

By replacing this well-established framework with a blanket requirement of Congressional approval, H.R. 427 would throw all major regulations into a months-long limbo, fostering uncertainty and impeding business investment that is vital to economic growth. Maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches is essential to ensuring that the Nation's regulatory system effectively protects public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.

If the President were presented with H.R. 427, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire as to how much time may be remaining for each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has half a minute remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I fully support Congressman KING's amendment. It improves the viability of the REINS Act and makes sure that the responsibility of legislation is in the hands of our legislators.

Let me just ask this simple question. My good friend on the other side says that we should let the agencies and departments regulate and make rules. Let me ask this: How has it been going in the last 20 years in this country?

We are \$20 trillion in debt, and 20 million people are out of work or underemployed.

Are we going to continue to let bureaucrats make these decisions that crush jobs?

No, I don't think so. It is our responsibility in the House and it is our responsibility in the Senate. We can hear from those individuals, as I have repeatedly said here, in those agencies. We need to make the final decision because just look at the track record over the last 20, 30 years of unelected bureaucrats making these rules, laws, and regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we can't blame a \$20 trillion deficit or debt on nameless, faceless bureaucrats. We can blame a lot of that debt on the George Bush administration and the legislators who voted for tax cuts for the wealthy that were not paid for and funded two wars that were not paid for. That is what we can blame that \$20 trillion debt on.

□ 1715

Again, if you are in favor of net neutrality, you should oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would say that yes, we can blame a lot of debt and deficit on a burden of regulations. We can blame it because there is a huge cost to our executive branch of government. That cost, much of it, the unnecessary component, all that goes against our debt and deficit.

We saw, as Barack Obama came in as President, we had a \$10 trillion debt, which he was very critical of throughout his campaign in 2007 and 2008. Now, as he leaves office here, thankfully, in a couple of weeks, it is a \$20 trillion debt, and we can start to ratchet this thing back down.

Looking at the Obama administration and their reports on the costs of regulation, they come up with this number reported to the Heritage Foundation that the annual cost of regulations to the United States, according to the Obama administration, is \$108 billion, Mr. Chairman. So that is what we are looking at here for costs.

But I want to get at the real meat of this. Article I of the Constitution says Congress shall make all law. Yet, we have the courts making laws across the street, and we have regulations coming at us at a rate of—and I expressed to the gentleman from Georgia—ten-to-one. For every law we passed in the 114th Congress, there were at least 10 regulations that were poured over our head, and we are sitting in a place where we don't have the tools to undo them.

Now we have a President that is ready, and he wants to undo these regulations. If we make him march through the Administrative Procedure Act, it is heavy, it is burdensome, and it is time-consuming. But the King amendment gives the tools for the next President of the United States to work with Congress to trim this regulatory burden down. And the most important part is, it makes all of us in the House and the Senate accountable then for all of the regulations.

The APA was allowed to dish off this legislative responsibility to the executive branch. Congress took a pass. They ducked their responsibility of being accountable for all legislation and found a way to be producing less than 10 percent of the legislation that exists even in a given year.

The King amendment says that over the period of a decade, 10 percent a year at a minimum, Congress will have to review all the regulations. The people from across America—we the people—will weigh in on that regulation. And then an even better part is not only will we be accountable here in Congress—and we should be—but when the nameless, faceless bureaucrats are across the desk from our constituents and they refuse to listen to our constituents, there is going to be a little bug in the back of their ear that is going to be saying to them: You know what? This constituent that may be losing their business over this regulation, the next stop they make is going to be with their Congressman. These regulations that we promulgated are going to be subject then to being repealed by the United States Congress, as they should be.

Support the King amendment. It puts the authority back into the hands of Article I, we the people.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 22, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 11

Whereas the United States has long supported a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security;

Whereas since 1993, the United States has facilitated direct, bilateral negotiations between both parties toward achieving a two-state solution and ending all outstanding claims;

Whereas it is the long-standing policy of the United States that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only come through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties;

Whereas it is the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto United Nations Security Council resolutions dictating additional binding parameters on the peace process;

Whereas it is the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto one-sided or anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas the United States has stood in the minority internationally over successive Administrations in defending Israel in international forums, including vetoing one-sided

resolutions in 2011, 2006, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, 1997, and 1995 before the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas the United States recently signed a new Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Israel regarding security assistance, consistent with longstanding support for Israel among successive Administrations and congresses and representing an important United States commitment toward Israel's qualitative military edge;

Whereas on November 29, 2016, the House of Representatives unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 165, expressing the sense of Congress and reaffirming longstanding United States policy in support of a direct bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions imposing a solution to the conflict;

Whereas on December 23, 2016, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations disregarded House Concurrent Resolution 165 and departed from longstanding United States policy by abstaining and permitting United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be adopted under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter;

Whereas the United States' abstention on United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contradicts the Oslo Accords and its associated process that is predicated on resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict between the parties through direct negotiations;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 claims that "the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace";

Whereas by referring to the "4 June 1967 lines" as the basis for negotiations, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively states that the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are "occupied territory" thereby equating these sites with outposts in the West Bank that the Israeli government has deemed illegal;

Whereas passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively lends legitimacy to efforts by the Palestinian Authority to impose its own solution through international organizations and through unjustified boycotts or divestment campaigns against Israel by calling "upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967", and will require the United States and Israel to take effective action to counteract the potential harmful impact of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334;

Whereas UNSCR 2334 did not directly call upon Palestinian leadership to fulfill their obligations toward negotiations or mention that part of the eventual Palestinian state is currently controlled by Hamas, a designated terrorist organization; and

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 both sought to impose or unduly influence solutions to final status issues, and is biased against Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermined the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final status issues, or are one-sided

and anti-Israel, reversing decades of bipartisan agreement;

(B) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermines the prospect of Israelis and Palestinians resuming productive, direct negotiations;

(C) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contributes to the politically motivated acts of boycott, divestment from, and sanctions against Israel and represents a concerted effort to extract concessions from Israel outside of direct negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians, which must be actively rejected;

(D) any future measures taken in international or outside organizations, including the United Nations Security Council or at the Paris conference on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict scheduled for January 15, 2017, to impose an agreement, or parameters for an agreement including the recognition of a Palestinian state, will set back the cause of peace, harm the security of Israel, run counter to the enduring bipartisan consensus on strengthening the United States-Israel relationship, and weaken support for such organizations;

(E) a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will come only through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties resulting in a Jewish, democratic state living side-by-side next to a demilitarized Palestinian state in peace and security;

(F) the United States should work to facilitate serious, direct negotiations between the parties without preconditions toward a sustainable peace agreement; and

(G) the United States Government should oppose and veto future United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final status issues, or are one-sided and anti-Israel; and

(2) the House of Representatives opposes United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and will work to strengthen the United States-Israel relationship, and calls for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that—

(A) it is no longer one-sided and anti-Israel; and

(B) it allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the esteemed Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read you a quote:

"Peace is hard work. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations—if it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now. Ultimately, it is the

Israelis and the Palestinians who must live side by side."

That was President Obama in 2011, and he was right.

I am stunned at what happened last month. This government—our government—abandoned our ally, Israel, when she needed us the most. Do not be fooled. This U.N. Security Council resolution was not about settlements, and it certainly was not about peace. It was about one thing and one thing only: Israel's right to exist as a Jewish, democratic state.

These types of one-sided efforts are designed to isolate and delegitimize Israel. They do not advance peace. They make it more elusive.

The cornerstone of our special relationship with Israel has always been right here in Congress. This institution, the heart of our democracy, has stood by the Jewish state through thick and thin. We were there for her when rockets rained down on Tel Aviv. We were there for her by passing historic legislation to combat the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement. And we have been there for her by ensuring Israel has the tools to defend herself against those who seek her destruction.

In every one of those instances, Republicans and Democrats worked together to get these things done. That is because our historic alliance with Israel transcends party labels and partisan bickering. We see that bipartisan relationship right here on the House floor today in condemning this anti-Israel resolution.

I want to thank our Chairman ED ROYCE, Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, and all of our Members on both sides of the aisle for speaking out on this issue and for helping assemble this legislation. It sends a powerful message, and it turns a page.

It is time to repair the damage done by this misguided hit job at the U.N. It is time to rebuild our partnership with Israel and reaffirm our commitment to her security. It is time to show all of our allies that, regardless of the shameful events of last week, the United States remains a force for good.

I ask the whole House to support this resolution on behalf of the American people.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (DAVID PRICE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, and I thank the Speaker for his words.

I want to start by thanking Chairman ED ROYCE, who authored this resolution. I am proud to be the lead Democratic cosponsor and glad to say that more than 30 Democrats representing a

broad cross-section of our party have signed on as cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation.

ED ROYCE and I have worked together for the past 4 years, and we believe that foreign policy should be bipartisan and that partisanship should stop at the water's edge. Frankly, this is what we are doing today. We are condemning what happened because we think it is unfair and unjust.

I want to also mention that I join with my friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) in authoring an amendment to this resolution that wasn't accepted which emphasizes a two-state solution. I want to thank Mr. PRICE for his hard work on that approach, and I support it. We talk in this resolution about a two-state solution as well.

Mr. Speaker, throughout its entire history, the State of Israel has never gotten a fair shake from the United Nations. Year after year after year, member states manipulate the U.N. to bully our ally, Israel, to pile on with one-sided resolutions, placing all of the blame for the ongoing conflict on Israel.

We saw a resolution like this come before the Security Council a few weeks ago, and today the House of Representatives will go on record saying that that U.N. resolution is wrong, plain and simple. And frankly, we should not have voted for that.

The Security Council resolution is highly critical of Israel yet asks nothing directly of the Palestinians. That is biased, that is unfair, and that is not balanced. Again, we should have opposed it. We should have vetoed it.

The language about Jerusalem is not new but it remains deeply offensive to Jews, whose holiest site lies on the Temple Mount in East Jerusalem. The Kotel, the Holy Western Wall, is simply nonoccupied territory. And it is offensive to hear that.

So in the measure the House is considering today, we repudiate this flawed Security Council resolution. And at the same time, we will say once again that we support a two-state solution, that the only way to reach that goal is through direct negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and that this shameful Security Council resolution put that goal further out of reach.

Mr. Speaker, the international community faces the longest suppressing issues: mass killings in South Sudan, a crisis in Yemen, a humanitarian disaster in Syria, Russia's illegal occupation of the Ukraine, and North Korea's nuclear weapons program. Yet, rather than deal with those critical problems, the member states of the U.N. have chosen instead to use the international body to embarrass Israel. It is outrageous. This House Resolution that I am cosponsoring with Mr. ROYCE rightfully says that it is outrageous.

I think it was a mistake for the current administration to abstain on this vote in the U.N. I have been very clear about that, but I want to be fair. Be-

fore anyone turns this into another attack on President Obama, we should be aware of the history of this issue.

This is the first time in 8 years the Obama administration has allowed a resolution, opposed by Israel, to go forward. The George Bush administration allowed it to happen 6 times; the Clinton administration, 3 times; the first Bush administration, 6 times; and the Reagan administration, 10 times, including voting for one strongly condemning Israel for its "premeditated and unprecedented attack of aggression" when it wisely destroyed Iraq's nuclear weapons reactor in 1981.

But regardless of that history, it doesn't justify these latest abstentions. My mother used to say that two wrongs don't make a right. And she was right. It was wrong then, and it is wrong now.

I think allowing governments to bully Israel and the U.N. is a mistake, no matter who is in power. Instead, let's focus on what we should be doing when it comes to advancing the two-state solution.

This resolution calls for us to get back to the policy that many of us support: one, standing with Israel and the United Nations; two, stopping one-sided resolutions; and three, supporting direct negotiations as the only way to move toward a two-state solution.

This resolution says all that. Every one in this Congress should be voting for it because it is balanced. I am pleased to support this resolution, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to begin by thanking the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). I thank him for working with me in a bipartisan manner not just on this resolution but on the one that we worked on late last year—a unanimous vote by this body directing the administration not to take the steps that the administration has taken.

I appreciate the leader and the Speaker as well working with us to ensure this resolution was brought quickly to the floor of this House.

Today, we put Congress on record objecting to the recent U.N. Security Council resolution that hurt our ally, that hurt Israel, and I believe that puts an enduring peace further out of reach.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, the United States has long recognized that a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only come about through direct bilateral negotiations between these two parties, and that is why it is longstanding U.S. policy to veto the many one-sided, the many anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council that violate that principle.

But just the other week, the Obama administration broke with this long-

standing U.S. policy by failing to veto U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. This dangerous resolution effectively states that the Jewish quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are, in the words of the resolution, "occupied territory." Why would we not veto that?

It also lends legitimacy to efforts by the Palestinian Authority to put pressure on Israel through the U.N. rather than to go through the process of engaging in direct negotiations, and it puts wind in the sails of the shameful boycott divestment and sanctions movement.

Unquestionably, this U.N. Security Council action damages the prospects for peace. The resolution and the bullying and harassment of Israel that it will spur only happened for one reason: the Obama administration let it happen—and that went against the distinct warnings from this body.

Mr. ENGEL and I engaged in letters, in conversations with senior administration officials seeking their assurance that the United States would veto one-sided, anti-Israel resolutions. In November, the House unanimously, all of us, passed a resolution which warned the administration against taking such last-minute action.

With that resolution, H. Con. Res. 165, the House unanimously stated that the United States Government should continue to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final-status issues or are one-sided and anti-Israel. Yet the administration rejected the call from Congress and chose a course that will bring harm for years to come by failing to veto U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

If the Palestinians want a lasting peace, they must accept that Israel, not the U.N., is their negotiating partner; and that means ending the incitement to violence against Israelis that goes on in so many of the mosques, that goes on in the schools, that goes on in the newspapers and on television there. It also means ending—and I think this is the most important fact, because leaving this out of the resolution at the U.N. is beyond me—their pay-to-slay scheme.

You talk about a lack of balance. Here we have a situation where, since 2003, it has been Palestinian law to reward Palestinian terrorists—terrorists—to go out, and they are given this incitement, this stipend for life. The more mayhem they create, the more horrific the number of civilians they attack and, therefore, the longer the sentence, the more they know: Well, I can serve my time, and then when I get out, I can get this stipend for the rest of my life—and it is larger and larger, depending upon the amount of mayhem—and if I don't make it, or if I am a suicide bomber, my family gets the stipend.

That, by law, is the way the Palestinian Authority has engineered this, costing the lives—and you can read

about it every month of those civilians attacked on the streets. It is not just Israealis, of course. Taylor Force, a U.S. Marine, was killed simply because he was in Israel, but it was by someone responding to the incitement.

