

Korea despite not being required to serve overseas as a non-U.S. citizen.

While in Korea, Corporal Rubin was ordered to defend a road while his division was in retreat. He held that position for 24 hours until the 8th Cavalry could safely withdraw.

Corporal Rubin spent 30 months as a prisoner of war in North Korea, where testimony from his fellow prisoners detailed his willingness to sacrifice for the others. He helped his fellow POWs by sneaking out of the camp at night and foraging for food, stealing from enemy supplies, and bringing back what he could to help the soldiers imprisoned with him. He declined the offer of his Communist captors to return him to Soviet Hungary, his country of origin, to help protect those from his adopted country.

"He shared the food evenly among the GIs," a fellow prisoner wrote. "He also took care of us, nursed us, carried us to the latrine." This GI also added, "Helping his fellow men was the most important thing to him."

For these actions and more, Mr. Rubin was awarded the Medal of Honor in 2005. For all that this brave immigrant did to protect the freedoms of our great country, we are honored to be able to name this VA Medical Center after him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California, who has been such a great leader on veterans' issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Holocaust survivor and Medal of Honor recipient and a person that I knew personally before he passed away, Mr. Tibor "Ted" Rubin.

With the support of all 53 members of the California delegation, both California Senators, and many of my State's leading veterans' groups, I recently introduced H.R. 6323, legislation to name the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Long Beach as the Tibor Rubin VA Medical Center.

As was already noted, Tibor Rubin was born in Hungary on June 18, 1929. During World War II, he survived 14 months in a Nazi concentration camp in Austria, where both his parents and both of his sisters would eventually die.

Liberated by the United States Army, he was inspired by the American soldiers who rescued him, immigrating to the United States and enlisting in the United States Army. He was deployed to Korea as a member of the United States Army's 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division during the Korean war.

Despite facing religious discrimination from his sergeant who sent him on the most dangerous patrols and missions and withheld his Medal of Honor commendation, Tibor fought valiantly in several notable engagements. In one

such engagement, Tibor enabled the complete withdrawal of his compatriots to the Pusan Perimeter by solely defending a hill under an overwhelming assault by North Korean troops. During this engagement, he inflicted a staggering number of casualties on the attacking force during his personal 24-hour battle, single-handedly slowing the enemy's advance and allowing the 8th Cavalry to withdraw successfully.

Following the successful U.S. Army breakout from the Pusan Perimeter and advance into North Korea, Tibor was personally responsible for the capture of several hundred North Korean soldiers.

In an additional engagement near Usan, Chinese forces attacked his unit during a massive nighttime assault. For nearly 24 hours, he remained at his post with a .30-caliber machine gun at the south end of the unit's line until his ammunition was exhausted. His determined stand slowed the pace of the enemy advance into his sector, permitting the remnants of his unit to retreat southward. However, as the battle raged, Tibor was severely wounded and captured by the Chinese. While in Chinese custody, he refused to be repatriated to Hungary, instead choosing to remain in the prison camp. He would refuse the offer on numerous occasions.

Tibor disregarded his own personal safety and immediately began sneaking out of the camp at night in search of food for his fellow prisoners. Breaking into enemy food storehouses and gardens, he risked certain torture or death if caught.

Tibor provided not only food for the starving soldiers, but also desperately needed medical care and moral support for the sick and wounded of the POW camp. As one of his fellow prisoners recounted about the camp: "Tibor did many good deeds, which he told us were mitzvahs in the Jewish tradition. He was a very religious Jew, and helping his fellow men was the most important thing to him."

Tibor's brave, selfless efforts were directly attributed to saving the lives of as many as 40 of his fellow prisoners. As his Medal of Honor citation reads: "Corporal Rubin's gallant actions in close contact with the enemy and unyielding courage and bravery while a prisoner of war are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army."

It is worth noting that Tibor was nominated in the field on four occasions for the Medal of Honor. When he was finally presented his Medal of Honor in 2005, it was not presented by President George W. Bush for a single act of heroism. It was instead presented for nearly his entire 3 years of service in the Korean war.

Tibor was fiercely proud of the country he adopted. When he was later asked about his decision to immigrate to the United States, he said: "I always wanted to become a citizen of the

United States, and when I became a citizen, it was one of the happiest days in my life.

"I think about the United States, and I am a lucky person to live here.

"When I came to America, it was the first time I was free. It was one of the reasons I joined the U.S. Army, because I wanted to show my appreciation.

