

have opposed settlement expansion, moves toward unilateral annexation of territory, and efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel;

Whereas United States administrations from both political parties have put forward proposals to provide a framework for negotiations toward a two-state solution, including the parameters put forward by President Bill Clinton in December 2000, the Road Map proposed by President George W. Bush in April 2003, and the principles set forth by President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry in December 2016;

Whereas ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is vital to the interests of both parties and the leadership of both parties must negotiate in good faith in order to achieve peace; and

Whereas delays to a political solution to the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians pose a threat to the ability to maintain a Jewish and democratic state of Israel and the establishment of a viable, democratic Palestinian state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) only the outcome of a two-state solution that enhances stability and security for Israel, Palestinians, and their neighbors can both ensure the state of Israel's survival as a Jewish and democratic state and fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own;

(2) while the United States remains indispensable to any viable effort to achieve that goal, only the Israelis and the Palestinians can make the difficult choices necessary to end their conflict;

(3) it is in the enduring United States' national interest to continue to stand by its iron-clad commitments under the 2016 United States-Israel Memorandum of Understanding, which seeks to help Israel defend itself against a wide range of threats;

(4) the United States, with the support of regional and international partners, can play a constructive role toward ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by putting forward a proposal for achieving a two-state solution that is consistent with previous United States proposals to resolve the conflict's final status issues in ways that recognize the Palestinian right to self-determination and enhance Israel's long-term security and normalization with its neighbors;

(5) it is in the United States' interest to continue promoting the security, stability, and humanitarian well-being of Palestinians and their neighbors by resuming the provision of foreign assistance pursuant to United States law; and

(6) a United States proposal to achieve a just, stable, and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should expressly endorse a two-state solution as its objective and discourage steps by either side that would put a peaceful end to the conflict further out of reach, including unilateral annexation of territory or efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) each will control 30 minutes.

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

0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 326, currently under consideration.

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, the measure we are considering today is something that ought to be straightforward. It is essentially a reiteration of our support for the consensus view that has prevailed for two decades on resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a two-state solution.

This measure emphasizes that presidents of both parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching the two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security with Israel. President George W. Bush said clearly, "My vision is two states living side by side in peace and security." And President Obama agreed that, "There is little secret about where they must lead, two states for two peoples." Prime Minister Netanyahu has said, "Israel remains fully committed to peace and the possibility of two states for two people."

There are reasons, Mr. Speaker, so many of us have supported this approach for so long. A two-state solution would go a long way to ensure Israel's survival as a secure Jewish and democratic state, and it would fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own.

The resolution we are considering underscores that a two-state solution puts us on the path toward these outcomes. It makes clear that any proposal to achieve a just, stable, and lasting solution to this conflict should likewise endorse a two-state solution.

This is what we have been talking about for decades, Mr. Speaker, here on the House floor and at international gatherings, across administrations of both parties and Congresses, and premierships and Knessets of every stripe. This isn't controversial. At least it shouldn't be. This is nothing radical. We all know two states won't spontaneously appear tomorrow. The parties have a lot of work ahead of them, but every day we seem farther away from the goal.

Some of the reasons are plain as can be. Violence and terrorism continue to come in waves. Hamas has rained down hundreds of rockets at populations across Israel, and there seems to be no end in sight. Palestinian leaders have not embraced their role as peacemaker. How can Israel sit down with people who pay off terrorists?

But no one said peace was easy. To paraphrase the late Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, "You don't make peace with your friends. You make peace with your enemies."

I haven't lost hope, but the minute America abandons its leadership role in the two-state solution, that hope dwin-

dles. We cannot get to the point where Israel's role as a Jewish and democratic state is at risk. So that is why we need to get back to what has rooted American policy toward the conflict for so long, what has guided our efforts.

Now, let's look at the history, because a little bit of history is important.

Back in 1947, the U.N. Security Council came up with Resolution 181, which partitioned the land into what they called a Jewish state and an Arab state. The Jews accepted it. And the Palestinians, the Arabs, rejected it and tried to push Israel and the Jews into the sea. It didn't work.

The war of independence happened. In 1948 Israel was declared a democracy and a nation state. And so fast forward and we see what happened each time the Arab states rejected the right of the Jewish people to have a homeland on their land for many years.

So when one side says, oh, we are being mistreated. I think they have to go back and look at how they reacted. Because, again, back in 1967, back in 1973, there was no so-called occupation, there was nothing that the Arabs object to today, and yet, they refused to make peace with Israel. So I think that we have to look at both sides and we have to say, you know, people who are protesting now and saying that there is no peace really should look at what their actions have been for these past years.

Unfortunately, there has not been the leadership, in my opinion, in the Arab world to be able to make peace. That is why it is so important that this Congress do it. That is why it is so important that we put our heads together and try to say that constant war is not going to solve anything, but a two-state solution probably ultimately will.

So that is why we need to get back to what has rooted American policy toward the conflict for so long, what has guided our efforts.

Do you know what a one-state solution means? It means a state where Jews could become the minority in their own country. It means one Palestinian state with no determination for the Jewish people or for the Palestinians. Israel's right to exist as a state that is both Jewish and democratic is incompatible with a one-state solution, period.

I would caution all Members to bear in mind that before making charges in this debate about who supports Israel and who doesn't, about who is turning this issue into a political football, there is no Member of this body who is a stronger supporter than I am of the U.S.-Israel relationship, of Israel's right to exist and defend itself.

That is why I support this legislation, because I want to see peace between Israelis and Palestinians. I want Israel to have a secure and prosperous future. And I want to see American leadership brought to bear on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 326.

I have great respect for the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who has been a long-time champion of the U.S.-Israel relationship. And as I was listening to his opening remarks, there is a lot that he said that I strongly agreed with. And it kind of pained me realizing that he didn't write this actual resolution that is before us, because I know it would have been worded differently and it would have received support.

Unfortunately, many of the opening remarks which I strongly agreed with are deliberately not in this resolution. It is a great opening for another resolution, not this one.

Last summer we came to the House floor and we almost unanimously passed a resolution to strongly oppose BDS. That resolution included a lot of what this resolution tries to do. It is a watered-down version of what we did last summer. When we woke up the next day, many Members in this House said, okay, now what are we going to do about it?

S. 1 was a bill that passed at the beginning of this year in the Senate with strong bipartisan support with under 80 Senators voting for it. It has a companion bill, H.R. 336, by lead Republican MICHAEL McCaul of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. There is a discharge petition that has almost 200 signatures on it led by Congressman BRIAN MAST to bring S. 1-H.R. 336 to the floor.

So we made a strong statement last summer, and we woke up the next day, and are motivated to do something about it. We can actually, right now, with this time that we are debating and with the vote that we are about to have, we can actually be passing a bill with teeth that would go to the President's desk and would be signed into law.

And that is where our focus should have been. This resolution before us today is deeply flawed, it is highly partisan, it is ill-timed, and it is poorly crafted.