So \$300 million per year spent by the Palestinian Authority to do that. No mention of that, of course, by the United Nations. And that is why today's action is so important, to demonstrate our united opposition to U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, call for its repeal, to head off any more moves the Obama administration might have in the next few days with respect to the Paris conference next week as well, and to provide the foundation for the next administration to move forcefully to counteract its dangerous impact.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, for yielding a portion of his time to opponents of this resolution. I also appreciate his willingness to work with me and other Members on our alternative resolution that is more accurate and less divisive, a resolution, unfortunately, the majority has denied a hearing for on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 11. The resolution before us today fails to credibly reaffirm our Nation's support for a two-state solution. It provides an inaccurate accounting of the United States' longstanding policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It includes reckless and divisive charges regarding the recent United Nations Security Council resolution, designed, it would appear, solely to embarrass the outgoing administration. It falsely claims, for example, that the Security Council resolution "contradicts the Oslo Accords." It goes so far as to link the resolution to the boycott and divestiture movement.

Mr. Speaker, there is room for honest debate about the U.N. resolution and about the U.S. decision to abstain, but there is not room, there shouldn't be room, for this kind of disgraceful distortion. H. Res. 11 doesn't really engage the issues; it obscures and distorts them.

I would suggest that both those who support and oppose recent U.S. actions should oppose this irresponsible and divisive resolution. It does distort the record. In fact, during the Obama administration, fewer U.N. Security Council resolutions related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have passed than under any other modern Presidency. In fact, the December resolution is the only one that has passed under President Obama's leadership; and if you want a fair and comprehensive account of the thinking that went into that difficult decision, I commend to every Member Samantha Power's statement at the United Nations, one

of the finest statements of its sort that I have ever read.

H. Res. 11 also doesn't take into account the fact that Republican and Democratic administrations alike have allowed Security Council resolutions addressing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to pass, many of which were opposed by Israel. The fact is H. Res. 11 runs a real risk of undermining the credibility of the United States Congress as a proactive force working toward a two-state solution.

In this period of great geopolitical turmoil and uncertainty, we must reaffirm those fundamental aspects of our foreign policy, including our strong and unwavering support for Israel, while also demonstrating to the world that we are committed to a diplomacy that defends human rights and promotes Israeli and Palestinian states that live side by side in peace and security, a formulation that has characterized our country's diplomacy for decades.

At best, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 11 would muddy the waters of our diplomacy and foreign policy. At worst, it could undermine our decade-long efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians. I can't, in good faith, support the adoption of this resolution, and I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, in response briefly, we did have a substitute from Mr. PRICE, and we looked at that substitute, but it did not once mention the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

Mr. ENGEL and I have worked hard together, in good faith and in a bipartisan manner, to develop a measure that rejects and repudiates this dangerous U.N. resolution that was passed; and also, ours warns the White House against taking additional measures in the last few weeks of the current administration. I think it is important to remind the body that this is very concerning, given the backdrop of the Paris conference on the 15th of this month and the very real concern that the President could take further steps at the U.N.

Again, Mr. PRICE's amendment did not include this urgent warning. I want to say that I am happy to work with Mr. PRICE in a bipartisan manner once the Committee on Foreign Affairs organizes, but time is of the essence. We must act to reject United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334, not remain silent on it, and we have got to limit the damage that the administration has caused to prospects for a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our esteemed chairman for the time.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, will not undo the damage that has been

done at the Security Council, but it sends an important message to the world that the United States Congress resoundingly and in a strong bipartisan manner disapproves of the vote taken on Resolution 2334, and it sends a warning to the nations that will gather in Paris next week to discuss the peace process that there will be repercussions if there is a move to introduce a parameters resolution before the 20th in an effort to further isolate Israel.

Our closest friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, has been under constant attack by the United Nations. Abu Mazen and the Palestinians have pushed a campaign to delegitimize the Jewish state, to undermine the peace process, to achieve unilateral statehood recognition. We have seen it this year at UNESCO, where that sham of an institution voted on several occasions to deny and distance Jewish and Christian historical and cultural ties to Jerusalem.

We have seen it at the Human Rights Council, where Israel is constantly demonized and falsely accused of human rights violations while the real abusers of human rights go unpunished because that body has utterly failed to uphold its mandate. This is a body that allows the worst abusers of human rights—like Cuba, Venezuela, and China—to actually sit in judgment of human rights worldwide. What a pathetic joke. Yet the only thing they can agree on is to attack Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East and the only place in the region where human rights are protected.

We have seen this scheme to delegitimize Israel at the General Assembly, where, in its closing legislative session, the General Assembly passed 20—20—anti-Israel resolutions and only 4, combined, for the entire world.

These institutions have no credibility, and now we have the unfortunate circumstance of the White House deciding to abstain from this anti-Israel, one-sided resolution at the Security Council. Our ally was abandoned, and credibility and momentum were given to the Palestinian schemes to delegitimize the Jewish state, to undermine the peace process.

While the damage has been done, Mr. Speaker, by this act of cowardice at the Security Council, we will have an opportunity to reverse that damage. In the coming weeks and months, this Congress and the incoming administration must show unyielding support for our ally Israel and undo the damage done.

This resolution by the chairman and the ranking member is an all-important first step that signals our intent. I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I look forward to working with Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL in further strengthening our U.S.-Israel bond.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), my good friend and senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1745

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the historic timeline. The Reagan administration and other administrations have failed in the past to veto anti-Israel resolutions, and that failure has not been helpful to the cause of peace. Over the last two decades, Israel has frozen or removed settlements in an effort to negotiate peace, all to no avail.

On November 29 of last year, this House unanimously urged our U.N. Ambassador to veto any U.N. resolution that sought to impose peace settlement terms. But a month later, our U.N. Ambassador ignored the input of this House and allowed the U.N. to adopt a one-sided resolution that sought to impose peace terms on the parties.

Worse yet, that U.N. resolution equates the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, with outposts deep in the West Bank that are illegal under Israeli law.

Today we consider a House resolution that has over 30 Democratic cosponsors. It is not a pro-settlements resolution. It strongly and repeatedly reaffirms our support for a two-state solution, achieved through direct negotiations, and it objects to a U.N. resolution that set back the cause of peace. Vote "yes."

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the long-time chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding and for offering this important resolution, along with the ranking member, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

President Obama's decision to abstain and not veto Security Council Resolution 2334 seriously undermines the peace process, abandons Israel at a critical hour in its life as a nation, and does serious injury to the historical record.

The egregiously flawed U.N. text says that all Israeli settlements after the 1949 armistice line including East Jerusalem and West Bank have no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law.

The pending House resolution repudiates 2334 and makes clear that a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will only come through direct bilateral negotiations, not one-sided, anti-Israel U.N. resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. resolution could open Israeli leaders and even average Israeli settlers to criminal prosecution. Israel's enemies are likely to exploit 2334 by seeking prosecutions in venues like the International Criminal Court for construction activities, even though the vast majority of this activity takes place legally, pursuant to Israeli law.

A few hours ago, the European Jewish press reported that "Leaders of the

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called for France to cancel or, at least, postpone what they called an 'ill-conceived, poorly timed and damaging' event—the Paris Mideast conference—scheduled for January 15."

I hope that we will also call upon our government not to go to this right before a transition of the White House and the Presidency and mischief that could be forthcoming from that.

They pointed out in their statement that "Israel has long sought direct talks" and "it is time for the Palestinian leaders to stop evading their responsibility and seeking to use international fora to avoid the only true path to a lasting peace"—and that is a negotiated settlement.

Nathan Diament of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America pointed out that the U.N. has a long-established bias against Israel. As my good friend from Florida said a moment ago, 20 anti-Israel resolutions against just 4 in 2016—a bias and a discrimination against Israel.

President Obama's decision to abstain and not veto Security Council Resolution 2334 seriously undermines the peace process, abandons Israel at a critical hour in its life as a nation, and does serious injury to the historical record.

The egregiously flawed UN text says that all Israeli settlements after the 1949 armistice line including East Jerusalem and the West Bank have no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law.

The pending House resolution repudiates 2334 and makes clear that a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will only come through direct bilateral negotiations not one-sided anti-Israel UN resolutions.

With over three thousand years of Jewish history bound up in East Jerusalem and the West Bank, it is preposterous to assert that Israel has no legitimacy in defending its connections to this extraordinary heritage. Sadly, these kinds of prejudiced and revisionist claims are all too common in the United Nations where UNESCO voted just a couple months ago on measures that excise any mention of Judaism and Christianity's ancient ties to East Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, the UN Resolution could open Israeli leaders and even average Israeli settlers to criminal prosecution. Israel's enemies are likely to exploit 2334 by seeking prosecutions in venues like the International Criminal Court (ICC) for construction activities, even though the vast majority of this activity takes place legally, pursuant to Israeli law.

By calling on countries to distinguish between the State of Israel and Israeli settlements, 2334 enables the narrative of the anti-Semitic boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement, or BDS movement, that is aimed at delegitimizing Israel.

And in mere days, the error of 2334 could be further compounded.

A few hours ago the European Jewish Press reported that "Leaders of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called for France to cancel or, at least, postpone what they called an 'ill-conceived, poorly timed and damaging'

event—the Paris Mideast conference—scheduled for January 15th."

"The international community should not plunge forward with the ill-conceived and poorly timed Paris conference," CPMAJO Chairman Stephen M. Greenberg and Vice Chairman and CEO Malcolm Hoenlein said in a statement . . . According to the Conference of Presidents, there are a number of compelling reasons to postpone the Paris event, including the impending transition to the Trump administration, just five days later. "It makes no sense that the next administration is precluded from participating in a discussion of an essential component of U.S. foreign policy with which it will be engaged," they explained.

"Israel has long sought direct talks, it is time for the Palestinian leaders to stop evading their responsibility and seeking to use international fora to avoid the only true path to a lasting peace," they added. Hoenlein cautioned it was possible the Obama administration could—following the recent passage of the anti-Israeli settlement Security Council resolution—take a 'further damaging step against the Jewish state before President-elect Donald Trump takes office.'"

Nathan Diament, Executive Director of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, wrote me a letter today and said, "On December 23, 2016, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 2334, a blatantly anti-Israel resolution condemning Israel's building of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. It has long been U.S. policy that any progress toward an agreement in the region must be based on direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders, not a vote of third-party nations at the UN."

"Unfortunately the UN has a long and established bias against Israel. In 2016 alone, the UN General Assembly adopted 20 anti-Israel resolutions and just four against other countries: North Korea, Syria, Iran and Russia. The World Health Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of 'mental, physical and environmental health,' while the U.N. Women condemned Israel as the world's only violator of women's rights. The International Labor Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of labor rights. These same UN committees were silent on the issue of human rights violations in China, Libya, or the Congo."

"Clearly, the UN has an agenda to undermine and delegitimize the state of Israel, and in that regard UN support for Resolution 2334 was not surprising. What was surprising—and deeply concerning—was the silence of the United States on this issue. Rather than exercising its veto power, the United States chose to abstain from voting, and thereby threatened the trust and support Israel has long placed in its most important ally. Over the course of his presidency, Mr. Obama has repeatedly assured American Jews and others concerned about Israel's security and welfare that his commitment to U.S. support for Israel's security was 'unshakeable.' By allowing the UN Security Council's resolution to pass in the final weeks of his Administration, President Obama undermined his legacy and threatened the longstanding alliance between the United States and Israel."

"Whether the abstaining vote was a parting statement from the Obama Administration or the influence of anti-Israeli forces at the UN, the incoming Trump Administration and the

115th Congress must make the United States' support of Israel and our common goals of peace, democracy, and fighting terrorism—a pillar of its foreign policy. Today's resolution condemning UN Resolution 2334 will send an important message to the world that the United States stands with Israel and will continue to support our common goals."

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I would like to note that many of us in Congress have been warning about these kinds of reckless gambits for months. Three-hundred and eighty of us in the House signed a letter in April to President Obama specifically calling on him to veto any one-sided resolution like 2443 if it were raised in the Security Council. In late November, the House voted overwhelmingly for H. Con. Res. 165 further stressing the need for the United States to stand by Israel and veto biased Security Council measures.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 11 to denounce this dangerous Security Council action. I look forward to working with President-elect Trump to align U.S. policy with the overwhelming consensus in Congress: that we are and remain committed to Israel's sovereignty and security.

OU ADVOCACY CENTER,
Washington, DC, January 5, 2017.

Hon. CHRIS SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: On behalf of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (Orthodox Union)—the nation's largest Orthodox Jewish umbrella organization—please accept our gratitude for your support of today's resolution opposing UN Security Council Resolution 2334, and thank you for submitting this letter to the official record of the House of Representatives.

On December 23, 2016, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 2334, a blatantly anti-Israel resolution condemning Israel's building of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. It has long been U.S. policy that any progress toward an agreement in the region must be based on direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders, not a vote of third-party nations at the UN.

Unfortunately, the UN has a long and established bias against Israel. In 2016 alone, the UN General Assembly adopted 20 anti-Israel resolutions and just four against other countries: North Korea, Syria, Iran and Russia. The World Health Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of "mental, physical and environmental health," while the U.N. Women condemned Israel as the world's only violator of women's rights. The International Labor Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of labor rights. These same UN committees were silent on the issue of human rights violations in China, Libya, or the Congo.

Clearly, the UN has an agenda to undermine and delegitimize the state of Israel, and in that regard UN support for Resolution 2334 was not surprising. What was surprising—and deeply concerning—was the silence of the United States on this issue. Rather than exercising its veto power, the United States chose to abstain from voting, and thereby threatened the trust and support Israel has long placed in its most important ally. Over the course of his presidency, Mr. Obama has repeatedly assured American Jews and others concerned about Israel's security and welfare that his commitment to U.S. support for Israel's security was "unshakeable." By allowing the UN Security Council's resolution to pass in the final

weeks of his Administration, President Obama undermined his legacy and threatened the longstanding alliance between the United States and Israel.

Whether the abstaining vote was a parting statement from the Obama Administration or the influence of anti-Israeli forces at the UN, the incoming Trump Administration and the 115th Congress must make the United States' support of Israel and our common goals of peace, democracy, and fighting terrorism—a pillar of its foreign policy. Today's resolution condemning UN Resolution 2334 will send an important message to the world that the United States stands with Israel and will continue to support our common goals.

Again, thank you for your support of Israel and today's resolution. I urge all members of the United States Congress to stand with Israel and vote in favor of the McCarthy-Royce resolution.

Best Regards,

NATHAN DIAMENT,
Executive Director.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a proud Jew and someone who, throughout my entire life, has been an advocate for the State of Israel, and I am standing here to oppose H. Res. 11.

As a Member of Congress, I have been committed to maintaining America's unwavering support for Israel, which has lasted from the very first moments of Israel's existence.

The U.S.-Israel bond is unbreakable, despite the fact that the United States' administrations have not always agreed with the particular policies of an Israeli Government. Contrary to the assertions of H. Res. 11, the U.S. has often expressed those differences in the context of the United Nations. Presidents, from Lyndon Johnson to George W. Bush, have each vetoed and sometimes voted for a U.N. resolution contrary to the wishes of Israel's Government at the time. Only the Obama administration, until 2 weeks ago, never, ever cast a vote against what Israel wanted.

