

hearing on women's health that included a panel with no women witnesses, to public statements diminishing the importance of women's access to a full range of preventive health services, to accusations that prenatal testing is in some way a pathway to abortions, it has been open season on women's health. This is not acceptable.

We need to trust women to know what is best for their families and for themselves, and those of us in Congress should always have their best interests in mind. Women do not deserve to have their health used as a political football.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, former New York Governor Mario Cuomo, a man who saw the duality in being a legislator and a man of faith, once noted that "all religiously based values don't have an a priori place in our public morality." I think my colleagues have forgotten that message in recent days when it comes to women's health, ignoring the important impacts that access to contraceptives can mean for women.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues may believe, contraception is not a cheap, easily accessible solution for all women. An objective, non-partisan panel developed recommendations for contraceptive coverage paid for by religiously affiliated employers. The Obama administration adopted new regulations based on these recommendations.

These regulations were not designed to jeopardize anyone's religious freedom. These regulations were designed to protect the health needs of women, period. We should be doing everything possible to support women's health, not attacking women for demanding better health care.

#### ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago I was diagnosed with ovarian cancer. I was lucky, had excellent doctors who detected the cancer by chance in Stage 1. I am alive today by the grace of God and biomedical research. Many women today are not so lucky.

Ten women in the U.S. are diagnosed with a gynecological cancer every hour, and yet we know that using contraception for a year reduces the risk of ovarian cancer by 10 to 12 percent, using it for 5 years reduces that risk by roughly 50 percent. Twenty-six thousand women will die from these terrible cancers each and every year. This is just one of the ways that access to contraception is beneficial to women's health.

Improved access to birth control is directly linked to declines in maternal and infant mortality and helps to reduce unintended pregnancies. It significantly reduces a woman's risk of endometrial cancer. That is why, after an impartial and comprehensive review of the scientific data, the Institute of Medicine made the decision to include contraception among covered preventive services under the Affordable Care Act because contraception is very much part of women's health. It can help prevent ovarian cancer. It can save women's lives.

#### SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RELIABILITY ACT

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1837, the so-called San Joaquin River Reliability Act. This bill should be called the San Joaquin River Runs Dry Act. It will literally divert water from fishing and farming communities in California and send it right into the open arms of agribusiness.

The author and backers of this bill don't want a sustainable water policy for California. Instead, they want to overturn a century of California law that protects healthy waterways for fish, crops, and drinking supplies.

This bill should be called the GRAB Act, Give Rights to Agribusiness. It represents an unprecedented intrusion on States' water rights by the Federal Government. This goes beyond California and would affect water policy across the Western States.

Taking water away from farmers and fishermen struggling to make ends meet is bad for our economy and bad for our country. I urge my colleagues to protect States' rights, to support farming and fishing families, and vote against this extreme overreach of a bill.

#### ACCESS TO WOMEN'S HEALTH SAVES LIVES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of meeting with leaders who treat women as OB/GYNs from Baylor College of Medicine and from St. Joseph Hospital in Houston, Texas. They acknowledged the importance of access to women's health care.

In a hearing in Judiciary, a very renowned doctor, an OB/GYN, indicated that thousands of women are impacted with respect to cervical cancer by having access to contraceptives and to be able to be treated properly.

Let me be very clear: Now, with the established compromise, no religious institution will have to pay any money. One of the witnesses who happened to be a bishop said, That's fine;

I'm not interfering with what some woman does elsewhere.

So why do we have this crisis? We have a settlement to resolve—the protection of religious liberty and the protection of women's rights.

May I quickly indicate that just recently I introduced H.R. 83 that has to do with preventing bullying. And with the tragic incidences of the last 48 hours—now three young people dead—it's time again for this House to move again on a bill that deals with best practices to help our schools understand how to help our children.

I look forward to this legislation moving forward. I also look forward to acknowledging that access to women's health saves lives. Let's save lives.

#### MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 562, DIRECTING OFFICE OF HISTORIAN TO COMPILE ORAL HISTORIES FROM MEMBERS INVOLVED IN ALABAMA CIVIL RIGHTS MARCHES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of March 1, 2012, to consider in the House House Resolution 562; the resolution be considered as read; and the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their respective designees.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1837, SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY WATER RELIABILITY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 566 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 566

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1837) to address certain water-related concerns on the San Joaquin River, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider

as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-15. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

This resolution provides a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 1837. It's entitled the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Water Reliability Act and provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

This is a bipartisan bill that came from our committee on a bipartisan vote.

□ 1240

In like manner, the Rules Committee has decided to make this a bipartisan amendment process because we made in order all amendments filed at the Rules Committee which were germane, which complied with the House rules. I think this is very fair, and it's a generous rule to talk about a bill that has support on both sides of the aisle.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to begin by acknowledging the service of DAVID TIMOTHY DREIER to this House of Representatives and to this country. There will be many more opportunities prior to his departure to acknowledge his work for his country,

but our chairman today announced that he will be retiring at the end of this session. Chairman DREIER said:

We all know that this institution has an abysmally low approval rating, and the American people are asking for a change in Congress. So I am announcing today that I will leave Congress at the end of the year.

I would like to reassure my chairman that the change the American people, my constituents, and our country had in mind was not, in fact, his retirement. That will be a tremendous loss to this body.

DAVID DREIER is a proud institutionalist, somebody who has capably served the country, has been a friend and mentor to me, first as ranking member and now chair of the powerful Rules Committee, and somebody that I've had the opportunity and the privilege to work with on a number of bipartisan issues around trade and U.S.-Mexico relations.

His retirement will constitute the loss of not only a wealth of knowledge but of a tireless and dedicated and honorable public servant, and I hope that he continues to find opportunities to serve the public, as he truly has much more to give and is too young to call it quits. I hope that, at the end of this session, his retirement from this body will be a new beginning for our chair.

I rise today with great concern over this bill's impact on my home State and its number one resource and scarcest resource in issue, water. You know, we have an old saying in the West that "whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting."

I think, Mr. Speaker, we're going to see some of that fighting here on the floor of the House tonight, and I would argue that this isn't the appropriate venue to settle inter-California disputes that have long been settled through case law and settlements.

Water fights are long, expensive, tiring, but, you know, they've led to an established and workable framework within which States and localities have operated for years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not just about California. This bill has far-reaching implications for nearly 17 other States, including my own State of Colorado. This bill would override the century-long legacy whereby the Bureau of Reclamation respects each State's legal ability to control, appropriate, use, and distribute irrigation water. Because of this, more than several dozens letters from stakeholders in opposition to this legislation, including the nonpartisan Western States Water Council and the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Oregon, have all been received by the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter in opposition from my home State of Colorado.