In the last 2 years, Israel has been hit by over 2,600 rockets and mortars. In the past year alone, 1,500 of those rockets were fired from the Gaza Strip into Israel.

Filing this resolution squarely into the category of worst timing possible, H. Res. 326 comes to the floor just 1 week after Israel was bombarded with over 450 rockets. In all of the pages of this resolution, guess where it mentions Palestinian terrorism? Nowhere.

This resolution fails to not only recognize these latest attacks, but all of the persistent assaults on innocent Israelis by Palestinian terrorists.

Guess what else this resolution fails to mention? It is silent on fundamental facts that shape the way Israel has

dealt with a constant threat on its border, as the chair so eloquently observed when he referenced Hamas rockets raining into Israel and Palestinians paying off terrorists, and the need for a Jewish and democratic state. It makes no reference to Hamas firing rockets. It makes no reference to Palestinians paying off terrorists. It makes no reference to recognizing Israel as a Jewish state.

During the March of Return, every single week protesters gather along the border of Israel in Gaza to throw Molotov cocktails and burning tires at IDF soldiers. Just this week, Hamas passed out leaflets calling on the public to join these protests in response to Israel defending itself against the Palestinian Islamic jihad. You won't find this in this resolution. Or that Hamas uses innocent women as human shields, that they call jihad an obligation, inciting violence. And that list goes on.

And maybe worst of all, this resolution completely fails to mention that Israel has made repeated attempts to offer peace proposals to the Palestinian Authority. After the Camp David talks in 2000, Israel offered to withdraw from 90 percent of Judea and Samaria, parts of East Jerusalem and Gaza. That same year, though, the Palestinians started the Second Intifada, and more than 1,000 innocent Israeli civilians were killed in a Palestinian campaign of suicide bombings and shootings.

In 2008, Israel offered to withdraw from 93 percent of Judea and Samaria, but time and again, the Palestinian Authority rejected peace proposals while continuing to refuse to this day, both publicly and privately, to accept Israel as a Jewish state.

In this vein, the Palestinian Authority continues to incite violence and financially rewards terrorism through its Pay for Slay program, which included the murder of an American, United States military academy graduate, Army veteran Taylor Force.

Yet, House Democrats added language to this resolution at the last minute to support the Palestinians, despite the fact that the Palestinian Authority refuses to suspend this Pay for Slay program to this day.

This resolution imposes a solution for Israel, stating specific Palestinian Authority demands and deliberately leaving out critical Israeli preconditions necessary to maintain security.

If you are going to engage in naming specific preconditions like the way this resolution puts those preconditions on Israel, the Palestinian Authority demands, well then try to balance it all out, but this resolution doesn't even make any reference to Palestinian terrorism. It is silent about providing assurances for Israel's safety and security through a demilitarized zone, but that didn't stop the resolution's authors from including Palestinian demands of Israel.

The timing of this vote is no coincidence either. This resolution, by the

authors' own admission, is a clear rebuke to the Trump administration's recent reversal of the Obama administration's targeting of Israel with U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. The timing is no coincidence.

The resolution references President Obama's policy toward Israel after the November 2016 election, but does not mention the Trump administration's efforts. One of the worst lines in this resolution references support for "the principles set forth by President Obama in December 2016." After the Obama administration abstained from U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, the House, along with many of my Democratic colleagues here today, voted in favor of a resolution to forcefully condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

This resolution, H. Res. 326, is a reversal on that point, pointing to that December 2016 moment in time as if it was something that should be applauded. This resolution chooses to reference President Obama's policy while intentionally leaving out the Trump administration's policy, ensuring a partisan outcome to this resolution.

The resolution doesn't mention the long list of victories that we have had in this administration to strengthen our support and security and stability of Israel, to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship, like moving our embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, to signing the Taylor Force Act, and recognizing Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

This partisan resolution creates a totally unnecessary schism in what has otherwise been a longstanding history of strong, bipartisan support for the U.S.-Israel relationship, which included the resolution that passed last summer.

There are other great bipartisan bills that support Israel and fight anti-Semitism at home. We should be spending our time debating and passing bills like S. 1 and H.R. 336 sponsored by MICHAEL McCaul, the Never Again Education Act or the Peace and Tolerance in Palestinian Education Act.

□ 0930

The House already passed, almost unanimously, that resolution, H. Res. 246, last summer that opposed BDS and supported peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. Now, we are bringing a watered-down, partisan, and weakened version of what has already passed in the House.

House Democrats should bring bipartisan legislation forward with teeth that will support Israel and fight the BDS movement. But rather than move forward and build on our longstanding history of bipartisan support of the U.S.-Israeli alliance, House Democrats have decided to play partisan politics with what is a powder keg.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), the author of this resolution.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to join me in voting to affirm a longstanding, bipartisan, and fundamental principle of American foreign policy. I believe we should pass this resolution today because it states facts which have been true for decades and which are true today.

A two-state solution represents the only path to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and it is the only way to safeguard Israel as a secure Jewish and democratic state while also upholding the rights and the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people.

We will never compromise on Israel's security, and we will not turn our backs on the Palestinian people's desire for dignity and justice.

Some ask why Congress should speak out now or in this way. To them, I say this: When peace appears most remote, our voices become more critical, not less. The ongoing conflict can only inflict more suffering on innocent people on both sides.

We cannot let the possibility of a just peace slip away, and we cannot accept any action that undermines a two-state solution.

We must speak out against policies that could put peace out of reach: unilateral annexation, unilateral pushes for statehood, violence, or settlement expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank many of my colleagues who have worked tirelessly to bring this legislation to the floor, including Congresswoman BASS and Congressman CONNOLLY, Congressman PRICE and Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, Chairman ENGEL, Congressman POCAN and Congresswoman LEE, Congressman DEUTCH and Congressman GOTTHEIMER, the 192 cosponsors who supported this important effort, and Leader HOYER and Speaker PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank another one of my colleagues, Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB. We spoke yesterday, and although she is not a supporter of H. Res. 326, I left our meeting feeling optimistic.

If a Jewish American from Queens and a Palestinian American from Detroit, both proud Americans, can find common ground about the need for all people, regardless of whether they are Californians or Michiganders, regardless of whether they are Jewish or Muslim, Israeli or Palestinian, if we can find common ground to live in peace and security with the same rights to self-determination and dignity, that fills me with hope.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, that fills me with hope.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution affirms the principles that have guided our for-

ign policy under Democratic and Republican administrations. We know that a two-state solution is the only path to a just peace.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan bill. I urge my Republican colleagues to join me in voting to pass H. Res. 326.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

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

As the senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and as a former chairman of the Middle East and South Asia Subcommittee, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 326, legislation that I believe is biased against Israel.

To understand this resolution, it must be taken in context. In July, this House overwhelmingly passed H. Res. 246, which condemned efforts to delegitimize Israel. It also reaffirmed our support for a two-state solution.

