

this bill on Native-American issues, which have been a bipartisan priority over the years. I am proud of all of my cardinals and all of my ranking members, but particularly the relationship between Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. PINGREE, which we have seen on this committee before, and my friend, Ms. MCCOLLUM, who also has chaired this subcommittee earlier in her career. As a matter of fact, we worked together on the matter that she mentioned in terms of forward-funding for Indian healthcare. It has just been a pleasure in these areas where we have so much in common and a common commitment to fulfill our trust obligations.

I, for one, am very proud of the community projects in this bill. It allows the Members, not just on our committee, but across the entire Congress, to do things that they think are important for their constituents. They are the best people to make that judgment because they represent them in the House.

My friend, again, Ms. DELAURO, has worked over the years to build a system that will make sure that these things are used appropriately, honestly, and openly. We continue to work together on that matter. Again, I am very proud of her.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join every other speaker today, which is unusual in a very partisan-polarized era, to urge the passage of this bill. We have worked together. We have worked in good faith. We have worked effectively. We have actually cut spending in these bills collectively. I think we have a common commitment to get the most out of our tax dollars.

I think this is a three-bill package, as the previous three-bill package was, that Members of this body can be proud of, should point to, and should celebrate. When we have bipartisan, bicameral cooperation and work together, we can get the job done and do a great job for the American people. I share my good friend Ms. DELAURO's opinion in this case, that is exactly what we did.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill and urge its passage. I urge my colleagues to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 977, the previous question is ordered.

Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 977, the Chair will put the question on retaining Division A of the bill, and then retaining Divisions B and C.

The question is: Shall Division A of the bill be retained?

Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 977, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

FINISH THE ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 2, 2026, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 131) to make certain modifications to the repayment for the Arkansas Valley Conduit in the State of Colorado.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of January 2, 2026, at page H6135.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), the ranking member of the House Committee on Natural Resources, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the veto message of the President of the United States to H.R. 131.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 131, the Finish the Arkansas Valley Conduit Act, facilitates the construction of the Arkansas Valley Conduit, or AVC, by easing the repayment requirements for project beneficiaries.

The AVC is designed to provide potable water from Pueblo Reservoir to 39 communities in southeastern Colorado, many of which are dependent on groundwater supplies that contain unacceptable levels of naturally-occurring heavy metals and radionuclides. According to the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District, 18 of those communities are currently failing to meet Federal drinking water standards due to these contaminants.

H.R. 131 passed the House Committee on Natural Resources and then the House of Representatives in July 2025. However, President Trump has returned H.R. 131 to the House without his approval. I respect the administration's views on this legislation and its commitment to fiscal responsibility. President Trump's record demonstrates a commitment to prioritizing unleashing abundant water supplies across the West.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1962, Congress authorized a 130-mile pipeline, known as the Arkansas Valley Conduit, to deliver clean, reliable water to communities in southeastern Colorado. More than 60 years later, the project remains uncompleted, while communities in the region continue to face unreliable water supplies and serious water quality challenges.

The drinking water sources they rely on are often contaminated with unsafe levels of radium, uranium, and other pollutants. Treating these contaminants places a significant burden on rural communities and forces many families to rely on bottled water or expensive filtration systems to meet basic needs that we all take for granted.

□ 1330

The Arkansas Valley Conduit was designed to address these challenges, but the project is still not completed largely because the communities that it will serve do not have the financial capacity to meet the traditional repayment obligations. They need our help.

For over a decade, the Colorado delegation has worked to advance this project so that families in southeastern Colorado can finally have access to clean, safe drinking water. Senators BENNET and HICKENLOOPER helped secure \$500 million through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act for this project that was a major step toward completion.

Last year, this body worked in a bipartisan manner to pass H.R. 131. Now, as introduced, Representative BOEBERT's bill did raise some concerns about removing interest payments and extending the repayment period, but our colleagues in the Senate worked to address these shared concerns, and we in the Natural Resources Committee came together to build on that work to ensure that this legislation addresses the real water reliability challenges facing the people of southeastern Colorado while remaining consistent with core reclamation law principles.