COLORADO DEPARTMENT  
OF NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Denver, CO, August 19, 2011.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK, *Chairman,*  
*Subcommittee on Water and Power, House Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO, *Ranking Member,*  
*Subcommittee on Water and Power, House Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: The State of Colorado would like to join with the Western States Water Council (WSWC) in an expression of unified opposition to House Resolution 1837, the "San Joaquin Water Reliability Act". The State concurs that this Act is an "unwarranted intrusion on the rights of the states to allocate and administer rights to the use of state water resources." Furthermore, in light of the current atmosphere of cooperation and amiability between the Western states and Federal agencies, this Act could detract from the hard work and efforts that have gone into the evolution of Western water law and policy.

The development of water law in the arid West has been a long incremental process, involving ratification of treaties, negotiation of interstate compacts, and litigation before the United States Supreme Court. To allow this Act to proceed would have the effect of throwing a proverbial "monkey wrench in the machinery", especially in regards to current projects, such as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, a bipartisan deal reached by the California Legislature.

The testimony on June 2 of John Laird, Secretary for the Natural Resources Agency of California, reminded the Subcommittee of Justice Rehnquist's opinion in the 1978 case *California v. United States*: "The history of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in the reclamation of the arid lands of the Western States is both long and involved, but through it runs the consistent thread of purposeful and continued deference to state water law by Congress."

For these reasons, and the reasons stated in the Western States Water Council correspondence and resolution passed on July 29, 2011, the State of Colorado opposes the passage of House Resolution 1837.

Regards,

MIKE KING,  
*Executive Director,*

*Colorado Department of Natural Resources.*

In this letter that I submitted to the RECORD from my home State of Colorado, our Natural Resources Department wrote:

The development of water law in the arid West has been a long incremental process, involving ratification of treaties, negotiation of interstate compacts, and litigation before the United States Supreme Court. To allow this Act to proceed would have the effect of throwing a proverbial "monkey wrench in the machinery."

And so today, under this rule, this House will be considering, with one broad, sweeping stroke of the Federal legislative brush, numerous unintended consequences that will undo the existing framework, wiping away decades of settled water law, wiping away relative certainty, to the detriment of our Western States and to the sole benefit of attorneys.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many of us in this body are concerned about frivolous lawsuits and States rights. Anybody who shares my concerns about

States rights and frivolous lawsuits should join me in opposing this bill. This legislation will open up a century of water law to new litigation across the West. If you ask me, that's the definition of needlessly frivolous lawsuits.

This bill imposes Federal law over bipartisan local agreements, in this case those reached by the California legislature on the Bay-Delta, all while imposing unintended consequences and burdens on other States. This bill simply isn't true to our values of local control.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the committee has refused to address many issues with this bill and how it will impact the West. Now, that's not because the committee was unaware of the problems. In fact, the testimony on June 2 of John Laird, the Secretary for the Natural Resources Agency of California, reminded the subcommittee of Justice Rehnquist's opinion in the 1978 case, *California v. United States*, where Justice Rehnquist wrote:

The history of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in the reclamation of the arid lands of the Western States is both long and involved, but through it runs the consistent thread of purposeful and continued deference to State water law by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does the exact opposite. The Western States Water Council wrote to express their strong opposition to H.R. 1837 as an "unwarranted intrusion on the rights of States to allocate and administer rights to the use of State water resources."

Mr. Speaker, this bill would set a dangerous precedent of preempting State water rights, leaving other States vulnerable to this kind of Federal infringement, effectively letting Representatives from New York, from Michigan, from Florida and from Texas vote on California water. And I know as the Representative from Colorado, I wouldn't want the shoe to be on the other foot and having Representatives from across the country deciding what we do with our water.

Finally, this bill would erode any efforts in the multistate work to recover listed salmon species along the West Coast, with immense impact to local economies and fisheries. It would preempt California State law, which is why the California Natural Resources Secretary has written in opposition to this bill, and why the California Attorney General is also opposed.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a colloquy, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado controls the time.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), who is the sponsor of this bipartisan piece of legislation, to talk about his particular underlying bill.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I was asking my good friend from Colorado to enter into a colloquy with me, and that's okay. But I do want to say that the gentleman from Colorado and myself work in a bipartisan manner. We're both cochairs of the Mexico-U.S. Caucus. We've worked hard on that, and I would hope that the gentleman from Colorado would listen to the debate today because I think after we listen to the debate—I understand some of the concerns that he raises.

But as Mr. BISHOP pointed out, the Rules Committee was very gracious to allow all the amendments on the Democrat side and the Republican side to be offered and accepted to be debated here on the floor. So I would just urge my colleague, with whom we work together on numerous other issues in this Congress, that we find today a way to come together in a bipartisan manner. Hopefully, the gentleman from Colorado will listen to all the facts as they're presented.

Mr. Speaker, after decades of California water being controlled by the Federal Government, Congress can conclude one thing: flushing water into the San Francisco Bay is not helping to recover species, and people are suffering needlessly.

We're going to hear a lot from opponents about this bill, about science. I want to start right off the bat and make one thing clear: we're supporting sound science with H.R. 1837, and we are rejecting junk science that has long been foisted on the people of California, junk science the Federal court has labeled the unlawful work of zealots.

It is important for me to impress upon the House, the opponents of H.R. 1837 do not possess scientific high ground, as they are all but certain to allege. Their experts, and the activists masquerading as experts who support them, have been biased from the beginning and have molded their work to produce the findings that best suit their radical agenda.

□ 1250

We can say this with certainty that this agenda has not improved the fish populations. If that were true, we would not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. District Court has thrown out the biological decisions used to justify the horrible regulations that cut off water supplies to families throughout California. The court's decision was a shocking indictment of the kind of government operating in America today when it comes to our environmental laws. The U.S. District Court judge said, I've never seen anything like it. He went on to say that government scientists acted like zealots and had attempted to mislead and to deceive the court into accepting junk science.

These are powerful statements by the Federal court and should give anyone who believes in due process, open government, and justice a cause for concern.

But the band has marched on without missing a beat; and instead of disciplining these scientists, the Fish and Wildlife Service actually gave them an award for outstanding service under pressure.