A mere 5 months later, we are considering this redundant legislation when we should be talking about the National Defense Authorization Act, funding the government, prescription drug prices, the opioid epidemic, so many other things. Instead, House Democrats find it more important to rebuke the Trump administration because it took the position that Jewish settlements in the West Bank are not illegal.

What is really happening here is this resolution is meant to paper over a deep division within the Democratic Party between responsible voices who understand the importance of our relationship with Israel, and many of those are here today speaking, and a campus radical left that pushes BDS, welcomes anti-Semitic attacks on Israel, and believes that Israel is the problem while the Palestinians are just helpless victims.

Forceful, principled Democratic leadership would take seriously their responsibility to educate the public and clear up these misbegotten notions. Instead, they have opted to cover over this serious problem with their flawed legislation today. That is most unfortunate.

Further, the resolution itself is fatally deficient in a number of ways. Again, context is critical. The resolution completely ignores the reason why the two-state solution has never gotten off the ground: venomous voices among the Palestinians don't want two states. They want one, a Palestinian state.

The blame falls squarely on these pernicious forces. Just look at the recent round of rocket attacks from Gaza.

That is why we shouldn't rule out other options by saying two states is the only possible solution, as this resolution does. It gives the Palestinians a vote over Israel's future, and we shouldn't let that happen.

Additionally, by raising the issues of settlements and annexation without serious criticism of Palestinian ter-

rorism and intransigence, which far outweighs anything that Israel has done, this resolution buys into the narrative of the campus left that Israel is the perpetrator and the Palestinians are just victims, an anti-Semitic narrative.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose this resolution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for his leadership on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, one point to clarify about this resolution, as the bill's author, my friend from Queens, we should say, even though he has a new district these days, talks about this not being a partisan resolution, this debate and this vote, the reality is this resolution is going to end up being, and is, the most partisan resolution that this House has ever taken up on Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to an opportunity to work with the bill's author. I believe strongly in the need to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship. I also feel strongly in my opposition to this bill, as many of my colleagues do as well, but it actually is quite partisan with regard to the text, the debate, and the ultimate vote.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 326.

“Mirabile dictu.” Wondrous to relate.

Mr. Speaker, it is finally on the floor.

I just heard a revision of history from my friend from Ohio. We were prepared to bring this resolution up on the floor in July. This has nothing to do with it. It wouldn't have even mentioned President Trump and Secretary Pompeo's strange acknowledgment of settlements that are recognized as illegal in international law.

This resolution is not, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) would have you believe, lacking in a recitation of all the grievances and incidents that continue to plague Israel and the Palestinian people. This is a prescription for a solution, which apparently my friend from New York is not interested in.

A two-state solution has been the policy of Republican and Democratic administrations. If you want to call it partisan, you take the blame, because you on the other side of the aisle are the ones who have blocked it.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is the Republicans who steadfastly have refused even to entertain being engaged in the drafting of this resolution. So, yes, if you want to call it partisan, you own it. It is your partisanship, not ours.

This is a restatement of United States policy. This is a prescription for a solution, a path toward a solution that would bring peace to both Israel and the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of time, I will save some of my thoughts on what was just said. That was a very alternate version of reality that we look forward to addressing over the course of this debate. Hopefully, my friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) sticks around.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) very much for yielding, and I very much appreciate his work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the Republican Foreign Affairs Committee staff and Ranking Member McCaul for their tireless defense of Israel.

Furthermore, I want to state that I have a long history of working in a bipartisan fashion with my dear friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ELIOT ENGEL. That is why it pains me to be here today debating a partisan resolution, a resolution that purports to defend a negotiated two-state solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but that is simply not what this resolution is about. If it were, it would be bipartisan.

This is a partisan resolution because it makes pointed criticisms of the Israeli Government on delicate, divisive, internal issues. It does so at a time when our Israeli counterparts struggle through the democratic process of forming a new government.

House Democrats would only move this unconstructive resolution to the floor if it achieved aims of radical leftists in scoring points against the Trump administration.

But, Mr. Speaker, I ask this majority, at what cost? At what cost are we voting on this?

Moving forward to this vote risks the bipartisan support that a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution has enjoyed for decades.

That is why I offered an alternative resolution at the Rules Committee, one that would support the peace process without alienating our major strategic partner and ally of the United States, the nation of Israel.

If there is any imperative for Congress, it should be to hold the Palestinian Authority to account for its efforts to bypass negotiations and unilaterally declare a Palestinian state.

For decades, the Palestinian Authority has undermined the peace process by appealing to the United Nations and other international organizations to impose its own solution and impose parameters for negotiations with Israel.

In 2000, Israel offered them full statehood on territory that included roughly 92 percent of the West Bank and all of Gaza, along with a capital in Jerusalem. The Palestinian Authority rejected it.

If there is any story that deserves more attention from this Congress, it is that Israel has made numerous concessions in the pursuit of peace while seeking only the right to exist, and this despite the continued efforts by Palestinian leadership to evade direct negotiations for peace.

That is the story this House should be telling, and that is why I oppose this partisan resolution that politicizes and, therefore, jeopardizes the sacred issue of Congress' support for Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 0945

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 326, the Lowenthal resolution, to support a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

I thank my good friend, ALAN LOWENTHAL, for the hard work he has done to support the State of Israel and to bring this resolution to the floor today.

This resolution strongly reaffirms longstanding, bipartisan U.S. policy regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This includes support for a two-state solution and expresses opposition to efforts that undermine the prospects for a lasting peace.

I, like so many in this Congress, have been a longtime and passionate supporter of Israel and the U.S.-Israeli relationship. We know that a strong Israel is good for America.

But I have been increasingly concerned that this administration's decision to unilaterally change American policies towards Israel outside of any negotiation are detrimental to the long-term prospects for peace. This resolution makes clear that the best and only real solution to achieving peace is the two-state solution.

And, again, I thank Mr. LOWENTHAL and Chairman ENGEL for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the body that, 2 years ago today, President Trump said this in the Diplomatic Room in the White House: "Today, we

finally acknowledge the obvious: that Jerusalem is Israel's capital. This is nothing more, or less, than a recognition of reality. It is also the right thing to do. It's something that has to be done."

Since that time, the Embassy was moved. I was privileged to join many of my colleagues to visit the new Embassy in Jerusalem this past August.

There, we stood, Democrats and Republicans, this August, looking at a border with Lebanon where Hezbollah has 150,000 rockets pointing at Jerusalem and at Tel Aviv.

We went near, but not too near, to Gaza, where rockets are being fired at Israel and balloons are being sent over to burn fields, despite Israel's good faith voluntary withdrawal from there in 2005.

But thank the Lord that America stands with Israel. Standing with Israel yields results for our national security and for the benefit of the great people of Israel, a true ally and democracy in which Jews, Muslims, and Christians live together with rights protected, and they live peacefully.