But opposition to the building of settlements on land belonging to Palestinians before the 1967 war—with the exception of the land, of course, that is going to be swapped, agreed to by both parties—has been the official U.S. policy for many decades, contrary, again, to the assertions of H. Res. 11.

It has also been the policy of the United States to recognize that the only long-term solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—the violence, the loss of life—is to create two states: one for the Palestinians and one for Israel. A two-state solution is the only way Israel can continue as both a democratic and a Jewish state, living in the peace and security that has eluded her from the very beginning. The building of settlements is an obstacle to achieving that goal.

And, of course, settlements aren't the only obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. The U.S. resolution reiterates the Palestinian Authority security

forces must continue to counter terrorism and condemn all of the provocations.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), who has served for years as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The recent stunt at the United Nations targeting Israel is the latest effort by this administration to cement a legacy of foreign policy that has failed, especially with our trusted ally Israel. It has been U.S. policy to veto any U.N. resolution dictating parameters on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

The reason is simple. True peace can only be achieved at the negotiating table between the Palestinians and the Israelis, not at the United Nations. The one-sided, anti-Israeli resolution will only make peace harder.

The U.N. adopted 20 anti-Israeli resolutions last year, while passing just 4 for the rest of the world. The U.N. is not fair and unbiased. While pointing the finger solely at Israel, the recent resolution did nothing to point out the Palestinians' lack of progress towards peace.

The Palestinian Authority has failed to stop violence against Jews. It continues to—get this, Mr. Speaker—make payments to jailed Palestinian terrorists who have harmed or killed Jews.

Over the years, Israel has traded land for promised peace. They have no peace. And soon, if the United Nations gets its way, they will have no land.

Despite the administration's policy of abandoning our trusted ally Israel, the United States Congress must stand with our ally Israel.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), one of our new Members, who has made support for Israel part of her entire life and is giving her first speech on the House floor in support of this resolution and support of Israel.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today in support of this resolution and to lend my name as a cosponsor. The United States alliance with Israel is absolutely critical, and this is not the time to sow uncertainty about the state of our relationship.

This resolution does a number of important things, but the most important is that it reaffirms Congress' longstanding support for a bilateral settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and objects to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334. Paragraph 5 of that resolution is reminiscent of a recent U.N. Human Rights

Council resolution that established a database of companies in the settlements, facilitating a boycott.

The UNSC resolution does nothing to advance the cause of peace and is, in fact, an obstacle to it. Strongly ensuring the security of Israel is the only pathway to a lasting settlement.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ED ROYCE for yielding. I appreciate your leadership for peace.

I am in strong support of the House resolution, which is taking a firm stand and clear stand objecting to the United Nations Security Council resolution as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace.

The United States has stood with Israel against one-sided, biased resolutions at the United Nations and in other international forums. Additionally, the United States has been adamant that a peaceful resolution will only come from direct, bilateral negotiations, not addressed by an international forum. The distorted ideology of moral neutrality is suicidal for civilization, encouraging what the chairman correctly identified as “pay for slay,” as evidenced by the murder of American tourist Taylor Force just last year.

On December 23, my constituents were shocked as the Obama administration betrayed the people of Israel, undermining the peace process by failing to veto the U.N. Security Council resolution. President Obama and Secretary Kerry’s actions revealed dangerous irresponsibility, putting Israeli and American families at risk of more terrorist attacks. Fortunately, Governor Nikki Haley, President-elect Donald Trump’s appointee, will soon be making a positive difference as U.N. Ambassador of the United States, promoting peace through strength.

Today, I am grateful to stand strong with Israel by being an original cosponsor of H. Res. 11. I appreciate the leadership of Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Chairman ED ROYCE, and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for sponsoring this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, my commitment to the State of Israel is steadfast, but my first loyalty is to peace—peace that is protected by genuine self-determination.

I know in my heart that the only path to peace is to have two separate, sovereign states that peacefully coexist. The two-state solution is at the heart of American foreign policy, and every President and every Congress since I got here in 1993 put the two-state solution at the heart of what America wants for her friend Israel.

As I said on the House floor on December 6, if we are ever going to achieve the permanent peace that allows Israel to exist without fear and Palestine to exist without occupation, we must continue to fight for the two-state solution. But under the current strongman government in Israel, all pretenses and illusions are being stripped away. From settlements, to water, to restricting the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem, it seems that anything goes.

Today, as America embarks on its own experiment with strongman politics, this Congress is falling in line. This Congress that allowed our Chamber to be used for an Israeli campaign rally and TV commercials is bending to pressure from abroad and pressure here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the commitment to peace of the American people, so I urge my colleagues to vote with their hearts and minds and defeat this House resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my remarks on the floor of December 6 in support of a two-state solution.

TWO STATE SOLUTION IS STILL THE PATH TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

[Luis V. Gutiérrez Floor Remarks, Dec. 6, 2016]

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about what is going on in Israel and I think it has implications both for U.S. foreign policy and for domestic policy and for our great ally, Israel.

As the right-wing government of Benjamin Netanyahu consolidates power and becomes in many ways the one-party rulers of Israel, a number of things are changing that should be of concern to all Americans.

Specifically, the increasing dominance of the Likud Party as the one-party in Israel jeopardizes the two state solution that I and many others in the United States and Israel feel is the only way to achieve long-term peace in the Middle East.

There is a retrenchment of hard line policies—aimed at solidifying alliances with smaller religious and hardline parties that keeps Likud in power—that will make it harder for Israelis and their allies in America—and anyone who seeks a lasting peace—to maintain progress towards a two state solution.

Right now, the Knesset is considering legislation to legalize all Israeli settlements in Palestinian territory on the West Bank, even those constructed on private Palestinian land.

Boom, 400,000 people in settlements across the West Bank, it’s all legal because they say it is legal. But it’s not.

And Israel is destroying Palestinian homes at a pace faster than we have seen before.

It is provocative, sweeping, and designed to make it harder to ever reach an agreement with the Palestinians.

The plan to restrict the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem has been revived, again to placate hardline religious constituents, by Prime Minister Netanyahu.

There is no clearer statement to people of the Islamic faith that they do not matter, they do not belong, and they will not be tolerated than to restrict the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem, a city that has heard the Muslim call to prayer for thousands of years.

I think what is going on in Israel with Prime Minister Netanyahu presents a cau-

tionary tale about the consequences of following a political strongman. The strongman has to keep proving that he is a strongman over and over.

Like other strongmen who ride fear into leadership—when you base your political career on injecting fear and resentment into political affairs—when you use the backdrop of terrorism and the understandable fear of the Israeli people as a political tool for years and decades—this is the kind of policy that results.

There is an appetite for constant escalation of what you are doing to stand up to the enemy you have constructed—an enemy based on, but not the same as the enemies that fight against the state of Israel and tolerance and peace in real life.

Strongmen construct a foil—in this case based on the Palestinians, but sometimes exaggerated beyond recognition—and they need to feed the thirst for more and more action to attack the caricature that has been constructed.

But strongman politics in Israel have the impact of making a long-lasting solution that brings peace to the Middle East harder to achieve.

The fundamental rights of Palestinians to have their own state, a state alongside the Israeli state where they have the basic rights and dignity to govern themselves and raise their families in peace—that is what many Israelis, many Palestinians, and many around the world have been fighting for.

If we are ever going to achieve the permanent peace that allows Israel to exist without fear and Palestine to exist without occupation, we must continue to fight for the two state solution.

When I was just a freshman, almost 25 years ago, we celebrated the accomplishments of Rabin and Arafat and President Clinton to build towards a peace that recognizes the rights and dignity of Israelis and the rights and dignities of the Palestinian people.

For decades, the United States—under different leaders in different parties from Carter to Reagan to Bush and Obama—have recognized that peace will only come with mutual respect and tolerance.

That is what we have based our foreign policy on and should continue to base our foreign policy on.

Having talked with average people and with leaders on both sides of the Palestinian/Israeli conflict—I am convinced that it is the only path to peace.

America has been a catalyst—a constructive influence from outside—a nation based on religious freedom and democracy that has served as a model for both Palestinians and Israelis—and we have worked towards helping parties continue to move in the direction of two separate but mutually respectful countries, two nations that are not at war with each other or subservient to one another.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that Israel herself is moving away from the two state solution as a goal and that we as her closest ally must remind her—and ourselves—of what is at stake if we lose sight of this important goal.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nation of Israel, one of our greatest allies in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 11, Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 calls for a Palestinian state but not a Jewish state. It does nothing to condemn or stop the Palestinian Authority's pay to slay, as we have heard talked over and over again, that rewarded over \$300 million to terrorists in Israeli jails last year for crimes committed against Israeli citizens and others. It legitimizes additional efforts to isolate and sanction Israel. It declares the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, where the City of David has been excavated, and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, as occupied territories.

□ 1800

This is absurd. Furthermore, the Obama administration refused to veto it. This shameful move broke with years of bipartisan U.S. efforts to protect Israel from deeply flawed and biased U.S. resolutions.

H. Res. 11 reasserts the U.S. position that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties. H. Res. 11 must pass to send a clear message to the outgoing Obama administration, to the U.N., and to the world that the United States stands with Israel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. SUOZZI), another new Member of Congress who is also making his maiden speech about the security of Israel and the U.S.-Israel partnership.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of the bipartisan H. Res. 11.

In 2002, during the Second Intifada, after the massacre in Hebron, I had the great, good fortune of meeting in Jerusalem with Shimon Peres, of blessed memory. He explained why a two-state solution is the only path to peace, and I will never abandon his dream of a two-state solution.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, however, pushes the hope of a two-state solution farther away for three reasons:

One, it discourages direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.

Two, it fails to distinguish between "long accepted" and "more controversial" settlements. "Long accepted" settlements, such as the long established Jewish neighborhoods in East Jerusalem, in the Jewish Quarter, places like the Western Wall, and the "consensus" settlements versus "more controversial" hilltop settlements in the West Bank, such as Amona, settlements that even the Israeli Supreme Court has declared illegal.

Three, it fails to explicitly condemn the number one impediment to a two-state solution: anti-Israel terrorism.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

This is an outrageous attack against the State of Israel, the world's only Jewish state and the only democracy in the Middle East. I also condemn the Obama administration's failure to veto such a resolution, because it betrayed Israel and it harmed our national security interests. The Obama administration's actions, or lack of actions, were more than just a sin of omission in that they worked behind the scenes to move this resolution forward so that it could be voted on in the United Nations General Assembly. That is a sin of commission.

Now, we have to be honest about how the two sides have acted in this in putting pressure on Israel and not on the Palestinian Authority. Remember, when you talk about a two-state solution, the Palestinian Arabs rejected a state in 1948. They tried to wipe Israel off the map. They tried to beat them in 1967. It has been a constant state of war, and they have chosen to get rid of the Jewish state as something that is more important to them than the creation of their own state, and we have to be honest about that.

I will support this resolution. I view it as a good statement, but as just a first step. We need something in the coming days that has teeth to deal with the United Nations and its outrageous conduct. It has become a hotbed of anti-Israeli activity where all of these tin-pot countries get together and rail against the world's only Jewish state. They did 20 resolutions against Israel at the United Nations in 2016 and four against the rest of the world.

We need to take our power of the purse and defund the U.N. until U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 is revoked.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, for what may or may not be their good intentions, this resolution and its authors undermined the security of families here and in Israel. This "go it alone" approach with the current Israeli Government—defying a unanimous vote of 14 countries and ignoring the concerns of many of our allies—is not a path to peace. We will not protect ourselves or our allies in Israel if we pursue the path of isolation.

For decades, we have enjoyed a bipartisan commitment to two states living in peace and security next door to one another. It has been a difficult goal to achieve, but now is not the time to give up on it. There are, sadly, some in Israel and some among the Palestinians who wholly reject this commitment. They believe it is all theirs. They believe in a divine entitlement to every piece of land west of the Jordan River. Their idea of a reasonable negotiation is that the other side gets next to nothing.

Few people who have worked on this difficult issue and have tried to over-

come such zealotry and achieve a just resolution have done as much as Secretary of State John Kerry. Despite the insults and the intransigence, he has made near Herculean efforts to achieve peace. To be honest, the roadblocks that have been thrown in his path have not come just from one side. In no way do we condone the many, many wrongs of the Palestinians and the Palestinian Authority by saying that some of those roadblocks were initiated by the current Israeli Government.

Then, to talk of one sided, what irony. Indeed, I think it is hypocrisy to talk about a one-sided resolution when this is a one-sided resolution. If there had been the slightest interest in bringing this body together—with all of us supporting Israel, with all of us supporting access to the Western Wall, with all of us supporting the security of our friend that was reflected in \$38 billion, which is the most money in military assistance we have ever provided to a single ally by this administration—instead of attacking the goodwill and the good faith of this administration, we wouldn't be here today. There is no urgency for us to act today. There is an urgency—just as the new designee for the Ambassador to Israel has slandered some other people—for them to besmirch the efforts of this administration.

The truth is that ever-expanding Israeli settlements—many of them first constructed in total violation of Israeli law—are a significant obstacle, but they are certainly not the only one. The clearer goal of settlers is to have facts on the ground, to be irreversible in moving to split up any potential Palestinian Authority.

Protect our families and those of Israel by rejecting this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334—an anti-Israel, anti-Jewish attempt on behalf of pro-Palestinian nations to delegitimize Israel and ethnically cleanse East Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria of the Jewish people.

The Israelis have long been willing to compromise large swaths of land in this region in pursuit of a two-state solution. It has been the Palestinians who have, time and again, declined real offers on the table for their own state. Just think about this reality. If the Israelis agreed right now to make all of the concessions this U.N. Security Council resolution calls for, there would still not be peace. A viable two-state solution isn't just about Israel's recognizing the Palestinians' right to exist; it is also about the Palestinians' recognizing Israel's right to exist.

As for me, I stand for freedom, and America should stand strong—shoulder to shoulder—with Israel.

President Obama lit a menorah this year at the White House. He reflected on Hanukkah as a celebration of the

Maccabees' fight for freedom—the Maccabees, who lived, prayed, and fought on the land that this resolution now calls illegally occupied territory. It is an insult this resolution was passed just one day before the start of Hanukkah. Israel is one of America's greatest allies and is a beacon of freedom and liberty in a very dark region of the world. The Obama administration, by allowing this resolution to pass, is attempting a dangerous shift in American foreign policy that cannot be allowed to stand.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in great support of the Ross-Engel bill against this most deceitful and shameful U.N. resolution. That is what we are here for. This act was shameful and it was deceitful.