The arrogant disregard for public trust didn't stop there. Just yesterday, the President issued a veto threat, essentially doubling down on the dishonest smear campaign accusing House Republicans, and I believe many Democrats, of doing just the sort of thing that his administration has been found guilty of by a Federal court.

Mr. Speaker, we are not ignoring the latest science in favor of special interests. We are not the people who are sending zealots into the Federal court to lie in the defense of junk science. We are not the people rigging regulations to favor a small minority of special interest groups.

The agenda of junk science governing the bay delta is indefensible. Just as the Federal court had said, it's dishonest.

Congress needs to ask itself, who are these people that come up with these things? Who are they?

I think the Congress will be interested to find out that one of the leaders just weeks ago, a guy by the name of Dr. Peter Gleick, he spent his career trying to dry up farmland in rural communities throughout California; and, in fact, he's even testified before Congress to this. But Dr. Gleick is an activist. He's an activist who poses as a scientist.

Just a few weeks ago, he admitted to impersonating another person and stealing information from a nonprofit. He then mingled that stolen information with a fake memo in an effort to discredit his intellectual critics. Radicals like Dr. Gleick lie; they make it their mission to destroy scientists who do not agree with their twisted, anti-human views.

Meanwhile, they are used by some in this House as an excuse to take people's water away, to take their private property rights away, to dry up farm land and, worst of all, to justify human suffering.

Mr. Speaker, people in our Nation's bread basket are standing in food lines, and they're getting carrots that have been imported from China.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, their sacrifices have done nothing to improve the environment. Fish populations have declined, and I think what we will prove today here in the Congress is that there is a better path forward, and H.R. 1837 provides that path forward.

So I would urge not only my Republican colleagues but also my Democrat colleagues to listen to the evidence, and I would urge them to vote for this rule so we can move on to the debate so we can finally restore sanity to California's water system.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a former member of the Rules Committee, Ms. MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to this bill. The issue of water in California has been debated for many decades because it is such a critical issue for our States. As a daughter of a California Central Valley farmer, I grew up on a farm; and I deeply understand the value of and the controversy over water.

Being able to plan the next growing season is critical for farmers. Unless they can count on the water being provided, there is no assurance for their crops. Now, in northern California, we have balanced our watershed. We have provided water for our farms, our cities, and our sensitive habitats in a way that we can have sustainability. But this legislation throws out the ability of the people of California to decide their own water future.

Mr. Speaker, any real solution to California's water issues will need to be crafted with consensus within California, not in a partisan manner on the House floor the way H.R. 1837 has been written.

This legislation purports to have the support of northern California, but I'm here to tell you that nothing could be further from the truth. My district, the Sacramento region as a whole, the five delta counties, are among countless others who oppose this bill, and the list continues to grow.

Some of the strong concerns include the loss of the State's right to manage its own water, the decimation of environmental protections for our Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the ability to manage the Folsom Dam reservoir for the benefit of the lower American River, and, most importantly, the overall instability that this bill would create in California. The idea of usurping the rights of States to control their own water is incredibly damaging, not only to the Sacramento area but to California and even to our country.

For those of our colleagues who represent areas outside of California and plan to support the bill because they may not impact your State, I have news for you. This is not just about California. H.R. 1837 will set a precedent that will create a domino effect so that it could happen next in Utah, Colorado, Nevada, Texas, and so forth. We don't need Federal legislation that only creates more problems for an already intractable problem. We cannot afford to give up California's right to control its own water future. The stakes are just too high.

I urge my colleagues to strongly reject this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of attending a public hearing in California with the gentleman to my right from California. It was an honor to listen to these people,

and I'm pleased to yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee that worked through this bipartisan bill, Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 2009 and again in 2010, hundreds of billions of gallons of contracted water were expropriated from California farms and instead dumped into the Pacific Ocean in the name of the delta smelt.

This tragic policy followed hundreds of thousands of acres of some of the most fertile and productive farmland in America. It threw thousands of hardworking families into unemployment. It devastated communities throughout the region, and it created the spectacle of unemployed farm workers standing in food lines to receive carrots imported from China in a region that, just a short time before, had produced much of American-grown fruits and vegetables; and it contributed to rising grocery prices that families felt far beyond the congressionally created dust bowl of California's Central Valley.

In the last Congress, the then-minority Republicans begged and pleaded for hearings to address this catastrophe. The majority turned a deaf ear.

Last year, we returned as the new House majority to take testimony on what could be done to correct this disaster. The result of those hearings is the bill by Mr. NUNES that this rule brings to the floor.

This bill restores the water allocations established under the historic Bay-Delta Accord in 1994. When that agreement, commanding broad bipartisan support, was signed, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt assured all parties:

A deal is a deal. And if it turns out that there is a need for additional water, it will come at the expense of the Federal Government.

The water diversions shattered that promise. This bill redeems it.

The Federal Central Valley Project is part of a coordinated operating agreement with the State Water Project at California's request and consent. The two are inseparable. In order to protect the water rights of every Californian, this bill brings the full force of Federal law to protect those rights so that there is no ambiguity. This protection has earned this provision the support of the Northern California Water Association, representing the water districts that serve the farms and communities and families throughout the areas of origin in California.

My opponents just said this preempts State water rights. It doesn't preempt State water rights. It specifically invokes and protects State water rights against infringement by any bureaucracy—local, State, or Federal—a legitimate constitutional function of the Federal Government established under the 14th Amendment and made essential by the terms of the State-approved joint operating agreement of these intertwined water systems.

□ 1300

The bill also restores common sense and practicality to protections for endangered native species like salmon and the delta smelt. One of the greatest threats to these endangered native species is nonnative invasive predators like the striped bass. Indeed, it is common to find striped bass in the Sacramento Delta gorged with endangered salmon smolts and delta smelt. This bill allows open season on these predators, and it encourages the use of fish hatcheries to assure the perpetuation of thriving native populations of salmon and smelt.

It replaces the cost-prohibitive provisions of the San Joaquin River Settlement Act, which contemplates spending an estimated \$1 billion to achieve the stated goal of establishing a population of 500 salmon below the Friant Dam. That comes to \$2 million per individual fish. This bill replaces the absurd mandate of a year-round cold water fishery on the hot valley floor with a warm water fishery that actually acts in concert with the habitat. It removes disincentives in current law that discourage groundwater banking in wet years. It allows for the recycling of environmental flows by communities once they've achieved their environmental purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the movement for stronger environmental protections began over legitimate concerns to protect our vital natural resources; but like many movements, as it succeeded in its legitimate ends, it also attracted a self-interested constituency that has driven far past the borders of common sense and into the realms of political extremism and outright plunder.