Following our example, Guatemala has moved its Embassy to Jerusalem. Honduras announced recognition of Jerusalem just a few months ago.

Just this week.

For the first time, Germany, the Czech Republic, Austria, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Lithuania, Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Brazil, and Colombia voted against the annual resolution supporting the Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat, which oversees the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. These countries previously abstained on the vote.

We are changing the world and recognizing Israel because we stand with Israel, and standing with Israel works.

But rather than standing with Israel on a bipartisan basis, today, our Democrat colleagues are pushing H. Res. 326. This is a liberal, progressive retreat from standing with Israel and a move to have our Nation tell Israel what to do.

This resolution spells out specific Palestinian Authority demands without listing critical Israeli pre-conditions, such as acknowledging Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state with an undivided Jerusalem as Israel's capital and providing assurances for Israel's safety and security through a demilitarized zone.

The resolution chooses to reference President Obama's policy announced after the November 2016 election, while intentionally leaving out the Trump administration's policy, designing the resolution to be hyperpartisan.

This resolution is a politically motivated exercise designed to undermine the policy of the Trump administration, the right policy, announced in November, that settlements in Judea and Samaria not be considered a violation of international law.

This resolution disproportionately criticizes the Israeli Government, while failing to recognize the dangerous actions targeting innocent Israelis that further remove the possibility of peace.

This resolution binds the U.S. Government and calls for Israel to only pursue a two-state solution.

This is wrong. We should not bind ourselves and our ally, a sovereign nation with equal standing before the United Nations, to only one solution.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. And, moreover, to one solution that has been a failed battle cry because Palestinians have perpetually failed to come to the negotiating table to pursue it in good faith.

How peace is reached in the Middle East begins and ends with actual and complete recognition of Israel's right to exist—and it is up to Israel to decide how and in what way a solution might be reached, whether that is two states or otherwise.

The rich history of Israel is increasingly known and celebrated by the world. It is a great and vibrant nation.

As we head into this celebratory season of our respective faiths, let us celebrate Israel, together, its greatness, and remember that America stands with Israel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last month, I visited Israel and the West Bank. I talked to Israeli Defense Forces leaders; Israeli settlers; members of the Knesset from many parties; U.S. Ambassador Friedman; Palestinians' top negotiator, Dr. Saeb Erakat; human rights activists; and ordinary Israelis and Palestinians.

My trip left me more committed than ever to seeing, in my lifetime, a two-state solution: a democratic Jewish state living in peace alongside a democratic Palestine. That is why I am here today.

My colleagues have spoken a lot about the need to safeguard Israel's security, and that is also why I am here today. We are at a moment when the prospects for a peaceful two-state solution—something that has long had overwhelming bipartisan support in this country and from Presidents from both parties—could be fading. If we let them fade, prospects for lasting security in Israel will fade as well.

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 Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Because, make no mistake, without a two-state solution, Israel's future as a secure

democratic homeland for the Jewish people will be in jeopardy. And Israelis, like the ones I visited in Netiv HaAsara, will continue to live in fear of rocket fire that gives them 8 seconds to reach a bomb shelter.

We need to express our support for a two-state solution, and I thank the chairman and my colleagues, Representatives Lowenthal, Bass, and Connolly, for their leadership.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is an Article I moment. The President has sowed doubt about this country's historic commitment to two-state diplomacy, diplomacy that aims at a secure, democratic, and Jewish future for Israel, and that aims at a state of their own and self-determination for the Palestinian people.

It is extremely important for this Congress to assert itself as a coequal branch of government at a time when this historic American commitment is being questioned and undermined.

This resolution makes clear that Israeli settlement expansion is unhelpful and that unilateral annexation of the territory is destructive of the prospects for peace. The resolution also reaffirms U.S. support for the security of Israel. And it makes clear that it is unacceptable for the President to cut off Palestinian aid, as he unilaterally has done, despite this aid being duly appropriated by this body.

This is unacceptable. We need to assert ourselves as an institution and reaffirm support for the two-state solution, which is really the only reliable path forward.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I am listening to different colleagues on the other side of the aisle speaking about this resolution, some are claiming that this is not partisan and that the timing doesn't have anything to do with the Trump administration, and then others are coming and speaking that this is about rebuking the Trump administration. So I am unclear as far as that messaging.

I do know that there have been multiple quotes that have been put out by Democrats in this Chamber that the timing is no coincidence. This was brought up after an announcement was made recently by Secretary Pompeo with regards to reversing President Obama's policy that was announced after the November 2016 election.

So, where my friends on the other side of the aisle speak about long-standing U.S. policy, I guess it is important for a quick recap of that long-standing U.S. policy over recent years.

At the end of 2016, after the November 2016 election, the Obama administration helped get through the United Nations U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 with regards to the view of ac-

tivity in Judea, Samaria, and parts of east Jerusalem; and, for the first time, the U.N. Security Council was saying that that was a violation of international law.

This Chamber, with more Democrats voting in favor of the resolution than against, voted for a resolution to condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. This Chamber had a problem on a large, bipartisan basis and came together to condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

That is what this resolution specifically references when it says the Obama administration's policy from December 2016. That was great when we all came together like that because we had a problem with reversing long-standing U.S. policy with that U.N. Security Council resolution.

Then this Chamber came together again this past summer, almost unanimously, passing a resolution—a strong, bipartisan resolution—strongly condemning BDS and talking about the need for peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

This resolution today is, unfortunately, a debate. It is a draft, and it is a vote that is going to be very partisan. But the inconsistency and the arguments on the other side of the aisle—some are saying this has nothing to do with President Trump and his policies and others are saying that it does. And some are saying that timing is no coincidence and others have made specific comments that it is absolutely a result of the Trump administration's recent announcements. Those inconsistencies are being noticed by all.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, who on this floor would stand with me for peace, and who on this floor would stand against our position and against peace?

It is well known that the United States, all of my life, has been a strong supporter of Israel, rooted in shared national security interests, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

I have sent to Israel young people, through the Mickey Leland Kibbutzim program, from my district for 25 years—almost 25 years—to develop the understanding and friendship that we continue to promote for the values of what Israel stands for.

The United States has worked for decades to strengthen our assistance. We are intertwined through national security. And, in essence, this two-state solution is a solution toward peace.

I have been to Palestine and met the Palestinians and their leaders over the years that I have served in the United States Congress. Presidents Bush, Clinton, and Obama stood with Israel, as we all stand today. But we stand with peace and the understanding of the two-state solution. Let us stand united.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I invite my Republican friends to join on the resolution, H. Res. 326. Do not read into it anything more than a pathway to peace, discussion, and dialogue, recognizing the dignity of all people.

I join my friends, my Jewish friends, my friends from Palestine, and I join Americans in wanting a two-state solution.