When the U.N. voted for this 2334 resolution, it was like cutting Israel's legs out from under it and then condemning Israel for being a cripple. Shameful and deceitful because they wanted to put all of the blame on Israel when it is the Palestinians who refuse to even meet to discuss or to even talk about a two-nation state. It is the Palestinians who say Israel doesn't even have a right to exist.

How in the hell are you going to meet with somebody to talk about a combined future when they will not give you decent recognition?

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman because this part is very important.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is blessed. We have been blessed with divine intervention all through our history to be that shining light on the hill, to let all of our great work show for the world. We have an opportunity here tonight for this Congress to stand up and show that light for Israel.

Stand up for Israel and show our great works to this world. That is what I say, so let it be written and let it be done.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 11, which offers a strong objection to U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

President Obama started his foreign policy 8 years ago with an apology tour in the Middle East, and now, not surprisingly, he ends it with a slap in the face to our ally and friend, Israel.

For over 40 years, the United States Government—Republicans and Democrats—stood shoulder to shoulder with our ally, vetoing countless resolutions

at the United Nations. However, this past December, President Obama broke that tradition and chose to allow this resolution to come before the Security Council for a vote. As Prime Minister Netanyahu said: "This was a disgraceful anti-Israel maneuver." Not only does this one-sided resolution blatantly target Israel, it seriously impedes the peace process.

Unfortunately, while I wholeheartedly reject what happened at the United Nations, I cannot say that I am surprised. The Obama administration has been more concerned with appeasing nefarious actors like Iran and Cuba, all the while ignoring friends like Israel. I look forward to a new era of foreign policy in which our enemies fear us and our allies respect us.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of a two-state solution, as a Jewish Member of Congress and as someone who has been to Israel and has seen the settlements firsthand, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Settlements are an impediment to peace between Israelis and Palestinians. This resolution only provides ammunition to those who oppose a two-state solution—the approach that is our only hope for lasting peace. We all agree that the incitement of violence and terrorism must end, which U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 discusses. But as Secretary Kerry so eloquently stated in his speech on December 28:

Some seem to believe that the U.S.' friendship means the U.S. must accept any policy regardless of our own interests, our own positions, our own words, our own principles—even after urging again and again that the policy must change. Friends need to tell each other the hard truths, and friendships require mutual respect.

□ 1815

Well, my friends, Israel must end settlement expansion, close their outposts, and get to the negotiating table. Prime Minister Netanyahu has not treated the Obama administration with respect, and this resolution does not offer the American people the honest, true debate we should be having about this critically important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Obama administration, especially Secretary of State Kerry, for their dedication in trying to find a path forward for a two-state solution. It is my hope that the principles laid out in Secretary Kerry's December 28, 2016 speech will help

guide serious negotiations in the days ahead. To ensure that his remarks are a part of this debate, I will now read his entire statement.

Secretary Kerry said: Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very, very much. Thank you. (Coughs.) Excuse me. Thank you for your patience, all of you. For those of you who celebrated Christmas, I hope you had a wonderful Christmas. Happy Chanukah. And to everybody here, I know it's the middle of a holiday week. I understand. (Laughter.) But I wish you all a very, very productive and Happy New Year.

Today, I want to share candid thoughts about an issue which for decades has animated the foreign policy dialogue here and around the world—the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Throughout his Administration, President Obama has been deeply committed to Israel and its security, and that commitment has guided his pursuit of peace in the Middle East. This is an issue which, all of you know, I have worked on intensively during my time as Secretary of State for one simple reason: because the two-state solution is the only way to achieve a just and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians. It is the only way to ensure Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state, living in peace and security with its neighbors. It is the only way to ensure a future of freedom and dignity for the Palestinian people. And it is an important way of advancing United States interests in the region.

Now, I'd like to explain why that future is now in jeopardy, and provide some context for why we could not, in good conscience, stand in the way of a resolution at the United Nations that makes clear that both sides must act now to preserve the possibility of peace.

I'm also here to share my conviction that there is still a way forward if the responsible parties are willing to act. And I want to share practical suggestions for how to preserve and advance the prospects for the just and lasting peace that both sides deserve.

So it is vital that we have an honest, clear-eyed conversation about the uncomfortable truths and difficult choices, because the alternative that is fast becoming the reality on the ground is in nobody's interest—not the Israelis, not the Palestinians, not the region—and not the United States.

Now, I want to stress that there is an important point here: My job, above all, is to defend the United States of America—to stand up for and defend our values and our interests in the world. And if we were to stand idly by and know that in doing so we are allowing a dangerous dynamic to take hold which promises greater conflict and instability to a region in which we have vital interests, we would be derelict in our own responsibilities.

Regrettably, some seem to believe that the U.S. friendship means the U.S. must accept any policy, regardless of our own interests, our own positions, our own words, our own principles—even after urging again and again that the policy must change. Friends need to tell each other the hard truths, and friendships require mutual respect.

Israel's permanent representative to the United Nations, who does not support a two-state solution, said after the vote last week, quote, "It was to be expected that Israel's greatest ally would act in accordance with the values that we share," and veto this resolution. I am compelled to respond today that the

United States did, in fact, vote in accordance with our values, just as previous U.S. administrations have done at the Security Council before us.

They fail to recognize that this friend, the United States of America, that has done more to support Israel than any other country, this friend that has blocked countless efforts to delegitimize Israel, cannot be true to our own values—or even the stated democratic values of Israel—and we cannot properly defend and protect Israel if we allow a viable two-state solution to be destroyed before our own eyes.

And that's the bottom line: the vote in the United Nations was about preserving the two-state solution. That's what we were standing up for: Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state, living side by side in peace and security with its neighbors. That's what we are trying to preserve for our sake and for theirs.

In fact, this Administration has been Israel's greatest friend and supporter, with an absolutely unwavering commitment to advancing Israel's security and protecting its legitimacy.

On this point, I want to be very clear: No American administration has done more for Israel's security than Barack Obama's. The Israeli prime minister himself has noted our, quote, "unprecedented" military and intelligence cooperation. Our military exercises are more advanced than ever. Our assistance for Iron Dome has saved countless Israeli lives. We have consistently supported Israel's right to defend itself, by itself, including during actions in Gaza that sparked great controversy.

Time and again we have demonstrated that we have Israel's back. We have strongly opposed boycotts, divestment campaigns, and sanctions targeting Israel in international fora, whenever and wherever its legitimacy was attacked, and we have fought for its inclusion across the UN system. In the midst of our own financial crisis and budget deficits, we repeatedly increased funding to support Israel. In fact, more than one-half of our entire global Foreign Military Financing goes to Israel. And this fall, we concluded an historic \$38 billion memorandum of understanding that exceeds any military assistance package the United States has provided to any country, at any time, and that will invest in cutting-edge missile defense and sustain Israel's qualitative military edge for years to come. That's the measure of our support.

This commitment to Israel's security is actually very personal for me. On my first trip to Israel as a young senator in 1986, I was captivated by a special country, one that I immediately admired and soon grew to love. Over the years, like so many others who are drawn to this extraordinary place, I have climbed Masada, swum in the Dead Sea, driven from one Biblical city to another. I've also seen the dark side of Hizballah's rocket storage facilities just across the border in Lebanon, walked through exhibits of the hell of the Holocaust at Yad Vashem, stood on the Golan Heights, and piloted an Israeli jet over the tiny airspace of Israel, which would make anyone understand the importance of security to Israelis. Out of those experiences came a steadfast commitment to Israel's security that has never wavered for a single minute in my 28 years in the Senate or my four years as Secretary.

I have also often visited West Bank communities, where I met Palestinians struggling for basic freedom and dignity amidst the occupation, passed by military checkpoints that can

make even the most routine daily trips to work or school an ordeal, and heard from business leaders who could not get the permits that they needed to get their products to the market and families who have struggled to secure permission just to travel for needed medical care.

And I have witnessed firsthand the ravages of a conflict that has gone on for far too long. I've seen Israeli children in Sderot whose playgrounds had been hit by Katyusha rockets. I've visited shelters next to schools in Kiryat Shmona that kids had 15 seconds to get to after a warning siren went off. I've also seen the devastation of war in the Gaza Strip, where Palestinian girls in Izbet Abed Rabo played in the rubble of a bombed-out building.

No children—Israeli or Palestinian—should have to live like that.

So, despite the obvious difficulties that I understood when I became Secretary of State, I knew that I had to do everything in my power to help end this conflict. And I was grateful to be working for President Obama, who was prepared to take risks for peace and was deeply committed to that effort.

Like previous U.S. administrations, we have committed our influence and our resources to trying to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict because, yes, it would serve American interests to stabilize a volatile region and fulfill America's commitment to the survival, security and well-being of an Israel at peace with its Arab neighbors.

Despite our best efforts over the years, the two-state solution is now in serious jeopardy.

The truth is that trends on the ground—violence, terrorism, incitement, settlement expansion and the seemingly endless occupation—they are combining to destroy hopes for peace on both sides and increasingly cementing an irreversible one-state reality that most people do not actually want.

Today, there are a number—there are a similar number of Jews and Palestinians living between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. They have a choice. They can choose to live together in one state, or they can separate into two states. But here is a fundamental reality: if the choice is one state, Israel can either be Jewish or democratic—it cannot be both—and it won't ever really be at peace. Moreover, the Palestinians will never fully realize their vast potential in a homeland of their own with a one-state solution.

Now, most on both sides understand this basic choice, and that is why it is important that polls of Israelis and Palestinians show that there is still strong support for the two-state solution—in theory. They just don't believe that it can happen.

After decades of conflict, many no longer see the other side as people, only as threats and enemies. Both sides continue to push a narrative that plays to people's fears and reinforces the worst stereotypes rather than working to change perceptions and build up belief in the possibility of peace.

And the truth is the extraordinary polarization in this conflict extends beyond Israelis and Palestinians. Allies of both sides are content to reinforce this with an us or—"you're with us or against us" mentality where too often anyone who questions Palestinian actions is an apologist for the occupation and anyone who disagrees with Israel policy is cast as anti-Israel or even anti-Semitic.

That's one of the most striking realities about the current situation: This critical decision

about the future—one state or two states—is effectively being made on the ground every single day, despite the expressed opinion of the majority of the people.

The status quo is leading towards one state and perpetual occupation, but most of the public either ignores it or has given up hope that anything can be done to change it. And with this passive resignation, the problem only gets worse, the risks get greater and the choices are narrowed.

This sense of hopelessness among Israelis is exacerbated by the continuing violence, terrorist attacks against civilians and incitement, which are destroying belief in the possibility of peace.

Let me say it again: There is absolutely no justification for terrorism, and there never will be.

And the most recent wave of Palestinian violence has included hundreds of terrorist attacks in the past year, including stabbings, shootings, vehicular attacks and bombings, many by individuals who have been radicalized by social media. Yet the murderers of innocents are still glorified on Fatah websites, including showing attackers next to Palestinian leaders following attacks. And despite statements by President Abbas and his party's leaders making clear their opposition to violence, too often they send a different message by failing to condemn specific terrorist attacks and naming public squares, streets and schools after terrorists.

President Obama and I have made it clear to the Palestinian leadership countless times, publicly and privately, that all incitement to violence must stop. We have consistently condemned violence and terrorism, and even condemned the Palestinian leadership for not condemning it.

Far too often, the Palestinians have pursued efforts to delegitimize Israel in international fora. We have strongly opposed these initiatives, including the recent wholly unbalanced and inflammatory UNESCO resolution regarding Jerusalem. And we have made clear our strong opposition to Palestinian efforts against Israel at the ICC, which only sets back the prospects for peace.

And we all understand that the Palestinian Authority has a lot more to do to strengthen its institutions and improve governance.

Most troubling of all, Hamas continues to pursue an extremist agenda: they refuse to accept Israel's very right to exist. They have a one-state vision of their own: all of the land is Palestine. Hamas and other radical factions are responsible for the most explicit forms of incitement to violence, and many of the images that they use are truly appalling. And they are willing to kill innocents in Israel and put the people of Gaza at risk in order to advance that agenda.

Compounding this, the humanitarian situation in Gaza, exacerbated by the closings of the crossings, is dire. Gaza is home to one of the world's densest concentrations of people enduring extreme hardships with few opportunities. 1.3 million people out of Gaza's population of 1.8 million are in need of daily assistance—food and shelter. Most have electricity less than half the time and only 5 percent of the water is safe to drink. And yet despite the urgency of these needs, Hamas and other militant groups continue to re-arm and divert reconstruction materials to build tunnels, threatening more attacks on Israeli civilians that no government can tolerate.

Now, at the same time, we have to be clear about what is happening in the West Bank. The Israeli prime minister publicly supports a two-state solution, but his current coalition is the most right wing in Israeli history, with an agenda driven by the most extreme elements. The result is that policies of this government, which the prime minister himself just described as “more committed to settlements than any in Israel’s history,” are leading in the opposite direction. They’re leading towards one state. In fact, Israel has increasingly consolidated control over much of the West Bank for its own purposes, effectively reversing the transitions to greater Palestinian civil authority that were called for by the Oslo Accords.

I don’t think most people in Israel, and certainly in the world, have any idea how broad and systematic the process has become. But the facts speak for themselves. The number of settlers in the roughly 130 Israeli settlements east of the 1967 lines has steadily grown. The settler population in the West Bank alone, not including East Jerusalem, has increased by nearly 270,000 since Oslo, including 100,000 just since 2009, when President Obama’s term began.

There’s no point in pretending that these are just in large settlement blocks. Nearly 90,000 settlers are living east of the separation barrier that was created by Israel itself in the middle of what, by any reasonable definition, would be the future Palestinian state. And the population of these distant settlements has grown by 20,000 just since 2009. In fact, just recently the government approved a significant new settlement well east of the barrier, closer to Jordan than to Israel. What does that say to Palestinians in particular—but also to the United States and the world—about Israel’s intentions?

Let me emphasize, this is not to say that the settlements are the whole or even the primary cause of this conflict. Of course they are not. Nor can you say that if the settlements were suddenly removed, you’d have peace. Without a broader agreement, you would not. And we understand that in a final status agreement, certain settlements would become part of Israel to account for the changes that have taken place over the last 49 years—we understand that—including the new democratic demographic realities that exist on the ground. They would have to be factored in. But if more and more settlers are moving into the middle of Palestinian areas, it’s going to be just that much harder to separate, that much harder to imagine transferring sovereignty, and that is exactly the outcome that some are purposefully accelerating.

Let’s be clear: Settlement expansion has nothing to do with Israel’s security. Many settlements actually increase the security burden on the Israeli Defense Forces. And leaders of the settler movement are motivated by ideological imperatives that entirely ignore legitimate Palestinian aspirations.

Among the most troubling illustrations of this point has been the proliferation of settler outposts that are illegal under Israel’s own laws. They’re often located on private Palestinian land and strategically placed in locations that make two states impossible. There are over 100 of these outposts. And since 2011, nearly one-third of them have been or are being legalized, despite pledges by past Israeli governments to dismantle many of them.