This bill replaces the cost-prohibitive and unachievable dictates that caused so much human suffering in California with workable, affordable, and realistic measures based on real science and not on what one Federal judge rightly called the "ideological zealotry" of rogue bureaucrats.

This debate will determine if we are about to enter a new era when common sense can be restored to our public policy and when a sensible balance can be restored between environmental and human needs. I welcome that debate, and I ask for the adoption of the rule to bring it forth.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

174 days ago, the President of the United States came to this floor and made a series of proposals to help small businesses and big businesses create jobs for the American people.

Only one element of that jobs plan has been dealt with, belatedly, which is the extension of the middle class tax cut. There has been no vote on a bill to create construction jobs, on the rebuilding of our libraries and schools; no

vote on a bill to cut taxes for small businesses that create jobs; no vote on bills that would put our police officers and firefighters back on the job or our teachers back in the classroom.

Nothing.

Now, the bill that is before us today is very important, not just for California but for the country, and it is something that needs to be taken up. I respect all views on all sides, but I think it's time that the House leadership respected the urgent economic problems of this country.

Since the President came here, there has been another increasingly urgent economic problem, which is the manipulation of gasoline prices by speculators, and Americans are seeing the consequences of this at the pump every day. Members on our side have some ideas to stop this speculation and to stop the pillaging of the wallets of American consumers at the gas pumps every day. Not surprisingly, that's not coming up for a vote either.

The priorities of the House are misaligned with the priorities of the American people. Let's put on this floor legislation that creates jobs and that gives relief to our people at the fuel pumps.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's comments. I would remind him also that the CBPA, the bill that started this problem, was actually authored by the Senator from New Jersey at the time, and I appreciate that. This is one of those things we are trying to fix.

I gladly yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. First, I want to mention to my friend from New Jersey that we have several bills, including that of the Keystone pipeline, sitting over in the Senate. They're bills that will create tens of thousands of jobs, maybe hundreds of thousands of jobs. Yet it does not seem that HARRY REID would like to bring those to the floor, so we are doing our job here.

Mr. Speaker, this bill today is about creating, really, a new environment for job creation in recognizing the human suffrage that has occurred in the Central Valley. I visited out there almost 2 years ago and saw the level of employment and the human impact of this Federal mandate upon California under the Endangered Species Act.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TERRY. I don't know about the court case where it really raised some serious issues regarding the credibility behind the rule, itself. What I do know is that, by passing this bill today, we basically push the restart button so that the entities that are hurt and the environmentalists can work together for an appropriate balanced rule that protects people's livelihoods as well.

This should be a bipartisan bill. It came out of committee as a bipartisan bill. This is exactly the type of thing

that we should be working together and across the aisle on, and I would encourage my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle to join with us in passing this bill.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1837.

California's water system is broken. For too long, the San Joaquin Valley, which many of us represent, has borne the brunt of the water challenges facing our State. We have a water system designed for 20 million people. We have 38 million people today living in California. By the year 2030, we could have 50 million people. My district was and is ground zero for the hydrological and regulatory drought that occurred in 2009 and 2010. I was in the food lines in which farmworkers, sadly, found themselves because there wasn't sufficient water to employ them.

My constituents who rely on water for their livelihoods are looking to Congress to see that we are listening and that we care to work on real solutions that impact their futures. The politics of water are not new in California nor in the West. They've existed for decades. I would hope that at some point we could put the politics aside. This debate is too important. It has been put off for too long.

For the farmers, the farmworkers, and the farm communities that I represent, I urge my colleagues to support this rule on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With gratitude to the last speaker, this may be about California water, but it impacts all of us who eat, and as you can tell, I am one who does that very well.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER).

Mr. McCOTTER. I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, a bill which is a piece of bipartisan legislation that was introduced not to serve mere partisans but to serve real people, not to promote one's party but to promote everyone's prosperity.

I say this in a true spirit of inclusion as someone who comes from a manufacturing State, as one whose auto companies stared into the abyss of potential bankruptcy. It was a bipartisan coalition that helped to save it and a policy that was put forward by a Republican President named Bush and continued by a Democratic President named Obama.

Today, we must come together in a similar bipartisan fashion, for there is a federally dictated drought in the San Joaquin Valley, one that devastates farmers and all of our fellow Americans who live and who, if they can, work there.

To me, as someone who has watched and lived with my constituents through such an experience, I see no choice but for the Federal Government to rectify its legislatively imposed

drought and to allow the people of the San Joaquin Valley the same rights that we have to pursue our prosperity and continue to keep the fruits of our labor without the heavy hand of government coming in and making it more difficult for us to pursue and to create a better life for ourselves and for our children.

□ 1310

Finally, on a note, I know that these are very contentious times, and one of the underlying issues regarding this bill is the Endangered Species Act. But whether you are wholeheartedly for the Endangered Species Act or wholeheartedly opposed, can we agree on one thing? The Endangered Species Act exists to preserve wildlife, not to impoverish human life.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the rule, and I rise in opposition to the legislation.

There is going to be an argument today about science. This bill makes it very simple. It ends that argument. It simply says that we will use the science that was in effect in 1994.

We use the science that's what, 18 years ago? That will be the science for the purposes of this legislation. You might as well tell the people of California to use the same telecommunications systems they had in 1994, no iPhones, no BlackBerries, no advancement in knowledge, skills, training, or technology.

It's a pretty simplistic approach to science. You might say it's mindless. The Federal Government is going to come in and tell the State of California that it cannot use its regulatory process or scientific process to determine what's best for its State.

As the Attorney General of our State says and the Supreme Court says, the Federal Government simply cannot commandeer the legislatures of the States, but that's what this legislation does. I love the fact that we have people here with wonderful conservative credentials who are now suggesting the Federal Government should preempt California law, preempt the California Legislature, preempt the Federal law, and go back to 1994.

Where else would you take America back to 1994 in terms of imposing the will of the Congress on the States, and that's why almost all of the Western States, their water agencies, their executive offices, oppose this legislation, because this is the greatest preemption of State water rights in the history of this country.

The people who are supporting this, these heavily subsidized farmers who have more than one or two or three subsidies from the Federal Government to grow their crops, are now insisting that the Federal Government take what is a contract right. It's a contract

right, that's it. They want to turn it into perpetuity. They want the water in perpetuity, and the hell with the rest of the State of California. That obviously isn't acceptable.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. That is not acceptable to any Member of this Congress about their own State. Why is it acceptable all of a sudden to do that to the State of California?