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

□ 1000

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is the chairwoman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 326, a resolution that reaffirms the House of Representatives' longstanding support for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Throughout my life and my 31 years serving in this great body, I have never lost hope that there will one day be two states for two peoples—a democratic Jewish state of Israel and a democratic Palestinian state living side by side in peace, security, and mutual recognition.

We cannot be naive. This will not be easy. Gaza continues to be run by Hamas, a terrorist organization responsible for attacks on Israel and the suffering of Palestinians in their borders. The Palestinian Authority has been a poor partner for peace, walking away from reasonable peace plans and the negotiating table altogether. And rhetoric from the Israeli Government officials about unilateral annexation pushes a future, negotiated solution farther from reality.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from New York an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. But we cannot and we must not lose hope. Simply put, a two-state solution for Israelis and Palestinians is the only means to ensure Israel's long-term security and enable Palestinian aspirations for their own state.

I thank my colleagues whose hard work brought this important resolution to the floor, and I urge immediate passage.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are few alliances as critical to America's national security, to global stability, and to our Na-

tion's values as the U.S.-Israel relationship. Israel and America share common values and together are committed to the principles of democracy and individual freedom. The United States will always stand by our ally, Israel, period.

Let me be clear. Military assistance to Israel is critical to America's national security. It is an investment in our security as well as Israel's. That is why I am opposed to imposing conditions on that assistance.

Since even before its independence in 1948, Israel has sought to achieve a secure peace with its neighbors on the basis of the principle of self-determination for both the Jewish people and for the Palestinian people. The Jewish people deserve to live in peace and security in their ancestral homeland, and Palestinians deserve the opportunity to chart their own future of peace and opportunity in a land of their own. That was the foundation of the peace process in the 1990s and subsequent efforts by Israeli Governments to achieve peace with security.

It makes clear in this resolution that both parties ought to take meaningful steps to end mistrust and avoid obstacles to peace. This includes encouraging both sides not to take any steps that make the pursuit of peace harder. Unfortunately, that has not always been the case, and the attacks on Israel undermine daily—and if not daily, too often—the ability to achieve an agreement helpful to the Palestinians as well as the Israelis.

I want to thank my friend and leader of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Chairman ENGEL, Representatives LOWENTHAL, POCAN, DEUTCH, PRICE, SCHAKOWSKY, and GOTTHEIMER, representing a broad spectrum of feelings about how we deal with and support our ally, Israel. But they have come together, as well as all of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to work hard to ensure that this resolution reaffirms Congress' strong support for the U.S.-Israel relationship, while contributing positively to helping Israel achieve the peace and security it seeks with the Palestinians.

The resolution says that settlements and annexation are inconsistent with that objective. I hope Members will support this resolution. I disagree with my friend from New York, that this is not policy that has been adopted by Republican administrations as well as Democratic administrations. To say this is an Obama policy that we are overturning—which is apparently much of what the focus of this administration is, overturning the policies of their predecessor—is incorrect. George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush believed that a contrary policy would undermine the realization of peace between two peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will on a bipartisan basis overwhelmingly support the restatement of America's policy.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we should not split hairs. We need to reaffirm our policy with this resolution because Congress in the past has not been clear enough. In my visits to Israel I have been struck how young people, Palestinian and Jews alike, believe passionately in a two-state solution, but, increasingly, they doubt that it is possible.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration's reckless policies are increasing that doubt. The latest is giving a green light to the destructive settlement policy and its expansion. Make no mistake: Trump and Netanyahu are currently careening towards a one-state solution, one that will challenge the ability of Israel to be both a democracy and a Jewish state.

Jimmy Carter said in his book that we are choosing between democracy and apartheid. This resolution suggests that we choose for democracy a negotiated solution; and reaffirming our longstanding goals, correct the ambiguity, get us back on track, and give hope to those young people in Israel, both Jew and Palestinian.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 326 which I am proud to co-sponsor. It really is an important resolution affirming the United States' support for a two-state solution, which has been longstanding bipartisan consensus for decades. It also makes clear that Congress opposes any action by the White House to encourage unilateral annexation of the West Bank.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not only needed but it is incredibly timely. The Trump administration is actively working against a two-state solution and lasting peace at every step, from support for unilateral annexation of the West Bank to reversal of U.S. policy toward illegal Israeli settlement expansion which jeopardizes Israeli security.

This resolution reaffirms the United States' commitment to a lasting peace in the region which can only be achieved through a negotiated two-state solution for both Israelis and Palestinians.

For the first time, this resolution includes clear language that the United States should resume assistance to the Palestinians.

I thank Chairman PRICE. Let me just say it is an incredibly important step. I thank Congressman LOWENTHAL and Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB for taking a bold step and seeking common ground.

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

The majority are tying themselves up in knots.

With all due respect to the majority leader, who said there was not a departure in policy towards the end of the Obama administration and that I was incorrect; I would like to point him to H. Res. 11 from January 2017, that he voted in favor of as well as most House Democrats, which included: “Whereas on December 23, 2016, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations disregarded H. Con. Res. 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.”

That is from a resolution that the majority leader voted in favor of, where he personally, and many others in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, took strong exception with that departure from longstanding U.S. policy with U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, now reversing that, once again, with the text of this resolution that is giving a shout-out to that December 2016 Obama administration policy as if it is something to be applauded.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 326.

It is critical that we take serious steps to reiterate the United States commitment towards a just two-state solution to the conflict that allows both Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace side by side.

Unfortunately, recent developments have put this vision, which remains the only viable framework for a lasting peace in the region, further out of reach.

Settlement activity in the West Bank has increasingly threatened the viability of a future Palestinian state in the region, and there is now open talk of Israeli annexation of the Jordan Valley. Settlements erode any possibility of a continuous, viable Palestinian state.

Additionally, the Trump administration's recent move to overturn decades of U.S. policy and legitimize the settlement activity represents a body blow to future peace and prosperity. In addition, the Trump administration's policies have discredited valid Palestinian claims to also have their capital in Jerusalem. We also cannot forget the humanitarian situation in Gaza which is untenable.

Mr. Speaker, this demands a response, and that is why we need a two-state solution to deal with it.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud granddaughter of a strong,

loving Palestinian woman, my sity. For me to stand up for her human dignity, I must oppose H. Res. 326.

This resolution not only endorses an unrealistic, unattainable solution, one that Israel has made impossible, but also one that legitimizes inequality, ethnic discrimination and inhuman conditions.

Prime Minister Netanyahu and the Likud party have actively fought against a two-state solution and took steps to ensure its demise. They increased their illegal taking of Palestinian homes, imprisoned more Palestinian children than ever before, and are building walls right now to annex the West Bank and other Palestinian villages.

Moreover, Israel's nation-state law, which states that only Jews have the right to self-determination, has eliminated the political rights of the Palestinian people and effectively made them second-class citizens.

Separate but equal didn't work in our country, and I can't see that it is possible in other countries. Given our Nation's history of segregation, we should recognize when such injustices are occurring. We cannot be honest brokers for peace if we refuse to use the words: illegal occupation by Israel.