"It is the best country in the world, and I am part of it now. I do not have to worry about the Gestapo knocking on my doors."

I am proud to say that after his service, Tibor became a longtime resident of Garden Grove, California, in my district. It was still his home when he passed away on December 5, 2015, and it was the Long Beach VA Hospital where he received his medical services for over 50 years.

It was my great honor to meet Tibor and to represent him in Congress. He was a survivor, a soldier, a nurse, a compatriot, and a wonderful citizen.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. What an amazing and inspiring story behind Corporal Rubin.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, H.R. 6323.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, encourage all of our colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6323.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REAFFIRMING LONGSTANDING UNITED STATES POLICY IN SUPPORT OF A DIRECT BILATERALLY NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 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.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 165

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 democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security;

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

Whereas President Barack Obama reiterated this policy at the United Nations General Assembly in 2011, stating, "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. Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians—not us—who must reach agreement on the issues that divide them . . .";

Whereas the Palestinian Authority has failed to end incitement to hatred and violence through Palestinian Authority-directed institutions against Israel and Israelis, and end payments to prisoners and the families of those who have engaged in terrorism or acts of violence against Israelis or the State of Israel;

Whereas the Palestinian Authority has continued to provide payments to prisoners and the families of those who have engaged in terrorism or acts of violence against Israelis or the State of Israel, including reports of approximately \$300 million in 2016;

Whereas efforts to impose a solution or parameters for a solution can make negotiations more difficult and can set back the cause of peace;

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

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

Whereas and for this reason, the United States has vetoed 42 Israel-related resolutions in the United Nations Security Council since 1972;

Whereas the Palestinian Authority must engage in broad, meaningful, and systemic reforms in order to ultimately prepare its institutions and people for statehood and peaceful coexistence with Israel; and

Whereas unilateral recognition of a Palestinian state would bypass negotiations and undermine incentives for the Palestinian Authority to make the changes necessary that are prerequisites for peace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of Congress that—*

(1) a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will come only through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties;

(2) any widespread international recognition of a unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood outside of the context of a peace agreement with Israel would cause severe harm to the peace process, and would likely trigger the implementation of penalties under sections 7036 and 7041(j) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-113);

(3) efforts by outside bodies, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose an agreement or parameters for an agreement are likely to set back the cause of peace;

(4) 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; and

(5) the United States Government should continue to support and facilitate the re-

sumption of negotiations without preconditions between Israelis and Palestinians toward a sustainable peace agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and thank Mr. BRAD SHERMAN of California as well for working with me in a bipartisan manner to bring this important resolution to the floor today.

There is a growing concern in Congress—it is a concern felt on both sides of the aisle—that despite established, bipartisan United States policy, the Obama administration may end the practice of vetoing resolutions in the Security Council that strayed from the principle that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties. This administration could also end the related practice of vetoing Security Council resolutions that are one-sided or anti-Israel. This is a real concern. Press reports—including one today—suggest that such a one-sided resolution could be submitted in days.

Worse, the Obama administration could support a resolution at the U.N. Security Council setting parameters for a final settlement between Israel and the Palestinians. U.S. policy has long and wisely been that only Israelis and Palestinians can work out a peace agreement between themselves and that efforts to impose one would be counterproductive. Whatever parameters the U.N. established would be unacceptable to any Israeli Government—a government to the left or a government to the right—making it impossible to see any future peace.

What on Earth today, at this point in time, suggests that Israel has a willing partner in peace?

Not at this moment. Our committee has held hearings to expose the current Palestinian Authority's complicity in inciting violence against the State of Israel as well as against Israelis.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is contending with a deep-seated hatred. It is a deep-seated hatred nurtured, unfortunately, by Palestinian leaders over radio and also in direct communication with the population many, many years, whether it was in the mosques or the schools or the newspapers or on television. As one witness told the committee:

"Incitement" is the term we usually use, but that is not really what we mean. Hatred is what we mean, teaching generations of Palestinians to hate Jews by demonizing and dehumanizing them.

That is the nature of the problem.

Unfortunately, some Palestinians are lured to terrorism with more than just words. Since 2003, it has been Palestinian law to reward Palestinian terrorists in Israeli jails with a monthly paycheck. The Palestinian Authority and the Palestinian Liberation Organization use a so-called martyrs' fund to pay the families of Palestinian prisoners and to pay suicide bombers.