Now leaders of the settler movement have advanced unprecedented new legislation that

would legalize most of those outposts. For the first time, it would apply Israeli domestic law to the West Bank rather than military law, which is a major step towards the process of annexation. When the law passed the first reading in the Israeli parliament, in the Knesset, one of the chief proponents said proudly—and I quote—“Today, the Israeli Knesset moved from heading towards establishing a Palestinian state towards Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria.” Even the Israeli attorney general has said that the draft law is unconstitutional and a violation of international law.

Now, you may hear from advocates that the settlements are not an obstacle to peace because the settlers who don’t want to leave can just stay in Palestine, like the Arab Israelis who live in Israel. But that misses a critical point, my friends. The Arab Israelis are citizens of Israel, subject to Israel’s law. Does anyone here really believe that the settlers will agree to submit to Palestinian law in Palestine?

Likewise, some supporters of the settlements argue that the settlers could just stay in their settlements and remain as Israeli citizens in their separate enclaves in the middle of Palestine, protected by the IDF. Well, there are over 80 settlements east of the separation barrier, many located in places that would make a continuous—a contiguous Palestinian state impossible. Does anyone seriously think that if they just stay where they are you could still have a viable Palestinian state?

Now, some have asked, “Why can’t we build in the blocs which everyone knows will eventually be part of Israel?” Well, the reason building there or anywhere else in the West Bank now results in such pushback is that the decision of what constitutes a bloc is being made unilaterally by the Israeli Government, without consultation, without the consent of the Palestinians, and without granting the Palestinians a reciprocal right to build in what will be, by most accounts, part of Palestine. Bottom line—without agreement or mutuality, the unilateral choices become a major point of contention, and that is part of why we are here where we are.

You may hear that these remote settlements aren’t a problem because they only take up a very small percentage of the land. Well, again and again we have made it clear, it’s not just a question of the overall amount of land available in the West Bank. It’s whether the land can be connected or it’s broken up into small parcels, like a Swiss cheese, that could never constitute a real state. The more outposts that are built, the more the settlements expand, the less possible it is to create a contiguous state. So in the end, a settlement is not just the land that it’s on, it’s also what the location does to the movement of people, what it does to the ability of a road to connect people, one community to another, what it does to the sense of statehood that is chipped away with each new construction. No one thinking seriously about peace can ignore the reality of what the settlements pose to that peace.

But the problem, obviously, goes well beyond settlements. Trends indicate a comprehensive effort to take the West Bank land for Israel and prevent any Palestinian development there. Today, the 60 percent of the West Bank known as Area C—much of which was supposed to be transferred to Palestinian control long ago under the Oslo Accords—much of it is effectively off limits to Palestinian devel-

opment. Most today has essentially been taken for exclusive use by Israel simply by unilaterally designating it as “state land” or including it within the jurisdiction of regional settlement councils. Israeli farms flourish in the Jordan River Valley, and Israeli resorts line the shores of the Dead Sea—a lot of people don’t realize this—they line the shore of the Dead Sea, where Palestinian development is not allowed. In fact, almost no private Palestinian building is approved in Area C at all. Only one permit was issued by Israel in all of 2014 and 2015, while approvals for hundreds of settlement units were advanced during that same period.

Moreover, Palestinian structures in Area C that do not have a permit from the Israeli military are potentially subject to demolition. And they are currently being demolished at an historically high rate. Over 1,300 Palestinians, including over 600 children, have been displaced by demolitions in 2016 alone—more than any previous year.

So the settler agenda is defining the future of Israel. And their stated purpose is clear. They believe in one state: greater Israel. In fact, one prominent minister, who heads a pro-settler party, declared just after the U.S. election—and I quote—“the era of the two-state solution is over,” end quote. And many other coalition ministers publicly reject a Palestinian state. And they are increasingly getting their way, with plans for hundreds of new units in East Jerusalem recently announced and talk of a major new settlement building effort in the West Bank to follow.

So why are we so concerned? Why does this matter? Well, ask yourself these questions: What happens if that agenda succeeds? Where does that lead?

There are currently about 2.75 million Palestinians living under military occupation in the West Bank, most of them in Areas A and B—40 percent of the West Bank—where they have limited autonomy. They are restricted in their daily movements by a web of checkpoints and unable to travel into or out of the West Bank without a permit from the Israelis.

So if there is only one state, you would have millions of Palestinians permanently living in segregated enclaves in the middle of the West Bank, with no real political rights, separate legal, education, and transportation systems, vast income disparities, under a permanent military occupation that deprives them of the most basic freedoms. Separate and unequal is what you would have. And nobody can explain how that works. Would an Israeli accept living that way? Would an American accept living that way? Will the world accept it?

If the occupation becomes permanent, over the time the Palestinian Authority could simply dissolve, turn over all the administrative and security responsibilities to the Israelis. What would happen then? Who would administer the schools and hospitals and on what basis? Does Israel want to pay for the billions of dollars of lost international assistance that the Palestinian Authority now receives? Would the Israel Defense Force police the streets of every single Palestinian city and town?

How would Israel respond to a growing civil rights movement from Palestinians, demanding a right to vote, or widespread protests and unrest across the West Bank? How does Israel reconcile a permanent occupation with

its democratic ideals? How does the U.S. continue to defend that and still live up to our own democratic ideals?

Nobody has ever provided good answers to those questions because there aren't any. And there would be an increasing risk of more intense violence between Palestinians and settlers, and complete despair among Palestinians that would create very fertile ground for extremists.

With all the external threats that Israel faces today, which we are very cognizant of and working with them to deal with, does it really want an intensifying conflict in the West Bank? How does that help Israel's security? How does that help the region?

The answer is it doesn't, which is precisely why so many senior Israeli military and intelligence leaders, past and present, believe the two-state solution is the only real answer for Israel's long term security.

Now, one thing we do know: if Israel goes down the one state path, it will never have true peace with the rest of the Arab world, and I can say that with certainty. The Arab countries have made clear that they will not make peace with Israel without resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. That's not where their loyalties lie. That's not where their politics are.

But there is something new here. Common interests in countering Iran's destabilizing activities, and fighting extremists, as well as diversifying their economies have created real possibilities for something different if Israel takes advantage of the opportunities for peace. I have spent a great deal of time with key Arab leaders exploring this, and there is no doubt that they are prepared to have a fundamentally different relationship with Israel. That was stated in the Arab Peace Initiative, years ago. And in all my recent conversations, Arab leaders have confirmed their readiness, in the context of Israeli-Palestinian peace, not just to normalize relations but to work openly on securing that peace with significant regional security cooperation. It's waiting. It's right there.

Many have shown a willingness to support serious Israeli-Palestinian negotiations and to take steps on the path to normalization to relations, including public meetings, providing there is a meaningful progress towards a two-state solution. My friends, that is a real opportunity that we should not allow to be missed.

And that raises one final question: Is ours the generation that gives up on the dream of a Jewish democratic state of Israel living in peace and security with its neighbors? Because that is really what is at stake.

Now, that is what informed our vote at the Security Council last week—the need to preserve the two-state solution—and both sides in this conflict must take responsibility to do that. We have repeatedly and emphatically stressed to the Palestinians that all incitement to violence must stop. We have consistently condemned all violence and terrorism, and we have strongly opposed unilateral efforts to delegitimize Israel in international fora.

We've made countless public and private exhortations to the Israelis to stop the march of settlements. In literally hundreds of conversations with Prime Minister Netanyahu, I have made clear that continued settlement activity would only increase pressure for an international response. We have all known for some time that the Palestinians were intent on moving forward in the UN with a settlements

resolution, and I advised the prime minister repeatedly that further settlement activity only invited UN action.

Yet the settlement activity just increased, including advancing the unprecedented legislation to legalize settler outposts that the prime minister himself reportedly warned could expose Israel to action at the Security Council and even international prosecution before deciding to support it.

In the end, we could not in good conscience protect the most extreme elements of the settler movement as it tries to destroy the two-state solution. We could not in good conscience turn a blind eye to Palestinian actions that fan hatred and violence. It is not in U.S. interest to help anyone on either side create a unitary state. And we may not be able to stop them, but we cannot be expected to defend them. And it is certainly not the role of any country to vote against its own policies.

That is why we decided not to block the UN resolution that makes clear both sides have to take steps to save the two-state solution while there is still time. And we did not take this decision lightly. The Obama Administration has always defended Israel against any effort at the UN and any international fora or biased and one-sided resolutions that seek to undermine its legitimacy or security, and that has not changed. It didn't change with this vote.

But remember it's important to note that every United States administration, Republican and Democratic, has opposed settlements as contrary to the prospects for peace, and action at the UN Security Council is far from unprecedented. In fact, previous administrations of both political parties have allowed resolutions that were critical of Israel to pass, including on settlements. On dozens of occasions under George W. Bush alone, the council passed six resolutions that Israel opposed, including one that endorsed a plan calling for a complete freeze on settlements, including natural growth.

Let me read you the lead paragraph from a New York Times story dated December 23rd. I quote: "With the United States abstaining, the Security Council adopted a resolution today strongly deploring Israel's handling of the disturbances in the occupied territories, which the resolution defined as, including Jerusalem. All of the 14 other Security Council members voted in favor." My friends, that story was not written last week. It was written December 23rd, 1987, 26 years to the day that we voted last week, when Ronald Reagan was president.

Yet despite growing pressure, the Obama Administration held a strong line against UN action, any UN action, we were the only administration since 1967 that had not allowed any resolution to pass that Israel opposed. In fact, the only time in eight years the Obama Administration exercised its veto at the United Nations was against a one-sided settlements resolution in 2011. And that resolution did not mention incitement or violence.

Now let's look at what's happened since then. Since then, there have been over 30,000 settlement units advanced through some stage of the planning process. That's right—over 30,000 settlement units advanced notwithstanding the positions of the United States and other countries. And if we had vetoed this resolution just the other day, the United States would have been giving license to further unfettered settlement construction that we fundamentally oppose.

So we reject the criticism that this vote abandons Israel. On the contrary, it is not this resolution that is isolating Israel; it is the permanent policy of settlement construction that risks making peace impossible. And virtually every country in the world other than Israel opposes settlements. That includes many of the friends of Israel, including the United Kingdom, France, Russia—all of whom voted in favor of the settlements resolution in 2011 that we vetoed, and again this year along with every other member of the council.

In fact, this resolution simply reaffirms statements made by the Security Council on the legality of settlements over several decades. It does not break new ground. In 1978, the State Department Legal Adviser advised the Congress on his conclusion that Israel's government, the Israeli Government's program of establishing civilian settlements in the occupied territory is inconsistent with international law, and we see no change since then to affect that fundamental conclusion.

Now, you may have heard that some criticized this resolution for calling East Jerusalem occupied territory. But to be clear, there was absolutely nothing new in last week's resolution on that issue. It was one of a long line of Security Council resolutions that included East Jerusalem as part of the territories occupied by Israel in 1967, and that includes resolutions passed by the Security Council under President Reagan and President George H.W. Bush. And remember that every U.S. administration since 1967, along with the entire international community, has recognized East Jerusalem as among the territories that Israel occupied in the Six-Day War.

Now, I want to stress this point: We fully respect Israel's profound historic and religious ties to the city and to its holy sites. We've never questioned that. This resolution in no manner prejudices the outcome of permanent status negotiations on East Jerusalem, which must, of course, reflect those historic ties and the realities on the ground. That's our position. We still support it.

We also strongly reject the notion that somehow the United States was the driving force behind this resolution. The Egyptians and Palestinians had long made clear to all of us—to all of the international community—their intention to bring a resolution to a vote before the end of the year, and we communicated that to the Israelis and they knew it anyway. The United States did not draft or originate this resolution, nor did we put it forward. It was drafted by Egypt—it was drafted and I think introduced by Egypt, which is one of Israel's closest friends in the region, in coordination with the Palestinians and others.

And during the time of the process as it went out, we made clear to others, including those on the Security Council, that it was possible that if the resolution were to be balanced and it were to include references to incitement and to terrorism, that it was possible the United States would then not block it, that—if it was balanced and fair. That's a standard practice with resolutions at the Security Council. The Egyptians and the Palestinians and many others understood that if the text were more balanced, it was possible we wouldn't block it. But we also made crystal clear that the President of the United States would not make a final decision about our own position until we saw the final text.

In the end, we did not agree with every word in this resolution. There are important

issues that are not sufficiently addressed or even addressed at all. But we could not in good conscience veto a resolution that condemns violence and incitement and reiterates what has been for a long time the overwhelming consensus and international view on settlements and calls for the parties to start taking constructive steps to advance the two-state solution on the ground.

Ultimately, it will be up to the Israeli people to decide whether the unusually heated attacks that Israeli officials have directed towards this Administration best serve Israel's national interests and its relationship with an ally that has been steadfast in its support, as I described. Those attacks, alongside allegations of U.S.-led conspiracy and other manufactured claims, distract attention from what the substance of this vote was really all about.

And we all understand that Israel faces very serious threats in a very tough neighborhood. Israelis are rightfully concerned about making sure that there is not a new terrorist haven right next door to them, often referencing what's happened with Gaza, and we understand that and we believe there are ways to meet those needs of security. And Israelis are fully justified in decrying attempts to legitimize their state and question the right of a Jewish state to exist. But this vote was not about that. It was about actions that Israelis and Palestinians are taking that are increasingly rendering a two-state solution impossible. It was not about making peace with the Palestinians now—it was about making sure that peace with the Palestinians will be possible in the future.

Now, we all understand that Israel faces extraordinary, serious threats in a very tough neighborhood. And Israelis are very correct in making sure that there's not a terrorist haven right on their border.

But this vote—I can't emphasize enough—is not about the possibility of arriving at an agreement that's going to resolve that overnight or in one year or two years. This is about a longer process. This is about how we make peace with the Palestinians in the future but preserve the capacity to do so.

So how do we get there? How do we get there, to that peace?

Since the parties have not yet been able to resume talks, the U.S. and the Middle East Quartet have repeatedly called on both sides to independently demonstrate a genuine commitment to the two-state solution—not just with words, but with real actions and policies—to create the conditions for meaningful negotiations.

We've called for both sides to take significant steps on the ground to reverse current trends and send a different message—a clear message—that they are prepared to fundamentally change the equation without waiting for the other side to act.

We have pushed them to comply with their basic commitments under their own prior agreements in order to advance a two-state reality on the ground.

We have called for the Palestinians to do everything in their power to stop violence and incitement, including publicly and consistently condemning acts of terrorism and stopping the glorification of violence.

And we have called on them to continue efforts to strengthen their own institutions and to improve governance, transparency, and accountability.

And we have stressed that the Hamas arms buildup and militant activities in Gaza must stop.

Along with our Quartet partners, we have called on Israel to end the policy of settlement construction and expansion, of taking land for exclusive Israeli use and denying Palestinian development.

