sails of the shameful boycott divestment and sanctions movement.

Unquestionably, this U.N. Security Council action damages the prospects for peace. The resolution and the bullying and harassment of Israel that it will spur only happened for one reason: the Obama administration let it happen—and that went against the distinct warnings from this body.

Mr. ENGEL and I engaged in letters, in conversations with senior administration officials seeking their assurance that the United States would veto one-sided, anti-Israel resolutions. In November, the House unanimously, all of us, passed a resolution which warned the administration against taking such last-minute action.

With that resolution, H. Con. Res. 165, the House unanimously stated that the United States Government should continue to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final-status issues or are one-sided and anti-Israel. Yet the administration rejected the call from Congress and chose a course that will bring harm for years to come by failing to veto U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

If the Palestinians want a lasting peace, they must accept that Israel, not the U.N., is their negotiating partner; and that means ending the incitement to violence against Israelis that goes on in so many of the mosques, that goes on in the schools, that goes on in the newspapers and on television there. It also means ending—and I think this is the most important fact, because leaving this out of the resolution at the U.N. is beyond me—their pay-to-slay scheme.

You talk about a lack of balance. Here we have a situation where, since 2003, it has been Palestinian law to reward Palestinian terrorists—terrorists—to go out, and they are given this incitement, this stipend for life. The more mayhem they create, the more horrific the number of civilians they attack and, therefore, the longer the sentence, the more they know: Well, I can serve my time, and then when I get out, I can get this stipend for the rest of my life—and it is larger and larger, depending upon the amount of mayhem—and if I don't make it, or if I am a suicide bomber, my family gets the stipend.

That, by law, is the way the Palestinian Authority has engineered this, costing the lives—and you can read

about it every month of those civilians attacked on the streets. It is not just Israelis, of course. Taylor Force, a U.S. Marine, was killed simply because he was in Israel, but it was by someone responding to the incitement.

So \$300 million per year spent by the Palestinian Authority to do that. No mention of that, of course, by the United Nations. And that is why today's action is so important, to demonstrate our united opposition to U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, call for its repeal, to head off any more moves the Obama administration might have in the next few days with respect to the Paris conference next week as well, and to provide the foundation for the next administration to move forcefully to counteract its dangerous impact.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, for yielding a portion of his time to opponents of this resolution. I also appreciate his willingness to work with me and other Members on our alternative resolution that is more accurate and less divisive, a resolution, unfortunately, the majority has denied a hearing for on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 11. The resolution before us today fails to credibly reaffirm our Nation's support for a two-state solution. It provides an inaccurate accounting of the United States' longstanding policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It includes reckless and divisive charges regarding the recent United Nations Security Council resolution, designed, it would appear, solely to embarrass the outgoing administration. It falsely claims, for example, that the Security Council resolution "contradicts the Oslo Accords." It goes so far as to link the resolution to the boycott and divestiture movement.

Mr. Speaker, there is room for honest debate about the U.N. resolution and about the U.S. decision to abstain, but there is not room, there shouldn't be room, for this kind of disgraceful distortion. H. Res. 11 doesn't really engage the issues; it obscures and distorts them.

I would suggest that both those who support and oppose recent U.S. actions should oppose this irresponsible and divisive resolution. It does distort the record. In fact, during the Obama administration, fewer U.N. Security Council resolutions related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have passed than under any other modern Presidency. In fact, the December resolution is the only one that has passed under President Obama's leadership; and if you want a fair and comprehensive account of the thinking that went into that difficult decision, I commend to every Member Samantha Power's statement at the United Nations, one

of the finest statements of its sort that I have ever read.

H. Res. 11 also doesn't take into account the fact that Republican and Democratic administrations alike have allowed Security Council resolutions addressing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to pass, many of which were opposed by Israel. The fact is H. Res. 11 runs a real risk of undermining the credibility of the United States Congress as a proactive force working toward a two-state solution.

In this period of great geopolitical turmoil and uncertainty, we must reaffirm those fundamental aspects of our foreign policy, including our strong and unwavering support for Israel, while also demonstrating to the world that we are committed to a diplomacy that defends human rights and promotes Israeli and Palestinian states that live side by side in peace and security, a formulation that has characterized our country's diplomacy for decades.

At best, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 11 would muddy the waters of our diplomacy and foreign policy. At worst, it could undermine our decade-long efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians. I can't, in good faith, support the adoption of this resolution, and I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, in response briefly, we did have a substitute from Mr. PRICE, and we looked at that substitute, but it did not once mention the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

Mr. ENGEL and I have worked hard together, in good faith and in a bipartisan manner, to develop a measure that rejects and repudiates this dangerous U.N. resolution that was passed; and also, ours warns the White House against taking additional measures in the last few weeks of the current administration. I think it is important to remind the body that this is very concerning, given the backdrop of the Paris conference on the 15th of this month and the very real concern that the President could take further steps at the U.N.

Again, Mr. PRICE's amendment did not include this urgent warning. I want to say that I am happy to work with Mr. PRICE in a bipartisan manner once the Committee on Foreign Affairs organizes, but time is of the essence. We must act to reject United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334, not remain silent on it, and we have got to limit the damage that the administration has caused to prospects for a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our esteemed chairman for the time.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, will not undo the damage that has been

done at the Security Council, but it sends an important message to the world that the United States Congress resoundingly and in a strong bipartisan manner disapproves of the vote taken on Resolution 2334, and it sends a warning to the nations that will gather in Paris next week to discuss the peace process that there will be repercussions if there is a move to introduce a parameters resolution before the 20th in an effort to further isolate Israel.

Our closest friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, has been under constant attack by the United Nations. Abu Mazen and the Palestinians have pushed a campaign to delegitimize the Jewish state, to undermine the peace process, to achieve unilateral statehood recognition. We have seen it this year at UNESCO, where that sham of an institution voted on several occasions to deny and distance Jewish and Christian historical and cultural ties to Jerusalem.

We have seen it at the Human Rights Council, where Israel is constantly demonized and falsely accused of human rights violations while the real abusers of human rights go unpunished because that body has utterly failed to uphold its mandate. This is a body that allows the worst abusers of human rights—like Cuba, Venezuela, and China—to actually sit in judgment of human rights worldwide. What a pathetic joke. Yet the only thing they can agree on is to attack Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East and the only place in the region where human rights are protected.

We have seen this scheme to delegitimize Israel at the General Assembly, where, in its closing legislative session, the General Assembly passed 20—anti-Israel resolutions and only 4, combined, for the entire world.

These institutions have no credibility, and now we have the unfortunate circumstance of the White House deciding to abstain from this anti-Israel, one-sided resolution at the Security Council. Our ally was abandoned, and credibility and momentum were given to the Palestinian schemes to delegitimize the Jewish state, to undermine the peace process.

While the damage has been done, Mr. Speaker, by this act of cowardice at the Security Council, we will have an opportunity to reverse that damage. In the coming weeks and months, this Congress and the incoming administration must show unyielding support for our ally Israel and undo the damage done.

This resolution by the chairman and the ranking member is an all-important first step that signals our intent. I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I look forward to working with Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL in further strengthening our U.S.-Israel bond.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), my good friend and senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1745

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the historic timeline. The Reagan administration and other administrations have failed in the past to veto anti-Israel resolutions, and that failure has not been helpful to the cause of peace. Over the last two decades, Israel has frozen or removed settlements in an effort to negotiate peace, all to no avail.

On November 29 of last year, this House unanimously urged our U.N. Ambassador to veto any U.N. resolution that sought to impose peace settlement terms. But a month later, our U.N. Ambassador ignored the input of this House and allowed the U.N. to adopt a one-sided resolution that sought to impose peace terms on the parties.

Worse yet, that U.N. resolution equates the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, with outposts deep in the West Bank that are illegal under Israeli law.

Today we consider a House resolution that has over 30 Democratic cosponsors. It is not a pro-settlements resolution. It strongly and repeatedly reaffirms our support for a two-state solution, achieved through direct negotiations, and it objects to a U.N. resolution that set back the cause of peace. Vote "yes."

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the long-time chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding and for offering this important resolution, along with the ranking member, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

President Obama's decision to abstain and not veto Security Council Resolution 2334 seriously undermines the peace process, abandons Israel at a critical hour in its life as a nation, and does serious injury to the historical record.

The egregiously flawed U.N. text says that all Israeli settlements after the 1949 armistice line including East Jerusalem and West Bank have no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law.

The pending House resolution repudiates 2334 and makes clear that a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will only come through direct bilateral negotiations, not one-sided, anti-Israel U.N. resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. resolution could open Israeli leaders and even average Israeli settlers to criminal prosecution. Israel's enemies are likely to exploit 2334 by seeking prosecutions in venues like the International Criminal Court for construction activities, even though the vast majority of this activity takes place legally, pursuant to Israeli law.

A few hours ago, the European Jewish press reported that "Leaders of the

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called for France to cancel or, at least, postpone what they called an 'ill-conceived, poorly timed and damaging' event—the Paris Mideast conference—scheduled for January 15."

I hope that we will also call upon our government not to go to this right before a transition of the White House and the Presidency and mischief that could be forthcoming from that.

They pointed out in their statement that "Israel has long sought direct talks" and "it is time for the Palestinian leaders to stop evading their responsibility and seeking to use international fora to avoid the only true path to a lasting peace"—and that is a negotiated settlement.

Nathan Diament of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America pointed out that the U.N. has a long-established bias against Israel. As my good friend from Florida said a moment ago, 20 anti-Israel resolutions against just 4 in 2016—a bias and a discrimination against Israel.

President Obama's decision to abstain and not veto Security Council Resolution 2334 seriously undermines the peace process, abandons Israel at a critical hour in its life as a nation, and does serious injury to the historical record.

The egregiously flawed UN text says that all Israeli settlements after the 1949 armistice line including East Jerusalem and the West Bank have no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law.

The pending House resolution repudiates 2334 and makes clear that a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will only come through direct bilateral negotiations not one-sided anti-Israel UN resolutions.

With over three thousand years of Jewish history bound up in East Jerusalem and the West Bank, it is preposterous to assert that Israel has no legitimacy in defending its connections to this extraordinary heritage. Sadly, these kinds of prejudiced and revisionist claims are all too common in the United Nations where UNESCO voted just a couple months ago on measures that excise any mention of Judaism and Christianity's ancient ties to East Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, the UN Resolution could open Israeli leaders and even average Israeli settlers to criminal prosecution. Israel's enemies are likely to exploit 2334 by seeking prosecutions in venues like the International Criminal Court (ICC) for construction activities, even though the vast majority of this activity takes place legally, pursuant to Israeli law.

By calling on countries to distinguish between the State of Israel and Israeli settlements, 2334 enables the narrative of the anti-Semitic boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement, or BDS movement, that is aimed at delegitimizing Israel.

And in mere days, the error of 2334 could be further compounded.

A few hours ago the European Jewish Press reported that "Leaders of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called for France to cancel or, at least, postpone what they called an 'ill-conceived, poorly timed and damaging'

event—the Paris Mideast conference—scheduled for January 15th."

"The international community should not plunge forward with the ill-conceived and poorly timed Paris conference," CPMAJO Chairman Stephen M. Greenberg and Vice Chairman and CEO Malcolm Hoenlein said in a statement . . . According to the Conference of Presidents, there are a number of compelling reasons to postpone the Paris event, including the impending transition to the Trump administration, just five days later. "It makes no sense that the next administration is precluded from participating in a discussion of an essential component of U.S. foreign policy with which it will be engaged," they explained.

"Israel has long sought direct talks, it is time for the Palestinian leaders to stop evading their responsibility and seeking to use international fora to avoid the only true path to a lasting peace," they added. Hoenlein cautioned it was possible the Obama administration could—following the recent passage of the anti-Israeli settlement Security Council resolution—take a 'further damaging step against the Jewish state before President-elect Donald Trump takes office.'"

Nathan Diament, Executive Director of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, wrote me a letter today and said, "On December 23, 2016, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 2334, a blatantly anti-Israel resolution condemning Israel's building of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. It has long been U.S. policy that any progress toward an agreement in the region must be based on direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders, not a vote of third-party nations at the UN."

"Unfortunately the UN has a long and established bias against Israel. In 2016 alone, the UN General Assembly adopted 20 anti-Israel resolutions and just four against other countries: North Korea, Syria, Iran and Russia. The World Health Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of 'mental, physical and environmental health,' while the U.N. Women condemned Israel as the world's only violator of women's rights. The International Labor Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of labor rights. These same UN committees were silent on the issue of human rights violations in China, Libya, or the Congo."

"Clearly, the UN has an agenda to undermine and delegitimize the state of Israel, and in that regard UN support for Resolution 2334 was not surprising. What was surprising—and deeply concerning—was the silence of the United States on this issue. Rather than exercising its veto power, the United States chose to abstain from voting, and thereby threatened the trust and support Israel has long placed in its most important ally. Over the course of his presidency, Mr. Obama has repeatedly assured American Jews and others concerned about Israel's security and welfare that his commitment to U.S. support for Israel's security was 'unshakeable.' By allowing the UN Security Council's resolution to pass in the final weeks of his Administration, President Obama undermined his legacy and threatened the longstanding alliance between the United States and Israel."

"Whether the abstaining vote was a parting statement from the Obama Administration or the influence of anti-Israeli forces at the UN, the incoming Trump Administration and the

115th Congress must make the United States' support of Israel and our common goals of peace, democracy, and fighting terrorism—a pillar of its foreign policy. Today's resolution condemning UN Resolution 2334 will send an important message to the world that the United States stands with Israel and will continue to support our common goals."

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I would like to note that many of us in Congress have been warning about these kinds of reckless gambits for months. Three-hundred and eighty of us in the House signed a letter in April to President Obama specifically calling on him to veto any one-sided resolution like 2443 if it were raised in the Security Council. In late November, the House voted overwhelmingly for H. Con. Res. 165 further stressing the need for the United States to stand by Israel and veto biased Security Council measures.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 11 to denounce this dangerous Security Council action. I look forward to working with President-elect Trump to align U.S. policy with the overwhelming consensus in Congress: that we are and remain committed to Israel's sovereignty and security.

OU ADVOCACY CENTER,
Washington, DC, January 5, 2017.

Hon. CHRIS SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: On behalf of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (Orthodox Union)—the nation's largest Orthodox Jewish umbrella organization—please accept our gratitude for your support of today's resolution opposing UN Security Council Resolution 2334, and thank you for submitting this letter to the official record of the House of Representatives.

On December 23, 2016, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 2334, a blatantly anti-Israel resolution condemning Israel's building of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. It has long been U.S. policy that any progress toward an agreement in the region must be based on direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders, not a vote of third-party nations at the UN.

Unfortunately, the UN has a long and established bias against Israel. In 2016 alone, the UN General Assembly adopted 20 anti-Israel resolutions and just four against other countries: North Korea, Syria, Iran and Russia. The World Health Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of "mental, physical and environmental health," while the U.N. Women condemned Israel as the world's only violator of women's rights. The International Labor Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of labor rights. These same UN committees were silent on the issue of human rights violations in China, Libya, or the Congo.

Clearly, the UN has an agenda to undermine and delegitimize the state of Israel, and in that regard UN support for Resolution 2334 was not surprising. What was surprising—and deeply concerning—was the silence of the United States on this issue. Rather than exercising its veto power, the United States chose to abstain from voting, and thereby threatened the trust and support Israel has long placed in its most important ally. Over the course of his presidency, Mr. Obama has repeatedly assured American Jews and others concerned about Israel's security and welfare that his commitment to U.S. support for Israel's security was "unshakeable." By allowing the UN Security Council's resolution to pass in the final

weeks of his Administration, President Obama undermined his legacy and threatened the longstanding alliance between the United States and Israel.

Whether the abstaining vote was a parting statement from the Obama Administration or the influence of anti-Israeli forces at the UN, the incoming Trump Administration and the 115th Congress must make the United States' support of Israel and our common goals of peace, democracy, and fighting terrorism—a pillar of its foreign policy. Today's resolution condemning UN Resolution 2334 will send an important message to the world that the United States stands with Israel and will continue to support our common goals.

Again, thank you for your support of Israel and today's resolution. I urge all members of the United States Congress to stand with Israel and vote in favor of the McCarthy-Royce resolution.

Best Regards,

NATHAN DIAMENT,
Executive Director.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a proud Jew and someone who, throughout my entire life, has been an advocate for the State of Israel, and I am standing here to oppose H. Res. 11.

As a Member of Congress, I have been committed to maintaining America's unwavering support for Israel, which has lasted from the very first moments of Israel's existence.

The U.S.-Israel bond is unbreakable, despite the fact that the United States' administrations have not always agreed with the particular policies of an Israeli Government. Contrary to the assertions of H. Res. 11, the U.S. has often expressed those differences in the context of the United Nations. Presidents, from Lyndon Johnson to George W. Bush, have each vetoed and sometimes voted for a U.N. resolution contrary to the wishes of Israel's Government at the time. Only the Obama administration, until 2 weeks ago, never, ever cast a vote against what Israel wanted.

But opposition to the building of settlements on land belonging to Palestinians before the 1967 war—with the exception of the land, of course, that is going to be swapped, agreed to by both parties—has been the official U.S. policy for many decades, contrary, again, to the assertions of H. Res. 11.

It has also been the policy of the United States to recognize that the only long-term solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—the violence, the loss of life—is to create two states: one for the Palestinians and one for Israel. A two-state solution is the only way Israel can continue as both a democratic and a Jewish state, living in the peace and security that has eluded her from the very beginning. The building of settlements is an obstacle to achieving that goal.

And, of course, settlements aren't the only obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. The U.S. resolution reiterates the Palestinian Authority security

forces must continue to counter terrorism and condemn all of the provocations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), who has served for years as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The recent stunt at the United Nations targeting Israel is the latest effort by this administration to cement a legacy of foreign policy that has failed, especially with our trusted ally Israel. It has been U.S. policy to veto any U.N. resolution dictating parameters on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

The reason is simple. True peace can only be achieved at the negotiating table between the Palestinians and the Israelis, not at the United Nations. The one-sided, anti-Israeli resolution will only make peace harder.

The U.N. adopted 20 anti-Israeli resolutions last year, while passing just 4 for the rest of the world. The U.N. is not fair and unbiased. While pointing the finger solely at Israel, the recent resolution did nothing to point out the Palestinians' lack of progress towards peace.

The Palestinian Authority has failed to stop violence against Jews. It continues to—get this, Mr. Speaker—make payments to jailed Palestinian terrorists who have harmed or killed Jews.

Over the years, Israel has traded land for promised peace. They have no peace. And soon, if the United Nations gets its way, they will have no land.

Despite the administration's policy of abandoning our trusted ally Israel, the United States Congress must stand with our ally Israel.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), one of our new Members, who has made support for Israel part of her entire life and is giving her first speech on the House floor in support of this resolution and support of Israel.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today in support of this resolution and to lend my name as a cosponsor. The United States alliance with Israel is absolutely critical, and this is not the time to sow uncertainty about the state of our relationship.

This resolution does a number of important things, but the most important is that it reaffirms Congress' longstanding support for a bilateral settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and objects to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334. Paragraph 5 of that resolution is reminiscent of a recent U.N. Human Rights

Council resolution that established a database of companies in the settlements, facilitating a boycott.

The UNSC resolution does nothing to advance the cause of peace and is, in fact, an obstacle to it. Strongly ensuring the security of Israel is the only pathway to a lasting settlement.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ED ROYCE for yielding. I appreciate your leadership for peace.

I am in strong support of the House resolution, which is taking a firm stand and clear stand objecting to the United Nations Security Council resolution as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace.

The United States has stood with Israel against one-sided, biased resolutions at the United Nations and in other international forums. Additionally, the United States has been adamant that a peaceful resolution will only come from direct, bilateral negotiations, not addressed by an international forum. The distorted ideology of moral neutrality is suicidal for civilization, encouraging what the chairman correctly identified as “pay for slay,” as evidenced by the murder of American tourist Taylor Force just last year.