□ 1745

This pay-to-play scheme has got to stop, period. In the face of such hatred, the United States must stand firm. The Israel-Palestinian conflict can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties.

I again thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), as well, for their work on this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 165. This is a bipartisan resolution put forward by the chair and ranking member of our committee, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, cosponsored by myself, with a host of other bipartisan cosponsors.

This resolution comes at a precarious time for the two-state solution, with a new administration preparing to enter office and as turmoil continues in the Middle East. I, myself, have always been a supporter of a negotiated solution between the Israeli and Palestinian sides of this conflict which would result in a secure, democratic Jewish State of Israel alongside a stable and democratic state for the Palestinian people.

This resolution reaffirms this commitment, which has been longstanding American policy. The United States has provided important leadership as the two parties have negotiated. We would hope to see bilateral negotiations in the future. Peace must be made by the parties themselves. A peace settlement will only come through direct bilateral negotiations. These negotiations are delicate and they are complicated.

As President Barack Obama said in 2011: "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." The President continued: "Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians who must live side by side. Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians, not us, who must reach agreement on the issues that divide them . . ."

This resolution is consistent with administration policy and consistent with the policy of several prior administrations.

We must heed this advice. Imposing a solution on the parties will not work. In fact, it will be counterproductive to peace. It would undermine incentives for the Palestinian authority to make the necessary changes that are prerequisites for peace. Statehood can be accomplished by ensuring security, eliminating incitement, and demonstrating that the Palestinian side can live peacefully with Israel.

This resolution expresses a sense of Congress as follows:

That the Israeli-Palestinian peace will come only through direct bilateral negotiations;

That recognition of a Palestinian state without a peace deal would cause harm to the peace process;

That efforts by outside bodies to impose an agreement or the parameters for an agreement are likely to set back the peace process;

The United States should veto any one-sided United Nations Security Council resolutions, or those resolutions that would seek to impose solutions on final status issues—again, consistent with the administration policies;

And finally, of course, that America will continue to support negotiations without preconditions between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

The Palestinian people deserve a state of their own. The Israeli people deserve to live in peace as Jews in the State of Israel. In this spirit, I call upon my colleagues to join us in passing this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), 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 the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 165, in support of direct bilateral negotiations to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, introduced by Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL. This resolution is much more than a restatement of longstanding U.S. policy. It is an urgent defense of our commitments to the State of Israel in the face of innumerable threats.

The United States has long insisted that the only path to peace for the Israelis and Palestinians is through direct, bilateral negotiations. Any so-called resolution imposed from the outside is doomed to failure because it inherently lacks the political support of both parties to the conflict. Peacemaking is hard work, but that reality has not stopped others from looking for a shortcut.

The U.N. Security Council is one such forum that has served as a platform for anti-Israel schemes for many, many years. Thankfully, the United States has always resolutely imposed such unilateralism and, when nec-

essary, through both Democratic and Republican White Houses, has always resolutely used the veto. Since 1972, the United States has used its veto power 42 times to block anti-Israel measures in the Security Council. However, in the closing days of this administration, this longstanding policy is being called into question.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reports that President Obama is considering moving the needle on the peace process before he leaves office by supporting a U.N. Security Council resolution enshrining certain conditions for peace. Just last month, The New York Times editorial board came out forcefully in favor of this scheme. The editorial board wrote: "The best idea under discussion now would be to have the United Nations Security Council, in an official resolution, lay down guidelines for a peace agreement covering such issues as Israel's security, the future of Jerusalem, the fate of Palestinian refugees and borders for both states."

On the contrary, this is just about the worst idea. It would have the effect of dangerously undercutting the peace process. Israel's security, the future of Jerusalem, Palestinian refugees, and borders—anyone familiar with this issue knows—are the four most sensitive matters at stake in this conflict and should not be imposed from without. The United States ought to be very clear when faced with such proposals. Any attempt to determine the fate of these issues outside of direct, bilateral talks undermines the sovereignty of our strong ally Israel, destroys goodwill, and threatens to prolong the conflict further.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Sadly, the drumbeat for unilateral United Nations action on this issue continues. On October 14, the U.N. Security Council held a special debate, titled, "Illegal Israeli Settlements: Obstacles to Peace and the Two-State Solution." The session was held at the request of Security Council members Egypt, Venezuela, Malaysia, Senegal, and Angola, with the backing of the Palestinians. Such one-sided initiatives only damage prospects for peace.