Our country and the United States Congress must condemn these undemocratic actions. We must take bolder actions to ensure that human rights are upheld in Israel and that Palestinians and Black Israelis are treated with equality every human being deserves.

To honor my Sity Mufteih who lives in the occupied West Bank, Palestine, I am unable to support this resolution today. She deserves better.

□ 1015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a distinguished member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL, and I rise in support of a resolution that speaks to a two-state solution that enhances the security and stability of Israel, a two-state solution that recognizes the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own and one that will come about only through the direct negotiations of Israelis and Palestinians.

The words in this resolution matter. The words that reaffirm that it is in the national interest to continue to stand by our ironclad commitments under the MOU, which seeks to help Israel defend itself against a wide range of threats, is a critical statement at this moment in our Nation's history.

Those are the words that are the language of this resolution. That is why I support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. I encourage all of my colleagues to oppose it as well.

It is no coincidence that this resolution is being brought now. It is an attempted rebuke of the Trump administration.

I think that this Chamber should be coming together and praising the decision to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, that this Chamber should be coming together and praising the decision to recognize Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights. We all should be coming together on a bipartisan basis with regard to the implementation of the Taylor Force Act.

The Palestinian Authority has a policy not just to incite violence but to financially reward terrorism. If you murder an innocent American or Israeli, by policy—this is no secret; it is documented; it is their own admission—they will pay you money.

Now, as far as this Chamber goes, we are stewards of U.S. tax dollars. To send money to the Palestinian Authority, as long as they have a policy where they are going to pay someone for murdering an American, that is something that this Chamber should be coming together on, on a bipartisan basis, with regard to the implementation of the Taylor Force Act and how to do even better.

This resolution attempts to get into that world of what preconditions need to be met in order to have an agreement between Israelis and Palestinians. It chooses to stay silent with regard to any of the Israeli preconditions on the Palestinians, but this resolution chooses not to be silent on the preconditions of the Palestinians toward the Israelis. Not just in the text of the resolution but today in the debate, the goal is to place pressure on the Israelis, on what they need to make concessions on, by not saying anything at all with regard to Palestinians committing acts of terror and being financially rewarded for it, saying nothing about Hamas.

Hamas literally put in their charter that jihad is an obligation. I wonder where Hamas stands.

If the Palestinian Authority sat down with Israelis and right now agreed, I don't know if whoever would sign that document on behalf of the Palestinian Authority would be assassinated within days. But I will say that he can't in good faith deliver all of his people because not only are the ranks of the Palestinian Authority filled with the likes of terrorist groups like Hamas—and Hamas is a designated foreign terrorist organization of the United States—not only can they not deliver their people, Hamas doesn't just refute the argument that Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish state, Hamas refutes the argument that Israel has a right to exist.

How are we silent about a resolution? If you want to get into preconditions, how do we not get into any acts of Hamas denying access to humanitarian aid to its own people or the fact that they use women and children as human shields, that Hamas will pay someone

to get shot? A kid goes to a check-point, gets shot, and gets paid \$500.

Right now, as we are here—I mean, literally, as the decision is being made to bring this resolution to the floor, Israel is getting showered by rockets from a terrorist group in Gaza, hundreds of rockets targeting innocent Israelis, kids who are going to school or are worshiping or are at home or are running to bomb shelters because they have rockets being launched at them, trying to kill them.

That is the issue with getting into that world of preconditions, only talking about the preconditions that the Palestinians want to place on the Israelis, and then to double down and triple down during floor debate and to be silent entirely with regard to any of the preconditions toward peace.

December 2016 is specifically referenced in this resolution. This House came together and condemned that December 2016 policy. After the November 2016 election, this House came together in January on a huge bipartisan basis and condemned that change of policy in December 2016.

The reversal here in this resolution is now this resolution is specifically referencing the December 2016 policy as if it is something to be celebrated.

What we should be doing right now is passing legislation with teeth—by the way, a whole lot of legislation with teeth: passing USMCA; lowering the cost of prescription drugs, a bipartisan agreement that passed out of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce; passing S.1/H.R. 336, legislation with teeth to stop BDS, to help support Israel with teeth; authorizing funding to support Jordan; legislation with teeth to increase sanctions on Assad in Syria.

This bill has already passed the Senate with all of these different Republicans and Democrats, almost 80 Senators passing it.

Bill numbers are set based on what is important. What is important to the Senate? That was S.1.

We made a strong statement last summer, almost unanimously passing a resolution condemning BDS, including language toward peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. We should have woken up the next day united to now do something about it.

It is one thing to make a statement about anything that anyone in this Chamber is passionate about, and I respect the different passions and backgrounds of all of my colleagues. There are people who have different opinions on just about anything that comes for a vote in this Chamber.

When we choose to make statements of something that we feel strongly about, it is important to wake up the next day and say: “Okay, well, what are we going to do about it?” That is why, while I am so proud of my colleagues for voting almost unanimously for that resolution, we should be passing S.1/H.R. 336.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for all of my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close debate on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one, no one in this Chamber, when it comes to support for Israel. I supported moving the Embassy to Jerusalem, the eternal capital of the Jewish people. I am happy to have an honest debate about the Middle East so long as that debate is on the policy, on the merits. That is true when it comes to my friends on the other side and with Members of my own party. That is why we are here, and that is what the House of Representatives is all about.

I want also to point out that this resolution, an important part of this resolution, says that there are to be no conditions on U.S. aid to Israel. That is something that is very important, and I think it is very important that we state that.

The debate on foreign policy turns toxic when the issue is tainted by party politics, when support for Israel is politicized through motions to recommit or poison pill amendments. Politics should stop at the water's edge, and that is what normally guides our work on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

What happens when we ignore that? What happens is that decisions about our own security and leadership on the world stage are trumped by decisions about our own political interests. That makes us less safe. What happens is that decisions about how we treat our friends and partners around the world are trumped by decisions about what may be more appealing to our political base or political supporters. That makes our friends and partners less safe, less trusting, less confident in America.

If we allow partisan politics to contaminate our foreign policy, we do so at our peril and the peril of many others around the world. We cannot allow that to happen when it comes to Israel, our most important ally in the Middle East.

For two decades, support for a two-state solution has won bipartisan support. Even when they disagreed on many policy issues, Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama agreed on this.

Of course, no one said anywhere along the line that it would be easy to achieve, but that doesn't mean we give up. It means we dig in and keep pushing and working to change minds. That is what American leadership is all about.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues don't walk away from that. Those of us who are strong supporters of Israel understand that Israel is best served by a two-state solution, that a two-state solution is not good for only Palestinians but also good for Jews, also good for Israelis, also good for all people in the Middle East. That is what we are trying to do.

My commitment to the U.S.-Israel relationship is second to none, to no-

body. That is why I do believe, by passing this resolution today, we are attempting to bring the parties together, attempting to state U.S. policy, acknowledging the fact that U.S. and Israel are unshakeable allies.