On December 23, my constituents were shocked as the Obama administration betrayed the people of Israel, undermining the peace process by failing to veto the U.N. Security Council resolution. President Obama and Secretary Kerry’s actions revealed dangerous irresponsibility, putting Israeli and American families at risk of more terrorist attacks. Fortunately, Governor Nikki Haley, President-elect Donald Trump’s appointee, will soon be making a positive difference as U.N. Ambassador of the United States, promoting peace through strength.

Today, I am grateful to stand strong with Israel by being an original cosponsor of H. Res. 11. I appreciate the leadership of Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Chairman ED ROYCE, and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for sponsoring this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, my commitment to the State of Israel is steadfast, but my first loyalty is to peace—peace that is protected by genuine self-determination.

I know in my heart that the only path to peace is to have two separate, sovereign states that peacefully coexist. The two-state solution is at the heart of American foreign policy, and every President and every Congress since I got here in 1993 put the two-state solution at the heart of what America wants for her friend Israel.

As I said on the House floor on December 6, if we are ever going to achieve the permanent peace that allows Israel to exist without fear and Palestine to exist without occupation, we must continue to fight for the two-state solution. But under the current strongman government in Israel, all pretenses and illusions are being stripped away. From settlements, to water, to restricting the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem, it seems that anything goes.

Today, as America embarks on its own experiment with strongman politics, this Congress is falling in line. This Congress that allowed our Chamber to be used for an Israeli campaign rally and TV commercials is bending to pressure from abroad and pressure here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the commitment to peace of the American people, so I urge my colleagues to vote with their hearts and minds and defeat this House resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my remarks on the floor of December 6 in support of a two-state solution.

TWO STATE SOLUTION IS STILL THE PATH TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

[Luis V. Gutiérrez Floor Remarks, Dec. 6, 2016]

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about what is going on in Israel and I think it has implications both for U.S. foreign policy and for domestic policy and for our great ally, Israel.

As the right-wing government of Benjamin Netanyahu consolidates power and becomes in many ways the one-party rulers of Israel, a number of things are changing that should be of concern to all Americans.

Specifically, the increasing dominance of the Likud Party as the one-party in Israel jeopardizes the two state solution that I and many others in the United States and Israel feel is the only way to achieve long-term peace in the Middle East.

There is a retrenchment of hard line policies—aimed at solidifying alliances with smaller religious and hardline parties that keeps Likud in power—that will make it harder for Israelis and their allies in America—and anyone who seeks a lasting peace—to maintain progress towards a two state solution.

Right now, the Knesset is considering legislation to legalize all Israeli settlements in Palestinian territory on the West Bank, even those constructed on private Palestinian land.

Boom, 400,000 people in settlements across the West Bank, it’s all legal because they say it is legal. But it’s not.

And Israel is destroying Palestinian homes at a pace faster than we have seen before.

It is provocative, sweeping, and designed to make it harder to ever reach an agreement with the Palestinians.

The plan to restrict the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem has been revived, again to placate hardline religious constituents, by Prime Minister Netanyahu.

There is no clearer statement to people of the Islamic faith that they do not matter, they do not belong, and they will not be tolerated than to restrict the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem, a city that has heard the Muslim call to prayer for thousands of years.

I think what is going on in Israel with Prime Minister Netanyahu presents a cau-

tionary tale about the consequences of following a political strongman. The strongman has to keep proving that he is a strongman over and over.

Like other strongmen who ride fear into leadership—when you base your political career on injecting fear and resentment into political affairs—when you use the backdrop of terrorism and the understandable fear of the Israeli people as a political tool for years and decades—this is the kind of policy that results.

There is an appetite for constant escalation of what you are doing to stand up to the enemy you have constructed—an enemy based on, but not the same as the enemies that fight against the state of Israel and tolerance and peace in real life.

Strongmen construct a foil—in this case based on the Palestinians, but sometimes exaggerated beyond recognition—and they need to feed the thirst for more and more action to attack the caricature that has been constructed.

But strongman politics in Israel have the impact of making a long-lasting solution that brings peace to the Middle East harder to achieve.

The fundamental rights of Palestinians to have their own state, a state alongside the Israeli state where they have the basic rights and dignity to govern themselves and raise their families in peace—that is what many Israelis, many Palestinians, and many around the world have been fighting for.

If we are ever going to achieve the permanent peace that allows Israel to exist without fear and Palestine to exist without occupation, we must continue to fight for the two state solution.

When I was just a freshman, almost 25 years ago, we celebrated the accomplishments of Rabin and Arafat and President Clinton to build towards a peace that recognizes the rights and dignity of Israelis and the rights and dignities of the Palestinian people.

For decades, the United States—under different leaders in different parties from Carter to Reagan to Bush and Obama—have recognized that peace will only come with mutual respect and tolerance.

That is what we have based our foreign policy on and should continue to base our foreign policy on.

Having talked with average people and with leaders on both sides of the Palestinian/Israeli conflict—I am convinced that it is the only path to peace.

America has been a catalyst—a constructive influence from outside—a nation based on religious freedom and democracy that has served as a model for both Palestinians and Israelis—and we have worked towards helping parties continue to move in the direction of two separate but mutually respectful countries, two nations that are not at war with each other or subservient to one another.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that Israel herself is moving away from the two state solution as a goal and that we as her closest ally must remind her—and ourselves—of what is at stake if we lose sight of this important goal.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nation of Israel, one of our greatest allies in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 11, Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 calls for a Palestinian state but not a Jewish state. It does nothing to condemn or stop the Palestinian Authority's pay to slay, as we have heard talked over and over again, that rewarded over \$300 million to terrorists in Israeli jails last year for crimes committed against Israeli citizens and others. It legitimizes additional efforts to isolate and sanction Israel. It declares the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, where the City of David has been excavated, and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, as occupied territories.

□ 1800

This is absurd. Furthermore, the Obama administration refused to veto it. This shameful move broke with years of bipartisan U.S. efforts to protect Israel from deeply flawed and biased U.S. resolutions.

H. Res. 11 reasserts the U.S. position that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties. H. Res. 11 must pass to send a clear message to the outgoing Obama administration, to the U.N., and to the world that the United States stands with Israel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. SUOZZI), another new Member of Congress who is also making his maiden speech about the security of Israel and the U.S.-Israel partnership.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of the bipartisan H. Res. 11.

In 2002, during the Second Intifada, after the massacre in Hebron, I had the great, good fortune of meeting in Jerusalem with Shimon Peres, of blessed memory. He explained why a two-state solution is the only path to peace, and I will never abandon his dream of a two-state solution.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, however, pushes the hope of a two-state solution farther away for three reasons:

One, it discourages direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.

Two, it fails to distinguish between "long accepted" and "more controversial" settlements. "Long accepted" settlements, such as the long established Jewish neighborhoods in East Jerusalem, in the Jewish Quarter, places like the Western Wall, and the "consensus" settlements versus "more controversial" hilltop settlements in the West Bank, such as Amona, settlements that even the Israeli Supreme Court has declared illegal.

Three, it fails to explicitly condemn the number one impediment to a two-state solution: anti-Israel terrorism.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

This is an outrageous attack against the State of Israel, the world's only Jewish state and the only democracy in the Middle East. I also condemn the Obama administration's failure to veto such a resolution, because it betrayed Israel and it harmed our national security interests. The Obama administration's actions, or lack of actions, were more than just a sin of omission in that they worked behind the scenes to move this resolution forward so that it could be voted on in the United Nations General Assembly. That is a sin of commission.

Now, we have to be honest about how the two sides have acted in this in putting pressure on Israel and not on the Palestinian Authority. Remember, when you talk about a two-state solution, the Palestinian Arabs rejected a state in 1948. They tried to wipe Israel off the map. They tried to beat them in 1967. It has been a constant state of war, and they have chosen to get rid of the Jewish state as something that is more important to them than the creation of their own state, and we have to be honest about that.

I will support this resolution. I view it as a good statement, but as just a first step. We need something in the coming days that has teeth to deal with the United Nations and its outrageous conduct. It has become a hotbed of anti-Israeli activity where all of these tin-pot countries get together and rail against the world's only Jewish state. They did 20 resolutions against Israel at the United Nations in 2016 and four against the rest of the world.

We need to take our power of the purse and defund the U.N. until U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 is revoked.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, for what may or may not be their good intentions, this resolution and its authors undermined the security of families here and in Israel. This "go it alone" approach with the current Israeli Government—defying a unanimous vote of 14 countries and ignoring the concerns of many of our allies—is not a path to peace. We will not protect ourselves or our allies in Israel if we pursue the path of isolation.

For decades, we have enjoyed a bipartisan commitment to two states living in peace and security next door to one another. It has been a difficult goal to achieve, but now is not the time to give up on it. There are, sadly, some in Israel and some among the Palestinians who wholly reject this commitment. They believe it is all theirs. They believe in a divine entitlement to every piece of land west of the Jordan River. Their idea of a reasonable negotiation is that the other side gets next to nothing.

Few people who have worked on this difficult issue and have tried to over-

come such zealotry and achieve a just resolution have done as much as Secretary of State John Kerry. Despite the insults and the intransigence, he has made near Herculean efforts to achieve peace. To be honest, the roadblocks that have been thrown in his path have not come just from one side. In no way do we condone the many, many wrongs of the Palestinians and the Palestinian Authority by saying that some of those roadblocks were initiated by the current Israeli Government.

Then, to talk of one sided, what irony. Indeed, I think it is hypocrisy to talk about a one-sided resolution when this is a one-sided resolution. If there had been the slightest interest in bringing this body together—with all of us supporting Israel, with all of us supporting access to the Western Wall, with all of us supporting the security of our friend that was reflected in \$38 billion, which is the most money in military assistance we have ever provided to a single ally by this administration—instead of attacking the goodwill and the good faith of this administration, we wouldn't be here today. There is no urgency for us to act today. There is an urgency—just as the new designee for the Ambassador to Israel has slandered some other people—for them to besmirch the efforts of this administration.

The truth is that ever-expanding Israeli settlements—many of them first constructed in total violation of Israeli law—are a significant obstacle, but they are certainly not the only one. The clearer goal of settlers is to have facts on the ground, to be irreversible in moving to split up any potential Palestinian Authority.

Protect our families and those of Israel by rejecting this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334—an anti-Israel, anti-Jewish attempt on behalf of pro-Palestinian nations to delegitimize Israel and ethnically cleanse East Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria of the Jewish people.

The Israelis have long been willing to compromise large swaths of land in this region in pursuit of a two-state solution. It has been the Palestinians who have, time and again, declined real offers on the table for their own state. Just think about this reality. If the Israelis agreed right now to make all of the concessions this U.N. Security Council resolution calls for, there would still not be peace. A viable two-state solution isn't just about Israel's recognizing the Palestinians' right to exist; it is also about the Palestinians' recognizing Israel's right to exist.

As for me, I stand for freedom, and America should stand strong—shoulder to shoulder—with Israel.

President Obama lit a menorah this year at the White House. He reflected on Hanukkah as a celebration of the

Maccabees' fight for freedom—the Maccabees, who lived, prayed, and fought on the land that this resolution now calls illegally occupied territory. It is an insult this resolution was passed just one day before the start of Hanukkah. Israel is one of America's greatest allies and is a beacon of freedom and liberty in a very dark region of the world. The Obama administration, by allowing this resolution to pass, is attempting a dangerous shift in American foreign policy that cannot be allowed to stand.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in great support of the Ross-Engel bill against this most deceitful and shameful U.N. resolution. That is what we are here for. This act was shameful and it was deceitful.

When the U.N. voted for this 2334 resolution, it was like cutting Israel's legs out from under it and then condemning Israel for being a cripple. Shameful and deceitful because they wanted to put all of the blame on Israel when it is the Palestinians who refuse to even meet to discuss or to even talk about a two-nation state. It is the Palestinians who say Israel doesn't even have a right to exist.

How in the hell are you going to meet with somebody to talk about a combined future when they will not give you decent recognition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman because this part is very important.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is blessed. We have been blessed with divine intervention all through our history to be that shining light on the hill, to let all of our great work show for the world. We have an opportunity here tonight for this Congress to stand up and show that light for Israel.

Stand up for Israel and show our great works to this world. That is what I say, so let it be written and let it be done.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 11, which offers a strong objection to U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

President Obama started his foreign policy 8 years ago with an apology tour in the Middle East, and now, not surprisingly, he ends it with a slap in the face to our ally and friend, Israel.

For over 40 years, the United States Government—Republicans and Democrats—stood shoulder to shoulder with our ally, vetoing countless resolutions

at the United Nations. However, this past December, President Obama broke that tradition and chose to allow this resolution to come before the Security Council for a vote. As Prime Minister Netanyahu said: "This was a disgraceful anti-Israel maneuver." Not only does this one-sided resolution blatantly target Israel, it seriously impedes the peace process.

Unfortunately, while I wholeheartedly reject what happened at the United Nations, I cannot say that I am surprised. The Obama administration has been more concerned with appeasing nefarious actors like Iran and Cuba, all the while ignoring friends like Israel. I look forward to a new era of foreign policy in which our enemies fear us and our allies respect us.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of a two-state solution, as a Jewish Member of Congress and as someone who has been to Israel and has seen the settlements firsthand, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Settlements are an impediment to peace between Israelis and Palestinians. This resolution only provides ammunition to those who oppose a two-state solution—the approach that is our only hope for lasting peace. We all agree that the incitement of violence and terrorism must end, which U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 discusses. But as Secretary Kerry so eloquently stated in his speech on December 28:

Some seem to believe that the U.S.' friendship means the U.S. must accept any policy regardless of our own interests, our own positions, our own words, our own principles—even after urging again and again that the policy must change. Friends need to tell each other the hard truths, and friendships require mutual respect.

□ 1815

Well, my friends, Israel must end settlement expansion, close their outposts, and get to the negotiating table. Prime Minister Netanyahu has not treated the Obama administration with respect, and this resolution does not offer the American people the honest, true debate we should be having about this critically important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Obama administration, especially Secretary of State Kerry, for their dedication in trying to find a path forward for a two-state solution. It is my hope that the principles laid out in Secretary Kerry's December 28, 2016 speech will help

guide serious negotiations in the days ahead. To ensure that his remarks are a part of this debate, I will now read his entire statement.

Secretary Kerry said: Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very, very much. Thank you. (Coughs.) Excuse me. Thank you for your patience, all of you. For those of you who celebrated Christmas, I hope you had a wonderful Christmas. Happy Chanukah. And to everybody here, I know it's the middle of a holiday week. I understand. (Laughter.) But I wish you all a very, very productive and Happy New Year.

Today, I want to share candid thoughts about an issue which for decades has animated the foreign policy dialogue here and around the world—the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Throughout his Administration, President Obama has been deeply committed to Israel and its security, and that commitment has guided his pursuit of peace in the Middle East. This is an issue which, all of you know, I have worked on intensively during my time as Secretary of State for one simple reason: because the two-state solution is the only way to achieve a just and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians. It is the only way to ensure Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state, living in peace and security with its neighbors. It is the only way to ensure a future of freedom and dignity for the Palestinian people. And it is an important way of advancing United States interests in the region.

Now, I'd like to explain why that future is now in jeopardy, and provide some context for why we could not, in good conscience, stand in the way of a resolution at the United Nations that makes clear that both sides must act now to preserve the possibility of peace.

I'm also here to share my conviction that there is still a way forward if the responsible parties are willing to act. And I want to share practical suggestions for how to preserve and advance the prospects for the just and lasting peace that both sides deserve.

So it is vital that we have an honest, clear-eyed conversation about the uncomfortable truths and difficult choices, because the alternative that is fast becoming the reality on the ground is in nobody's interest—not the Israelis, not the Palestinians, not the region—and not the United States.

Now, I want to stress that there is an important point here: My job, above all, is to defend the United States of America—to stand up for and defend our values and our interests in the world. And if we were to stand idly by and know that in doing so we are allowing a dangerous dynamic to take hold which promises greater conflict and instability to a region in which we have vital interests, we would be derelict in our own responsibilities.

Regrettably, some seem to believe that the U.S. friendship means the U.S. must accept any policy, regardless of our own interests, our own positions, our own words, our own principles—even after urging again and again that the policy must change. Friends need to tell each other the hard truths, and friendships require mutual respect.

Israel's permanent representative to the United Nations, who does not support a two-state solution, said after the vote last week, quote, "It was to be expected that Israel's greatest ally would act in accordance with the values that we share," and veto this resolution. I am compelled to respond today that the

United States did, in fact, vote in accordance with our values, just as previous U.S. administrations have done at the Security Council before us.

They fail to recognize that this friend, the United States of America, that has done more to support Israel than any other country, this friend that has blocked countless efforts to delegitimize Israel, cannot be true to our own values—or even the stated democratic values of Israel—and we cannot properly defend and protect Israel if we allow a viable two-state solution to be destroyed before our own eyes.

And that's the bottom line: the vote in the United Nations was about preserving the two-state solution. That's what we were standing up for: Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state, living side by side in peace and security with its neighbors. That's what we are trying to preserve for our sake and for theirs.

In fact, this Administration has been Israel's greatest friend and supporter, with an absolutely unwavering commitment to advancing Israel's security and protecting its legitimacy.

On this point, I want to be very clear: No American administration has done more for Israel's security than Barack Obama's. The Israeli prime minister himself has noted our, quote, "unprecedented" military and intelligence cooperation. Our military exercises are more advanced than ever. Our assistance for Iron Dome has saved countless Israeli lives. We have consistently supported Israel's right to defend itself, by itself, including during actions in Gaza that sparked great controversy.

Time and again we have demonstrated that we have Israel's back. We have strongly opposed boycotts, divestment campaigns, and sanctions targeting Israel in international fora, whenever and wherever its legitimacy was attacked, and we have fought for its inclusion across the UN system. In the midst of our own financial crisis and budget deficits, we repeatedly increased funding to support Israel. In fact, more than one-half of our entire global Foreign Military Financing goes to Israel. And this fall, we concluded an historic \$38 billion memorandum of understanding that exceeds any military assistance package the United States has provided to any country, at any time, and that will invest in cutting-edge missile defense and sustain Israel's qualitative military edge for years to come. That's the measure of our support.

This commitment to Israel's security is actually very personal for me. On my first trip to Israel as a young senator in 1986, I was captivated by a special country, one that I immediately admired and soon grew to love. Over the years, like so many others who are drawn to this extraordinary place, I have climbed Masada, swum in the Dead Sea, driven from one Biblical city to another. I've also seen the dark side of Hizballah's rocket storage facilities just across the border in Lebanon, walked through exhibits of the hell of the Holocaust at Yad Vashem, stood on the Golan Heights, and piloted an Israeli jet over the tiny airspace of Israel, which would make anyone understand the importance of security to Israelis. Out of those experiences came a steadfast commitment to Israel's security that has never wavered for a single minute in my 28 years in the Senate or my four years as Secretary.

I have also often visited West Bank communities, where I met Palestinians struggling for basic freedom and dignity amidst the occupation, passed by military checkpoints that can

make even the most routine daily trips to work or school an ordeal, and heard from business leaders who could not get the permits that they needed to get their products to the market and families who have struggled to secure permission just to travel for needed medical care.

And I have witnessed firsthand the ravages of a conflict that has gone on for far too long. I've seen Israeli children in Sderot whose playgrounds had been hit by Katyusha rockets. I've visited shelters next to schools in Kiryat Shmona that kids had 15 seconds to get to after a warning siren went off. I've also seen the devastation of war in the Gaza Strip, where Palestinian girls in Izbet Abed Rabo played in the rubble of a bombed-out building.

No children—Israeli or Palestinian—should have to live like that.

So, despite the obvious difficulties that I understood when I became Secretary of State, I knew that I had to do everything in my power to help end this conflict. And I was grateful to be working for President Obama, who was prepared to take risks for peace and was deeply committed to that effort.

Like previous U.S. administrations, we have committed our influence and our resources to trying to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict because, yes, it would serve American interests to stabilize a volatile region and fulfill America's commitment to the survival, security and well-being of an Israel at peace with its Arab neighbors.