Last April, 390 Members of the House on both sides of the aisle signed a letter to the President. It was signed by so many of us, including some in this room, including NITA LOWEY, KAY GRANGER, KAREN BASS, TED DEUTCH, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, ED ROYCE, ELIOT ENGEL, KEVIN MCCARTHY, STENY HOYER, NANCY PELOSI, and myself—390 in all—that laid out the simple principles that have guided our policy. These principles include:

A refusal to support counterproductive efforts aimed at imposing a solution on the parties;

Opposition to Palestinian efforts to seek recognition of statehood status in international bodies; and

A willingness to oppose, if need be, a one-sided U.N. resolution by way of a veto.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), my friend, for yielding.

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 165, reaffirming longstanding U.S. policy in support of a direct, bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

For several decades, the United States has maintained a consistent, bipartisan policy toward the conflict that supports a two-state solution and opposes settlement expansion. Explicit congressional support for the two-state solution is critically important, especially in light of President-elect Donald Trump's previous statements on this very subject.

My friends on the other side have indicated an abiding fear that something bad might happen at the U.N. in the waning 52 days of the Obama administration. I don't share that concern. What I am concerned about is the next 4 years and what Donald Trump will do to the longstanding, bipartisan support for a two-state solution that has been the cornerstone of American policy. If he pulls out of that commitment, then you are right, Middle East peace is at risk, but it is not because of what Obama is going to do over the next 52 days.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, which reiterates that longstanding, bipartisan support for a two-state solution, and help combat the unpredictability of U.S. foreign policy in these difficult days of transition.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as always, I want to thank our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), as well as our ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who is so wonderfully represented by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). I thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for authoring this very important resolution, which I am proud to cosponsor. And while I fully support this measure and I urge all of my colleagues to back it as well, I wish that this resolution was not needed; but, sadly, we know better.

The fact that we need to bring this up for debate and pass a resolution urging a United States administration to uphold longstanding U.S. policy as it relates to the peace process is telling and also disappointing, Mr. Speaker.

These next 2 months are going to be crucial for our friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, and the U.S.-Israel alliance, which must remain ever strong. Israel is facing a constant barrage by the Palestinians and

their supporters at the United Nations, and there are indications that Abu Mazen will once again attempt to further his plan for unilateral statehood through the Security Council.

Ordinarily, any attempt to dictate a two-state solution or impose parameters on negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians would be summarily dismissed by the United States. However, sadly, it has become clear over the past year that this administration may be looking to take unprecedented action; and, in fact, we have heard that the administration has been actively seeking ways in which it could force the Israelis into making dangerous concessions.

I have asked Secretary Kerry, I have asked Ambassador Power, our Ambassador to the U.N., I have asked Ambassador Patterson and nearly every administration official who has come before our Foreign Affairs Committee headed by Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL if President Obama will uphold longstanding U.S. policy and will veto any Security Council resolution related to Israel. Each one has evaded the question, refusing to reaffirm this longstanding, unambiguous, noncontroversial policy.

We hear speak of one-sided resolutions, but that is slick administration talk. Who defines the one-sidedness? It should have been a resounding blanket statement—it is easy—that the President believes that the only way to a real and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians must come through direct bilateral negotiations between the two, and lacking that, yes, we will urge the President to veto it. It is not hard.

Peace cannot be forced. Any short-term achievement an imposed solution will bring will be far outweighed by the long-term damage that it will cause.

Mr. Speaker, this is a lameduck administration; and it should go without saying that any action, whether it be at the U.N. or undertaken unilaterally, aimed at forcing solutions to final status issues will be detrimental to the prospects of peace and would harm both Israelis and Palestinians.

I support this measure, strongly, brought forth by Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL. I urge my colleagues to support it to reaffirm longstanding U.S. policy that true peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians can only come between direct bilateral negotiations between them, and to urge the administration to not allow the Palestinian scheme of unilateral statehood to gain any legitimacy at the U.N.

□ 1800

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DOLD. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, stand in strong support of H. Con. Res. 165.

What I find so fascinating is that we need here in the United States to respect Israel's democratically elected leadership. They are a nation, and they are our one true ally; and any efforts by the United Nations or by any other body to try to impose a two-state solution, frankly, I think, is detrimental and reckless. We should never try to force their hand. Frankly, what we find now is it is not the time to try to establish a legacy for an administration that has just a very few short days left by attempting a reckless Hail Mary pass. We here do want a two-state solution, which I think is important to note, but it must be done by direct negotiations by the two parties; and when the United States pressures Israel, all we do is weaken the chances for long-term, durable peace.