You simply cannot do this. We have in place a process that is working today for the first time in 40 years, and that's why the resources director of the State of California, that's why both of our Senators oppose this process, because this group of people had never come together in the last 40 years to work on California problems.

The urban users, the rural users, the agricultural interests, the manufacturing interests, the municipal interests, with the blessings of the State legislature that set out the guidelines, that set out the goals, that set out the purposes—that's going on today. Every party to that agreement except for this select few of special interests. This party is the only party that says "blow it up." Use the United States Congress to blow up a process that for the first time has the possibility of solving the water problems in this State and making it sustainable for agriculture, for the environment, for manufacturing, and for municipal use in our State. Yes, we have a tough problem. We have 30 million people. The drought that they talk about, that was imposed.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. That was a Statewide drought. Yes, they lost some employment in farm work, but, in fact, agricultural employment, even through the drought, was pretty stable.

The big employment in the Central Valley came because we were selling homes to people who couldn't pay for them. That was the crash. It was first place and the longest crash that we had in this country in terms of mortgages and the loss of the people who were working in those trades.

But that drought was still felt across the State. Thousands of people lost their jobs in tourism in northern California, in commercial fisheries, in recreational fisheries, in the bait shops and the support services all across our State. That drought was an equal destroyer of this California economy from north to south.

Don't wreck this opportunity for California to settle California's problems.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an

amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 964, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act. Mr. ANDREWS mentioned that, rather than discussing this, why aren't we tackling the big issues of the day, such as gas prices? Well, my colleague from New York (Mr. BISHOP) has a proposal to do just that.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) to talk about his proposal.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and urge the House to defeat the previous question so we can bring to the floor today my bill that would have an immediate impact on lowering gas prices.

Leap day arrives more often than a Republican energy plan. A year ago, when it became clear that the Republican leadership wouldn't help Americans fight rising gas prices, I introduced a bill that this motion is modeled after to crack down on speculation, which forces prices up artificially.

This legislation makes it illegal to sell gasoline at excessive prices and prevents Big Oil from taking advantage of consumers by manipulating prices. This is real help for consumers in a tough economy.

Domestic oil output is the highest it's been for 8 years. In fact, we've become a net exporter of gasoline, unable to consume all that we produce. And yet it's clear speculators are behind the spike in prices. They will never take delivery of oil, but they make up 64 percent of the market.

When speculators place their bets that prices will rise, it follows that actual prices will rise. They have for 21 straight days. In that time, the average price per gallon went up 60 cents in my district.

Still the Republican leadership has yet to address market manipulation or turn off the spigot of subsidies for Big Oil, which made a record-high \$137 million in profits last year. That's up 75 percent from the profits they realized in 2010.

We could invest in an energy plan that further expands domestic production, develops renewable sources, and forges a long-term strategy that weans us off Middle Eastern oil and protects consumers from rising gas prices over the long run. Mr. Speaker, let's make a leap to support American families while striking at the heart of rising American gas prices.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about two issues here, one of which was discussed by my colleague from California, which is the bill that will be up later this afternoon.

While the rule allows for amendments, some of the amendments that were proposed are not going to be before us. Specifically, this bill is a blatant attempt to do two things: one, steal 800,000 acre feet of water and transfer it to heavily subsidized farmers on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley; and, secondly, completely overrule and override State law. That's why, I suppose, States such as Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Wyoming, and the Western States Water Council, which is composed of the representatives of the Governors of 16 Western States, are all opposed to this bill.

This is a terrible precedent. If you care anything about your State's ability to control its own destiny insofar as water is concerned, you do not want this bill to pass because it is a blatant attempt by the Westside Farmers to simply grab water and take total control of the California water system.

It blows away all of the environmental laws of the Federal Government and all of the environmental laws of the State of California and even overrides the State Constitution. I cannot think of a worse policy for anyone to be supporting if you care anything at all about States' rights.

In addition to that, the bill totally destroys the efforts that have been underway to solve the problems that do exist in California water. There is absolutely not one new drop of water in this bill, but there is 800,000 acre feet stolen and delivered to the southern water contractors. For many, many reasons it ought to be defeated.

Briefly on Mr. BISHOP's attempt to have his bill heard on this floor: not a bad idea. Consider for a moment the fact that 26 million gallons of gasoline are exported from the United States every day. Something is wrong when that is occurring at the same time we're finding higher and higher gas prices.

□ 1320

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I remind the body, once again, that 9 out of the 10 amendments were made in order, and the only one that was not made in order had a question of its germaneness to the body here.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), who does have a germane amendment that will be debated later on on the floor.

Mr. DENHAM. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to talk on this not only in support of the rule, but in support of the bill. This is something we went through in committee with very great debate, but it goes well beyond the debate of committee.

We've debated this in the State of California for many, many years, if not decades now. To have Members from California come down to the floor and say that this is mindless, this is anything but mindless. These are jobs. When you go down to DENNIS CARDOZA's district and see 30 percent unemployment in the Los Banos area or

down to JIM COSTA's district and see 30 to 40 percent unemployment in Firebaugh or over in Mendota, and you call it mindless? Come down and talk to the people in our districts and tell them that their jobs are mindless, that their homes are mindless, that their cars that they're having to give up are mindless. These are farmworkers. These are individuals. These are farmers that are seeing their families destroyed right now. It is not mindless. They are certainly not special interests. Come down to these districts.

We have invited the President, on a bipartisan basis, many times now to come to California. Don't just go to L.A. and San Francisco, but come see the Central Valley and the challenges that we have. See how, when the water is shut off, we see our farms destroyed.

This absolutely has impact on the rest of the Nation. If you want a safe food supply, if you want a reliable food supply, make sure we have reliable water delivery. That is simply all this does.

Anytime that we talk about water throughout the Nation, or certainly throughout California, it becomes a battle. A lot have talked about pre-'94 when a deal was a deal. That deal hasn't been changed by the farmers. That deal has been changed by Members of Congress that have preempted State water rights.

We want a deal. We want a deal every year. We want an agreement that says that if you're going to have a contract for 100 percent of your water, you actually get 100 percent of your water. This year, because we had a lack of storage last year on the wettest of water years in California, this year we're going to have a 30 percent water allocation. We're still going to pay 100 percent of the cost of the contract but have 30 percent of the water, which means once again we will see 30 percent unemployment in JIM COSTA's district, in DENNIS CARDOZA's district, in my district, and in many of the districts throughout the Central Valley.