Despite our best efforts over the years, the two-state solution is now in serious jeopardy.

The truth is that trends on the ground—violence, terrorism, incitement, settlement expansion and the seemingly endless occupation—they are combining to destroy hopes for peace on both sides and increasingly cementing an irreversible one-state reality that most people do not actually want.

Today, there are a number—there are a similar number of Jews and Palestinians living between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. They have a choice. They can choose to live together in one state, or they can separate into two states. But here is a fundamental reality: if the choice is one state, Israel can either be Jewish or democratic—it cannot be both—and it won't ever really be at peace. Moreover, the Palestinians will never fully realize their vast potential in a homeland of their own with a one-state solution.

Now, most on both sides understand this basic choice, and that is why it is important that polls of Israelis and Palestinians show that there is still strong support for the two-state solution—in theory. They just don't believe that it can happen.

After decades of conflict, many no longer see the other side as people, only as threats and enemies. Both sides continue to push a narrative that plays to people's fears and reinforces the worst stereotypes rather than working to change perceptions and build up belief in the possibility of peace.

And the truth is the extraordinary polarization in this conflict extends beyond Israelis and Palestinians. Allies of both sides are content to reinforce this with an us or—"you're with us or against us" mentality where too often anyone who questions Palestinian actions is an apologist for the occupation and anyone who disagrees with Israel policy is cast as anti-Israel or even anti-Semitic.

That's one of the most striking realities about the current situation: This critical decision

about the future—one state or two states—is effectively being made on the ground every single day, despite the expressed opinion of the majority of the people.

The status quo is leading towards one state and perpetual occupation, but most of the public either ignores it or has given up hope that anything can be done to change it. And with this passive resignation, the problem only gets worse, the risks get greater and the choices are narrowed.

This sense of hopelessness among Israelis is exacerbated by the continuing violence, terrorist attacks against civilians and incitement, which are destroying belief in the possibility of peace.

Let me say it again: There is absolutely no justification for terrorism, and there never will be.

And the most recent wave of Palestinian violence has included hundreds of terrorist attacks in the past year, including stabbings, shootings, vehicular attacks and bombings, many by individuals who have been radicalized by social media. Yet the murderers of innocents are still glorified on Fatah websites, including showing attackers next to Palestinian leaders following attacks. And despite statements by President Abbas and his party's leaders making clear their opposition to violence, too often they send a different message by failing to condemn specific terrorist attacks and naming public squares, streets and schools after terrorists.

President Obama and I have made it clear to the Palestinian leadership countless times, publicly and privately, that all incitement to violence must stop. We have consistently condemned violence and terrorism, and even condemned the Palestinian leadership for not condemning it.

Far too often, the Palestinians have pursued efforts to delegitimize Israel in international fora. We have strongly opposed these initiatives, including the recent wholly unbalanced and inflammatory UNESCO resolution regarding Jerusalem. And we have made clear our strong opposition to Palestinian efforts against Israel at the ICC, which only sets back the prospects for peace.

And we all understand that the Palestinian Authority has a lot more to do to strengthen its institutions and improve governance.

Most troubling of all, Hamas continues to pursue an extremist agenda: they refuse to accept Israel's very right to exist. They have a one-state vision of their own: all of the land is Palestine. Hamas and other radical factions are responsible for the most explicit forms of incitement to violence, and many of the images that they use are truly appalling. And they are willing to kill innocents in Israel and put the people of Gaza at risk in order to advance that agenda.

Compounding this, the humanitarian situation in Gaza, exacerbated by the closings of the crossings, is dire. Gaza is home to one of the world's densest concentrations of people enduring extreme hardships with few opportunities. 1.3 million people out of Gaza's population of 1.8 million are in need of daily assistance—food and shelter. Most have electricity less than half the time and only 5 percent of the water is safe to drink. And yet despite the urgency of these needs, Hamas and other militant groups continue to re-arm and divert reconstruction materials to build tunnels, threatening more attacks on Israeli civilians that no government can tolerate.

Now, at the same time, we have to be clear about what is happening in the West Bank. The Israeli prime minister publicly supports a two-state solution, but his current coalition is the most right wing in Israeli history, with an agenda driven by the most extreme elements. The result is that policies of this government, which the prime minister himself just described as “more committed to settlements than any in Israel’s history,” are leading in the opposite direction. They’re leading towards one state. In fact, Israel has increasingly consolidated control over much of the West Bank for its own purposes, effectively reversing the transitions to greater Palestinian civil authority that were called for by the Oslo Accords.

I don’t think most people in Israel, and certainly in the world, have any idea how broad and systematic the process has become. But the facts speak for themselves. The number of settlers in the roughly 130 Israeli settlements east of the 1967 lines has steadily grown. The settler population in the West Bank alone, not including East Jerusalem, has increased by nearly 270,000 since Oslo, including 100,000 just since 2009, when President Obama’s term began.

There’s no point in pretending that these are just in large settlement blocks. Nearly 90,000 settlers are living east of the separation barrier that was created by Israel itself in the middle of what, by any reasonable definition, would be the future Palestinian state. And the population of these distant settlements has grown by 20,000 just since 2009. In fact, just recently the government approved a significant new settlement well east of the barrier, closer to Jordan than to Israel. What does that say to Palestinians in particular—but also to the United States and the world—about Israel’s intentions?

Let me emphasize, this is not to say that the settlements are the whole or even the primary cause of this conflict. Of course they are not. Nor can you say that if the settlements were suddenly removed, you’d have peace. Without a broader agreement, you would not. And we understand that in a final status agreement, certain settlements would become part of Israel to account for the changes that have taken place over the last 49 years—we understand that—including the new demographic realities that exist on the ground. They would have to be factored in. But if more and more settlers are moving into the middle of Palestinian areas, it’s going to be just that much harder to separate, that much harder to imagine transferring sovereignty, and that is exactly the outcome that some are purposefully accelerating.

Let’s be clear: Settlement expansion has nothing to do with Israel’s security. Many settlements actually increase the security burden on the Israeli Defense Forces. And leaders of the settler movement are motivated by ideological imperatives that entirely ignore legitimate Palestinian aspirations.

Among the most troubling illustrations of this point has been the proliferation of settler outposts that are illegal under Israel’s own laws. They’re often located on private Palestinian land and strategically placed in locations that make two states impossible. There are over 100 of these outposts. And since 2011, nearly one-third of them have been or are being legalized, despite pledges by past Israeli governments to dismantle many of them.

Now leaders of the settler movement have advanced unprecedented new legislation that

would legalize most of those outposts. For the first time, it would apply Israeli domestic law to the West Bank rather than military law, which is a major step towards the process of annexation. When the law passed the first reading in the Israeli parliament, in the Knesset, one of the chief proponents said proudly—and I quote—“Today, the Israeli Knesset moved from heading towards establishing a Palestinian state towards Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria.” Even the Israeli attorney general has said that the draft law is unconstitutional and a violation of international law.

Now, you may hear from advocates that the settlements are not an obstacle to peace because the settlers who don’t want to leave can just stay in Palestine, like the Arab Israelis who live in Israel. But that misses a critical point, my friends. The Arab Israelis are citizens of Israel, subject to Israel’s law. Does anyone here really believe that the settlers will agree to submit to Palestinian law in Palestine?

Likewise, some supporters of the settlements argue that the settlers could just stay in their settlements and remain as Israeli citizens in their separate enclaves in the middle of Palestine, protected by the IDF. Well, there are over 80 settlements east of the separation barrier, many located in places that would make a continuous—a contiguous Palestinian state impossible. Does anyone seriously think that if they just stay where they are you could still have a viable Palestinian state?

Now, some have asked, “Why can’t we build in the blocs which everyone knows will eventually be part of Israel?” Well, the reason building there or anywhere else in the West Bank now results in such pushback is that the decision of what constitutes a bloc is being made unilaterally by the Israeli Government, without consultation, without the consent of the Palestinians, and without granting the Palestinians a reciprocal right to build in what will be, by most accounts, part of Palestine. Bottom line—without agreement or mutuality, the unilateral choices become a major point of contention, and that is part of why we are here where we are.

You may hear that these remote settlements aren’t a problem because they only take up a very small percentage of the land. Well, again and again we have made it clear, it’s not just a question of the overall amount of land available in the West Bank. It’s whether the land can be connected or it’s broken up into small parcels, like a Swiss cheese, that could never constitute a real state. The more outposts that are built, the more the settlements expand, the less possible it is to create a contiguous state. So in the end, a settlement is not just the land that it’s on, it’s also what the location does to the movement of people, what it does to the ability of a road to connect people, one community to another, what it does to the sense of statehood that is chipped away with each new construction. No one thinking seriously about peace can ignore the reality of what the settlements pose to that peace.

But the problem, obviously, goes well beyond settlements. Trends indicate a comprehensive effort to take the West Bank land for Israel and prevent any Palestinian development there. Today, the 60 percent of the West Bank known as Area C—much of which was supposed to be transferred to Palestinian control long ago under the Oslo Accords—much of it is effectively off limits to Palestinian devel-

opment. Most today has essentially been taken for exclusive use by Israel simply by unilaterally designating it as “state land” or including it within the jurisdiction of regional settlement councils. Israeli farms flourish in the Jordan River Valley, and Israeli resorts line the shores of the Dead Sea—a lot of people don’t realize this—they line the shore of the Dead Sea, where Palestinian development is not allowed. In fact, almost no private Palestinian building is approved in Area C at all. Only one permit was issued by Israel in all of 2014 and 2015, while approvals for hundreds of settlement units were advanced during that same period.

Moreover, Palestinian structures in Area C that do not have a permit from the Israeli military are potentially subject to demolition. And they are currently being demolished at an historically high rate. Over 1,300 Palestinians, including over 600 children, have been displaced by demolitions in 2016 alone—more than any previous year.

So the settler agenda is defining the future of Israel. And their stated purpose is clear. They believe in one state: greater Israel. In fact, one prominent minister, who heads a pro-settler party, declared just after the U.S. election—and I quote—“the era of the two-state solution is over,” end quote. And many other coalition ministers publicly reject a Palestinian state. And they are increasingly getting their way, with plans for hundreds of new units in East Jerusalem recently announced and talk of a major new settlement building effort in the West Bank to follow.

So why are we so concerned? Why does this matter? Well, ask yourself these questions: What happens if that agenda succeeds? Where does that lead?

There are currently about 2.75 million Palestinians living under military occupation in the West Bank, most of them in Areas A and B—40 percent of the West Bank—where they have limited autonomy. They are restricted in their daily movements by a web of checkpoints and unable to travel into or out of the West Bank without a permit from the Israelis.

So if there is only one state, you would have millions of Palestinians permanently living in segregated enclaves in the middle of the West Bank, with no real political rights, separate legal, education, and transportation systems, vast income disparities, under a permanent military occupation that deprives them of the most basic freedoms. Separate and unequal is what you would have. And nobody can explain how that works. Would an Israeli accept living that way? Would an American accept living that way? Will the world accept it?

If the occupation becomes permanent, over the time the Palestinian Authority could simply dissolve, turn over all the administrative and security responsibilities to the Israelis. What would happen then? Who would administer the schools and hospitals and on what basis? Does Israel want to pay for the billions of dollars of lost international assistance that the Palestinian Authority now receives? Would the Israel Defense Force police the streets of every single Palestinian city and town?

How would Israel respond to a growing civil rights movement from Palestinians, demanding a right to vote, or widespread protests and unrest across the West Bank? How does Israel reconcile a permanent occupation with

its democratic ideals? How does the U.S. continue to defend that and still live up to our own democratic ideals?

Nobody has ever provided good answers to those questions because there aren't any. And there would be an increasing risk of more intense violence between Palestinians and settlers, and complete despair among Palestinians that would create very fertile ground for extremists.

With all the external threats that Israel faces today, which we are very cognizant of and working with them to deal with, does it really want an intensifying conflict in the West Bank? How does that help Israel's security? How does that help the region?

The answer is it doesn't, which is precisely why so many senior Israeli military and intelligence leaders, past and present, believe the two-state solution is the only real answer for Israel's long term security.

Now, one thing we do know: if Israel goes down the one state path, it will never have true peace with the rest of the Arab world, and I can say that with certainty. The Arab countries have made clear that they will not make peace with Israel without resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. That's not where their loyalties lie. That's not where their politics are.

But there is something new here. Common interests in countering Iran's destabilizing activities, and fighting extremists, as well as diversifying their economies have created real possibilities for something different if Israel takes advantage of the opportunities for peace. I have spent a great deal of time with key Arab leaders exploring this, and there is no doubt that they are prepared to have a fundamentally different relationship with Israel. That was stated in the Arab Peace Initiative, years ago. And in all my recent conversations, Arab leaders have confirmed their readiness, in the context of Israeli-Palestinian peace, not just to normalize relations but to work openly on securing that peace with significant regional security cooperation. It's waiting. It's right there.

Many have shown a willingness to support serious Israeli-Palestinian negotiations and to take steps on the path to normalization to relations, including public meetings, providing there is a meaningful progress towards a two-state solution. My friends, that is a real opportunity that we should not allow to be missed.

And that raises one final question: Is ours the generation that gives up on the dream of a Jewish democratic state of Israel living in peace and security with its neighbors? Because that is really what is at stake.

Now, that is what informed our vote at the Security Council last week—the need to preserve the two-state solution—and both sides in this conflict must take responsibility to do that. We have repeatedly and emphatically stressed to the Palestinians that all incitement to violence must stop. We have consistently condemned all violence and terrorism, and we have strongly opposed unilateral efforts to delegitimize Israel in international fora.

We've made countless public and private exhortations to the Israelis to stop the march of settlements. In literally hundreds of conversations with Prime Minister Netanyahu, I have made clear that continued settlement activity would only increase pressure for an international response. We have all known for some time that the Palestinians were intent on moving forward in the UN with a settlements

resolution, and I advised the prime minister repeatedly that further settlement activity only invited UN action.

Yet the settlement activity just increased, including advancing the unprecedented legislation to legalize settler outposts that the prime minister himself reportedly warned could expose Israel to action at the Security Council and even international prosecution before deciding to support it.

In the end, we could not in good conscience protect the most extreme elements of the settler movement as it tries to destroy the two-state solution. We could not in good conscience turn a blind eye to Palestinian actions that fan hatred and violence. It is not in U.S. interest to help anyone on either side create a unitary state. And we may not be able to stop them, but we cannot be expected to defend them. And it is certainly not the role of any country to vote against its own policies.

That is why we decided not to block the UN resolution that makes clear both sides have to take steps to save the two-state solution while there is still time. And we did not take this decision lightly. The Obama Administration has always defended Israel against any effort at the UN and any international fora or biased and one-sided resolutions that seek to undermine its legitimacy or security, and that has not changed. It didn't change with this vote.

But remember it's important to note that every United States administration, Republican and Democratic, has opposed settlements as contrary to the prospects for peace, and action at the UN Security Council is far from unprecedented. In fact, previous administrations of both political parties have allowed resolutions that were critical of Israel to pass, including on settlements. On dozens of occasions under George W. Bush alone, the council passed six resolutions that Israel opposed, including one that endorsed a plan calling for a complete freeze on settlements, including natural growth.

Let me read you the lead paragraph from a New York Times story dated December 23rd. I quote: "With the United States abstaining, the Security Council adopted a resolution today strongly deploring Israel's handling of the disturbances in the occupied territories, which the resolution defined as, including Jerusalem. All of the 14 other Security Council members voted in favor." My friends, that story was not written last week. It was written December 23rd, 1987, 26 years to the day that we voted last week, when Ronald Reagan was president.

Yet despite growing pressure, the Obama Administration held a strong line against UN action, any UN action, we were the only administration since 1967 that had not allowed any resolution to pass that Israel opposed. In fact, the only time in eight years the Obama Administration exercised its veto at the United Nations was against a one-sided settlements resolution in 2011. And that resolution did not mention incitement or violence.

Now let's look at what's happened since then. Since then, there have been over 30,000 settlement units advanced through some stage of the planning process. That's right—over 30,000 settlement units advanced notwithstanding the positions of the United States and other countries. And if we had vetoed this resolution just the other day, the United States would have been giving license to further unfettered settlement construction that we fundamentally oppose.

So we reject the criticism that this vote abandons Israel. On the contrary, it is not this resolution that is isolating Israel; it is the permanent policy of settlement construction that risks making peace impossible. And virtually every country in the world other than Israel opposes settlements. That includes many of the friends of Israel, including the United Kingdom, France, Russia—all of whom voted in favor of the settlements resolution in 2011 that we vetoed, and again this year along with every other member of the council.

In fact, this resolution simply reaffirms statements made by the Security Council on the legality of settlements over several decades. It does not break new ground. In 1978, the State Department Legal Adviser advised the Congress on his conclusion that Israel's government, the Israeli Government's program of establishing civilian settlements in the occupied territory is inconsistent with international law, and we see no change since then to affect that fundamental conclusion.

Now, you may have heard that some criticized this resolution for calling East Jerusalem occupied territory. But to be clear, there was absolutely nothing new in last week's resolution on that issue. It was one of a long line of Security Council resolutions that included East Jerusalem as part of the territories occupied by Israel in 1967, and that includes resolutions passed by the Security Council under President Reagan and President George H.W. Bush. And remember that every U.S. administration since 1967, along with the entire international community, has recognized East Jerusalem as among the territories that Israel occupied in the Six-Day War.

Now, I want to stress this point: We fully respect Israel's profound historic and religious ties to the city and to its holy sites. We've never questioned that. This resolution in no manner prejudices the outcome of permanent status negotiations on East Jerusalem, which must, of course, reflect those historic ties and the realities on the ground. That's our position. We still support it.

We also strongly reject the notion that somehow the United States was the driving force behind this resolution. The Egyptians and Palestinians had long made clear to all of us—to all of the international community—their intention to bring a resolution to a vote before the end of the year, and we communicated that to the Israelis and they knew it anyway. The United States did not draft or originate this resolution, nor did we put it forward. It was drafted by Egypt—it was drafted and I think introduced by Egypt, which is one of Israel's closest friends in the region, in coordination with the Palestinians and others.

And during the time of the process as it went out, we made clear to others, including those on the Security Council, that it was possible that if the resolution were to be balanced and it were to include references to incitement and to terrorism, that it was possible the United States would then not block it, that—if it was balanced and fair. That's a standard practice with resolutions at the Security Council. The Egyptians and the Palestinians and many others understood that if the text were more balanced, it was possible we wouldn't block it. But we also made crystal clear that the President of the United States would not make a final decision about our own position until we saw the final text.

In the end, we did not agree with every word in this resolution. There are important

issues that are not sufficiently addressed or even addressed at all. But we could not in good conscience veto a resolution that condemns violence and incitement and reiterates what has been for a long time the overwhelming consensus and international view on settlements and calls for the parties to start taking constructive steps to advance the two-state solution on the ground.

Ultimately, it will be up to the Israeli people to decide whether the unusually heated attacks that Israeli officials have directed towards this Administration best serve Israel's national interests and its relationship with an ally that has been steadfast in its support, as I described. Those attacks, alongside allegations of U.S.-led conspiracy and other manufactured claims, distract attention from what the substance of this vote was really all about.

And we all understand that Israel faces very serious threats in a very tough neighborhood. Israelis are rightfully concerned about making sure that there is not a new terrorist haven right next door to them, often referencing what's happened with Gaza, and we understand that and we believe there are ways to meet those needs of security. And Israelis are fully justified in decrying attempts to legitimize their state and question the right of a Jewish state to exist. But this vote was not about that. It was about actions that Israelis and Palestinians are taking that are increasingly rendering a two-state solution impossible. It was not about making peace with the Palestinians now—it was about making sure that peace with the Palestinians will be possible in the future.

Now, we all understand that Israel faces extraordinary, serious threats in a very tough neighborhood. And Israelis are very correct in making sure that there's not a terrorist haven right on their border.

But this vote—I can't emphasize enough—is not about the possibility of arriving at an agreement that's going to resolve that overnight or in one year or two years. This is about a longer process. This is about how we make peace with the Palestinians in the future but preserve the capacity to do so.