My good friend from Virginia talked about his actually being fearful of the next administration. Let me simply say that I hope this body will stand in bipartisan support to ensure that any administration does not pressure Israel. We understand that a long-lasting peace, which is what we are hoping for, comes through direct, bilateral negotiations.

I, for one, am hopeful that this body will stand united to make sure that the world knows that we stand shoulder to shoulder with our one true ally—Israel—and with the hope that the administration and the United Nations Security Council will veto any efforts by the United Nations to try to unilaterally put a statehood in there for the Palestinians. We know that true peace can only happen through direct, bilateral negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, again, I stand in strong support of Mr. ROYCE's and Mr. ENGEL's resolution, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues will stand together, in bipartisan support, to make sure that this administration does not take steps that will weaken Israel's hand in going forward. I hope, in going forward, in administration after administration, that this body will stand as we do today—in bipartisan support.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution reaffirms longstanding American policy that can be summarized in five points: talks must be direct and bilateral; a solution cannot be imposed on the parties; both sides must be willing to make important compromises; disagreements should be resolved privately; and the United States should work closely with the State of Israel. This resolution deserves the support of those on both sides of the aisle.

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

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

In the past, both Republican and Democratic administrations have recognized that efforts to internationalize the Israeli-Palestinian conflict are not a substitute for direct negotiations be-

tween the parties. In fact, such an approach can undermine these negotiations. Direct negotiations between the parties, not a U.N. dictate, are the only way, in our view, to bring about a peaceful coexistence. After all, direct negotiations mean legitimatizing the other party, which, unfortunately, is why Palestinian leaders routinely shun them.

Other past Presidents have pushed peace initiatives in the final hours of their administrations. Indeed, the Obama administration has pointedly not ruled out allowing the U.N. Security Council to dictate the terms of peace negotiations. That, in fact, is what has given rise to our bipartisan concerns about this process. In the absence of a clear answer from the administration as to whether it will continue to use that veto power at the United Nations, this bipartisan approach here, with this resolution, takes a stand.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the resolution so that the bipartisan policy of encouraging direct negotiations continues and is endorsed loud and clear.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the House's consideration of H. Con. Res. 165 is given special relevance by the presidential transition now underway.

The resolution sends an important message to the incoming Administration:

that the United States Congress reaffirms our nation's commitment to supporting negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians in pursuit of a just and lasting two-state solution, and

that the United States Congress reaffirms a supportive and constructive role, for our country in facilitating resolution of the conflict.

Unfortunately, the resolution also contains overly broad and negative language concerning third-party efforts to facilitate an agreement. Still, it does not preclude the United States from putting forward ideas for bridging differences between the parties, for articulating suggestions that fill in gaps, for offering a nonbinding comprehensive framework to help bring the Israelis and Palestinians to the negotiating table—just as Republican and Democrat Administrations have done in the past.

It is my hope, in fact, that the Obama administration might in the coming weeks "help provide a political horizon for ending the conflict"—I'm quoting now from House Resolution 686, introduced by Representative YARMUTH and myself and cosponsored by 64 members—"by articulating a non-binding vision of what a comprehensive final status agreement might entail that could help foster and guide revived negotiations between the parties."

The resolution also encourages the U.S. government to "firmly articulate 49 years of consistent, bipartisan United States opposition to settlement expansion."

We must be vigilant in protecting 50 years of bipartisan policy to help the Israelis and Palestinians reach as viable two-state solution in order to protect Israel as a secure, democratic, and Jewish state, and to end the cycle of violence that has plagued the region.

As a longstanding supporter of the special relationship between the United States and Israel, I believe the United States must remain steadfast in its commitment to help Israel defend itself, to ensure that Israelis and Palestinians feel that a viable political horizon to ending this conflict continues to exist despite the current absence of ongoing, productive negotiations, and to stand ready to help create better conditions for peace—so that real and achievable progress may prove viable in the months and years ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 165.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ENCOURAGING REUNIONS OF DIVIDED KOREAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) encouraging reunions of divided Korean American families.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 40

Whereas the Republic of Korea (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as “South Korea”) and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as “North Korea”) remain divided since the armistice agreement was signed on July 27, 1953;