Before you start to ignore many of our agriculture acres and many of the jobs that go with it, let's come together in a bipartisan fashion as we've done in the committee level, as we've done elsewhere within the State, but making sure that Republicans and Democrats are working together and, more importantly, that the House and Senate are working together.

I give a great deal of praise to the author of the bill, Congressman NUNES, for getting a regional perspective for this, getting north and south and central California to actually work together. That is a tremendous accomplishment. The bigger accomplishment is actually getting the Senate and the House to work together.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. It is time that we come up with a solution that avoids

further cost, that avoids further delay, that avoids us having to continue to cut jobs in the Central Valley and in California. It's time to come to an agreement that will actually save the Central Valley and our farming industry and making sure that we've got certainty in water year in and year out. This bill will show the priority of the House. If the Senate has a different priority, let them show that. But the California public expects the Senate and the House to work together, just as we've come together in a bipartisan fashion on this bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I think it was Einstein that said: If you start with the wrong numbers in your equation, you can never get to the correct solution. What we just heard was a textbook perfect example of that.

The idea that there's 30,000 to 60,000 lost jobs as a result of what is happening south of the delta, I don't know where those numbers came from. You're certainly welcome to your own opinion, but you're not welcome to your own facts. The facts tell a whole different story.

If you look at what UC Davis did, if you look at what the University of the Pacific did, UC Berkeley, all their numbers point to a loss associated with certain things: a loss of jobs associated with the drought, a loss of jobs associated with an endangered species. But these are in the hundreds or the single-digit thousands, not anywhere close to 30,000 or 60,000. We need to get this thing right.

My friend from California was absolutely correct when he called for us to work together. That's exactly what we've been trying to do, to work together. This bill was not crafted with the stakeholders at the table. This bill was crafted in the proverbial back room with not all of the stakeholders present. None of us who have a legitimate dog in this fight were included in this.

If this bill were to pass, there will be thousands of jobs lost. They'll be north of the delta. They'll be farming jobs; they'll be fisheries jobs; they'll be recreational jobs. They'll be all kinds of jobs associated with the economy north of the delta.

You can't come to this floor with legislation that creates winners and losers in the marketplace without bringing everybody to the table to work on that. That's exactly what this bill does—it creates winners and losers. It chooses jobs south of the delta at the expense of jobs north of the delta. That's wrong and this bill should be defeated.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is hard to estimate jobs when you're thirsty, but I realize if there was even one job that is cost because of bad Federal behavior, that is one job too many.

I would be happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I'm glad, sir, that you just mentioned that, because I just heard here that, no, no, it's not maybe X thousands of jobs that are going to be lost; it is X minus a few thousand jobs that are going to be lost.

What? Did I just hear that? I just did.

Rarely do you see such a reckless and immoral disregard for American families, for American farmers, for American farmworkers, for hardworking people than what we have in front of us and what this bill is trying to solve in a bipartisan way, because this does have bipartisan support.

I keep hearing about all of these horrors. But wait a second. Take a step back, Mr. Speaker. These are farmers who have been farming that very land for generations. This is not like they are trying to do something new. They've been doing this for generations.

Can you imagine the circumstances if the Federal Government steps in and says, "No, we are going to cut off your water. You're not going to be able to farm, and forget about those jobs. Go do something else," just because some bureaucrat someplace decides that they found a fish all of the sudden after these farmers have been there for generations?

Sometimes a little common sense has to prevail and sometimes a little moral sense has to prevail. Let's stand up for these farmers who have been there for generations. Let's stand up for these farmworkers, the poorest, hardest working individuals for generations. Let's say "no" to a Federal Government that thinks that, oh, just a few less jobs won't hurt, won't matter.

This is grotesque. This is immoral. Let's stand up together in a bipartisan way to stand up for American families, for American farmers like they deserve this Congress to do for them.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Utah how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. To be honest, I'm not quite sure. I know I have a speech and there may be another one coming down here.

Mr. POLIS. I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I had the opportunity of going down to California to one of the hearings where we met the farmers who are living in this particular area. I heard their anguish. I understood their anger. Their ability to make a living was being prohibited while we in Congress simply talked about unrealistic concepts. They were living in pain while we continued to talk. Actually, our actions and talking were causing that particular pain.

This bill is about trying to help people. This is time to put people in the forefront and put our ideology behind

so that we can solve a problem that has been caused by us. This effort is to put forward legislation that corrects harms that are inflicted by onerous, extreme, completely unbalanced Federal regulations which too often seem to favor a narrow special interest group constituency as opposed to a balanced approach to protect our environment while considering jobs and the needs of real human people.

□ 1330

As many have said already, our colleagues have put forth a program which, unfortunately, is causing massive unemployment in the San Joaquin Valley, causing thousands of acres which were the most productive farmland to go fallow, and risks turning this productive area into a dust bowl causing erosion. These are negative environmental and economic impacts that were not considered in the Federal Government's original decision, but ought to have been and should be considered now.

The unfortunate reality is that California's Central Valley is one place where our actions and other regulations have had a negative impact on the country, leaving those farmers in danger but also affecting all of us. If you are an artichoke lover, which I am not, 98 percent of those that are sold in the supermarket are raised in San Joaquin Valley of California. For those who enjoy walnuts—I'm now zero for two—or almonds and garlic—which I finally like—98 percent of those supplies come from California. Nearly all of the domestic avocados and nectarines are raised in California. Just for the record, I'm three out of six for those particular food items.

California's man-made drought does not just impact Californians. It attacks and it touches each and every one of us in some way. The next time we go to the grocery store and stop and take a look at where these products come from, the chances are pretty good they're coming from California's Central Valley. You can nearly have a complete food meal group just by looking at what comes out of a 10-square-mile area of Central Valley California.

As prices continue to rise at the grocery store for fresh produce of all kinds, you can be assured that some of the main drivers of those increased costs come from a combination of skyrocketing fuel costs under this administration's poor domestic energy production policies, as well as less domestic food caused by this water diversion.

Ironically and sadly, in recent years since the Federal water takings—and that's takings by the Federal Government—more and more produce has found its way from other foreign sources to replace what should have been produced in our own particular country. This bill addresses that problem in a positive way by reinstating water rights to farmers from water that was unjustly taken away by Federal regulations.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Colorado I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I will yield myself the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. My colleague, Mr. BISHOP, has brought forth something that I think is an important national issue that my constituents have certainly been calling me about. And I know that there has been concern from across the country about rising gas prices. If we defeat the rule and the previous question, we will be able to immediately bring forth Mr. BISHOP's bill and the discussion about price gouging and gas prices.