So how do we get there? How do we get there, to that peace?

Since the parties have not yet been able to resume talks, the U.S. and the Middle East Quartet have repeatedly called on both sides to independently demonstrate a genuine commitment to the two-state solution—not just with words, but with real actions and policies—to create the conditions for meaningful negotiations.

We've called for both sides to take significant steps on the ground to reverse current trends and send a different message—a clear message—that they are prepared to fundamentally change the equation without waiting for the other side to act.

We have pushed them to comply with their basic commitments under their own prior agreements in order to advance a two-state reality on the ground.

We have called for the Palestinians to do everything in their power to stop violence and incitement, including publicly and consistently condemning acts of terrorism and stopping the glorification of violence.

And we have called on them to continue efforts to strengthen their own institutions and to improve governance, transparency, and accountability.

And we have stressed that the Hamas arms buildup and militant activities in Gaza must stop.

Along with our Quartet partners, we have called on Israel to end the policy of settlement construction and expansion, of taking land for exclusive Israeli use and denying Palestinian development.

To reverse the current process, the U.S. and our partners have encouraged Israel to resume the transfer of greater civil authority to the Palestinians in Area C, consistent with the transition that was called for by Oslo. And we have made clear that significant progress across a range of sectors, including housing, agriculture, and natural resources, can be made without negatively impacting Israel's legitimate security needs. And we've called for significantly easing the movement and access restrictions to and from Gaza, with due consideration for Israel's need to protect its citizens from terrorist attacks.

So let me stress here again: None of the steps that I just talked about would negatively impact Israel's security.

Let me also emphasize this is not about offering limited economic measures that perpetuate the status quo. We're talking about significant steps that would signal real progress towards creating two states.

That's the bottom line: If we're serious about the two-state solution, it's time to start implementing it now. Advancing the process of separation now, in a serious way, could make a significant difference in saving the two-state solution and in building confidence in the citizens of both sides that peace is, indeed, possible. And much progress can be made in advance of negotiations that can lay the foundation for negotiations, as contemplated by the Oslo process. In fact, these steps will help create the conditions for successful talks.

Now, in the end, we all understand that a final status agreement can only be achieved through direct negotiations between the parties. We've said that again and again. We cannot impose the peace.

There are other countries in the UN who believe it is our job to dictate the terms of a solution in the Security Council. Others want us to simply recognize a Palestinian state, absent an agreement. But I want to make clear today, these are not the choices that we will make.

We choose instead to draw on the experiences of the last eight years, to provide a way forward when the parties are ready for serious negotiations. In a place where the narratives from the past powerfully inform and mold the present, it's important to understand the history. We mark this year and next a series of milestones that I believe both illustrate the two sides of the conflict and form the basis for its resolution. It's worth touching on them briefly.

A hundred and twenty years ago, the First Zionist Congress was convened in Basel by a group of Jewish visionaries, who decided that the only effective response to the waves of anti-Semitic horrors sweeping across Europe was to create a state in the historic home of the Jewish people, where their ties to the land went back centuries—a state that could defend its borders, protect its people, and live in peace with its neighbors. That was the vision. That was the modern beginning, and it remains the dream of Israel today.

Nearly 70 years ago, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181 finally paved the way to making the State of Israel a reality.

The concept was simple: to create two states for two peoples—one Jewish, one Arab—to realize the national aspirations of both Jews and Palestinians. And both Israel and the PLO referenced Resolution 181 in their respective declarations of independence.

The United States recognized Israel seven minutes after its creation. But the Palestinians and the Arab world did not, and from its birth, Israel had to fight for its life. Palestinians also suffered terribly in the 1948 war, including many who had lived for generations in a land that had long been their home too. And when Israel celebrates its 70th anniversary in 2018, the Palestinians will mark a very different anniversary: 70 years since what they call the Nakba, or catastrophe.

Next year will also mark 50 years since the end of the Six-Day War, when Israel again fought for its survival. And Palestinians will again mark just the opposite: 50 years of military occupation. Both sides have accepted UN Security Council Resolution 242, which called for the withdrawal of Israel from territory that it occupied in 1967 in return for peace and secure borders, as the basis for ending the conflict.

It has been more than 20 years since Israel and the PLO signed their first agreement—the Oslo Accords—and the PLO formally recognized Israel. Both sides committed to a plan to transition much of the West Bank and Gaza to Palestinian control during permanent status negotiations that would put an end to their conflict. Unfortunately, neither the transition nor the final agreement came about, and both sides bear responsibility for that.

Finally, some 15 years ago, King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia came out with the historic Arab Peace Initiative, which offered fully normalized relations with Israel when it made peace—an enormous opportunity then and now, which has never been fully been embraced.

That history was critical to our approach to trying to find a way to resolve the conflict. And based on my experience with both sides over the last four years, including the nine months of formal negotiations, the core issues can be resolved if there is leadership on both sides committed to finding a solution.

In the end, I believe the negotiations did not fail because the gaps were too wide, but because the level of trust was too low. Both sides were concerned that any concessions would not be reciprocated and would come at too great a political cost. And the deep public skepticism only made it more difficult for them to be able to take risks.

In the countless hours that we spent working on a detailed framework, we worked through numerous formulations and developed specific bridging proposals, and we came away with a clear understanding of the fundamental needs of both sides. In the past two and a half years, I have tested ideas with regional and international stakeholders, including our Quartet partners. And I believe what has emerged from all of that is a broad consensus on balanced principles that would satisfy the core needs of both sides.

President Clinton deserves great credit for laying out extensive parameters designed to bridge gaps in advanced final status negotiations 16 years ago. Today, with mistrust too high to even start talks, we're at the opposite end of the spectrum. Neither side is willing to even risk acknowledging the other's bottom

line, and more negotiations that do not produce progress will only reinforce the worst fears.

Now, everyone understands that negotiations would be complex and difficult, and nobody can be expected to agree on the final result in advance. But if the parties could at least demonstrate that they understand the other side's most basic needs—and are potentially willing to meet them if theirs are also met at the end of comprehensive negotiations—perhaps then enough trust could be established to enable a meaningful process to begin.

It is in that spirit that we offer the following principles—not to prejudge or impose an outcome, but to provide a possible basis for serious negotiations when the parties are ready. Now, individual countries may have more detailed policies on these issues—as we do, by the way—but I believe there is a broad consensus that a final status agreement that could meet the needs of both sides would do the following.

Principle number one: Provide for secure and recognized international borders between Israel and a viable and contiguous Palestine, negotiated based on the 1967 lines with mutually agreed equivalent swaps.

Resolution 242, which has been enshrined in international law for 50 years, provides for the withdrawal of Israel from territory it occupied in 1967 in return for peace with its neighbors and secure and recognized borders. It has long been accepted by both sides, and it remains the basis for an agreement today.

As Secretary, one of the first issues that I worked out with the Arab League was their agreement that the reference in the Arab Peace Initiative to the 1967 lines would from now on include the concept of land swaps, which the Palestinians have acknowledged. And this is necessary to reflect practical realities on the ground, and mutually agreed equivalent swaps that will ensure that the agreement is fair to both sides.

There is also broad recognition of Israel's need to ensure that the borders are secure and defensible, and that the territory of Palestine is viable and contiguous. Virtually everyone that I have spoken to has been clear on this principle as well: No changes by Israel to the 1967 lines will be recognized by the international community unless agreed to by both sides.

Principle two: Fulfill the vision of the UN General Assembly Resolution 181 of two states for two peoples, one Jewish and one Arab, with mutual recognition and full equal rights for all their respective citizens.

This has been the fundamental—the foundational principle of the two-state solution from the beginning: creating a state for the Jewish people and a state for the Palestinian people, where each can achieve their national aspirations. And Resolution 181 is incorporated into the foundational documents of both the Israelis and Palestinians. Recognition of Israel as a Jewish state has been the U.S. position for years, and based on my conversations in these last months, I am absolutely convinced that many others are now prepared to accept it as well—provided the need for a Palestinian state is also addressed.

We also know that there are some 1.7 million Arab citizens who call Israel their home and must now and always be able to live as equal citizens, which makes this a difficult

issue for Palestinians and others in the Arab world. That's why it is so important that in recognizing each other's homeland—Israel for the Jewish people and Palestine for the Palestinian people—both sides reaffirm their commitment to upholding full equal rights for all of their respective citizens.

Principle number three: Provide for a just, agreed, fair, and realistic solution to the Palestinian refugee issue, with international assistance, that includes compensation, options and assistance in finding permanent homes, acknowledgment of suffering, and other measures necessary for a comprehensive resolution consistent with two states for two peoples.

The plight of many Palestinian refugees is heartbreaking, and all agree that their needs have to be addressed. As part of a comprehensive resolution, they must be provided with compensation, their suffering must be acknowledged, and there will be a need to have options and assistance in finding permanent homes. The international community can provide significant support and assistance. I know we are prepared to do that, including in raising money to help ensure the compensation and other needs of the refugees are met, and many have expressed a willingness to contribute to that effort, particularly if it brings peace. But there is a general recognition that the solution must be consistent with two states for two peoples, and cannot affect the fundamental character of Israel.

Principle four: Provide an agreed resolution for Jerusalem as the internationally recognized capital of the two states, and protect and assure freedom of access to the holy sites consistent with the established status quo.

Now, Jerusalem is the most sensitive issue for both sides, and the solution will have to meet the needs not only of the parties, but of all three monotheistic faiths. That is why the holy sites that are sacred to billions of people around the world must be protected and remain accessible and the established status quo maintained. Most acknowledge that Jerusalem should not be divided again like it was in 1967, and we believe that. At the same time, there is broad recognition that there will be no peace agreement without reconciling the basic aspirations of both sides to have capitals there.

Principle five: Satisfy Israel's security needs and bring a full end, ultimately, to the occupation, while ensuring that Israel can defend itself effectively and that Palestine can provide security for its people in a sovereign and non-militarized state.

Security is the fundamental issue for Israel together with a couple of others I've mentioned, but security is critical. Everyone understands that no Israeli Government can ever accept an agreement that does not satisfy its security needs or that risk creating an enduring security threat like Gaza transferred to the West Bank. And Israel must be able to defend itself effectively, including against terrorism and other regional threats. In fact, there is a real willingness by Egypt, Jordan, and others to work together with Israel on meeting key security challenges. And I believe that those collective efforts, including close coordination on border security, intelligence-sharing, joint cooperations—joint operation, can all play a critical role in securing the peace.

At the same time, fully ending the occupation is the fundamental issue for the Palestinians. They need to know that the military oc-

cupation itself will really end after an agreed transitional process. They need to know they can live in freedom and dignity in a sovereign state while providing security for their population even without a military of their own. This is widely accepted as well. And it is important to understand there are many different ways without occupation for Israel and Palestine and Jordan and Egypt and the United States and others to cooperate in providing that security.

Now, balancing those requirements was among the most important challenges that we faced in the negotiations, but it was one where the United States has the ability to provide the most assistance. And that is why a team that was led by General John Allen, who is here, for whom I am very grateful for his many hours of effort, along with—he is one of our foremost military minds, and dozens of experts from the Department of Defense and other agencies, all of them engaged extensively with the Israeli Defense Force on trying to find solutions that could help Israel address its legitimate security needs.

They developed innovative approaches to creating unprecedented, multi-layered border security; enhancing Palestinian capacity; enabling Israel to retain the ability to address threats by itself even when the occupation had ended. General Allen and his team were not suggesting one particular outcome or one particular timeline, nor were they suggesting that technology alone would resolve these problems. They were simply working on ways to support whatever the negotiators agreed to. And they did some very impressive work that gives me total confidence that Israel's security requirements can be met.

Principle six: End the conflict and all outstanding claims, enabling normalized relations and enhanced regional security for all as envisaged by the Arab Peace Initiative. It is essential for both sides that the final status agreement resolves all the outstanding issues and finally brings closure to this conflict, so that everyone can move ahead to a new era of peaceful coexistence and cooperation. For Israel, this must also bring broader peace with all of its Arab neighbors. That is the fundamental promise of the Arab Peace Initiative, which key Arab leaders have affirmed in these most recent days.

The Arab Peace Initiative also envisions enhanced security for all of the region. It envisions Israel being a partner in those efforts when peace is made. This is the area where Israel and the Arab world are looking at perhaps the greatest moment of potential transformation in the Middle East since Israel's creation in 1948. The Arab world faces its own set of security challenges. With Israeli-Palestinian peace, Israel, the United States, Jordan, Egypt—together with the GCC countries—would be ready and willing to define a new security partnership for the region that would be absolutely groundbreaking.

So ladies and gentlemen, that's why it is vital that we all work to keep open the possibility of peace, that we not lose hope in the two-state solution, no matter how difficult it may seem—because there really is no viable alternative.

Now, we all know that a speech alone won't produce peace. But based on over 30 years of experience and the lessons from the past 4 years, I have suggested, I believe, and President Obama has signed on to and believes in

a path that the parties could take: realistic steps on the ground now, consistent with the parties' own prior commitments, that will begin the process of separating into two states; a political horizon to work towards to create the conditions for a successful final status talk; and a basis for negotiations that the parties could accept to demonstrate that they are serious about making peace.

We can only encourage them to take this path; we cannot walk down it for them. But if they take these steps, peace would bring extraordinary benefits in enhancing the security and the stability and the prosperity of Israelis, Palestinians, all of the nations of the region. The Palestinian economy has amazing potential in the context of independence, with major private sector investment possibilities and a talented, hungry, eager-to-work young workforce. Israel's economy could enjoy unprecedented growth as it becomes a regional economic powerhouse, taking advantage of the unparalleled culture of innovation and trading opportunities with new Arab partners. Meanwhile, security challenges could be addressed by an entirely new security arrangement, in which Israel cooperates openly with key Arab states. That is the future that everybody should be working for.

President Obama and I know that the incoming administration has signaled that they may take a different path, and even suggested breaking from the longstanding U.S. policies on settlements, Jerusalem, and the possibility of a two-state solution. That is for them to decide. That's how we work. But we cannot—in good conscience—do nothing, and say nothing, when we see the hope of peace slipping away.

This is a time to stand up for what is right. We have long known what two states living side by side in peace and security looks like. We should not be afraid to say so.

Now, I really began to reflect on what we have learned—and the way ahead—when I recently joined President Obama in Jerusalem for the state funeral for Shimon Peres. Shimon was one of the founding fathers of Israel who became one of the world's great elder statesmen—a beautiful man. I was proud to call him my friend, and I know that President Obama was as well.

And I remembered the first time that I saw Shimon in person—standing on the White House lawn for the signing the historic Oslo Accords. And I thought about the last time, at an intimate one-on-one Shabbat dinner just a few months before he died, when we toasted together to the future of Israel and to the peace that he still so passionately believed in for his people.

He summed it up simply and eloquently, as only Shimon could, quote, "The original mandate gave the Palestinians 48 percent, now it's down to 22 percent. I think 78 percent is enough for us."

As we laid Shimon to rest that day, many of us couldn't help but wonder if peace between Israelis and Palestinians might also be buried along with one of its most eloquent champions. We cannot let that happen. There is simply too much at stake—for future generations of Israelis and Palestinians—to give in to pessimism, especially when peace is, in fact, still possible.

We must not lose hope in the possibility of peace. We must not give in to those who say what is now must always be, that there is no

chance for a better future. It is up to Israelis and Palestinians to make the difficult choices for peace, but we can all help. And for the sake of future generations of Israelis and Palestinians, for all the people of the region, for the United States, for all those around the world who have prayed for and worked for peace for generations, let's hope that we are all prepared—and particularly Israelis and Palestinians—to make those choices now.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 11. Contrary to the U.N. resolution that we are condemning today, which condemns the settlements that are taking place in Israel, the new settlements that the Israelis find themselves permitting are not undermining the cause of peace. Let's get this straight. This is what we just hear over and over again that the settlements are undermining peace.

What undermines peace is when the Palestinian people continue with their policies of terrorism, both attacking with missiles and rockets, as well as stabbings, as well as the Palestinian people and their leaders unwilling to stand up and recognize that Israel exists. They don't have a right to flood into that country with a right of return. That is what undermines the peace.

The settlements wouldn't be taking place, except the Israelis and the United Nations and the supporters of the Palestinians have made a mockery of the deal that was made.

The Israelis withdrew from control of the territory. They withdrew, and they permitted the Palestinians to establish authority there with two promises: number one, they wouldn't use the territory to attack Israel; and number two, they would recognize Israel's right to exist, and this right of return permitting them to flood into Israel and eliminate it that way did not exist.

The Palestinians have given up nothing. The Israelis have given up territory and made themselves vulnerable to the type of attack that leaves Israelis dead every day from terrorist attacks.

No, the U.N. has it wrong. That resolution by the U.N. makes peace less likely.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate the strong, bipartisan support for our ally, Israel, in the United States Congress.

Support for Israel has always been a bipartisan value, and it reflects the values of our country. Although we are entering a period of one-party government, bipartisan support for Israel remains a strategic asset, and those who support Israel need to be careful not to jeopardize that. I think none of my colleagues do that. I want to make it clear.

In supporting this House resolution, we are expressing our deep concern regarding the decision to abstain in the U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. Some may point out that the decision to abstain does not veer from the actions of past administrations. They would be right. It does not. That may be true, but it does not justify, in my view, this particular vote.

Allowing a one-sided resolution, which I perceived the U.N. resolution to be, to be adopted at this juncture sends the wrong signal and emboldens Israel's and America's enemies.

The United Nations is notorious for its disproportionate criticism of Israel. As Ambassador Samantha Power said before the U.N. Security Council vote on Resolution 2334: "As long as Israel has been a member of this institution, Israel has been treated differently from other nations at the United Nations."

She also noted that, in 2016 alone, the U.N. adopted more resolutions critical of Israel than it did nations that brazenly violate international law and violate human rights—more than Syria, more than Iran, more than North Korea, more than South Sudan, more than Russia, combined.

A one-sided resolution that assigns exclusive blame to Israel for the continuation of the conflict—without addressing Palestinian incitement to violence, Hamas control of Gaza, or their continued insistence on the so-called right of return and refusing to accept Israel as a Jewish state—undermines prospects for a two-state solution.

Also deeply concerning is this resolution's reference of Israeli presence in East Jerusalem, including the Jewish Quarter of the Old City and the Western Wall, as illegal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The only way to achieve a real and lasting peace that enables Israel to protect its security and remain both a Jewish state and a democratic one is a two-state solution, which I strongly support.

There are two parties to this conflict. Both have responsibilities. Both need to take steps toward peace. For Israel, this means not building in areas envisioned in the long term as part of a future Palestinian state; and for Palestinians, it means ending incitement, ending terrorism, and affirmatively accepting Israel's right to existence.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 11.

The U.N. resolution, on the other hand, is vastly disproportionate and includes language that seems designed to provoke Israel. Categorizing the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, as occupied territory is entirely inappropriate.

I believe that President Obama should have directed the United States to veto the U.N. resolution. Instead, our Ambassador sat silent. Abstaining on this vote handed a victory to the forces that wish to delegitimize Israel.

This resolution erects a greater barrier between the two sides, hindering critical negotiations. The peace process must be negotiated bilaterally by Israel and the Palestinians with support, not provocation, by outside actors.

In this new year and new Congress, we should act to reassert a position of strength on the world stage. We must stand by our allies, including our strongest ally in the Middle East, Israel. This country should have exercised its veto power as it has done before and thwarted this divisive anti-Israel effort.

Please vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, who are we kidding? I heard the ranking member say this isn't about Obama, and yet virtually every statement on the other side of the aisle is trashing President Obama.

If you want to simply condemn the U.N. resolution, let's do so. I will join you. But that isn't what this is about. It is subterfuge. This is about kicking a President on the way out one more time, enhancing a false narrative about his lack of support for our ally Israel. And it greases the skids to defund the United Nations while they are at it.

I say to my friends on my side of the aisle: Don't be fooled. Don't be enablers. That is what this agenda is about.

There was a viable alternative we could have had on the floor, and we were denied that right. We were even denied to have a motion to recommit for a reason: because they don't want to risk that. They want to control the platform that is negative and insidious and a resolution filled with insinuations and distortions of fact and history.