This is simply saying that there is a dispute, that there are two peoples, two states for two peoples. That seems fair to me, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts on H. Res. 326, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

While I am a firm believer in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and the two-state solution, I am disappointed that the version of the resolution brought to the Floor did not reflect the language as introduced, language that I and 191 of my colleagues cosponsored.

It remains my firm belief that the United States must continue to call for an end to Israeli settlement expansion and oppose Israel's unilateral annexation of territory. Furthermore, the United States must do more to uphold human rights and ensure that democratic ideals are preserved as part of the process.

All humankind deserves to live a productive life without fear of threat to their safety. That is why I remain committed to the peace process and welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to achieve that aim.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 326, a resolution I drafted with Congressman ALAN LOWENTHAL and Congressman GERRY CONNOLY to express the support of Congress regarding efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

For more than 20 years, U.S. Presidents from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state living side by side with Israel in peace and security. I am proud to have assisted in drafting this important resolution, which affirms that commitment.

Our government's established decades-worth of commitment to a two-state solution in order to enhance stability and security in the Middle East and to ensure the state of Israel's survival while addressing the legitimate desires of the Palestinian people for a state of their own reflects our fundamental dedication to promote peace.

This resolution builds on our ongoing commitment and our historic alliance with Israel. I strongly support it.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 326. This resolution expresses this chamber's strong support for the longstanding belief that a two-state solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict is the best option to ensure Palestinian autonomy and Israel's survival as a Jewish democratic state.

During my time in this chamber, I have been a firm supporter of a negotiated two-state solution between Israel and Palestine. While I believe both parties will have to make difficult decisions to ensure a long-lasting peace, I believe it can be done in a way that ensures that

the human rights of Palestinians are respected while also securing the safety of our closest ally in the region.

This administration's capitulation to Benjamin Netanyahu and his allies on the extreme right in Israeli domestic politics has severely damaged the ability of the United States to be considered a fair neutral party in this conflict. It has made Israel less safe in the long term and has only driven Palestinians into the arms of bad actors in the region like Hamas.

In May 2018, this administration chose to abandon our European allies by announcing the withdrawal of the United States from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, commonly known as the Iran Nuclear Deal. Shortly thereafter, the Administration relocated the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem while subsequently eliminating the Consulate General office in Jerusalem, which served as a key diplomatic line to the Palestinian Authority.

Additionally, this administration has stripped funding from the United Nations Relief and Work Agency. This agency has worked tirelessly to help Palestinian refugees in Gaza, the West Bank, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan, by providing food, housing, education, and other necessities. Eliminating these funds jeopardizes the ability of the UNRWA to help these individuals live as normal a life as possible. It also threatens the security of the Israeli people by ensuring more of these people turn to terrorist organizations like Hamas when their basic needs fail to be met.

Last month, Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, announced that Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank did not violate international law. This drastic change in policy on the issue of Israeli settlements essentially gives the green light to the Israeli government to unilaterally annex portions of this region. Any form of annexation would essentially kill the idea of a two-state solution.

Mr. Speaker, we are voting on this resolution today to show the international community that regardless of this administration's reckless actions, the United States can play a constructive role in resolving this conflict that has lasted for more than 70 years. I urge all my colleagues to swiftly pass this resolution.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of H. Res. 326 as introduced on April 25, 2019, I support Representative LOWENTHAL's determination to advance U.S. leadership in seeking a diplomatic resolution to achieve a "two-state solution" to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Unfortunately, amendments to the resolution mean I can no longer vote in favor of H. Res. 326 and I will be voting "present."

For years, I have heard colleagues say, "It's only a resolution. It really doesn't mean anything." At a time when the Trump administration is actively taking policy actions to inflict pain on the Palestinian people while giving a green light to Israel's annexation of Palestinian lands, a statement by the House of Representatives to Israelis and Palestinians does mean something.

Is there any doubt Israel and the security of the Israeli people have the strong support of Congress? There is zero doubt. But millions of Palestinians working to build a peaceful future feel that they have been abandoned by Congress and attacked by the White House. The

U.S. is no longer an honest broker in any diplomatic peace initiative between Israelis and Palestinians. The language added to H. Res. 326 stating an "ironclad commitment" to \$38 billion in foreign military aid only highlights the contrast that there is no ironclad U.S. commitment to human rights or even providing the most basic life-saving humanitarian aid to the Palestinian people. This House vote today does not reflect the reality on the ground.

This is the time to unequivocally support both the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, justice, equality, and human rights as well as Israel's right to live in peace and security. U.S. aid must never be an "ironclad" blank check to any nation. I believe if U.S. military aid to Israel is being used to enable or support the military detention and torture of Palestinian children, the demolition of Palestinian homes, or the annexation of Palestinian lands there should be conditions on that aid—not cuts to aid, but conditions—as has been done to aid to the Palestinians.

Striving for an Israeli state and a Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security is worth the effort of every Member of Congress. But that means Congress will need to support the legitimate rights, needs, and aspirations of both Palestinians and Israelis. In my opinion, H. Res. 326 maintains the status quo and fails to move us towards achieving peace. A peace that both Israelis and Palestinians deserve and need.

[From Noa Landau, Lisbon, Dec. 5, 2019]

NETANYAHU SAYS 'OUR FULL RIGHT' TO ANNEX JORDAN VALLEY, DESPITE ICC PROSECUTOR REPORT

AFP LISBON—Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told Haaretz Thursday that it's Israel's full right to annex the Jordan Valley if it chooses to do so.

PM says political deadlock hinders controversial move, adding: 'Exactly because of that we should form a government now and do it'

Earlier Thursday, International Criminal Court Prosecutor Fatou Bensouda expressed concern over Israeli proposals to annex this West Bank region.

Asked on the matter by reports in Lisbon, the premier said "It's our full right to do so if we decide," despite the ICC prosecutor's report.

Asked about a timeline for the proposed annexation, Netanyahu said "there are some questions about what can be done in a transition government. Exactly because of that we should form a government now and do it."

When asked whether he would agree to renounce serving first as prime minister in a rotation agreement if Kahol Lavan agrees to annex the Jordan Valley and to a defense treaty with the United States, Netanyahu said "those things will be achieved when I'm prime minister. I have thousands of hours on American prime-time TV and that has a certain influence on the United States, especially now. I won't be able [to influence] if I'm not prime minister."

Netanyahu refused to tell the press whether he intends to seek immunity from the Knesset in his three pending corruption cases and cancel Likud's primary election, arguing he wouldn't address personal matters in the briefing.

"I intend to invest every effort, despite Kahol Lavan's objection, to reach an agreement and prevent this truly unnecessary election. Benny Gantz can [prevent it] if he

manages to overcome Yair Lapid and if [Avigdor] Lieberman overcomes himself," Netanyahu said, referring to Kahol Lavan co-leader and Yisrael Beiteinu chairman, who said he has no intention to have his party join a narrow, right-wing government headed by Netanyahu.