To reverse the current process, the U.S. and our partners have encouraged Israel to resume the transfer of greater civil authority to the Palestinians in Area C, consistent with the transition that was called for by Oslo. And we have made clear that significant progress across a range of sectors, including housing, agriculture, and natural resources, can be made without negatively impacting Israel's legitimate security needs. And we've called for significantly easing the movement and access restrictions to and from Gaza, with due consideration for Israel's need to protect its citizens from terrorist attacks.

So let me stress here again: None of the steps that I just talked about would negatively impact Israel's security.

Let me also emphasize this is not about offering limited economic measures that perpetuate the status quo. We're talking about significant steps that would signal real progress towards creating two states.

That's the bottom line: If we're serious about the two-state solution, it's time to start implementing it now. Advancing the process of separation now, in a serious way, could make a significant difference in saving the two-state solution and in building confidence in the citizens of both sides that peace is, indeed, possible. And much progress can be made in advance of negotiations that can lay the foundation for negotiations, as contemplated by the Oslo process. In fact, these steps will help create the conditions for successful talks.

Now, in the end, we all understand that a final status agreement can only be achieved through direct negotiations between the parties. We've said that again and again. We cannot impose the peace.

There are other countries in the UN who believe it is our job to dictate the terms of a solution in the Security Council. Others want us to simply recognize a Palestinian state, absent an agreement. But I want to make clear today, these are not the choices that we will make.

We choose instead to draw on the experiences of the last eight years, to provide a way forward when the parties are ready for serious negotiations. In a place where the narratives from the past powerfully inform and mold the present, it's important to understand the history. We mark this year and next a series of milestones that I believe both illustrate the two sides of the conflict and form the basis for its resolution. It's worth touching on them briefly.

A hundred and twenty years ago, the First Zionist Congress was convened in Basel by a group of Jewish visionaries, who decided that the only effective response to the waves of anti-Semitic horrors sweeping across Europe was to create a state in the historic home of the Jewish people, where their ties to the land went back centuries—a state that could defend its borders, protect its people, and live in peace with its neighbors. That was the vision. That was the modern beginning, and it remains the dream of Israel today.

Nearly 70 years ago, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181 finally paved the way to making the State of Israel a reality.

The concept was simple: to create two states for two peoples—one Jewish, one Arab—to realize the national aspirations of both Jews and Palestinians. And both Israel and the PLO referenced Resolution 181 in their respective declarations of independence.

The United States recognized Israel seven minutes after its creation. But the Palestinians and the Arab world did not, and from its birth, Israel had to fight for its life. Palestinians also suffered terribly in the 1948 war, including many who had lived for generations in a land that had long been their home too. And when Israel celebrates its 70th anniversary in 2018, the Palestinians will mark a very different anniversary: 70 years since what they call the Nakba, or catastrophe.

Next year will also mark 50 years since the end of the Six-Day War, when Israel again fought for its survival. And Palestinians will again mark just the opposite: 50 years of military occupation. Both sides have accepted UN Security Council Resolution 242, which called for the withdrawal of Israel from territory that it occupied in 1967 in return for peace and secure borders, as the basis for ending the conflict.

It has been more than 20 years since Israel and the PLO signed their first agreement—the Oslo Accords—and the PLO formally recognized Israel. Both sides committed to a plan to transition much of the West Bank and Gaza to Palestinian control during permanent status negotiations that would put an end to their conflict. Unfortunately, neither the transition nor the final agreement came about, and both sides bear responsibility for that.

Finally, some 15 years ago, King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia came out with the historic Arab Peace Initiative, which offered fully normalized relations with Israel when it made peace—an enormous opportunity then and now, which has never been fully embraced.

That history was critical to our approach to trying to find a way to resolve the conflict. And based on my experience with both sides over the last four years, including the nine months of formal negotiations, the core issues can be resolved if there is leadership on both sides committed to finding a solution.

In the end, I believe the negotiations did not fail because the gaps were too wide, but because the level of trust was too low. Both sides were concerned that any concessions would not be reciprocated and would come at too great a political cost. And the deep public skepticism only made it more difficult for them to be able to take risks.

In the countless hours that we spent working on a detailed framework, we worked through numerous formulations and developed specific bridging proposals, and we came away with a clear understanding of the fundamental needs of both sides. In the past two and a half years, I have tested ideas with regional and international stakeholders, including our Quartet partners. And I believe what has emerged from all of that is a broad consensus on balanced principles that would satisfy the core needs of both sides.

President Clinton deserves great credit for laying out extensive parameters designed to bridge gaps in advanced final status negotiations 16 years ago. Today, with mistrust too high to even start talks, we're at the opposite end of the spectrum. Neither side is willing to even risk acknowledging the other's bottom

line, and more negotiations that do not produce progress will only reinforce the worst fears.

Now, everyone understands that negotiations would be complex and difficult, and nobody can be expected to agree on the final result in advance. But if the parties could at least demonstrate that they understand the other side's most basic needs—and are potentially willing to meet them if theirs are also met at the end of comprehensive negotiations—perhaps then enough trust could be established to enable a meaningful process to begin.

It is in that spirit that we offer the following principles—not to prejudge or impose an outcome, but to provide a possible basis for serious negotiations when the parties are ready. Now, individual countries may have more detailed policies on these issues—as we do, by the way—but I believe there is a broad consensus that a final status agreement that could meet the needs of both sides would do the following.

Principle number one: Provide for secure and recognized international borders between Israel and a viable and contiguous Palestine, negotiated based on the 1967 lines with mutually agreed equivalent swaps.

Resolution 242, which has been enshrined in international law for 50 years, provides for the withdrawal of Israel from territory it occupied in 1967 in return for peace with its neighbors and secure and recognized borders. It has long been accepted by both sides, and it remains the basis for an agreement today.

As Secretary, one of the first issues that I worked out with the Arab League was their agreement that the reference in the Arab Peace Initiative to the 1967 lines would from now on include the concept of land swaps, which the Palestinians have acknowledged. And this is necessary to reflect practical realities on the ground, and mutually agreed equivalent swaps that will ensure that the agreement is fair to both sides.

There is also broad recognition of Israel's need to ensure that the borders are secure and defensible, and that the territory of Palestine is viable and contiguous. Virtually everyone that I have spoken to has been clear on this principle as well: No changes by Israel to the 1967 lines will be recognized by the international community unless agreed to by both sides.

Principle two: Fulfill the vision of the UN General Assembly Resolution 181 of two states for two peoples, one Jewish and one Arab, with mutual recognition and full equal rights for all their respective citizens.

This has been the fundamental—the foundational principle of the two-state solution from the beginning: creating a state for the Jewish people and a state for the Palestinian people, where each can achieve their national aspirations. And Resolution 181 is incorporated into the foundational documents of both the Israelis and Palestinians. Recognition of Israel as a Jewish state has been the U.S. position for years, and based on my conversations in these last months, I am absolutely convinced that many others are now prepared to accept it as well—provided the need for a Palestinian state is also addressed.

We also know that there are some 1.7 million Arab citizens who call Israel their home and must now and always be able to live as equal citizens, which makes this a difficult

issue for Palestinians and others in the Arab world. That's why it is so important that in recognizing each other's homeland—Israel for the Jewish people and Palestine for the Palestinian people—both sides reaffirm their commitment to upholding full equal rights for all of their respective citizens.

Principle number three: Provide for a just, agreed, fair, and realistic solution to the Palestinian refugee issue, with international assistance, that includes compensation, options and assistance in finding permanent homes, acknowledgment of suffering, and other measures necessary for a comprehensive resolution consistent with two states for two peoples.

The plight of many Palestinian refugees is heartbreaking, and all agree that their needs have to be addressed. As part of a comprehensive resolution, they must be provided with compensation, their suffering must be acknowledged, and there will be a need to have options and assistance in finding permanent homes. The international community can provide significant support and assistance. I know we are prepared to do that, including in raising money to help ensure the compensation and other needs of the refugees are met, and many have expressed a willingness to contribute to that effort, particularly if it brings peace. But there is a general recognition that the solution must be consistent with two states for two peoples, and cannot affect the fundamental character of Israel.

Principle four: Provide an agreed resolution for Jerusalem as the internationally recognized capital of the two states, and protect and assure freedom of access to the holy sites consistent with the established status quo.

Now, Jerusalem is the most sensitive issue for both sides, and the solution will have to meet the needs not only of the parties, but of all three monotheistic faiths. That is why the holy sites that are sacred to billions of people around the world must be protected and remain accessible and the established status quo maintained. Most acknowledge that Jerusalem should not be divided again like it was in 1967, and we believe that. At the same time, there is broad recognition that there will be no peace agreement without reconciling the basic aspirations of both sides to have capitals there.

Principle five: Satisfy Israel's security needs and bring a full end, ultimately, to the occupation, while ensuring that Israel can defend itself effectively and that Palestine can provide security for its people in a sovereign and non-militarized state.

Security is the fundamental issue for Israel together with a couple of others I've mentioned, but security is critical. Everyone understands that no Israeli Government can ever accept an agreement that does not satisfy its security needs or that risk creating an enduring security threat like Gaza transferred to the West Bank. And Israel must be able to defend itself effectively, including against terrorism and other regional threats. In fact, there is a real willingness by Egypt, Jordan, and others to work together with Israel on meeting key security challenges. And I believe that those collective efforts, including close coordination on border security, intelligence-sharing, joint cooperations—joint operation, can all play a critical role in securing the peace.

At the same time, fully ending the occupation is the fundamental issue for the Palestinians. They need to know that the military oc-

cupation itself will really end after an agreed transitional process. They need to know they can live in freedom and dignity in a sovereign state while providing security for their population even without a military of their own. This is widely accepted as well. And it is important to understand there are many different ways without occupation for Israel and Palestine and Jordan and Egypt and the United States and others to cooperate in providing that security.

Now, balancing those requirements was among the most important challenges that we faced in the negotiations, but it was one where the United States has the ability to provide the most assistance. And that is why a team that was led by General John Allen, who is here, for whom I am very grateful for his many hours of effort, along with—he is one of our foremost military minds, and dozens of experts from the Department of Defense and other agencies, all of them engaged extensively with the Israeli Defense Force on trying to find solutions that could help Israel address its legitimate security needs.

They developed innovative approaches to creating unprecedented, multi-layered border security; enhancing Palestinian capacity; enabling Israel to retain the ability to address threats by itself even when the occupation had ended. General Allen and his team were not suggesting one particular outcome or one particular timeline, nor were they suggesting that technology alone would resolve these problems. They were simply working on ways to support whatever the negotiators agreed to. And they did some very impressive work that gives me total confidence that Israel's security requirements can be met.

Principle six: End the conflict and all outstanding claims, enabling normalized relations and enhanced regional security for all as envisaged by the Arab Peace Initiative. It is essential for both sides that the final status agreement resolves all the outstanding issues and finally brings closure to this conflict, so that everyone can move ahead to a new era of peaceful coexistence and cooperation. For Israel, this must also bring broader peace with all of its Arab neighbors. That is the fundamental promise of the Arab Peace Initiative, which key Arab leaders have affirmed in these most recent days.

The Arab Peace Initiative also envisions enhanced security for all of the region. It envisions Israel being a partner in those efforts when peace is made. This is the area where Israel and the Arab world are looking at perhaps the greatest moment of potential transformation in the Middle East since Israel's creation in 1948. The Arab world faces its own set of security challenges. With Israeli-Palestinian peace, Israel, the United States, Jordan, Egypt—together with the GCC countries—would be ready and willing to define a new security partnership for the region that would be absolutely groundbreaking.

So ladies and gentlemen, that's why it is vital that we all work to keep open the possibility of peace, that we not lose hope in the two-state solution, no matter how difficult it may seem—because there really is no viable alternative.

Now, we all know that a speech alone won't produce peace. But based on over 30 years of experience and the lessons from the past 4 years, I have suggested, I believe, and President Obama has signed on to and believes in

a path that the parties could take: realistic steps on the ground now, consistent with the parties' own prior commitments, that will begin the process of separating into two states; a political horizon to work towards to create the conditions for a successful final status talk; and a basis for negotiations that the parties could accept to demonstrate that they are serious about making peace.

We can only encourage them to take this path; we cannot walk down it for them. But if they take these steps, peace would bring extraordinary benefits in enhancing the security and the stability and the prosperity of Israelis, Palestinians, all of the nations of the region. The Palestinian economy has amazing potential in the context of independence, with major private sector investment possibilities and a talented, hungry, eager-to-work young workforce. Israel's economy could enjoy unprecedented growth as it becomes a regional economic powerhouse, taking advantage of the unparalleled culture of innovation and trading opportunities with new Arab partners. Meanwhile, security challenges could be addressed by an entirely new security arrangement, in which Israel cooperates openly with key Arab states. That is the future that everybody should be working for.

President Obama and I know that the incoming administration has signaled that they may take a different path, and even suggested breaking from the longstanding U.S. policies on settlements, Jerusalem, and the possibility of a two-state solution. That is for them to decide. That's how we work. But we cannot—in good conscience—do nothing, and say nothing, when we see the hope of peace slipping away.

This is a time to stand up for what is right. We have long known what two states living side by side in peace and security looks like. We should not be afraid to say so.

Now, I really began to reflect on what we have learned—and the way ahead—when I recently joined President Obama in Jerusalem for the state funeral for Shimon Peres. Shimon was one of the founding fathers of Israel who became one of the world's great elder statesmen—a beautiful man. I was proud to call him my friend, and I know that President Obama was as well.

And I remembered the first time that I saw Shimon in person—standing on the White House lawn for the signing the historic Oslo Accords. And I thought about the last time, at an intimate one-on-one Shabbat dinner just a few months before he died, when we toasted together to the future of Israel and to the peace that he still so passionately believed in for his people.

He summed it up simply and eloquently, as only Shimon could, quote, "The original mandate gave the Palestinians 48 percent, now it's down to 22 percent. I think 78 percent is enough for us."

As we laid Shimon to rest that day, many of us couldn't help but wonder if peace between Israelis and Palestinians might also be buried along with one of its most eloquent champions. We cannot let that happen. There is simply too much at stake—for future generations of Israelis and Palestinians—to give in to pessimism, especially when peace is, in fact, still possible.

We must not lose hope in the possibility of peace. We must not give in to those who say what is now must always be, that there is no

chance for a better future. It is up to Israelis and Palestinians to make the difficult choices for peace, but we can all help. And for the sake of future generations of Israelis and Palestinians, for all the people of the region, for the United States, for all those around the world who have prayed for and worked for peace for generations, let's hope that we are all prepared—and particularly Israelis and Palestinians—to make those choices now.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 11. Contrary to the U.N. resolution that we are condemning today, which condemns the settlements that are taking place in Israel, the new settlements that the Israelis find themselves permitting are not undermining the cause of peace. Let's get this straight. This is what we just hear over and over again that the settlements are undermining peace.