Vote "no" on H. Res. 11.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, just by way of the facts, what this resolution attempts to do is to reject the U.N. resolution that calls for a Palestinian state but not a Jewish state, a resolution that opens the door for those who want to impose boycott, divestment, or other sanctions measures against Israel or Israeli companies and, in essence, declares Judaism's holiest site as occupied territory. That is what is in this resolution. Those are the facts that we are debating here. Those are the facts that need to be rejected, my colleagues.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the U.N. resolution which hinders the path to peace and aims to undermine Israel, one of our country's top allies.

Our policy has long been that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should be resolved by direct, bilateral talks between the two parties. This U.N. resolution contradicts our longstanding policy, first, by legitimatizing Palestinian Authority efforts to utilize international organizations to carry out its own solution; and second, by not providing for the Palestinian Authority to uphold their own responsibility as it relates to the peace negotiations.

The U.N. resolution disregards that Hamas, a terrorist organization, presently controls a portion of what would be the Palestinian state. That is an outrage, Mr. Speaker.

We must not sit on the sidelines or be silenced when anti-Israel resolutions are presented at international organizations. That is why I support H. Res. 11 today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER). We are pleased that he is back.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, for 19 years, when Jordan occupied East Jerusalem and the West Bank, Jews could not visit the Western Wall or the Jewish Quarter of the Old City. They were denied access to places where, for 2,000 years, they have continuously made a personal connection to their faith and their history.

It is impossible to separate Jewish identity from the Western Wall or the Western Wall from its Jewish identity or Jerusalem from the Jewish State of Israel, yet this is exactly what has been happening in the United Nations for years and exactly what Security Council Resolution 2334 sought to do.

In addition, the resolution overwhelmingly assigns blame to Israel, while avoiding direct criticism of Palestinian incitement and violence. That is why, last month, I strongly urged President Obama to veto the resolution.

The U.S. has and must continue to seek a sustainable two-state solution with a democratic, Jewish State of Israel and a demilitarized democratic Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security. But the only path to two states is through direct negotiations by the two parties. Efforts to force a solution at the U.N. or internationalize the issues are misguided and risk moving peace further away.

As an original cosponsor, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 11.

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

□ 1830

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this resolution. We need to close ranks in the House of Representatives. We need to, as colleagues, support what for decades has been the cornerstone principle of American diplomacy towards Israel

and Palestine, and that is direct negotiation between these two countries. That is the only way that peace can be achieved. The fact that our Ambassador to the United Nations went against decades of precedent by abstaining from this vote is appalling. It is another vote for tyrants and terrorists.

All of us need to close ranks to support a two-state solution between Israel and Palestine. I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle tonight, Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ROYCE, in opposing this mistake that has been made by our U.N. Ambassador and by the U.N. resolution itself. Both are wrong. Both our decision to abstain and the drafting have been destructive.

I am proud to have this resolution in the House to once again undo this harm and support our ally.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 11 to reject the anti-Israel U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. Since 1972, the United States has vetoed 42 anti-Israel resolutions; but all of that changed in 2016.

The facts are, in the very final days of his administration, President Obama left our only ally in the Middle East to stand alone by blatantly and deliberately violating longstanding U.S. policy. For crying out loud, either we are with Israel or we are not.

I could go on and on about the severity of the President's refusal to veto an anti-Israel U.N. resolution and his decision to abstain from a vote on it. Instead, I will let Prime Minister Netanyahu's words speak for themselves:

"The Obama administration not only failed to protect Israel against this gang-up at the U.N., it colluded with it behind the scenes."

Antagonizing our allies is not much of a foreign policy strategy. This is betrayal of the worst kind. Anti-Israel policies will not be tolerated. We are partners in this world and allies in democracy. I urge my colleagues to stand with Israel and support this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's bipartisan measure. There are no shortcuts to peace. Only the Israelis and the Palestinians can resolve their complicated differences through direct negotiation. That is why it has been longstanding policy to defend our ally Israel against one-sided U.N. Security Council resolutions seeking to impose solutions.

Last year, Congresswoman GRANGER and I led a letter to President Obama signed by 394 Members of this body

cautioning against one-sided U.N. initiatives that dangerously hinder the prospects for resuming direct negotiations. I believe the administration's abstention is a stain on our country's long and consistent record.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank our chair of the committee and our ranking member.

I am here to stand with Israel. The question of the best way to do that is one of legitimate debate. It is a debate that we are having here in the House. It is a debate that the folks in Israel are having there. There is no question that the resolution before us is not the one that everyone would have written, or the one that was before the U.N. was the one everyone would have written. There is no question that there is fault on the side of the Palestinians with respect to coming to the table for peace.

But here is the question that is starting to really make an impact on the possibility of achieving the two-state solution that both sides by and large believe is essential, and that is something that is within the control of the Israeli Government: Will it continue to intensify the support for settlements in the West Bank? If it does, as it has been, there are 600,000 settlers now between the West Bank and east Jerusalem. If it continues to do that, it makes as a practical matter it virtually impossible the land-for-peace swap that we know is essential to get to a two-state solution. That is the practical challenge that we have.

We are all friends of Israel. All of us here believe in a Jewish state and a democratic state.

The second issue of major concern that is discussed in Israel as well as here is the fact that demographics are going to catch up and cause a real crisis in Israel to maintain that Jewish identity and that democratic tradition. There are 4.5 million Arabs who live between the West Bank and in Israel proper. There are 6.5 million Jewish citizens. If there is not some resolution, at some point a decision has to be made to maintain the Jewish character at the expense of democratic ideals or compromise democratic ideals in order to maintain that Jewish identity.

The Israeli State has a proud, strong tradition of being democratic, of being reliable, of standing up for civil and human rights. Many there, and some of us here, believe settlements are an impediment to that tradition.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

A couple of weeks ago I stood in the Judea/Sumeria area in the West Bank speaking with numerous out of thousands of Palestinians working in factories, those who earn three times the

salary that they would under the Palestinian Authority. They don't want their proudly made products boycotted. They don't want to lose their jobs. They don't want disruptive Palestinian Authority leaders to always speak for them—whose own area has 40 percent unemployment and no opportunity.

The Obama administration had 8 years to show their true colors. But when they didn't get their way, they insecurely, naively, and cowardly lashed out at our greatest and strongest ally in the Middle East.

Women, religious minorities, LGBT, and Jews would not have equal rights, democracy, or peace in a Palestinian country. In fact, the Palestinian Authority punishes Palestinians by death if they sell their land to the Jewish people lawfully.

The current administration has used the United Nations to both legitimize a profoundly flawed Iran deal and delegitimize Israel. To think that settlements are the only thing that stands in front of peace is dangerously naive.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the bipartisan Royce-Engel resolution. I urge my colleagues to stand with Israel and to stand with the Palestinians in the West Bank.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my friend on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, in April of last year, 394 Members of this House sent a letter to the President urging him to oppose and veto if necessary any one-sided United Nations resolutions. Unfortunately, the resolution that passed the Security Council resolution without our veto was exactly that. It was one-sided.

The resolution contained no fewer than five provisions on Israeli settlement activity. It calls the Jewish neighborhoods of Jerusalem illegal, and it characterizes Jews praying at the Western Wall as being in flagrant violation of international law.

But even if you choose to accept every provision on settlement activity, the resolution included only one very general statement about violence. The U.N., which is historically biased against Israel, could not even condemn Palestinian terrorism against Israel as an obstacle to peace. It is, and the U.N. must acknowledge it. That is not balanced. It is one-sided.

Today's resolution clearly supports the goal of two states: a Jewish democratic State of Israel living next to a demilitarized Palestinian state as it stands against one-sided U.N. resolutions to take us further than this goal. Please support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all friends of Israel, but that friendship requires

more than demonizing the United Nations and the Obama administration. In fact, it requires the facing of hard truths, the destructive effect of incitement and violence on the Palestinian side, which the U.N. resolution explicitly acknowledges, and the threat to peace and to any conceivable two-state solution by relentless settlement expansion on the Israeli side, pushed by the right wing, unchallenged by H. Res. 11.

The majority, seeking to push this resolution through, has displayed little interest in what it would take actually to achieve peace, choosing instead to distort the history, to impugn the motives of those attempting to achieve peace. It is not worthy of this body. I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

When an unfair, one-sided resolution moves forward in the U.N., as Israel's ally, we have an obligation to say it is wrong. That is what this resolution does. This resolution also calls for a two-state solution. So my colleagues who are somehow portraying this resolution as not being for a two-state resolution, they are absolutely wrong.

I urge my colleagues, especially my Democratic colleagues, to continue to support the U.S.-Israel alliance, and you continue to support it by voting for this resolution. This is a fair resolution.

Let's remember, when Israel left Gaza and uprooted settlements, what did it get in return? Not peace, but terrorism. Stand with the people of Israel. Vote "yes" on this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in short, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 has harmed our ally Israel. It has harmed the prospects for peace. It is one-sided. It is an anti-Israel resolution, the kind of which it has been longstanding U.S. policy to veto within the U.N. Security Council, and it is not hard to see why because this resolution opens the door for those who want to impose boycott, divestment, or other sanctions measures against Israel or against Israeli companies. And, in essence, it declares Judaism's holiest site, the Western Wall, as occupied territory.

Mr. Speaker, this is reminiscent of another action by the United Nations, the infamous "Zionism is racism" resolution whose damage took decades to undo.

Fortunately, the bipartisan rejection of the President's U.N. decision provides an opportunity for the House to rally around a more constructive policy and renewed U.S. leadership in the region.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution so that the bipartisan policy of rejecting this harmful U.N. Security

Council resolution and encouraging direct negotiation is endorsed loud and clear. It is far past time for the incitement to stop and the budgeting of \$300 million by the Palestinian Authority to pay people to slay Israeli civilians be discontinued.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the bipartisan House Resolution 11 expressing opposition to UNSCR 2334.

In the summer of 1983 I visited the Western Wall in Jerusalem, Judaism's most holy site, for the first time. Merely 17 years earlier I could not have gone to the Wall, or for that matter anywhere in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem.

From 1949 to 1967, when Jordan occupied Jerusalem, Jews could not visit the one place where for nearly 2000 years, they had continuously made a personal connection to their faith and their history.

It is impossible to separate Jewish identity from the Western Wall, just as it is impossible to separate the Western Wall from its Jewish identity, or Jerusalem from the Jewish State of Israel.

Yet this is exactly what has been happening in the United Nations for years, and exactly what the one-sided UN Resolution sought to do.

In addition to seeking to declare the eastern part of Jerusalem a settlement, the resolution overwhelmingly assigns blame to Israel, while averting direct criticism of Palestinian incitement and violence.

That is why last month I strongly urged President Obama to veto the resolution.

The U.S. has, and must continue to seek a sustainable two-state solution with a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security.

But the only path to two states is through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties. Efforts to force a solution at the U.N. or to internationalize the issue are misguided, and risk moving peace further away, not closer.

Israel is our most important strategic ally in a most important and chaotic region of the world. The United States always has and always will ensure the security of Israel.

As an original co-sponsor, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 11.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 11.

I'd like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for bringing this resolution to the Floor.

Your continued bipartisan support for our friend and ally, Israel, sets the right tone for any discussion this body has regarding this vital relationship.

Almost 70 years ago, on May 14, 1948, with the support of fiercely Democratic president, Harry Truman, the nation of Israel was born.

Created in the aftermath of World War II, the special relationship that our two countries now enjoy was founded. For 70 years, our government has supported Israeli interest because they represent American interest.

Throughout the decades, from Dwight Eisenhower to Barack Obama, from the great Texan, and Speaker Sam Rayburn to Speaker RYAN, our government has worked across

party lines and across branches of government to ensure the one, true democracy in the Middle East is able to grow and prosper without hindrance.

Recently, we have reaffirmed our support for Israel by signing a new Memorandum of Understanding and resoundingly telling the world that we support our ally in the Middle East. UNSCR 2334 does not align with this affirmation.

It should be the policy of the United States to support a viable two-state solution, where Palestinians and Israelis live in prosperity and security. This does not mean negotiating out of fear or forced necessity.

I want to, again, express my gratitude and appreciation for this body and our friends on the Foreign Affairs Committee for leading by example.

U.S.-Israeli relations have always been bipartisan and should remain that way. It is my hope the new Administration will build on the foundation created by the Presidents and elected officials that came before us and support Israel in a bipartisan fashion.

I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 11.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, any measure that seeks to promote a peaceful resolution to tensions between Israelis and Palestinians—whether coming from the United Nations or from this Chamber—should provide a balanced picture of the facts on the ground and the challenges confronting both sides. The recent UN Security Resolution on Israeli settlements failed that test by blaming Israel almost solely for impeding a two-states solution for peace and by using prejudicial language that places an unfair burden on Israel in depicting the basis for future negotiations. Calling any settlement activity by Israel since 1967 a major obstacle to peace, as the UN resolution does, ignores the reality that geographical adjustments will have to be made as part of any two-states solution reached by parties through direct negotiations.

However, the resolution before us today is also not balanced in that it too ignores conditions on the ground. Expressing the sense of Congress to repeal the UN Resolution does not focus on the increasingly fragile state of the two-states solution, and on conditions that make its potential achievement increasingly difficult to obtain. Prime Minister Netanyahu has called his government the most pro-settlement in history. President-elect Trump further diminishes chances for the two-states solution by choosing envoys who undercut the prospects for peace by expressing support for major settlement expansions, and whose opposition to a two-states solution reinforces opposition within the Israeli government. These positions threaten to continue to move momentum dangerously away from the possibility of a two-states solution.

I believe that the two-states approach, as challenging as it is to achieve, is the only way to ensure a Jewish and democratic state of Israel living in security with a non-militarized Palestinian state. It is important for peace in the Middle East and U.S. national interests.

This resolution is at present the only vehicle to express my concerns with the UN resolution, and I will therefore support it. However, I will continue to speak out on further actions that I believe will diminish the chance of a two-states solution and on other issues vital to peace in the Middle East.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 11, Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. On December 23, 2016, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 2334 which describes Israeli settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem as illegal, with the United States abstaining from the vote.

Now, U.S. Congress has chosen to disapprove of President Obama's leadership and longstanding U.S. foreign policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. UNSC Resolution 2334 merely reiterates the international community consensus and bipartisan U.S. policy that building settlements impedes the path to a lasting peaceful two-state solution. H. Res. 11 asserts that the UNSCR is "anti-Israel" and "one-sided," but it does not break new ground or create any new policy. For example, in 1987, the Reagan administration abstained and allowed the passage of UNSCR 605, reaffirming the application of the Geneva Convention which included Jerusalem in the "Palestinian and Arab Territories, occupied by Israel since 1967."

Instead, I am urging support of an alternative resolution introduced and led by Congressman DAVID PRICE. Instead of disapproving of a resolution that reaffirms longstanding U.S. policy, Congress would work towards the progress of a two-state solution. H. Res. 11 would undermine our decades-long efforts towards a peaceful situation between Israelis and Palestinians and it is not the best way to show our support for Israel, our strong ally. Our goal must be to reaffirm U.S. policy in the Middle East and to find solutions with the international community.

We must be steadfast in our commitment to a two-state solution and to longstanding U.S. policy. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose H. Res. 11 and to support the alternative resolution introduced by Congressman PRICE.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for peace in the Middle East and between Israel and the Palestinians. That is why I am for a two-state solution and the end to new Israeli settlements.

However, the one-sided UN Security Council Resolution 2334 issued last month would declare the Western Wall and some Jewish holy sites, where many Jews live and pray, illegally occupied territory.

I am voting for H. Res. 11 today because the United States should veto any UN resolution that would require Israel to give away the Western Wall or the Jewish Quarters of Jerusalem. What the United States should encourage is an end to new settlements, a two-state solution and direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. That is the only framework that can lead to a just and lasting peace.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against H. Res. 11, the Object to UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 2334 as Obstacle

to Israeli-Palestinian Peace resolution. The resolution expresses the House's disapproval of UNSC Resolution 2334, which passed 14 to 0 with the United States abstaining from the vote.

H. Res. 11 mischaracterizes the UN resolution and falsely claims that the United States has never abstained from votes on similar resolutions. The UN resolution reaffirms that Israel's settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem are a "major obstacle" to peace, which has been long-standing US policy. H. Res. 11 states that the Obama Administration took an unprecedented step by abstaining from the vote when in fact the decision is not unique. The Reagan Administration took a similar step when it abstained from voting on UNSCR 605 that identified Jerusalem as part of the Palestinian and Arab Territories which is now occupied by Israel. Both Republican and Democratic presidents have continued similar U.S. policies.

Representatives PRICE, ENGEL and CONNOLLY offered a more balanced resolution as an amendment to H. Res. 11, but unfortunately House leadership refused to allow it a vote. The text of the amendment is now H. Res. 23, of which I am a cosponsor.

H. Res. 23 supports the longstanding policy that it is in the best interest of the international community that a two-state solution is reached only through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. It reiterates United States support for Israel by opposing any outside efforts to impose a solution on the parties but rather to help facilitate peace negotiations. It includes continued opposition to the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign which calls for boycotting certain products and companies, divesting from various organizations, and encouraging the use of sanctions against Israel.

I have always supported a two-state solution with Israel and a Palestinian state through direct negotiations between the two parties. As an ally of Israel, the United States has an interest to ensure a lasting peace is reached between Israel and Palestine. Let me be clear, while I support the United States' strong relationship and alliance with Israel, Israel's proliferation of settlements around the West Bank and East Jerusalem is directly at odds with establishing a two-state solution.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I remain committed to a two-state solution, where a Jewish state of Israel and a Palestinian state can co-exist in peace. The best path to ultimately achieving this peace is through direct, bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, not imposed solutions by international organizations. Instead of this Administration concluding its strong Israel record with the single largest pledge of military assistance in U.S. history, it chose to end on a perplexing note by choosing not to veto United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

The expansion of settlements in occupied territory has been long recognized on a bipartisan basis and in U.S. policy for decades as doing little to improve the confidence of Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated. United Nations action does not help advance the cause of peace, nor does it bring about direct negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians so they might resolve their complicated differences and find a much needed, lasting two-state solution, which I have supported my entire career.