"I hope that a minority government with the Joint List is not an option," the premier said, reiterating a claim that his political rivals are backed by Arab lawmakers.

When asked why he refuses to resign, the prime minister said that "the public has chosen me. Let the public decide."

Responding on the option of holding a direct election for the prime minister between him and Gantz, Netanyahu said: "First, let's try to avoid another election, but this that's an option that's becoming interesting."

Earlier today, Netanyahu met with U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo after his phone call conversation with U.S. President Donald Trump on Sunday, when they also discussed the annexation of the Jordan Valley, which Netanyahu told voters in September he would achieve.

Before taking off from Tel Aviv, Netanyahu told reporters his meeting with Pompeo would be focused on "Iran, first of all," a mutual defense treaty and a "future" American recognition of Israel's annexation of the Jordan Valley.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution that reaffirms longstanding U.S. policy regarding the two-state solution and which squarely condemns unilateral acts by any party (and I hope the Administration understands that includes the U.S.) that undermines that goal.

The two-state solution has been such a central part of the U.S. policy for this region that it rightly deserves its own debate in this House, rather than just a passing reference in legislation as we have seen in the past.

As noted by the resolution, for more than 20 years, "Presidents of the United States from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state co-existing side by side with Israel in peace and security."

Yet, somehow the two-state solution has now become a controversial position, including within the current Administration which goes out of its way to not even mention it as a goal of our policy anymore. In light of the Administration's refusal to even say the phrase, more and more leaders in the region feel emboldened to also publicly oppose two states living side by side in peace and security.

It is even more critical now that the U.S. Congress unambiguously and clearly express support for the two-state solution.

Current trends are moving us farther away from peace or security and the Administration's efforts are doing nothing to stop that. As a hundred of my colleagues and I recently noted in a letter to the State Department, the Administration's recent announcement declaring that Israeli settlements in the occupied territories do not violate international law as far as the U.S. is concerned, "following the administration's decision to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem outside of a negotiated agreement; its closure of the Palestinian mission in Washington, D.C. and U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem; and its halting of aid Congress appropriated to the West Bank and Gaza, has

discredited the United States as an honest broker between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, severely damaged prospects for peace, and endangered the security of America, Israel, and the Palestinian people.”

This legislation sends a clear message that any U.S. proposal to achieve a just and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict “should expressly endorse a two-state solution as its objective.”

Additionally, the resolution also makes clear that “Presidents of the United States from both political parties have opposed settlement expansion, moves toward unilateral annexation of territory, and efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.”

It reaffirms the Administration’s obligation to actively “discourage steps by either side that would put a peaceful end to the conflict further out of reach, including unilateral annexation of territory or efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.”

I don’t have to tell my colleagues that unilateral actions, such as annexation or unilateral declarations of statehood will not or cannot achieve the peace or security that is so urgently desired.

Additionally, I know that this legislation has been changed to remove references to occupation and to the settlement enterprise. Whether you agree or disagree with those changes, doing so does not and will not change the actual facts on the ground or the obstacles to peace that remain. And our debate should be based on recognizing those facts, however discouraging or contentious they may be. The Israeli’s and Palestinians deserve a debate that does so accurately.

The time for pushing for peace is always now.

But let’s be clear, the sentiment in this resolution is only a start. Acknowledging the need for two states is important but even more so is working to actually achieve it. And that is where work needs to happen.

What we need are bold steps forward. Not some half-baked peace plan that has taken nearly three years to develop, is apparently subject to the whims of the U.S. and Israeli election cycles, and has already been dismissed by key stakeholders in the region.

If the Administration refuses to do so, then its time that Congress consider what actions it can take to make the vision of the two-state that we so beautifully describe in this resolution into a reality. Because today, the reality on the ground is one state, continuing tensions, and cycles of violence that can easily escalate.

It’s no longer good enough to give lip service to two-states.

So I thank the leadership for bringing this to the floor and for welcoming this debate in the House.

And I know that the two-state solution has its critics who are just as frustrated as I am that both sides have seemingly never failed to miss an opportunity to let peace slip away. But the deadly status quo is no substitute. And wishful thinking for some other “alternative” option also is no substitute.

Achieving two-states was never going to be easy. Peace never is.

But ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is vital to the interests of our country, Israel, the Palestinians, and the broader region and inter-

national communities. This is why we continue to advocate for two-states despite the setbacks and spoilers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 741, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble, as amended.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1030

VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 741, I call up the bill (H.R. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 741, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-322, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. VIOLATIONS TRIGGERING AUTHORITY OF COURT TO RETAIN JURISDICTION.

(a) TYPES OF VIOLATIONS.—Section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) is amended by striking “violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment” and inserting “violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10302(a)) is amended by striking “violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment” and inserting “violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group.”.

SEC. 3. CRITERIA FOR COVERAGE OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.

(a) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO SECTION 4(a).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10303(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) EXISTENCE OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS DURING PREVIOUS 25 YEARS.—

“(A) STATEWIDE APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a State and all political subdivisions within the State during a calendar year if—

“(i) 15 or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years; or

“(ii) 10 or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years, at least one of which was committed by the State itself (as opposed to a political subdivision within the State).

“(B) APPLICATION TO SPECIFIC POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a political subdivision as a separate unit during a calendar year if 3 or more voting rights violations occurred in the subdivision during the previous 25 calendar years.

“(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if, pursuant to paragraph (1), subsection (a) applies with respect to a State or political subdivision during a calendar year, subsection (a) shall apply with respect to such State or political subdivision for the period—

“(i) that begins on January 1 of the year in which subsection (a) applies; and

“(ii) that ends on the date which is 10 years after the date described in clause (i).

“(B) NO FURTHER APPLICATION AFTER DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—

“(i) STATES.—If a State obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such State pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(A) applies to the State solely on the basis of voting rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

“(ii) POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—If a political subdivision obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such political subdivision pursuant to paragraph (1), including pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) (relating to the statewide application of subsection (a)), unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(B) applies to the political subdivision solely on the basis of voting rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

“(3) DETERMINATION OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a voting rights violation occurred in a State or political subdivision if any of the following applies:

“(A) FINAL JUDGMENT; VIOLATION OF THE 14TH OR 15TH AMENDMENT.—In a final judgment (which has not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has determined that a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment, occurred anywhere within the State or subdivision.

“(B) FINAL JUDGMENT; VIOLATIONS OF THIS ACT.—In a final judgment (which has not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has determined that a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting was imposed or applied or would have been imposed or applied anywhere within the State or subdivision in a manner that resulted or would have resulted in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, in violation of subsection (e) or (f), or section 2 or 203 of this Act.

“(C) FINAL JUDGMENT; DENIAL OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—In a final judgment (which has not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has denied the request of the