

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
Ciциlline	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	Loeb sack	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,	Suoizzi
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	
Gallego	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
Moelenaar
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
Tenney
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
Perlmuter
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