Any action, whether coming from the United Nations or the Congress, must provide a complete picture of the facts on the ground and full appreciation for the challenges confronting all sides. Like the one-sided resolution from the United Nations Security Council, H. Res. 11 too ignores the reality of the conditions on the ground. While I don't believe either resolution is balanced, I am voting in favor of H. Res. 11 to express my displeasure with the actions of the UN, which make direct negotiations all the more difficult to resume. I will continue to speak out in support of efforts that lay the foundation for peace in the Middle East and vigorously oppose those that undermine a lasting two state solution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 342, nays 80, answered "present" 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—342

Abraham	Cole	Gottheimer
Adams	Collins (GA)	Gowdy
Aderholt	Comer	Granger
Aguilar	Comstock	Graves (GA)
Allen	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Amodei	Cook	Graves (MO)
Arrington	Cooper	Green, Gene
Babin	Correa	Griffith
Bacon	Costa	Grothman
Banks (IN)	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Barletta	Courtney	Hanabusa
Barr	Cramer	Harper
Barragán	Crawford	Harris
Barton	Crowley	Hartzler
Beatty	Cuellar	Hastings
Bera	Culberson	Hensarling
Bergman	Cummings	Hice, Jody B.
Beutler	Curbelo (FL)	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	Davidson	Higgins (NY)
Billirakis	Davis (CA)	Hill
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Rodney	Himes
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Holding
Black	DeBene	Hollingsworth
Blackburn	Demings	Hoyer
Blum	Denham	Hudson
Bonamici	Dent	Huizenga
Bost	DeSantis	Hultgren
Boyle, Brendan	DesJarlais	Hunter
F.	Deutch	Hurd
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Brady (TX)	Donovan	Jackson Lee
Brat	Duffy	Jeffries
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Brown (MD)	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Brownley (CA)	Españillat	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Esty	Jordan
Buck	Farenthold	Joyce (OH)
Bucshon	Faso	Katko
Budd	Ferguson	Keating
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Byrne	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Flores	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Fortenberry	Khanna
Carter (GA)	Fox	Kilmer
Carter (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Kind
Cartwright	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	King (NY)
Chabot	Gaetz	Kinzing
Chaffetz	Gallagher	Knight
Cheney	Garrett	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Gibbs	Kustoff (TN)
Clarke (NY)	Gonzalez (TX)	Labrador
Cleaver	Goodlatte	LaHood
Coffman	Gosar	LaMalfa

Lamborn	Olson	Sewell (AL)
Lance	Palazzo	Sherman
Langevin	Pallone	Shimkus
Larsen (WA)	Palmer	Shuster
Latta	Panetta	Simpson
Lawrence	Pascarell	Sinema
Lawson (FL)	Paulsen	Sires
Levin	Pearce	Smith (MO)
Lewis (MN)	Perlmutter	Smith (NE)
Lieu, Ted	Perry	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Peters	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Long	Pittenger	Smucker
Loudermilk	Poe (TX)	Soto
Love	Poliquin	Stefanik
Lowey	Polis	Stewart
Lucas	Posey	Stivers
Luetkemeyer	Price, Tom (GA)	Suozi
Lujan Grisham, M.	Quigley	Taylor
Luján, Ben Ray	Raskin	Tenney
MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)
Maloney,	Reed	Thornberry
Carolyn B.	Reichert	Tiberi
Maloney, Sean	Renacci	Tipton
Marchant	Rice (NY)	Titus
Marino	Rice (SC)	Torres
Marshall	Richmond	Trott
Massie	Roby	Turner
Mast	Roe (TN)	Upton
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Valadao
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
McCaul	Rohrabacher	Veasey
McClintock	Rokita	Vela
McEachin	Rooney, Francis	Velázquez
McHenry	Rooney, Thomas	Visclosky
McKinley	J.	Wagner
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Rodgers	Rosen	Walden
McSally	Roskam	Walker
Meadows	Ross	Walorski
Meehan	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi
Meng	Rouzer	Walz
Messer	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Mitchell	Royce (CA)	Schultz
Moolenaar	Ruiz	Weber (TX)
Mooney (WV)	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Moulton	Russell	Wenstrup
Mullin	Rutherford	Westerman
Mulvaney	Ryan (OH)	Williams
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Wilson (SC)
Nadler	Sarbanes	Wittman
Napolitano	Scalise	Womack
Neal	Schiff	Woodall
Newhouse	Schneider	Yoder
Noem	Schweikert	Yoho
Norcross	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Nunes	Scott, David	Young (IA)
O'Halleran	Sensenbrenner	Zeldin
	Sessions	Zinke

NAYS—80

Amash	Duncan (TN)	McCollum
Bass	Ellison	McGovern
Beyer	Eshoo	McNerney
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Meeks
Blumenauer	Gabbard	Moore
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	Nolan
Bustos	Gohmert	O'Rourke
Butterfield	Green, Al	Payne
Carbajal	Grijalva	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Castro (TX)	Heck	Pocan
Chu, Judy	Huffman	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Schakowsky
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Serrano
Cohen	Jones	Slaughter
Connolly	Kaptur	Speier
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Kihuen	Takano
DeFazio	Kildee	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lee	Tsongas
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Waters, Maxine
Doggett	Loebach	Watson Coleman
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Welch
F.	Lynch	Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Capuano	Lofgren
Evans	Shea-Porter

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra	Franks (AZ)	Rush
Collins (NY)	Gallego	
Crist	Pompeo	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1905

Mr. CASTRO of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. TIBERI and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 11.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO COMMEMORATE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF SHOOTING IN TUCSON

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues from Arizona and around the country, to commemorate the sixth anniversary of the January 8, 2011, shooting in Tucson that killed six people and wounded 13 more.

Six years ago this week, Congresswoman Giffords was sworn into office, just like we were 3 days ago. Six years ago this week, she headed home to her district, just like we all will tomorrow. And 6 years ago, on Sunday, she was engaging in one of the most fundamental activities of representative government by meeting with her constituents to hear their thoughts, concerns, and ideas, just like we will all do in the days ahead.

As Representatives, we each carry out this critical discourse when home in our districts. Its exercise is vital to our free society, which is why this shooting wasn't just an attack on Tucson, but this body and our very democratic foundations.

The attack marked the first time in our country's history that an assassination attempt was made on a congressional Member while engaging with her constituents. It also is remembered as the first assassination of a congressional staffer, Gabe Zimmerman, in the line of duty.

As we remember those we lost, we also reflect on the renewed sense of compassion and civility that emerged from this tragedy. This weekend, in Tucson, we will commemorate how our community came together to support those grieving and provide an example of courage and unity that the entire country can follow.

It is in this spirit of unity that we stand here for a moment of silence to recognize the six lives that were cut tragically short that day:

Nine-year-old Christina Taylor Green;

Dorothy Morris;
Judge John Roll;
Phyllis Schneck;
Dorwan Stoddard; and
Congressional staffer Gabriel “Gabe” Zimmerman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will observe a moment of silence.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 26.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1910

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-1 offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-1 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MESSER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CONYERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—235

Abraham	Gallagher	Mitchell
Aderholt	Garrett	Moolenaar
Allen	Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Amash	Gohmert	Mullin
Amodei	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Arrington	Gosar	Newhouse
Babin	Gowdy	Noem
Bacon	Granger	Nunes
Banks (IN)	Graves (GA)	Olson
Barletta	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Barr	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Barton	Griffith	Paulsen
Bergman	Grothman	Pearce
Beutler	Guthrie	Perry
Biggs	Harper	Peterson
Bilirakis	Harris	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Poliquin
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Blackburn	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Blum	Hill	Reed
Bost	Holding	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Renacci
Brat	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Huizenga	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hurd	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Issa	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Francis
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Thomas
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	J.
Calvert	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Roskam
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Ross
Chabot	Katko	Rothfus
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)
Coffman	King (IA)	Russell
Cole	King (NY)	Rutherford
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Sanford
Comer	Knight	Scalise
Comstock	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Conaway	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cook	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Cramer	Lamborn	Shimkus
Crawford	Lance	Shuster
Culberson	Latta	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Lewis (MN)	Smith (MO)
Davidson	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Long	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
DeSantis	Love	Smucker
DesJarlais	Lucas	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Donovan	MacArthur	Stivers
Duffy	Marchant	Taylor
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Tenney
Duncan (TN)	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Dunn	Massie	Thornberry
Emmer	Mast	Tiberi
Farenthold	McCarthy	Tipton
Faso	McCauley	Trott
Ferguson	McClintock	Turner
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Upton
Fleischmann	McKinley	Valadao
Flores	McMorris	Wagner
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Walberg
Fox	McSally	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Walker
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Walorski
Gaetz	Messer	Walters, Mimi

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Crowley
Denham
Gallego

□ 1914

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Stated against:
Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

AYES—193

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NOES—230

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Bergman
Beutler
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost

Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren

Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)

□ 1918

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis J.
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 233, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—190

Adams	Gabbard	Neal
Aguilar	Garamendi	Nolan
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Bass	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Beatty	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bera	Green, Gene	Pallone
Beyer	Grijalva	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pelosi
Bonamici	Heck	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Peters
F.	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Bustos	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jones	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Cartwright	Keating	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Costa	Lee	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sinema
Crist	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Loebach	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Suozi
DeFazio	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,	Takano
Delaney	M.	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lynch	Titus
Demings	Maloney,	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dingell	Matsui	Veasey
Doggett	McCollum	Vela
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Velázquez
F.	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Eshoo	Meeks	Wasserman
Espallat	Meng	Schultz
Esty	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NOES—233

Abraham	Bost	Comer
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Comstock
Allen	Brat	Conaway
Amash	Bridenstine	Cook
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Babin	Buchanan	Crawford
Bacon	Buck	Culberson
Banks (IN)	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Barletta	Budd	Davidson
Barr	Burgess	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Byrne	Dent
Bergman	Calvert	DeSantis
Beutler	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Chabot	Donovan
Bishop (MI)	Chaffetz	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	Duncan (SC)
Black	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Cole	Dunn
Blum	Collins (GA)	Ellison

Emmer	Lamborn	Rooney, Thomas
Farenthold	Lance	J.
Faso	Latta	Roskam
Ferguson	Lewis (MN)	Ross
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Long	Rouzer
Flores	Loudermilk	Royce (CA)
Fortenberry	Love	Russell
Fox	Lucas	Rutherford
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Scalise
Gaetz	Marchant	Schweikert
Gallagher	Marino	Scott, Austin
Garrett	Marshall	Sensenbrenner
Gibbs	Massie	Sessions
Gohmert	Mast	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Shuster
Gosar	McCauley	Simpson
Gowdy	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Granger	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Graves (LA)	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Smucker
Griffith	McSally	Stefanik
Grothman	Meadows	Stewart
Guthrie	Meehan	Stivers
Harper	Messer	Taylor
Harris	Mitchell	Tenney
Hartzler	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry
Hice, Jody B.	Mullin	Tiberi
Higgins (LA)	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
Hill	Newhouse	Trott
Holding	Noem	Turner
Hollingsworth	Nunes	Upton
Hudson	Olson	Valadao
Huizenga	Palazzo	Wagner
Hultgren	Palmer	Walberg
Hunter	Paulsen	Walden
Hurd	Pearce	Walker
Issa	Perry	Walorski
Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Walters, Mimi
Johnson (LA)	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Poliquin	Webster (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Posey	Wenstrup
Jordan	Ratcliffe	Westerman
Joyce (OH)	Reed	Williams
Katko	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Kelly (MS)	Renacci	Wittman
Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)	Womack
King (IA)	Roby	Woodall
King (NY)	Roe (TN)	Yoder
Kinzie	Rogers (AL)	Yoho
Knight	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)
Kustoff (TN)	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)
Labrador	Rokita	Zeldin
LaHood	Rooney, Francis	Zinke
LaMalfa		

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Jenkins (KS)	Rush
Collins (NY)	Mulvaney	Torres
Denham	Pompeo	
Gallego	Price, Tom (GA)	

□ 1921

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 232, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

AYES—186

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Napolitano
Aguilar	Fudge	Neal
Barragán	Gabbard	Nolan
Bass	Garamendi	Norcross
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bera	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa	Payne
Bonamici	Hastings	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Perlmutter
F.	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Polis
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Quigley
Capuano	Jeffries	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rosen
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Sánchez
Cicilline	Kihuen	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schneider
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Lawrence	Sherman
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Costa	Lee	Sires
Courtney	Levin	Slaughter
Crist	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Cuellar	Lipinski	Speier
Cummings	Loebach	Suozi
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takano
DeFazio	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	M.	Titus
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DelBene	Lynch	Torres
Demings	Maloney,	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Dingell	Matsui	Vela
Doggett	McCollum	Velázquez
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Visclosky
F.	McGovern	Walz
Engel	McNerney	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meeks	Schultz
Espallat	Meng	Watson Coleman
Esty	Moore	Welch
Evans	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
	Nadler	

NOES—232

Abraham	Budd	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Burgess	Dunn
Allen	Byrne	Emmer
Amash	Calvert	Farenthold
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Faso
Arrington	Carter (TX)	Ferguson
Babin	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Bacon	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Banks (IN)	Cheney	Flores
Barletta	Coffman	Fortenberry
Barr	Cole	Fox
Barton	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Bergman	Comer	Frelinghuysen
Beutler	Conaway	Gaetz
Biggs	Cook	Gallagher
Bilirakis	Costello (PA)	Garrett
Bishop (MI)	Cramer	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gohmert
Black	Culberson	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Gosar
Blum	Davidson	Gowdy
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Granger
Brady (TX)	Denham	Graves (GA)
Brat	Dent	Graves (LA)
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Griffith
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Buchanan	Donovan	Guthrie
Buck	Duffy	Harper
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Harris

Cooper	Kennedy	Pingree	Lucas	Posey	Smucker	Evans	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Correa	Khanha	Pocan	Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Foster	Loeb	Ruiz
Costa	Kihuen	Polis	MacArthur	Reed	Stewart	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kildee	Price (NC)	Marchant	Reichert	Stivers	Fudge	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Crist	Kilmer	Quigley	Marino	Renacci	Taylor	Gabbard	Lowe	Sánchez
Crowley	Kind	Raskin	Marshall	Rice (SC)	Tenney	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham,	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)	Massie	Roby	Thompson (PA)	Gonzalez (TX)	M.	Schakowsky
Cummings	Kuster (NH)	Richmond	Mast	Roe (TN)	Thornberry	Gottheimer	Luján, Ben Ray	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rosen	McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi	Green, Al	Lynch	Schneider
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Tipton	Green, Gene	Maloney,	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruiz	McClintock	Rohrabacher	Trott	Grijalva	Carolyn B.	Scott, David
DeGette	Lawrence	Ruppersberger	McHenry	Rokita	Turner	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Delaney	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)	McKinley	Rooney, Francis	Upton	Hanabusa	Matsui	Sewell (AL)
DeLauro	Lee	Sánchez	McMorris	Rooney, Thomas	Valadao	Hastings	McCollum	Shea-Porter
DelBene	Levin	Sarbanes	Rodgers	J.	Wagner	Heck	McEachin	Sherman
Demings	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky	McSally	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg	Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Sinema
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Schiff	Meadows	Roskam	Walden	Himes	McNerney	Sires
Deutch	Lipinski	Schneider	Meehan	Ross	Walker	Hoyer	Meeks	Slaughter
Dingell	Loeb	Scott (VA)	Messer	Rothfus	Walorski	Huffman	Meng	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Lofgren	Scott, David	Mitchell	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi	Jackson Lee	Moore	Smith (WA)
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Serrano	Moolenaar	Royce (CA)	Weber (TX)	Jayapal	Moulton	Soto
F.	Lowe	Sewell (AL)	Mooney (WV)	Russell	Webster (FL)	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Ellison	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter	Mullin	Rutherford	Suostrup	Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Suostrup
Engel	M.	Sherman	Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Westerman	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Neal
Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema	Newhouse	Scalise	Williams	Jones	Neal	Nolan
Espallat	Lynch	Sires	Noem	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)	Kaptur	Nolan	Norcross
Esty	Maloney,	Slaughter	Nunes	Scott, Austin	Wittman	Keating	Norcross	O'Halleran
Evans	Carolyn B.	Smith (WA)	Olson	Sensenbrenner	Womack	Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	O'Rourke
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Soto	Palazzo	Sessions	Woodall	Kennedy	Pallone	Panetta
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Speier	Palmer	Shimkus	Yoder	Khanna	Pascrell	Pascrell
Fudge	McCollum	Suostrup	Paulsen	Shuster	Yoho	Kihuen	Payne	Pelosi
Gabbard	McEachin	Swalwell (CA)	Pearce	Simpson	Young (AK)	Kildee	Perlmutter	Peters
Garamendi	McGovern	Takano	Perry	Smith (MO)	Young (IA)	Kilmer	Peters	Peterson
Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney	Thompson (CA)	Pittenger	Smith (NE)	Zinke	Kind	Richmond	Rosen
Gottheimer	Meeks	Thompson (MS)	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)		Krishnamoorthi	Lipinski	
Green, Al	Meng	Titus	Poliquin	Smith (TX)		Langevin		
Green, Gene	Moore	Tonko				Larsen (WA)		
Grijalva	Moulton	Torres				Larson (CT)		
Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas				Lawrence		
Hanabusa	Nadler	Vargas				Lawson (FL)		
Hastings	Napolitano	Veasey				Lee		
Heck	Neal	Vela				Levin		
Higgins (NY)	Nolan	Velázquez				Lewis (GA)		
Himes	Norcross	Visclosky				Lieu, Ted		
Hoyer	O'Halleran	Walz						
Huffman	O'Rourke	Wasserman						
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Schultz						
Jayapal	Panetta	Waters, Maxine						
Jeffries	Pascrell	Watson Coleman						
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Welch						
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)						
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Yarmuth						
Keating	Peters							
Kelly (IL)	Peterson							

NOES—234

Abraham	Comstock	Grothman
Aderholt	Conaway	Guthrie
Allen	Cook	Harper
Amash	Costello (PA)	Harris
Amodei	Cramer	Hartzer
Arrington	Culberson	Hensarling
Babin	Curbelo (FL)	Hice, Jody B.
Bacon	Davidson	Higgins (LA)
Banks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Hill
Barletta	Dennham	Holding
Barr	Dent	Hollingsworth
Barton	DeSantis	Hudson
Bergman	DesJarlais	Huizenga
Beutler	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Biggs	Donovan	Hunter
Bilirakis	Duffy	Hurd
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Black	Dunn	Johnson (LA)
Blackburn	Emmer	Johnson (OH)
Blum	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Bost	Faso	Jones
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	Jordan
Brat	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (OH)
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Fox	King (IA)
Buck	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger
Budd	Gaetz	Knight
Burgess	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Byrne	Garrett	Labrador
Calvert	Gibbs	LaHood
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Chabot	Gosar	Lance
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Latta
Cheney	Granger	Lewis (MN)
Coffman	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Cole	Graves (LA)	Long
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Comer	Griffith	Love

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra Gallego Pompeo
Collins (NY) Jenkins (KS) Price, Tom (GA)
Crawford Mulvaney Rush

□ 1932

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 231, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

AYES—194

Adams	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Barragán	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bass	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Beatty	Cicilline	Delaney
Bera	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Demings
Blunt Rochester	Cleaver	Denham
Bonamici	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	Deutch
F.	Connolly	Dingell
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Doggett
Brown (MD)	Cooper	Doyle, Michael
Brownley (CA)	Correa	F.
Bustos	Costa	Duncan (TN)
Butterfield	Courtney	Ellison
Capuano	Crist	Engel
Carbajal	Crowley	Eshoo
Cárdenas	Cuellar	Espallat
Carson (IN)	Cummings	Esty

Abraham	Curbelo (FL)	Issa
Aderholt	Davidson	Jenkins (WV)
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)
Amash	Dent	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	DeSantis	Johnson, Sam
Arrington	DesJarlais	Jordan
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)
Bacon	Donovan	Katko
Banks (IN)	Duffy	Kelly (MS)
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Dunn	King (IA)
Barton	Emmer	King (NY)
Bergman	Farenthold	Kinzinger
Beutler	Faso	Knight
Biggs	Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bishop (MI)	Fleischmann	LaHood
Bishop (UT)	Flores	LaMalfa
Black	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Blackburn	Fox	Lance
Blum	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Bost	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (MN)
Brady (TX)	Gaetz	Long
Brat	Gallagher	Loudermilk
Bridenstine	Garrett	Love
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Lucas
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Buchanan	Goodlatte	MacArthur
Buck	Gosar	Marchant
Bucshon	Gowdy	Marino
Budd	Granger	Marshall
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Massie
Byrne	Graves (LA)	Mast
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McClintock
Chabot	Guthrie	McHenry
Chaffetz	Harper	McKinley
Cheney	Harris	McMorris
Coffman	Hartzer	Rodgers
Cole	Hensarling	McSally
Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Meehan
Comstock	Hill	Messer
Conaway	Holding	Mitchell
Cook	Hollingsworth	Moolenaar
Costello (PA)	Mooney (WV)	Hudson
Cramer	Huizenga	Mullin
Crawford	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Culberson	Hunter	Newhouse
	Hurd	Noem

NOES—231

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi

Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego

Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo

Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 1936

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

AYES—190

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo

Españat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy

Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff

Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swallow (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Beutler
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)

Dunn
Emmer
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelighuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance

Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Clyburn
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker

Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego

Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo

Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 1940

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

AYES—193

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy

Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy

Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters

Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rosen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Rumpersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter

NOES—232

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Beutler
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Cheney
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Farenthold
 Faso
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann

Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hensarling
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd
 Issa
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lewis (MN)
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Marshall
 Mast
 McCarthy

McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Murphy (PA)
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Baretta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Beutler
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Cheney
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer

Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden

Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)

Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
 Collins (NY)
 Gallego

Jenkins (KS)
 Mulvaney
 Pompeo

Price, Tom (GA)
 Rush

□ 1944

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

AYES—230

Abraham
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Beutler
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Cheney
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer

Crawford
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Farenthold
 Faso
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hensarling
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill

Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd
 Issa
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lewis (MN)
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Marshall
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley

McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Murphy (PA)
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney, Francis
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce (CA)
 Walker
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor

NOES—193

Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Barragan
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty
 Evans
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)

Fudge
 Gabbard
 Garamendi
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hanabusa
 Hastings
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano

Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halloran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rosen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Rumpersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Speier
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Jenkins (KS)	Price, Tom (GA)
Collins (NY)	Mulvaney	Rush
Culberson	Pompeo	
Gallego	Price (NC)	

□ 1948

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and, pursuant to House Resolution 22, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in 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 reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Murphy of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 26 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 7. EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES THAT PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION BY INSURANCE ISSUERS AGAINST DEPENDENTS UNDER THE AGE OF 26.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall apply in the case of any rule that pertains to prohibiting an insurance issuer from eliminating, weakening, or reducing health coverage benefits for dependents under the age of 26.