Whereas the United States, which as a signatory to the armistice agreement as representing the United Nations Forces Command, and with 28,500 of its troops currently stationed in South Korea, has a stake in peace on the Korean Peninsula and is home to more than 1,700,000 Americans of Korean descent;

Whereas the division on the Korean Peninsula separated more than 10,000,000 Korean family members, including some who are now citizens of the United States;

Whereas there have been 19 rounds of family reunions between South Koreans and North Koreans along the border since 2000;

Whereas Congress signaled its interest in family reunions between United States Citizens and their relatives in North Korea in section 1265 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 28, 2008;

Whereas the number of more than 100,000 estimated divided family members in the United States last identified in 2001 has been significantly dwindling as many of them have passed away;

Whereas many Korean Americans are waiting for a chance to meet their relatives in North Korea for the first time in more than 60 years; and

Whereas peace on the Korean Peninsula remains a long-term goal for the Governments of South Korea and the United States, and would mean greater security and stability for the region and the world: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) encourages North Korea to allow Korean Americans to meet with their family members from North Korea; and

(2) calls on North Korea to take concrete steps to build goodwill that is conducive to peace on the Korean Peninsula.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

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

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

As the Republican coauthor of this measure, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 40—a resolution I was proud to introduce alongside my good friend, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL. As always, I appreciate the help from the gentleman from New York, the ranking member, for his assistance in bringing it to the House floor for consideration. It has been a privilege to have worked alongside one of the true champions of peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL. He is, indeed, a true patriot.

We all know about his bravery and heroism as a young Army officer in the Korean war—spending his days literally freezing behind enemy lines. While wounded, CHARLIE courageously led 40 men from his unit out of a Chinese encirclement, undoubtedly saving many, many lives. For his bravery, CHARLIE earned the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star. Yes, CHARLIE suffered for his country, but his focus has continued to also be on the suffering of the Korean people. A nation was destroyed; millions were killed; families were brutally ripped apart. CHARLIE has never forgotten that. He didn’t leave Korea behind, which is why I was happy to work with him on the cause of bringing together the many, many Korean families that have been ripped apart by war.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, Korea remains a divided peninsula. There is a prosperous and free South Korea and a brutal, totalitarian, impoverished North Korea. This division is a calamity that is acutely felt by South Korean families that have been separated by the DMZ, but it is equally felt here by many Korean American families in the United States. In the decades since the momentous liberation of Korea, millions of Korean families have been separated from their loved ones. Today, an estimated 100,000 Korean Americans have been separated from their relatives in North Korea and have long sought an opportunity to be reunited.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. Earlier this year, the average Korean separated by the war was 80 years old. A large number is over 90. It is far past time that these war-torn families be given one last opportunity to reunite with the family members they were separated from six decades ago. It is everyone’s hope—and, of course, of those in this body—that someday we will see Korea reunited. In the meantime, we can do what we can to encourage the reuniting of these families; so I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

I rise to support H. Con. Res. 40. I am pleased to support this measure that was introduced by Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL of New York, and I associate myself with the chairman’s remarks in the praise of Charlie’s service not only during the Korean war, but after that war, to focus on families that are both here and in Korea who were affected by that conflict.

A decorated veteran of the Korean war, Representative RANGEL has been a tireless advocate for peace and security on the peninsula and for the Korean American community here in the United States. His achievements are many, and as he retires after 40 decades of service here in Congress, he will, of course, be missed.

What Congressman RANGEL and the many cosponsors of H. Con. Res. 40 bring forth today—154 bipartisan cosponsors, including the chair and ranking member of the committee, myself, and so many others—is a reminder not just of the complex security situation on the peninsula, but of the human dimension of a war that has not been formally ended.

As this resolution reminds us, there are 10 million people on the Korean Peninsula and around the world who are victims of this family division, and there are some 100,000 American citizens who are still waiting to see—perhaps for one last time—family members that they have not seen for 60 years, who have remained north of the 38th parallel in the aftermath of the Korean war. There are approximately 1.7 million Korean Americans here in the United States. As I mentioned, over 100,000 of them have relatives who are north of the DMZ, and I am pleased to say that over half of those Korean Americans reside in the State of California.

The Korean Americans who have been divided from their families in North Korea are now in their senior years. Time is running out for these separated families to reunite—perhaps for just one last time—with parents, siblings, children. For many, reunification will be the only contact they will have had in so many decades. As of yet, Korean Americans have not been permitted to participate in family reunions. North Korea should encourage