What undermines peace is when the Palestinian people continue with their policies of terrorism, both attacking with missiles and rockets, as well as stabbings, as well as the Palestinian people and their leaders unwilling to stand up and recognize that Israel exists. They don't have a right to flood into that country with a right of return. That is what undermines the peace.

The settlements wouldn't be taking place, except the Israelis and the United Nations and the supporters of the Palestinians have made a mockery of the deal that was made.

The Israelis withdrew from control of the territory. They withdrew, and they permitted the Palestinians to establish authority there with two promises: number one, they wouldn't use the territory to attack Israel; and number two, they would recognize Israel's right to exist, and this right of return permitting them to flood into Israel and eliminate it that way did not exist.

The Palestinians have given up nothing. The Israelis have given up territory and made themselves vulnerable to the type of attack that leaves Israelis dead every day from terrorist attacks.

No, the U.N. has it wrong. That resolution by the U.N. makes peace less likely.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate the strong, bipartisan support for our ally, Israel, in the United States Congress.

Support for Israel has always been a bipartisan value, and it reflects the values of our country. Although we are entering a period of one-party government, bipartisan support for Israel remains a strategic asset, and those who support Israel need to be careful not to jeopardize that. I think none of my colleagues do that. I want to make it clear.

In supporting this House resolution, we are expressing our deep concern regarding the decision to abstain in the U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. Some may point out that the decision to abstain does not veer from the actions of past administrations. They would be right. It does not. That may be true, but it does not justify, in my view, this particular vote.

Allowing a one-sided resolution, which I perceived the U.N. resolution to be, to be adopted at this juncture sends the wrong signal and emboldens Israel's and America's enemies.

The United Nations is notorious for its disproportionate criticism of Israel. As Ambassador Samantha Power said before the U.N. Security Council vote on Resolution 2334: "As long as Israel has been a member of this institution, Israel has been treated differently from other nations at the United Nations."

She also noted that, in 2016 alone, the U.N. adopted more resolutions critical of Israel than it did nations that brazenly violate international law and violate human rights—more than Syria, more than Iran, more than North Korea, more than South Sudan, more than Russia, combined.

A one-sided resolution that assigns exclusive blame to Israel for the continuation of the conflict—without addressing Palestinian incitement to violence, Hamas control of Gaza, or their continued insistence on the so-called right of return and refusing to accept Israel as a Jewish state—undermines prospects for a two-state solution.

Also deeply concerning is this resolution's reference of Israeli presence in East Jerusalem, including the Jewish Quarter of the Old City and the Western Wall, as illegal.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The only way to achieve a real and lasting peace that enables Israel to protect its security and remain both a Jewish state and a democratic one is a two-state solution, which I strongly support.

There are two parties to this conflict. Both have responsibilities. Both need to take steps toward peace. For Israel, this means not building in areas envisioned in the long term as part of a future Palestinian state; and for Palestinians, it means ending incitement, ending terrorism, and affirmatively accepting Israel's right to existence.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 11.

The U.N. resolution, on the other hand, is vastly disproportionate and includes language that seems designed to provoke Israel. Categorizing the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, as occupied territory is entirely inappropriate.

I believe that President Obama should have directed the United States to veto the U.N. resolution. Instead, our Ambassador sat silent. Abstaining on this vote handed a victory to the forces that wish to delegitimize Israel.

This resolution erects a greater barrier between the two sides, hindering critical negotiations. The peace process must be negotiated bilaterally by Israel and the Palestinians with support, not provocation, by outside actors.

In this new year and new Congress, we should act to reassert a position of strength on the world stage. We must stand by our allies, including our strongest ally in the Middle East, Israel. This country should have exercised its veto power as it has done before and thwarted this divisive anti-Israel effort.

Please vote “yes” on this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, who are we kidding? I heard the ranking member say this isn't about Obama, and yet virtually every statement on the other side of the aisle is trashing President Obama.

If you want to simply condemn the U.N. resolution, let's do so. I will join you. But that isn't what this is about. It is subterfuge. This is about kicking a President on the way out one more time, enhancing a false narrative about his lack of support for our ally Israel. And it greases the skids to defund the United Nations while they are at it.

I say to my friends on my side of the aisle: Don't be fooled. Don't be enablers. That is what this agenda is about.

There was a viable alternative we could have had on the floor, and we were denied that right. We were even denied to have a motion to recommit for a reason: because they don't want to risk that. They want to control the platform that is negative and insidious and a resolution filled with insinuations and distortions of fact and history.

Vote “no” on H. Res. 11.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, just by way of the facts, what this resolution attempts to do is to reject the U.N. resolution that calls for a Palestinian state but not a Jewish state, a resolution that opens the door for those who want to impose boycott, divestment, or other sanctions measures against Israel or Israeli companies and, in essence, declares Judaism's holiest site as occupied territory. That is what is in this resolution. Those are the facts that we are debating here. Those are the facts that need to be rejected, my colleagues.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the U.N. resolution which hinders the path to peace and aims to undermine Israel, one of our country's top allies.

Our policy has long been that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should be resolved by direct, bilateral talks between the two parties. This U.N. resolution contradicts our longstanding policy, first, by legitimatizing Palestinian Authority efforts to utilize international organizations to carry out its own solution; and second, by not providing for the Palestinian Authority to uphold their own responsibility as it relates to the peace negotiations.

The U.N. resolution disregards that Hamas, a terrorist organization, presently controls a portion of what would be the Palestinian state. That is an outrage, Mr. Speaker.

We must not sit on the sidelines or be silenced when anti-Israel resolutions are presented at international organizations. That is why I support H. Res. 11 today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER). We are pleased that he is back.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, for 19 years, when Jordan occupied East Jerusalem and the West Bank, Jews could not visit the Western Wall or the Jewish Quarter of the Old City. They were denied access to places where, for 2,000 years, they have continuously made a personal connection to their faith and their history.

It is impossible to separate Jewish identity from the Western Wall or the Western Wall from its Jewish identity or Jerusalem from the Jewish State of Israel, yet this is exactly what has been happening in the United Nations for years and exactly what Security Council Resolution 2334 sought to do.

In addition, the resolution overwhelmingly assigns blame to Israel, while avoiding direct criticism of Palestinian incitement and violence. That is why, last month, I strongly urged President Obama to veto the resolution.

The U.S. has and must continue to seek a sustainable two-state solution with a democratic, Jewish State of Israel and a demilitarized democratic Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security. But the only path to two states is through direct negotiations by the two parties. Efforts to force a solution at the U.N. or internationalize the issues are misguided and risk moving peace further away.

As an original cosponsor, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 11.

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

□ 1830

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this resolution. We need to close ranks in the House of Representatives. We need to, as colleagues, support what for decades has been the cornerstone principle of American diplomacy towards Israel

and Palestine, and that is direct negotiation between these two countries. That is the only way that peace can be achieved. The fact that our Ambassador to the United Nations went against decades of precedent by abstaining from this vote is appalling. It is another vote for tyrants and terrorists.

All of us need to close ranks to support a two-state solution between Israel and Palestine. I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle tonight, Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ROYCE, in opposing this mistake that has been made by our U.N. Ambassador and by the U.N. resolution itself. Both are wrong. Both our decision to abstain and the drafting have been destructive.

I am proud to have this resolution in the House to once again undo this harm and support our ally.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 11 to reject the anti-Israel U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. Since 1972, the United States has vetoed 42 anti-Israel resolutions; but all of that changed in 2016.

The facts are, in the very final days of his administration, President Obama left our only ally in the Middle East to stand alone by blatantly and deliberately violating longstanding U.S. policy. For crying out loud, either we are with Israel or we are not.

I could go on and on about the severity of the President's refusal to veto an anti-Israel U.N. resolution and his decision to abstain from a vote on it. Instead, I will let Prime Minister Netanyahu's words speak for themselves:

“The Obama administration not only failed to protect Israel against this gang-up at the U.N., it colluded with it behind the scenes.”

Antagonizing our allies is not much of a foreign policy strategy. This is betrayal of the worst kind. Anti-Israel policies will not be tolerated. We are partners in this world and allies in democracy. I urge my colleagues to stand with Israel and support this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's bipartisan measure. There are no shortcuts to peace. Only the Israelis and the Palestinians can resolve their complicated differences through direct negotiation. That is why it has been longstanding policy to defend our ally Israel against one-sided U.N. Security Council resolutions seeking to impose solutions.

Last year, Congresswoman GRANGER and I led a letter to President Obama signed by 394 Members of this body

cautioning against one-sided U.N. initiatives that dangerously hinder the prospects for resuming direct negotiations. I believe the administration's abstention is a stain on our country's long and consistent record.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank our chair of the committee and our ranking member.

I am here to stand with Israel. The question of the best way to do that is one of legitimate debate. It is a debate that we are having here in the House. It is a debate that the folks in Israel are having there. There is no question that the resolution before us is not the one that everyone would have written, or the one that was before the U.N. was the one everyone would have written. There is no question that there is fault on the side of the Palestinians with respect to coming to the table for peace.

But here is the question that is starting to really make an impact on the possibility of achieving the two-state solution that both sides by and large believe is essential, and that is something that is within the control of the Israeli Government: Will it continue to intensify the support for settlements in the West Bank? If it does, as it has been, there are 600,000 settlers now between the West Bank and east Jerusalem. If it continues to do that, it makes as a practical matter it virtually impossible the land-for-peace swap that we know is essential to get to a two-state solution. That is the practical challenge that we have.

We are all friends of Israel. All of us here believe in a Jewish state and a democratic state.

The second issue of major concern that is discussed in Israel as well as here is the fact that demographics are going to catch up and cause a real crisis in Israel to maintain that Jewish identity and that democratic tradition. There are 4.5 million Arabs who live between the West Bank and in Israel proper. There are 6.5 million Jewish citizens. If there is not some resolution, at some point a decision has to be made to maintain the Jewish character at the expense of democratic ideals or compromise democratic ideals in order to maintain that Jewish identity.

The Israeli State has a proud, strong tradition of being democratic, of being reliable, of standing up for civil and human rights. Many there, and some of us here, believe settlements are an impediment to that tradition.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

A couple of weeks ago I stood in the Judea/Sumeria area in the West Bank speaking with numerous out of thousands of Palestinians working in factories, those who earn three times the

salary that they would under the Palestinian Authority. They don't want their proudly made products boycotted. They don't want to lose their jobs. They don't want disruptive Palestinian Authority leaders to always speak for them—whose own area has 40 percent unemployment and no opportunity.

The Obama administration had 8 years to show their true colors. But when they didn't get their way, they insecurely, naively, and cowardly lashed out at our greatest and strongest ally in the Middle East.

Women, religious minorities, LGBT, and Jews would not have equal rights, democracy, or peace in a Palestinian country. In fact, the Palestinian Authority punishes Palestinians by death if they sell their land to the Jewish people lawfully.

The current administration has used the United Nations to both legitimize a profoundly flawed Iran deal and delegitimize Israel. To think that settlements are the only thing that stands in front of peace is dangerously naive.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the bipartisan Royce-Engel resolution. I urge my colleagues to stand with Israel and to stand with the Palestinians in the West Bank.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my friend on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, in April of last year, 394 Members of this House sent a letter to the President urging him to oppose and veto if necessary any one-sided United Nations resolutions. Unfortunately, the resolution that passed the Security Council resolution without our veto was exactly that. It was one-sided.

The resolution contained no fewer than five provisions on Israeli settlement activity. It calls the Jewish neighborhoods of Jerusalem illegal, and it characterizes Jews praying at the Western Wall as being in flagrant violation of international law.

But even if you choose to accept every provision on settlement activity, the resolution included only one very general statement about violence. The U.N., which is historically biased against Israel, could not even condemn Palestinian terrorism against Israel as an obstacle to peace. It is, and the U.N. must acknowledge it. That is not balanced. It is one-sided.

Today's resolution clearly supports the goal of two states: a Jewish democratic State of Israel living next to a demilitarized Palestinian state as it stands against one-sided U.N. resolutions to take us further than this goal. Please support this resolution.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all friends of Israel, but that friendship requires

more than demonizing the United Nations and the Obama administration. In fact, it requires the facing of hard truths, the destructive effect of incitement and violence on the Palestinian side, which the U.N. resolution explicitly acknowledges, and the threat to peace and to any conceivable two-state solution by relentless settlement expansion on the Israeli side, pushed by the right wing, unchallenged by H. Res. 11.

The majority, seeking to push this resolution through, has displayed little interest in what it would take actually to achieve peace, choosing instead to distort the history, to impugn the motives of those attempting to achieve peace. It is not worthy of this body. I urge its rejection.

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

When an unfair, one-sided resolution moves forward in the U.N., as Israel's ally, we have an obligation to say it is wrong. That is what this resolution does. This resolution also calls for a two-state solution. So my colleagues who are somehow portraying this resolution as not being for a two-state resolution, they are absolutely wrong.

I urge my colleagues, especially my Democratic colleagues, to continue to support the U.S.-Israel alliance, and you continue to support it by voting for this resolution. This is a fair resolution.

Let's remember, when Israel left Gaza and uprooted settlements, what did it get in return? Not peace, but terrorism. Stand with the people of Israel. Vote "yes" on this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in short, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 has harmed our ally Israel. It has harmed the prospects for peace. It is one-sided. It is an anti-Israel resolution, the kind of which it has been longstanding U.S. policy to veto within the U.N. Security Council, and it is not hard to see why because this resolution opens the door for those who want to impose boycott, divestment, or other sanctions measures against Israel or against Israeli companies. And, in essence, it declares Judaism's holiest site, the Western Wall, as occupied territory.

Mr. Speaker, this is reminiscent of another action by the United Nations, the infamous "Zionism is racism" resolution whose damage took decades to undo.

Fortunately, the bipartisan rejection of the President's U.N. decision provides an opportunity for the House to rally around a more constructive policy and renewed U.S. leadership in the region.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution so that the bipartisan policy of rejecting this harmful U.N. Security

Council resolution and encouraging direct negotiation is endorsed loud and clear. It is far past time for the incitement to stop and the budgeting of \$300 million by the Palestinian Authority to pay people to slay Israeli civilians be discontinued.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the bipartisan House Resolution 11 expressing opposition to UNSCR 2334.

In the summer of 1983 I visited the Western Wall in Jerusalem, Judaism's most holy site, for the first time. Merely 17 years earlier I could not have gone to the Wall, or for that matter anywhere in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem.

From 1949 to 1967, when Jordan occupied Jerusalem, Jews could not visit the one place where for nearly 2000 years, they had continuously made a personal connection to their faith and their history.

It is impossible to separate Jewish identity from the Western Wall, just as it is impossible to separate the Western Wall from its Jewish identity, or Jerusalem from the Jewish State of Israel.