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If the amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Like a number of my new colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I was not a Member of Congress in 2010 when Congress enacted the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The law has now been in place for nearly 7 years, and it has become part of the fabric of our health care system, fundamentally changing the way that we provide and pay for health care in this country.

The Members of this Chamber, our counterparts in the Senate, and the incoming President will soon have a binary choice to make, and the stakes for patients, physicians, hospitals, and health insurance providers could not be higher.

The choice is this: Will we retain the many provisions in the Affordable Care Act that are functioning well and work together in a bipartisan manner to reform, refine, and rectify those provisions that need improvement; or, on the other hand, will we repeal the entire Affordable Care Act without a clear and comprehensive plan in place to replace the law with something as good or better, which is almost certain to cause chaos in our health care system and disrupt the lives and livelihoods of millions of our constituents?

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect; but I believe the responsible and moral course of action for this body is to strengthen the law, not repeal it. A look to historic precedent gives us guidance here. In the past, when Congress enacted important legislation, like Social Security or Medicare, designed to address serious national problems, it rarely gets it perfectly right the first time. Congress almost always needs to revisit the law down the line to observe how the law has operated in practice, to see who the law has helped or who it may have inadvertently harmed, to learn from that experience, and then, based on the evidence and the counsel of our constituents, to work across party lines to make any necessary improvements to the law. The perfect must never become the enemy of the good.

Just as in business, when your business plan runs into challenges, you don't scrap the whole plan; you make left and right adjustments along the way and keep moving forward toward your goals. Health care is too central to the lives of our constituents to be rebooted every few years in a partisan, haphazard manner.

My specific amendment is consistent with this broader philosophy. One of the most popular and well-functioning provisions of the Affordable Care Act is a provision requiring certain health insurance plans to allow young adults to

stay on their parents' health insurance plans until the age of 26. This provision has been particularly beneficial for my district in central Florida, which has one of the lowest median ages of any congressional district in the Sunshine State and which is home to the University of Central Florida—the Nation's second largest university, with over 63,000 enrolled students.

Prior to the Affordable Care Act, too many young adults in central Florida and around the country were uninsured either because they were not employed or because they were employed at jobs that did not provide affordable coverage or any coverage at all. If these young men and women were to become sick or get injured, the resulting medical bills could bankrupt them or their families. The Affordable Care Act sought to mitigate this risk, and the evidence indicates that it has done so successfully; and the American people have said, overwhelmingly, that they want to keep this popular provision.

Accordingly, my amendment would establish an exception to the REINS Act. It would ensure that any Federal regulation that executes or enforces the Affordable Care Act provision enabling young adults up to age 26 to obtain health insurance coverage through their parents' plans will not be annulled by Congress. By voting for my amendment, you will send a signal that you support this provision, which has benefited millions of our constituents whether they live in red States, blue States, or purple States.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

On the floor of this House in 2011, the President of the United States promised the American people "to reduce barriers to growth and investment . . . when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them."

But, Mr. Speaker, those were just President Obama's words. His actions were starkly different. Throughout the entire 8 years of the Obama administration, a flood of new, major regulations has been burying America's job creators and households at record levels; and to make matters worse, when Congress declined to legislate the President's misguided policies for him, he increasingly resorted to unilateral regulatory actions to legislate by executive fiat.

It is time to say, "Never again." The REINS Act, in one fell swoop, puts a stop to abuses like President Obama's and assures that Congress—the body to which the Constitution assigns the power to legislate—has the necessary tools to block the most overreaching

regulations and mandates on the American people.

This motion to recommit seeks only to distract from the urgent need to reform our regulatory system and reduce unnecessary burdens on the public. When health care reform regulations are adopted, they should be adopted with the approval of this body.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, reject this motion to recommit, and show America that Congress can act for the good of job creators and all Americans who desperately want and need jobs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

AYES—190

Adams	Delaney	Kind
Aguilar	DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi
Barragán	DeBene	Kuster (NH)
Bass	Demings	Langevin
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Bera	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Beyer	Dingell	Lawrence
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Lawson (FL)
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Lee
Blunt Rochester	F.	Levin
Bonomici	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Engel	Lieu, Ted
F.	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Espallat	Loeb sack
Brown (MD)	Esty	Lofgren
Brownley (CA)	Evans	Lowenthal
Bustos	Foster	Lowey
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham,
Capuano	Fudge	M.
Carbajal	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,
Cartwright	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	Matsui
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	McCollum
Ciicilline	Gutiérrez	McEachin
Clark (MA)	Hanabusa	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Hastings	McNerney
Clay	Heck	Meeks
Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Clyburn	Himes	Moore
Cohen	Hoyer	Moulton
Connolly	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Cooper	Jayapal	Napolitano
Correa	Jeffries	Neal
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Nolan
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Norcross
Crist	Kaptur	O'Halleran
Crowley	Keating	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Pallone
Cummings	Kennedy	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Khanna	Pascarell
Davis, Danny	Kihuen	Payne
DeFazio	Kildee	Pelosi
DeGette	Kilmer	Perlmutter

Peters	Schiff
Peterson	Schneider
Pingree	Scott (VA)
Pocan	Scott, David
Polis	Serrano
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)
Quigley	Shea-Porter
Raskin	Sherman
Rice (NY)	Sinema
Richmond	Sires
Rosen	Slaughter
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)
Ruiz	Soto
Ruppersberger	Speier
Ryan (OH)	Suozi
Sánchez	Swalwell (CA)
Sarbanes	Takano
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)

NOES—235

Abraham	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Gosar
Allen	Govdy
Amash	Granger
Amodei	Graves (GA)
Arrington	Graves (LA)
Babin	Graves (MO)
Bacon	Griffith
Banks (IN)	Grothman
Barletta	Guthrie
Barr	Harper
Barton	Harris
Bergman	Hartzler
Beutler	Hensarling
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Hill
Bishop (UT)	Holding
Black	Hollingsworth
Blackburn	Hudson
Blum	Huizenga
Bost	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Hunter
Brat	Hurd
Bridenstine	Issa
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)
Buck	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Jones
Budd	Jordan
Burgess	Joyce (OH)
Byrne	Katko
Calvert	Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	King (IA)
Chabot	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Kinzinger
Cheney	Knight
Coffman	Kustoff (TN)
Cole	Labrador
Collins (GA)	LaHood
Comer	LaMalfa
Comstock	Lamborn
Conaway	Lance
Cook	Latta
Costello (PA)	Lewis (MN)
Cramer	LoBiondo
Crawford	Long
Culberson	Loudermilk
Curbelo (FL)	Lover
Davidson	Lucas
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer
Denham	MacArthur
Dent	Marchant
DeSantis	Marino
DesJarlais	Marshall
Diaz-Balart	Massie
Donovan	Mast
Duffy	McCarthy
Duncan (SC)	McCaul
Duncan (TN)	McClintock
Dunn	McHenry
Emmer	McKinley
Farenthold	McMorris
Faso	Rodgers
Ferguson	McSally
Fitzpatrick	Meadows
Fleischmann	Meehan
Flores	Messer
Fortenberry	Mitchell
Foxen	Moolenaar
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)
Frelinghuysen	Mullin
Gaetz	Murphy (PA)
Gallagher	Newhouse
Garrett	Noem
Gibbs	Nunes
Gohmert	Olson

Thompson (MS)	Titus
	Tonko
	Torres
	Visclosky
	Walz
	Wasserman
	Schultz
	Waters, Maxine
	Watson Coleman
	Welch
	Wilson (FL)
	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra	Jenkins (KS)	Price, Tom (GA)
Collins (NY)	Mulvaney	Rush
Gallego	Pompeo	

□ 2005

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 187, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

AYES—237

Abraham	Faso	Luetkemeyer
Aderholt	Ferguson	MacArthur
Allen	Fitzpatrick	Marchant
Amash	Fleischmann	Marino
Amodei	Flores	Marshall
Arrington	Fortenberry	Massie
Babin	Fox	Mast
Bacon	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy
Banks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Barletta	Gaetz	McClintock
Barr	Gallagher	McHenry
Barton	Garrett	McKinley
Bergman	Gibbs	McMorris
Beutler	Gohmert	Rodgers
Biggs	Goodlatte	McSally
Bilirakis	Gosar	Meadows
Bishop (MI)	Gowdy	Meehan
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Messer
Black	Graves (GA)	Mitchell
Blackburn	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Blum	Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)
Bost	Griffith	Mullin
Brady (TX)	Grothman	Murphy (PA)
Brat	Guthrie	Newhouse
Bridenstine	Harper	Noem
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Olson
Bucshon	Hensarling	Palazzo
Budd	Hice, Jody B.	Palmer
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Paulsen
Byrne	Hill	Pearce
Calvert	Holding	Perry
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Peterson
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Pittenger
Chabot	Huizenga	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hultgren	Poliquin
Cheney	Hunter	Posay
Coffman	Hurd	Ratcliffe
Cole	Issa	Reed
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Renacci
Comstock	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Cook	Jones	Roe (TN)
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cramer	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Katko	Rohrabacher
Cuellar	Kelly (MS)	Rokita
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Rooney, Francis
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rooney, Thomas
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	J.
Davidson	Kinzinger	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Roskam
Denham	Kustoff (TN)	Ross
Dent	Labrador	Rothfus
DeSantis	LaHood	Rouzer
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Royce (CA)
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Russell
Donovan	Lance	Rutherford
Duffy	Latta	Sanford
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (MN)	Scalise
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Dunn	Long	Scott, Austin
Emmer	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	Love	Sessions
Faso	Lucas	Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego

□ 2011

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on rollcall votes 12 through 23 on the evening of January 5, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall

No. 12, "nay" on rollcall No. 13, "nay" on rollcall No. 14, "nay" on rollcall No. 15, "nay" on rollcall No. 16, "nay" on rollcall No. 17, "nay" on rollcall No. 18, "nay" on rollcall No. 19, "nay" on rollcall No. 20, "yea" on rollcall No. 21, "nay" on rollcall No. 22, "yea" on rollcall No. 23.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 2017, TO MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 9, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 25

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Ms. Sánchez.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2015

PERVERSE TORTURE PER- PETRATED BY HEARTLESS YOUNG ADULTS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, four people were charged with a violent crime after a Facebook showed 30 minutes of horror. The criminal charges barely scratch the surface in describing the terror experienced by an 18-year-old boy who suffers from mental disabilities.

He was forced for 5 hours to cower in a corner scared, stunned, and powerless by people he thought were his friends. His mouth was duct taped shut. His hands and feet were tied. They cut his clothes, his hair, and scalp with a knife. He was burned, punched, and beaten. He was humiliated and berated. This was not just bullying, this was violent, perverse torture perpetrated by heartless young adults. His psychological trauma will haunt him for years.

He is not alone because children with disabilities are four times more likely to be assaulted than the general population.

We enacted major mental health reforms just a few weeks ago. Unfortunately, we cannot litigate compassion, mandate morality, nor legislate common decency for perpetrators who have no sense of shame. But today, as a Nation, we should all be ashamed and recommit to teach our children there is never any excuse to harm a disabled person. Never. I pray for the victim and his family.

IMPACT OF ACA REPEAL ON MOMS AND BABIES

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Maternity Care Caucus, I rise on behalf of mothers and babies who will suffer if Republicans repeal the Affordable Care Act.

It is undisputable that, with prenatal care, babies are born healthier. Before the ACA, approximately 10 percent of childbearing women had no health insurance, and the plans of 60 percent of all insured women had no maternity coverage.

With ObamaCare's Medicaid expansion and insurance subsidies, more than half of these women who were uninsured became eligible for maternity care. In addition, the ACA also requires health plans to cover maternity care and preexisting conditions. All of this will be lost with ACA repeal.

Women will also lose coverage for lactation counseling and the cost of breast pumps, a known barrier to successful breastfeeding which is one of the most effective ways to protect the health of babies.

I urge my Republican colleagues to consider the negative impacts repealing ObamaCare will have on our Nation's mothers and babies. We must protect the future health of our children by ensuring all moms have access to maternity care and breastfeeding support.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEROY BALDWIN

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

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and achievements of Leroy Baldwin. A true American original, Leroy Baldwin was born and raised in Ocala, Florida, on December 15, 1932. Not coming from a family with a rich ag background, Mr. Baldwin bought his first calf when he was 6 years of age from the money he earned delivering newspapers.

Mr. Baldwin served honorably in the U.S. Army from 1952 to 1955 during the Korean war. After the war, he pursued his lifelong project, the Baldwin Angus Ranch. Starting with 40 acres, the ranch now spans 620 acres and has taken the Florida Angus breed all over the world.

Mr. Baldwin thanked God each and every day for the blessings his family and business enjoyed.

God, family, and country are the words he lived by, words vitally important to our Nation today. We have lost a true giant.

Mr. Baldwin, may God bless you, your family, and thank you for what you have done for Florida and our Nation's agriculture.

PATHWAY OF DESTRUCTION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, in the Senate, the other body, unfortunately, joined the pathway of destruction for most Americans and voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. These are not my words, the pathway of destruction, but is evidence what will happen to millions and millions of Americans. By repealing without a replacement, which does not exist, insurance will be taken away from 32 million working families. Now, some 4 million uninsured children will have no insurance.

Let me be very clear that many of these individuals do not have college degrees. Many of them, the voters of those who now will take the rein of government. Healthcare premiums will increase by 50 percent for millions of Americans. Hundreds of billions of dollars will go to tax breaks for insurance companies while eliminating the tax credits and subsidies for millions of working families.

It will take healthcare coverage away from millions of low- and moderate-income Americans by cutting Medicaid, and it will close rural hospitals and public hospitals that provide the lifeline for many Americans. It will cut off Federal funds for health care for women through Planned Parenthood. And yes, it will eliminate and have cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, this is a pathway of disaster. We should not repeal the Affordable Care Act.

STEMMING AVALANCHE OF REGULATIONS

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that, in my first week as a Representative of Michigan's 10th Congressional District, we have passed two important pieces of legislation to stem the avalanche of Federal regulations.

The top concern I hear from employers of all sizes across my district is

that regulation from Washington is making it harder for them to do business. I spent my career in business, so I have firsthand knowledge of the damage caused by excessive Federal regulations.

The Midnight Rules Act and the REINS Act will provide much-needed regulatory relief to families and businesses alike. Both pieces of legislation will make unelected bureaucrats accountable to Congress.

The American Dream is achievable, and, as the son of a General Motors line worker, my life is proof of it. But that dream is only possible when we give Americans the freedom they need to be successful and unleash their capabilities in our economy.

TRAVEL TO CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about a bill that JIM MCGOVERN of Massachusetts and I have that we will be offering tomorrow. I think it is an important bill from the standpoint of advancing and perpetuating this American notion called freedom. It is a bill that had 130 sponsors in the last Congress. I am joined on the bill by TOM EMMER and Mr. POE and Mr. AMASH as original cosponsors as we drop the bill tomorrow. It is quite simply entitled the Freedom to Travel to Cuba bill. It does what the name suggests, to lift the current restrictions in encumbering Americans' ability to travel to Cuba.

Why is that important?

I think it is important for a number of different reasons, first of which is tied to the basic, fundamental notion of American liberty. American liberty is built of many different things. The Supreme Court has actually determined that as real as what you choose to wear, what you choose to eat, or what you choose to read is this basic, fundamental right to travel.

In the American system, we can travel as we see fit. I can go here, I can go there. I am going to visit my grandmother in Des Moines, my cousin in Chicago. We choose without government control and without government edict where we come and where we go. It is a far cry from what we saw in the former Soviet Union where you had to have your papers to determine where you could travel.

I have a map of the globe here. Did you know that you or I could travel to any country on this globe except one? You or I could travel to North Korea. You or I could travel to Syria. You or I could travel to Iran. You or I could travel to Iraq. It may not work out well for you, it may not be the best of trips, but you or I could travel without government prohibition to any spot on

this globe except one, and that one is Cuba.

That may have made sense in 1960. For security reasons in the time of the cold war, it may have made sense to have that prohibition in place. But the question is: Does it make sense today? I don't think it does for a whole variety of reasons.

One, this is about the basic, fundamental American right of travel as we see fit, not as government sees fit.

Two, this is about the American liberty and this fragile notion of, if we don't protect it, government tends to grow. Jefferson talked about this theme a long time ago. He talked about the normal course of things for government to gain ground and for government to yield. So if we don't push back—and this is what the REINS Act was all about—if we don't push back about the government edict or laws that have outgrown their usefulness, what we are doing is we are allowing government to encroach on this fragile notion of liberty.

Fundamental to the notion of common sense is, if you tried something for 50 years and it has not worked, may we not try something different? I was here in the 1990s. I signed onto Helms-Burton. But it didn't work, and so we asked: Why not try something different?

What Ronald Reagan proposed at the time of the Iron Curtain was for Americans, kids with backpacks, to travel on the other side of that curtain. That personal diplomacy, that one-on-one diplomacy, would be key in bringing down that wall. That was the notion of engagement.

So I think this is about saying American policy has been the excuse that the Castros have used for 50 years. We have almost the longest-serving dictatorship in the history of globe there with the Castro brothers. What was oftentimes the case is they would blame the blockade, the embargo, Americans' inability to travel, whatever was going wrong with the country rather than simply addressing the real issue. The problem was communism and the way that it encumbers people and their hopes and their dreams. We gave them an excuse. So this is about pulling back the excuse and trying something different. It is about pushing back on a regulation that has not served its purpose.

Three, this is about engaging because that is part and parcel to American liberty. You know, I don't like some of the things that are going on in Russia. I don't like some of the things that are going on in China. I don't like some of the things that are going on in Vietnam. You can pick your country. But what we have chosen, as an American policy, is this notion of engagement, that we ultimately are going to be able to solve more by engaging with other countries. Again, that is why Ronald Reagan embraced it with countries of the former Soviet Union in helping to bring down that wall. So this is about

perpetuating the notion of engagement and government regulation.

We have just passed the REINS Act, which is all about saying if something isn't making sense, let's peel it back. Let's not have the fourth branch of government going out and perpetuating all kinds of regulations without them going through Congress. Yet, with regard to travel to Cuba, you have to sign an affidavit as to why you are going there. You have to keep receipts for up to 5 years proving where you did or didn't spend money. If you fill out a form wrong, you can be subject to a \$250,000 fine. Is that kind of regulation consistent with free travel that we all should enjoy as Americans?

Finally, I think that this bill is about bringing about change to Cuba. My interest is not primarily about Cuba. My interest is about American liberty and the need to perpetuate American liberty.

But one of the offshoots, one of the benefits is about bringing change to Cuba. Even the worst detractor of the bill, we are all about the same thing, which is bringing more freedom to that country and the 11 million people that make up that country.

I think that allowing Americans to go there and to tell folks about what you are hearing from your state-run radio station or television station is not the truth, here is what is really going on. It is part and parcel to bringing about a change in Cuba. It is part and parcel to eliminating the excuses that have been used by the communist regime there. It is continuing the theme of engagement that we have employed for more than 100 years. And most all, it is part and parcel to maintain this fragile notion of American liberty which always needs to be protected.