Mr. Speaker, this bill sets a dangerous precedent for preempting State water rights, leaving other States vulnerable to this kind of Federal interference. This bill is opposed by the State of California, California's two U.S. Senators, the leaders of both State legislative houses, commercial and recreational fishing associations, water districts, local governments and the California Bay Delta Farmers. This bill overrides a bipartisan local settlement to restore the San Joaquin River that ended 18 years of costly litigation and uncertainty. This bill guts the review process for water projects in California's Central Valley and eliminates science-based protections for many species required under both California law and the U.S. Endangered Species Act.

There is simply no reason to support legislation that has a myriad of unintended consequences. It is an attack on certainty, and it is an attack on issues that should be decided, frankly, by States and stakeholders.

H.R. 1837 would eliminate desperately needed protections for fisheries, threatening thousands of fishing jobs and millions of dollars in income that sustains families, as evidenced by the impact seen during the first-ever closures of California's salmon fishery in 2008 and 2009 due to collapsing runs.

This bill is a recipe for lawsuit after lawsuit, an attack on a century of State leadership on water law and a dismissal of the consensus agreement that the people of California have reached without the needless meddling of this body, without those from other States being called upon to settle a California matter of water.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a solution in search of a problem, a bill that ends up creating more problems for more people than the problem it's trying to solve. Simply put, this bill is cutting

off the nose to spite the face; and my State, along with 17 others, stands to get harmed over in the process, particularly by the dangerous precedent of Federal second-guessing of local water rights.

If this bill were really about the delta smelt, then it should be drafted more narrowly. If this bill were really about jobs, then take into account the jobs of the salmon industry which the bill would decimate. Take those concerns to local stakeholders and to the State of California and work out a solution that is in the best interests of California citizens. Unfortunately, this bill is not about real problems. It's about scoring political points and advancing sound bites.

I urge my colleagues to join me on a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill and defeat the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in addition to restoring agricultural productivity in this area, what has been referred to as "America's salad bowl," this bill is a comprehensive piece of legislation which would reduce Federal spending by \$300 million by allowing certain water users, presently obligated to repay Federal loans on water projects in this area, to repay those loans early on a penalty-free basis.

In addition, as we are facing unprecedented debt, this bill would stop wasteful spending, terminate over a billion dollars in unproven and unnecessary Federal spending projects, and it codifies the historic, previously-agreed-upon bipartisan State and Federal agreement known as the Bay-Delta Accord. It is pro-environment by restoring warm-water fish habitats. It also protects northern California waterfowl habitat and still helps those who are trying to make a living as farmers in this area.

Mr. Speaker, in this body, we always use comparatives and superlatives at the drop of the hat or any other cliché you wish to use. If a bird flies over this Capitol, we will talk about it in superlatives. We often do that. We talk about bills being so important. In this case, I think superlatives are appropriate. This is a significant bill that is life and death for these farmers, and it is unique. Even though it deals with California, there is no other State that has this particular problem. We are not setting any precedent for anywhere else.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding. My colleagues know that I don't often come to the floor and speak on bills; but as I saw this bill coming up today, I thought to myself, here is a perfect example of government getting in the way.

I never thought, in my wildest dreams, I'd ever run for public office or ever seek to come here to Congress. But as a small businessman, I was concerned about the ever-growing size of

the Federal Government and the ever-growing reach of the Federal Government. I saw it in my own business, I saw it with my suppliers, and I saw it with my customers. And out of that frustration, I came here because I thought government was too big, spent too much, and was far too intrusive into our economy and, frankly, our society.

Look at this bill and you will see it's a perfect example of the overreach of government. We've got a group of people in California who don't like production agriculture and who think that using water to grow crops to feed the world is environmentally dangerous. They're using the endangered species law for what I would describe as an unintended purpose. They're using a law to shut down production agriculture that they don't like, and they're abusing a law that was created by this Congress. It is wrong, and it should not stand.

Secondly, here we are in a country where the American people are asking where are the jobs. The President says he's doing everything he can to help create more jobs in America.

□ 1340

Well, here's a situation where we've got tens of thousands of farmers and those who work on those farms in the Central Valley of California being denied the use of their own land, being denied the labor to feed their own families because someone is abusing the law.

This is a good bill, and it ought to pass.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 566 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 964) to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy impli-

cations. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—241

Adams	Duffy	King (NY)
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Kingston
Akin	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Alexander	Ellmers	Kissell
Amash	Emerson	Kline
Amodei	Farenthold	Labrador
Austria	Fincher	Lamborn
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Bachus	Flake	Landry
Barletta	Fleischmann	Lankford
Bartlett	Fleming	Latham
Barton (TX)	Flores	LaTourette
Bass (NH)	Forbes	Latta
Benishek	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Berg	Fox	LoBiondo
Biggert	Franks (AZ)	Long
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Billirakis	Gallely	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT)	Gardner	Lummis
Black	Garrett	Lungren, Daniel
Blackburn	Gerlach	E.
Bonner	Gibbs	Mack
Bono Mack	Gibson	Manzullo
Boren	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Boustany	Gohmert	Marino
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Matheson
Brooks	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Granger	McCaul
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McCotter
Buerkle	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	McKeon
Burton (IN)	Grimm	McKinley
Calvert	Guinta	McMorris
Camp	Guthrie	Rodgers
Campbell	Hall	Meehan
Canseco	Hanna	Mica
Capito	Harper	Miller (FL)
Cardoza	Harris	Miller (MI)
Carter	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hayworth	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Heck	Neugebauer
Coble	Hensarling	Noem
Coffman (CO)	Herger	Nugent
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Conaway	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Costa	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Cravaack	Hultgren	Palazzo
Crawford	Hunter	Paulsen
Crenshaw	Hurt	Pearce
Culberson	Issa	Pence
Davis (KY)	Jenkins	Petri
Denham	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Platts
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Pompeo
Dold	Kelly	Posey
Dreier	King (IA)	Price (GA)

Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)

Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NAYS—178

Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi

Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Napolitano  
Neal

Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Chabot  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman  
Bass (CA)  
Cantor  
Crowley  
Goodlatte

Lee (CA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Paul  
Payne

Rangel  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Sherman  
Woolsey

□ 1407

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ALEXANDER, STIVERS, and BURGESS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 173, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—245

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barietta  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishak  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Bostany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Buschon  
Buerkle  
Heck  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Capito  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Eilmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming

Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.

Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Murphy  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Runyan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner

Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan

Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West

Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NOES—173

Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge

Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kucich  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Napolitano

Neal  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman  
Bass (CA)  
Braley (IA)  
Cantor  
Crowley

Goodlatte  
Lee (CA)  
Nadler  
Paul  
Payne

Rangel  
Rivera  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ruppersberger  
Woolsey

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

□ 1415

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:  
Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 81, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 81 and 80, due to being unavoidably detained, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 283, nays 127, answered "present" 2, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]  
YEAS—283

Aderholt	Cuellar	Hurt
Alexander	Culberson	Issa
Altmire	Jenkins (CA)	Jenkins
Amodei	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Austria	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Baca	Denham	Johnson, Sam
Bachmann	DesJarlais	Kaptur
Bachus	Deutch	Kelly
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Kildee
Barrow	Dingell	King (IA)
Bartlett	Doggett	King (NY)
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Kingston
Bass (NH)	Duncan (SC)	Kissell
Becerra	Duncan (TN)	Kline
Berg	Edwards	Labrador
Berkley	Ellison	Lamborn
Biggert	Ellmers	Landry
Bilbray	Engel	Langevin
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Lankford
Bishop (GA)	Farenthold	Larsen (WA)
Black	Farr	Larson (CT)
Blackburn	Fincher	LaTourette
Blumenauer	Flake	Latta
Bonamici	Fleischmann	Levin
Bonner	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Bono Mack	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Boren	Frank (MA)	Loeb
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Long
Bralley (IA)	Gallely	Lowe
Brooks	Garamendi	Lucas
Broun (GA)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brown (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Lujan
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Lungren, Daniel
Bucshon	Gosar	E.
Buerkle	Gowdy	Mack
Burton (IN)	Granger	Maloney
Butterfield	Graves (GA)	Manzullo
Calvert	Green, Al	Marchant
Camp	Green, Gene	Marino
Campbell	Griffith (VA)	Matsui
Canseco	Grimm	McCarthy (CA)
Capito	Guinta	McCarthy (NY)
Capps	Guthrie	McCaul
Carnahan	Hahn	McClintock
Carney	Hall	McCollum
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	McHenry
Carter	Harris	McIntyre
Cassidy	Hartzler	McKeon
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	McKinley
Chaffetz	Hayworth	McMorris
Cicilline	Heinrich	Rodgers
Coble	Hensarling	McNerney
Cohen	Herger	Meehan
Cole	Higgins	Meeks
Connolly (VA)	Hinojosa	Mica
Cooper	Hirono	Michaud
Courtney	Hochul	Miller (FL)
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)
Miller, George	Rogers (MI)	Speier
Moran	Rohrabacher	Stark
Mulvaney	Rokita	Stearns
Murphy (CT)	Roskam	Stutzman
Myrick	Ross (AR)	Sullivan
Napolitano	Ross (FL)	Sutton
Neugebauer	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (PA)
Noem	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Nugent	Royce	Tiberi
Nunes	Runyan	Tonko
Nunnelee	Ruppersberger	Towns
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Tsongas
Palazzo	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner (NY)
Pascarella	Scalise	Upton
Paulsen	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pelosi	Schmidt	Walden
Pence	Schock	Walz (MN)
Perlmutter	Schrader	Wasserman
Petri	Schwartz	Schultz
Pitts	Schweikert	Watt
Platts	Scott (SC)	Waxman
Polis	Scott (VA)	Webster
Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Welch
Posey	Scott, David	West
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Price (NC)	Serrano	Whitfield
Quigley	Sessions	Wilson (FL)
Rehberg	Sewell	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Sherman	Wolf
Reyes	Shimkus	Womack
Richardson	Shuster	Yarmuth
Rigell	Simpson	Young (FL)
Rivera	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)
Roby	Smith (NJ)	
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	

NAYS—127

Adams	Gibbs	Olver
Andrews	Gibson	Pallone
Baldwin	Graves (MO)	Pastor (AZ)
Benishek	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Peters
Boswell	Gutierrez	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Pingree (ME)
Burgess	Hastings (FL)	Poe (TX)
Capuano	Heck	Quayle
Cardoza	Herrera Beutler	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Himes	Reed
Chandler	Hinche	Renacci
Chu	Holden	Ribble
Clarke (MI)	Holt	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Honda	Roe (TN)
Clay	Hoyer	Rooney
Cleaver	Hunter	Rush
Clyburn	Inlee	Ryan (OH)
Coffman (CO)	Israel	Sanchez, Linda
Conaway	Jackson (IL)	T.
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Sarbanes
Costa	(TX)	Schakowsky
Costello	Johnson (OH)	Schilling
Cravaack	Johnson, E. B.	Shuler
Critz	Jones	Sires
Cummings	Jordan	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Keating	Southerland
Davis (KY)	Kind	Stivers
DeFazio	Kinzinger (IL)	Terry
Dent	Kucinich	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	Lance	Thompson (MS)
Dold	Latham	Tierney
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Tipton
Doyle	LoBiondo	Turner (OH)
Duffy	Lynch	Velázquez
Emerson	Markey	Viscosky
Fattah	Matheson	Walberg
Filner	McCotter	Walsh (IL)
Fitzpatrick	McDermott	Waters
Foxx	McGovern	Wittman
Fudge	Moore	Woodall
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Garrett	Neal	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Amash	Owens
Ackerman	Fleming
Akin	Flores
Bass (CA)	Gohmert
Berman	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Harper
Cantor	Huelskamp
Crowley	Lee (CA)

NOT VOTING—21

Lummis
Nadler
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Woolsey

□ 1422

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY WATER RELIABILITY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 1387.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 566 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1387.

□ 1422

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1387) to address certain water-related concerns on the San Joaquin River, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1387, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Water Reliability Act.

Like California, my central Washington district is heavily dependent on irrigated water to support my agricultural industry. I understand the importance of having a stable, reliable water supply. I've witnessed how government regulations and environmental lawsuits can create conflicts for people, and jobs are the losers. However, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen anything like the economic devastation that California's San Joaquin Valley has experienced as a direct result of Federal policies that restrict water supply and that created this man-made drought.

Mr. Chairman, in 2009, Federal regulations to protect an endangered species 3-inch fish led to the deliberate diversion of over 300 billion, Mr. Chairman, 300 billion gallons of water away