Yet this is exactly what has been happening in the United Nations for years, and exactly what the one-sided UN Resolution sought to do.

In addition to seeking to declare the eastern part of Jerusalem a settlement, the resolution overwhelmingly assigns blame to Israel, while averting direct criticism of Palestinian incitement and violence.

That is why last month I strongly urged President Obama to veto the resolution.

The U.S. has, and must continue to seek a sustainable two-state solution with a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security.

But the only path to two states is through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties. Efforts to force a solution at the U.N. or to internationalize the issue are misguided, and risk moving peace further away, not closer.

Israel is our most important strategic ally in a most important and chaotic region of the world. The United States always has and always will ensure the security of Israel.

As an original co-sponsor, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 11.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 11.

I'd like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for bringing this resolution to the Floor.

Your continued bipartisan support for our friend and ally, Israel, sets the right tone for any discussion this body has regarding this vital relationship.

Almost 70 years ago, on May 14, 1948, with the support of fiercely Democratic president, Harry Truman, the nation of Israel was born.

Created in the aftermath of World War II, the special relationship that our two countries now enjoy was founded. For 70 years, our government has supported Israeli interest because they represent American interest.

Throughout the decades, from Dwight Eisenhower to Barack Obama, from the great Texan, and Speaker Sam Rayburn to Speaker RYAN, our government has worked across

party lines and across branches of government to ensure the one, true democracy in the Middle East is able to grow and prosper without hindrance.

Recently, we have reaffirmed our support for Israel by signing a new Memorandum of Understanding and resoundingly telling the world that we support our ally in the Middle East. UNSCR 2334 does not align with this affirmation.

It should be the policy of the United States to support a viable two-state solution, where Palestinians and Israelis live in prosperity and security. This does not mean negotiating out of fear or forced necessity.

I want to, again, express my gratitude and appreciation for this body and our friends on the Foreign Affairs Committee for leading by example.

U.S.-Israeli relations have always been bipartisan and should remain that way. It is my hope the new Administration will build on the foundation created by the Presidents and elected officials that came before us and support Israel in a bipartisan fashion.

I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 11.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, any measure that seeks to promote a peaceful resolution to tensions between Israelis and Palestinians—whether coming from the United Nations or from this Chamber—should provide a balanced picture of the facts on the ground and the challenges confronting both sides. The recent UN Security Resolution on Israeli settlements failed that test by blaming Israel almost solely for impeding a two-states solution for peace and by using prejudicial language that places an unfair burden on Israel in depicting the basis for future negotiations. Calling any settlement activity by Israel since 1967 a major obstacle to peace, as the UN resolution does, ignores the reality that geographical adjustments will have to be made as part of any two-states solution reached by parties through direct negotiations.

However, the resolution before us today is also not balanced in that it too ignores conditions on the ground. Expressing the sense of Congress to repeal the UN Resolution does not focus on the increasingly fragile state of the two-states solution, and on conditions that make its potential achievement increasingly difficult to obtain. Prime Minister Netanyahu has called his government the most pro-settlement in history. President-elect Trump further diminishes chances for the two-states solution by choosing envoys who undercut the prospects for peace by expressing support for major settlement expansions, and whose opposition to a two-states solution reinforces opposition within the Israeli government. These positions threaten to continue to move momentum dangerously away from the possibility of a two-states solution.

I believe that the two-states approach, as challenging as it is to achieve, is the only way to ensure a Jewish and democratic state of Israel living in security with a non-militarized Palestinian state. It is important for peace in the Middle East and U.S. national interests.

This resolution is at present the only vehicle to express my concerns with the UN resolution, and I will therefore support it. However, I will continue to speak out on further actions that I believe will diminish the chance of a two-states solution and on other issues vital to peace in the Middle East.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 11, Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. On December 23, 2016, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 2334 which describes Israeli settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem as illegal, with the United States abstaining from the vote.

Now, U.S. Congress has chosen to disapprove of President Obama's leadership and longstanding U.S. foreign policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. UNSC Resolution 2334 merely reiterates the international community consensus and bipartisan U.S. policy that building settlements impedes the path to a lasting peaceful two-state solution. H. Res. 11 asserts that the UNSCR is "anti-Israel" and "one-sided," but it does not break new ground or create any new policy. For example, in 1987, the Reagan administration abstained and allowed the passage of UNSCR 605, reaffirming the application of the Geneva Convention which included Jerusalem in the "Palestinian and Arab Territories, occupied by Israel since 1967."

Instead, I am urging support of an alternative resolution introduced and led by Congressman DAVID PRICE. Instead of disapproving of a resolution that reaffirms longstanding U.S. policy, Congress would work towards the progress of a two-state solution. H. Res. 11 would undermine our decades-long efforts towards a peaceful situation between Israelis and Palestinians and it is not the best way to show our support for Israel, our strong ally. Our goal must be to reaffirm U.S. policy in the Middle East and to find solutions with the international community.

We must be steadfast in our commitment to a two-state solution and to longstanding U.S. policy. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose H. Res. 11 and to support the alternative resolution introduced by Congressman PRICE.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for peace in the Middle East and between Israel and the Palestinians. That is why I am for a two-state solution and the end to new Israeli settlements.

However, the one-sided UN Security Council Resolution 2334 issued last month would declare the Western Wall and some Jewish holy sites, where many Jews live and pray, illegally occupied territory.

I am voting for H.Res. 11 today because the United States should veto any UN resolution that would require Israel to give away the Western Wall or the Jewish Quarters of Jerusalem. What the United States should encourage is an end to new settlements, a two-state solution and direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. That is the only framework that can lead to a just and lasting peace.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against H. Res. 11, the Object to UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 2334 as Obstacle

to Israeli-Palestinian Peace resolution. The resolution expresses the House's disapproval of UNSC Resolution 2334, which passed 14 to 0 with the United States abstaining from the vote.

H. Res. 11 mischaracterizes the UN resolution and falsely claims that the United States has never abstained from votes on similar resolutions. The UN resolution reaffirms that Israel's settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem are a "major obstacle" to peace, which has been long-standing US policy. H. Res. 11 states that the Obama Administration took an unprecedented step by abstaining from the vote when in fact the decision is not unique. The Reagan Administration took a similar step when it abstained from voting on UNSCR 605 that identified Jerusalem as part of the Palestinian and Arab Territories which is now occupied by Israel. Both Republican and Democratic presidents have continued similar U.S. policies.

Representatives PRICE, ENGEL and CONNOLLY offered a more balanced resolution as an amendment to H. Res. 11, but unfortunately House leadership refused to allow it a vote. The text of the amendment is now H. Res. 23, of which I am a cosponsor.

H. Res. 23 supports the longstanding policy that it is in the best interest of the international community that a two-state solution is reached only through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. It reiterates United States support for Israel by opposing any outside efforts to impose a solution on the parties but rather to help facilitate peace negotiations. It includes continued opposition to the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign which calls for boycotting certain products and companies, divesting from various organizations, and encouraging the use of sanctions against Israel.

I have always supported a two-state solution with Israel and a Palestinian state through direct negotiations between the two parties. As an ally of Israel, the United States has an interest to ensure a lasting peace is reached between Israel and Palestine. Let me be clear, while I support the United States' strong relationship and alliance with Israel, Israel's proliferation of settlements around the West Bank and East Jerusalem is directly at odds with establishing a two-state solution.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I remain committed to a two-state solution, where a Jewish state of Israel and a Palestinian state can co-exist in peace. The best path to ultimately achieving this peace is through direct, bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, not imposed solutions by international organizations. Instead of this Administration concluding its strong Israel record with the single largest pledge of military assistance in U.S. history, it chose to end on a perplexing note by choosing not to veto United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

The expansion of settlements in occupied territory has been long recognized on a bipartisan basis and in U.S. policy for decades as doing little to improve the confidence of Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated. United Nations action does not help advance the cause of peace, nor does it bring about direct negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians so they might resolve their complicated differences and find a much needed, lasting two-state solution, which I have supported my entire career.

Any action, whether coming from the United Nations or the Congress, must provide a complete picture of the facts on the ground and full appreciation for the challenges confronting all sides. Like the one-sided resolution from the United Nations Security Council, H. Res. 11 too ignores the reality of the conditions on the ground. While I don't believe either resolution is balanced, I am voting in favor of H. Res. 11 to express my displeasure with the actions of the UN, which make direct negotiations all the more difficult to resume. I will continue to speak out in support of efforts that lay the foundation for peace in the Middle East and vigorously oppose those that undermine a lasting two state solution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 342, nays 80, answered "present" 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]
YEAS—342

Abraham	Cole	Gottheimer
Adams	Collins (GA)	Gowdy
Aderholt	Comer	Granger
Aguilar	Comstock	Graves (GA)
Allen	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Amodei	Cook	Graves (MO)
Arrington	Cooper	Green, Gene
Babin	Correa	Griffith
Bacon	Costa	Grothman
Banks (IN)	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Barletta	Courtney	Hanabusa
Barr	Cramer	Harper
Barragan	Crawford	Harris
Barton	Crowley	Hartzler
Beatty	Cueellar	Hastings
Bera	Culberson	Hensarling
Bergman	Cummings	Hice, Jody B.
Beutler	Curbelo (FL)	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	Davidson	Higgins (NY)
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Hill
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Rodney	Himes
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Holding
Black	DeBene	Hollingsworth
Blackburn	Demings	Hoyer
Blum	Denham	Hudson
Bonamici	Dent	Huizenga
Boyt	DeSantis	Hultgren
Boyle, Brendan	DesJarlais	Hunter
F.	Deutch	Hurd
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Brady (TX)	Donovan	Jackson Lee
Brat	Duffy	Jeffries
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Brown (MD)	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Brownley (CA)	Españillat	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Esty	Jordan
Buck	Farenthold	Joyce (OH)
Bucshon	Faso	Katko
Budd	Ferguson	Keating
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Byrne	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Flores	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Fortenberry	Khanna
Carter (GA)	Poxx	Kilmer
Carter (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Kind
Cartwright	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	King (NY)
Chabot	Gaetz	Kinzinger
Chaffetz	Gallagher	Knight
Cheney	Garrett	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Gibbs	Kustoff (TN)
Clarke (NY)	Gonzalez (TX)	Labrador
Cleaver	Goodlatte	LaHood
Coffman	Gosar	LaMalfa

Lamborn	Olson	Sewell (AL)
Lance	Palazzo	Sherman
Langevin	Pallone	Shimkus
Larsen (WA)	Palmer	Shuster
Latta	Panetta	Simpson
Lawrence	Pascarell	Sinema
Lawson (FL)	Paulsen	Sires
Levin	Pearce	Smith (MO)
Lewis (MN)	Perlmutter	Smith (NE)
Lieu, Ted	Perry	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Peters	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Long	Pittenger	Smucker
Loudermilk	Poe (TX)	Soto
Love	Poliquin	Stefanik
Lowey	Polis	Stewart
Lucas	Posey	Stivers
Luetkemeyer	Price, Tom (GA)	Suozyi
Lujan Grisham, M.	Quigley	Taylor
Luján, Ben Ray	Raskin	Tenney
MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)
Maloney, Carolyn B.	Reed	Thornberry
Maloney, Sean	Reichert	Tiberi
Marchant	Renacci	Tipton
Marino	Rice (NY)	Titus
Marshall	Rice (SC)	Torres
Massie	Richmond	Trott
Mast	Roby	Turner
Matsui	Roe (TN)	Upton
McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Valadao
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
McClintock	Rohrabacher	Veasey
McEachin	Rokita	Vela
McHenry	Rooney, Francis	Velázquez
McKinley	Rooney, Thomas	Visclosky
McMorris	J.	Wagner
Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
McSally	Rosen	Walden
Meadows	Roskam	Walker
Meehan	Ross	Walorski
Meng	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi
Messer	Rouzer	Walz
Mitchell	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Moolenaar	Royce (CA)	Schultz
Mooney (WV)	Ruiz	Weber (TX)
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Mullin	Russell	Wenstrup
Mulvaney	Rutherford	Westerman
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Williams
Murphy (PA)	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Sanford	Wilson (SC)
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Wittman
Neal	Scalise	Womack
Newhouse	Schiff	Woodall
Noem	Schneider	Yoder
Norcross	Schweikert	Yoho
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
O'Halleran	Scott, David	Young (IA)
	Sensenbrenner	Zeldin
	Sessions	Zinke

NAYS—80

Amash	Duncan (TN)	McCollum
Bass	Ellison	McGovern
Beyer	Eshoo	McNerney
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Meeks
Blumenauer	Gabbard	Moore
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	Nolan
Bustos	Gohmert	O'Rourke
Butterfield	Green, Al	Payne
Carbajal	Grijalva	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Castro (TX)	Heck	Pocan
Chu, Judy	Huffman	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Schakowsky
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Serrano
Cohen	Jones	Slaughter
Connolly	Kaptur	Speier
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Kihuen	Takano
DeFazio	Kildee	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lee	Tsongas
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Waters, Maxine
Doggett	Loeback	Watson Coleman
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Welch
F.	Lynch	Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Capuano	Lofgren
Evans	Shea-Porter

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra	Franks (AZ)	Rush
Collins (NY)	Gallego	
Crist	Pompeo	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1905

Mr. CASTRO of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. TIBERI and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 11.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO COMMEMORATE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF SHOOTING IN TUCSON

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues from Arizona and around the country, to commemorate the sixth anniversary of the January 8, 2011, shooting in Tucson that killed six people and wounded 13 more.

Six years ago this week, Congresswoman Giffords was sworn into office, just like we were 3 days ago. Six years ago this week, she headed home to her district, just like we all will tomorrow. And 6 years ago, on Sunday, she was engaging in one of the most fundamental activities of representative government by meeting with her constituents to hear their thoughts, concerns, and ideas, just like we will all do in the days ahead.

As Representatives, we each carry out this critical discourse when home in our districts. Its exercise is vital to our free society, which is why this shooting wasn’t just an attack on Tucson, but this body and our very democratic foundations.

The attack marked the first time in our country’s history that an assassination attempt was made on a congressional Member while engaging with her constituents. It also is remembered as the first assassination of a congressional staffer, Gabe Zimmerman, in the line of duty.

As we remember those we lost, we also reflect on the renewed sense of compassion and civility that emerged from this tragedy. This weekend, in Tucson, we will commemorate how our community came together to support those grieving and provide an example of courage and unity that the entire country can follow.

It is in this spirit of unity that we stand here for a moment of silence to recognize the six lives that were cut tragically short that day:

Nine-year-old Christina Taylor Green;

Dorothy Morris;
Judge John Roll;
Phyllis Schneck;
Dorwan Stoddard; and
Congressional staffer Gabriel “Gabe” Zimmerman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will observe a moment of silence.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 26.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1910

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-1 offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-1 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MESSER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CONYERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—235

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