□ 2030

If something has encroached upon American liberty, it is not about a tangible result in the here and the now. It needs to be pushed back. So, fundamentally, this bill is about those five different things. It is for that reason I would ask that viewers talk to their House or Senate Member and ask them to sign on to this bill.

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

ISRAEL AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, today we took up what was intended to be a very noble action on H. Res. 11 to rein in the out-of-control and outrageous actions of so many despots that occupy positions of authority in the United Nations. The United Nations, whether you go back to Libya being in charge of human rights, you have U.N. troops

molesting so many females. There are all kinds of problems that have been wrought, and yet the U.N. has the gall to continually show how bigoted it is and how anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli that it is.

It is easy to find, if anyone bothers to check, that the United Nations never asked once for any other country to pony up land, much less demand that other countries like Jordan, who is a good friend of the United States, but the U.N. never said: Look, you are occupying this land that they call Palestine, so you have to give it up. They never did until it was controlled by the Israeli people, thus making clear this is really a bigoted move by the U.N. to constantly slander and slam the nation of Israel.

Also, if one wants to conduct another test to check to see how bigoted, if it is, the U.N. is, you could check on the condemnations by the U.N. for activities of Israel. Compare the facts of those activities and self-defense efforts by Israel and compare them to acts of other nations—the genocide, for example, that even Secretary Kerry, as tough as it was for him to finally admit that there was a genocide of Christians going on in the Middle East.

Is there any outrage by the U.N.? No. In fact, the U.N. head of the refugees who is now the U.N. General Secretary made clear about over a year and a half ago or so that the reason that they weren't helping Christians to the extent that they were helping Muslim refugees is because of the historic importance Christians have in staying where they were—that means where they are being murdered, where they are having their throats slashed, being crucified, tortured, raped, incinerated. The U.N. General Secretary, when he was in charge of the refugee program, thought it was very important to leave Christians in the Middle East so they can be murdered in some of the most heinous and egregious fashions imaginable.

So it was just and proper, to borrow from history, that we condemn the United Nations Resolution 2334 as being an obstacle to peace in Israel. Palestinians have made clear they don't want peace with Israel. They want it eliminated from the map. They name holidays, squares, and all kinds of things for people who go out and kill innocent Jewish children and others just for being Jewish. They reward the families of those who go and blow themselves up, killing, in atrocious fashions, innocent Israeli people. The United Nations turns a blind eye to it since the U.N. has become so racist, so bigoted, and so anti-Israel, the most antiterrorist country in all of the Middle East, including north Africa—although Egypt is of great help in that regard these days, and there are those in Libya who would like to. But after President Obama helped turn Libya into absolute anarchy and chaos, then Egypt is having their problems even coming from Libya.

What has the U.N. had to say about all that? Not really anything because if the Muslim Brotherhood supports it, so does, basically, the U.N., and far too often so has the Obama administration.

That is why, I guess, Israel got the lecture from Secretary John Kerry. Secretary Kerry, even in the days when he talked about the heinous acts of Genghis Khan, never bothered to mention the plight of the poor Palestinians before 1967 when they were under control of the most non-Israeli people you could imagine. There has been no discussion about that, only leveling really bigoted allegations at Israel.

So we have H. Res. 11 today, and I was thrilled because it meant that I was going to be able to come to the floor and vote to condemn the U.N. passage of U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

Unfortunately, as some of my friends here in Congress have pointed out, I am a bit anal at times. I actually want to read the things that we are going to vote on. So I got my copy of H. Res. 11, immediately noting that, in the very first whereas, it says the United States has long supported a two-state solution. It does say "sustainable two-state solution." It says: "Whereas since 1993, the United States has facilitated direct, bilateral negotiations between both parties toward achieving a two-state solution . . ."

Well, it is the truth that President Clinton twisted the arm of the Israeli Prime Minister and convinced him to basically give Arafat almost everything he wanted. Now, if you believe what Scripture says about Moses going and pleading to Pharaoh to let the Jewish people, the children of Israel, go, we are told that God hardens Pharaoh's heart so that He could make a big demonstration of His power and glory down the road. Although there was suffering that came—great suffering—ultimately, incredible miracles were performed as a result of his hardened heart.

I think it is likely that when Arafat got everything he wanted—almost everything he wanted—in the offer from Israel, I thank God that Arafat turned him down. For anybody that has been in the military and goes to Israel, you can see readily, if Arafat had accepted what the Prime Minister of Israel had been willing, finally, to offer, it would have virtually made Israel indefensible unless they were using nuclear weapons or the threat of nuclear weapons.

Israel needs to be able to defend itself. King David was ruling from Hebron in the year around 1020 B.C. to around 1012 B.C. Then he moved, and he was ruling over Israel. What is now called the West Bank was actually called Israel—I mean, it was part of the nation of Israel. Solomon had control, but he did so from the City of David because that is where, up to Jerusalem, that David had moved the capital from Hebron, which is also where Abraham and Sarah are buried.

I have also visited the tomb of David's father, Jesse, that is there in Hebron. To be told: Oh, no, this needs to be Palestinian lands. The reason some of us think that Hebron, Judea, and Samaria should be Palestinian lands is because 1,600 years after David ruled from Hebron and then Jerusalem, Mohammed came along. Some say it was a vision, some say a dream. Some say he actually, during one night, was taken by a winged horse or donkey and flown to Jerusalem. Some say he actually got there and back to bed before morning. Whatever the case, 1,600 years before that did or didn't happen, David was ruling over that whole country.

There is no one alive today descended from any occupants of the Promised Land, the land of Israel, descended from people who lived in that land predating King David and King Saul before him, King Solomon after him—nobody. Nobody alive today has a prior claim. There is nobody, no country, from whom the United Nations has demanded a secession of land back to people that attacked that country and the land was taken back in a defensive mode in protection from the attack.

So at page 3 of our H. Res. 11, it points out that the U.N. resolution is a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-state solution. At the bottom of page 5, it says: "A durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will come only through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties resulting in a Jewish, democratic state living side-by-side next to a demilitarized Palestinian state in peace and security."

Mr. Speaker, there cannot be peace and security in the Middle East when a people are allowed to occupy an area, and those people continue, with the encouragement of the United Nations, with John Kerry and this President, to conduct intensive terrorism on the people of Israel and we continue to condemn the victims of that terrorism.

You can't have peace in a land where the most powerful nation—possibly the most powerful nation up to now. We were at one time. Our Navy is down, I think, to pre-World War I standards, and our troops are down below pre-World War II. But at one time, we were the most powerful nation. The most powerful or near most powerful nation is taking up for the victims and encouraging that the victims give away more of the land that they have already given so much of to those who are inflicting terror upon them. It is like my friends on the far left, constantly complaining about bullies, who never had been bullied like I was as a small child because I was very small in elementary school.

□ 2045

I got beat up a lot, and I defended myself, but it didn't matter. When people are coming after you that are a foot and a half taller than you are and they flunked two grades, you are not going to come out well.

My fifth grade teacher, after I got beat up trying to get back my football I got for Christmas, took me up in front of the class. My nose is still bleeding, dripping down my shirt. She said: I want everybody to see what happens when the little boys try to play with the big boys.

She always took up for the bullies. And that is what this administration has been doing and this is what this United Nations has been doing: taking up for the terrorist bullies.

I am amazed that the nation of Israel has held back all hell breaking loose on the Gaza Strip because of the continued assaults day after day, sending rockets into Israel, Israel spending millions of dollars to protect themselves against the constant attack from the Gaza Strip.

And what happens?

They try to protect themselves with a legitimate blockade to make sure nobody is taking rockets in, and the U.N. and world opinion goes nuts over that.

Page 6 of our resolution we voted on today goes on to say that the House of Representatives calls for United Nations Security Council 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that it is no longer one-sided and anti-Israel.

Here is my problem again. B, it allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution be resolved and have direct negotiations between the parties.

Nobody at the U.N., if we are a part of it, and nobody in the United States administration should even mention the little phrase "two-state solution." This body should not even mention in a resolution that we are in any way endorsing a two-state solution.

I know there are a lot of Christians that aren't as familiar with the Bible, perhaps, as they will be one day, but my friend, Joel Rosenberg, pointed out numerous times in the book of Joel, chapter 3:

For look. In those days and at that time I will return the exiles to Judah and Jerusalem. Then I will gather all the nations. I will bring them down to the Valley of Jehoshaphat. I will enter into judgment against them there concerning my people Israel, who are my inheritance, whom they scattered among the nations.

Then it lists the number one grievance that the God of the Bible, the God I believe in, had against those nations he is going to rain down only hell judgment on. The number one grievance is: they partitioned my land. They divided my land, the promised land.

When the United States Congress embraces, demands that Israel be divided into separate states instead of being able to live in, peacefully, the land that was occupied and promised over 3,000 years ago, I think we are making a big mistake. That is why I had to vote "no" on the resolution.

Now just as our leadership rushed this resolution to the floor, I am hopeful they will rush H. Res. 311 to the floor. I filed it today, this afternoon. H. Res. 311 is very basic. It says:

"To withhold United States assessed and voluntary contributions to the United Nations, and for other purposes.

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

"Section 1. Short title.

"This Act may be cited as the 'Refusing to Assist Paying for United Nations Actions Against Israel Act'."

United States assessed involuntary contributions to the United Nations. That is section 2. And the operative wording says:

"No funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for assessed or voluntary contributions of the United States to the United Nations or to any organ, specialized agency, commission, treaty or treaty body, or other affiliated body of the United Nations . . ."

It goes on: ". . . until such time as United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334, regarding Israel's Settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, is repealed in its entirety."

Then, section 3 says: "No funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to pay interest on assessed or voluntary contributions that are withheld under this Act."

So the purpose of that is I am hoping and praying that this body will not just pay lip service to a U.N. resolution, and actually embrace, as John Kerry, apparently, was saying that day, not much difference between AIPAC's position in supporting this resolution. He may not have mentioned they would support the resolution, but AIPAC's position and John Kerry's position. If you look at what is in the resolution, he may have something there.

This would actually put some teeth into it. This is something that would send a message to the United Nations and the nations around the world that if you are going to continue to be so anti-Israel, so bigoted, so racist, so anti-Jewish, then the United States is not going to continue to fund your outrageous, bigoted activities, your lush, lavish lifestyle.

I would think if we could pass this, the United Nations delayed in withdrawing that resolution or rescinding it, then that should ultimately lead to our denial of any visas to diplomats of the United Nations. Then, once that occurs, apparently under the deed to the United Nations, it was only for such time as the headquarters in New York—is the main headquarters of the United Nations. So if they can't get diplomats there, they will have to move the headquarters elsewhere and that land would be ceded back to the foundation.

Hopefully, if we will go ahead and do something that has teeth in it and not embrace language that will be fatal to this nation of Israel, we can make a difference. That can bring peace in the world. Terrorists only understand power, and sometimes power is conveyed in the way of money.

We should not be funding a United Nations that is so bigoted and so hateful to the nation of Israel.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 6, 2017, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Egg Research and Promotion Rules and Regulations to Update Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, and Information Provisions [Docket No.: AMS-LPS-15-0042] received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of multiple violations of the Antideficiency Act, Air Force case number 12-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2016 annual Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program Report to Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2249(c); Public Law 108-136, Sec. 1221(a)(1); (117 Stat. 1651); to the Committee on Armed Services.

12. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Chambers and Harris Counties, TX, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8461] received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

13. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP): Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0012] (RIN:1660-AA86) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

14. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modernizing HUD's Consolidated Planning Process To Narrow the Digital Divide and Increase Resilience to Natural Hazards [Docket No.: FR 5891-F-02] (RIN: 2506-AC41) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

15. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing

and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Narrowing the Digital Divide Through Installation of Broadband Infrastructure in HUD-Funded New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation of Multifamily Rental Housing [Docket No.: FR 5890-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD75) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

16. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's National Health Service Corps Report to Congress for the Year 2015, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 254i; July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 336A (as amended by Public Law 107-251, Sec. 307(b)); (116 Stat. 1649); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

17. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's Quarterly Report on the Transition of the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority Functions, covering the activities from June 1, 2016 to October 24, 2016, pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, Public Law 114-113; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

18. A letter from the Deputy Director, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AA89) received January 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

19. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the Board's report titled "Report to the U.S. Congress and the Secretary of Energy: Board Activities for the Period January 1, 2013 — December 31, 2015", pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

20. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

21. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

22. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List, and Clarification of License Review Policy [Docket No.: 161206999-6999-01] (RIN: 0694-AH25) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

23. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Revision of U.S. Munitions List Category XV [Public Notice: 9688]

(RIN: 1400-AD33) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

24. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Traffic in Arms Regulations: International Trade Data System, Reporting [Public Notice: 9811] (RIN: 1400-AE07) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

25. A letter from the Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting notification of a federal vacancy, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

26. A letter from the Chairwoman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Federal Trade Commission's Inspector General Semi-annual Report to Congress for the period April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

27. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period of April 1 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

28. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Alaska; Subsistence Collections [NPS-AKRO-22487; PPAKAKROZ5, PPMRLE1Y.L00000] (RIN: 1024-AE28) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

29. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Operating Plan for Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2017, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1552(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

30. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties (RIN: 1990-AA46) received December 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

31. A letter from the Director, Contract and Grant Policy Division, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Financial Reporting of Property (2016-N024) (RIN: 2700-AE33) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

32. A letter from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at the Bozeman Yellowstone International Airport (BZN), Glacier Park International Airport (FCA), and Yellowstone Airport (WYS) in Montana will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers and that the screening company is owned and controlled by citizens of the

United States, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d)(1); Public Law 107-71, Sec. 108(a); (115 Stat. 613); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

33. A letter from the Chair, Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting the Office's report titled "Recommendations for Improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act", pursuant to Sec. 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and House Administration.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. VELA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HURD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 294. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Ekpanya Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 295. A bill to provide for a limitation on the number of civilian employees at the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude major professional sports leagues from qualifying as tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 297. A bill to require greater accountability in discretionary and direct spending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 298. A bill to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 299. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SHIMKUS,

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 300. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CARDENAS):

H.R. 301. A bill to require the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a premise plumbing research laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 302. A bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or combat-related special compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 304. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KIND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 305. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure

of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 306. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 307. A bill to ensure that Members of Congress and Congressional staff receive health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs instead of under the Federal Health Benefits Program or health care exchanges; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. TIBERI,

Mr. BRAT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARR, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUM, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 308. A bill to prevent proposed regulations relating to restrictions on liquidation of an interest with respect to estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes from taking effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SINEMA,

Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 309. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with a complex metabolic or autoimmune disease, a disease resulting from insulin deficiency or insulin resistance, or complications caused by such a disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 310. A bill to withdraw certain land located in Curry County and Josephine County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 311. A bill to withhold United States assessed and voluntary contributions to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRIST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 312. A bill to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 313. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in the Account until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Fund in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security surplus in the Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 314. A bill to repeal title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. ESHOO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 315. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 316. A bill to protect investors in futures contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 317. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require that repurchase-to-maturity transactions be treated as secured borrowings; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 318. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require any person subject to accounting principles or standards under the securities laws to show all transactions of such person on the balance sheet of such person; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 319. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the limit on the amount of certain contributions which may be made to a candidate with respect to an election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 320. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to give members of the United States Capitol Police the option to delay mandatory retirement until age 60; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr.

COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIP-TON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HILL, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. EMMER, Ms. BEUTLER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 321. A bill to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 322. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the termination of certain retirement benefits for Members of Congress, except the right to continue participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 323. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act to provide equity for certain eligible survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 324. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a higher Federal matching rate for increased expenditures under Medicaid for mental and behavioral health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 325. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 326. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to create a National Neuromyelitis Optica Consortium to provide grants and coordinate research with respect to the causes of, and risk factors associated with, neuromyelitis optica, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 327. A bill to provide for United States participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to the hiring of veterans in the field of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for expenses for household and elder care services necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 330. A bill to prohibit monetary payments by the Federal Government to employees, officers, and elected officials of foreign countries for purposes of bribery, coercion, or any activity that is illegal or undermines the rule of law or corrupts a public officer or the office such officer represents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 331. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act so as to exempt real property from civil forfeiture due to medical marijuana-related conduct that is authorized by State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 332. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Peace Corps Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 333. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated less than 50 percent to receive concurrent payment of both retired pay and veterans' disability compensation, to extend eligibility for concurrent receipt to chapter 61 disability retirees with less than 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 334. A bill to direct the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance for individuals affected by exposure to Agent Orange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 335. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide parity among States in the timing of the application of higher Federal Medicaid matching rates for the ACA-expansion population; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 336. A bill to provide transit benefits to Federal employees who use the services of digital transportation companies within the national capital region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 337. A bill to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 338. A bill to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 339. A bill to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs and to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 341. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for start-up expenditures for business for 2017 and 2018; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SANFORD):

H.R. 342. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 343. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a program enabling communities to better leverage resources to address health, economic development, and conservation concerns through needed investments in parks, recreational areas, facilities, and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 344. A bill to amend the Forest Legacy Program of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to authorize States to allow certain entities to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements under the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 345. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, and other officers of the executive branch from lobbying on behalf of countries designated as countries of particular concern for religious freedom for 10 years after leaving office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 346. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a uniform 5-year post-employment ban on lobbying by former Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 347. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for requirements relating to documentation for major acquisition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 348. A bill to more accurately identify and transfer subsurface gravel sources originally intended to be made available to the Ukpavik Inupiat Corporation in exchange for its relinquishment of related property rights; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should provide, on an annual basis, an amount equal to at least one percent of United States gross domestic product for nonmilitary foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HARRIS):

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution directing the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue commemorating the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 for placement in the United States Capitol, authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony for the presentation of the statue, and directing the Architect of the Capitol to place the statue in a suitable permanent location in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr.

CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TONKO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. BASS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BERA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 23. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives and reaffirming long-standing United States policy in support of a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Res. 24. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should not bail out State and local government employee pension plans or other plans that provide post-employment benefits to State and local government retirees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 25. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H. Res. 26. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that restored the original black lung benefits eligibility requirements should not be reduced but should be preserved and protected; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H. Res. 27. A resolution rejecting the "two-state solution" as the United States' diplomatic policy objective and calls for the Administration to advocate for a new approach that prioritizes the State of Israel's sovereignty, security, and borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 28. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take

all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of door delivery for all business and residential customers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LIPINSKI introduced a bill (H.R. 349) for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, specifically Clauses 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) of such section.

OR

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18 of the Constitution states To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8,

Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United State Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sections 4 and 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—

“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . .”

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 310.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 18: “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States . . .” and

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.”

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight, Clause Three “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 4, CLAUSE 1

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 17

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution: The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 8, Section—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, which says that: “The Congress shall have the power . . . to establish post offices . . . and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 1: to provide for the common defense and general welfare.

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 12: to raise and support Armies.

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 16: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, which says that: “The Congress shall have the power . . . to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water . . . and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof”

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SABLON:

H.R. 339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement ins submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 4 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section. 6.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 & Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

“The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

“The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes”

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to “establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.” The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), “that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government.” And, as the Court found in *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting *Boutilier v. INS*, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), “[t]he Court without

exception has sustained Congress’ ‘plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.’”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.J. Res. 19.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.J. Res. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V:

“The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this, Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 26: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 38: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. BOST, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 66: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 74: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 79: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 99: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 111: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 173: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 184: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota and Mr. CARDENAS.

H.R. 244: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 246: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HARRIS.

H. Res. 11: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BUCK, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. FOXX, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. CRIST.

H. Res. 14: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Borough of Metuchen, County of Middlesex, State of NJ, relative to Resolution 2016-261, confirming for the record its support of H.R. 814 and urging the United States House of Representatives and U.S. Senate to enact this important legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2. Also, a petition of Electors of the City of Manitowoc, WI, relative to a resolution, supporting the passage of an amendment to the United States Constitution seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.