Together, Congress sent the President a carefully negotiated and narrowly tailored bipartisan bill to support the completion of this project.

The administration has no problem subsidizing water for certain stakeholders, including large-scale agricultural projects, yet when it comes to a tailored bill to ensure access to safe drinking water for rural communities, unfortunately, the President has taken a different path.

Now, we are going to talk about the merits of this bill today. I am sure, but we all know that this veto has nothing to do with fiscal policy, nothing to do with the merits. There has been extensive reporting that raises broader concerns about the administration's posture toward the State of Colorado and even toward the sponsor of this bill.

We know what this veto was about, and the message that that sends to Colorado and communities awaiting the

completion of the Arkansas Valley Conduit is deeply troubling.

Meanwhile, and the good news, is that this Congress has kept working to find a solution, and the legislation before us today is reasonably negotiated and bipartisan. It is going to help communities who have waited too long to finally have clean water.

I thank my colleagues for their commitment to working with us to reach the language before us today. I am deeply disappointed that the President chose to veto a bill that would help communities gain access to clean drinking water. The communities of southeastern Colorado deserve better, and today we have a bipartisan opportunity to do that for them.

I express my support and urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on overriding the President’s veto, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT), the lead sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our House Natural Resources Committee and the ranking member of our committee for all the work that has been put in on this legislation. I also thank my colleagues in the Senate for their work on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of today’s veto override to ensure my bill, H.R. 131, becomes law.

In December of last year, this commonsense, bipartisan, and bicameral bill passed both the House and Senate unanimously. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that my bill will not result in a measurable increase to Federal spending.

H.R. 131, the Finish the Arkansas Valley Conduit Act, will help small rural communities in southeast Colorado finally complete a Federal water project that was authorized in 1962 under the Kennedy administration.

Radium, uranium, and other naturally occurring elements are found in the surface and groundwater of southeastern Colorado, and the water quality is problematic year-round because of its salinity, selenium, sulfate, hardness, and manganese levels.

The Bureau of Reclamation has found that these contamination levels are so severe that local communities could see the costs of their drinking water triple without this legislation.

Contrary to what the veto message states, my bill does not authorize any additional Federal funding. It simply modifies the repayment terms for small rural communities in my district so they are able to afford their 35 percent cost share of the project that they are statutorily obligated to repay.

After the project broke ground, inflation took place. Costs doubled under the previous administration. The price tag of this project doubled due to construction and labor costs.

Once completed, the Arkansas Valley Conduit will provide 7,500 acre-feet of

water per year to as many as 50,000 Coloradans across 40 different communities in Pueblo, Otero, Bent, Kiowa, Prowers, Crowley, and Baca Counties.

I boldly remind my colleagues here today that this project broke ground during the first Trump administration in 2020 due to major investments from the Trump-led Bureau of Reclamation and the State of Colorado.

From 1962 until 2020, only \$24 million had been invested in this project. In 2020, President Trump and his team, his administration, did the right thing, continuing with their commitment to improve Western water infrastructure. He more than doubled the Federal investments in this project with \$28 million going toward it. The State of Colorado then invested over \$100 million in this project.

Former Secretary of the Interior David Bernhardt personally attended the groundbreaking of the AVC and retweeted: “For nearly 60 years, Colorado’s leaders have worked to move the Arkansas Valley Conduit forward.”

The Trump administration got it done.

A press release from the Department of the Interior announcing the groundbreaking reads: “Western water supply reliability and infrastructure investments has been a priority for President Trump and his administration.”

This bill makes good on not only a 60-year plus commitment without wasting hundreds of millions of dollars in State and local and Federal investments, but it also makes good on President Trump’s commitment to rural communities, to Western water issues.

President Trump’s commitment to Western water supply and reliability will be upheld, and the Arkansas Valley Conduit will finally be completed.

We were able to get this bill passed and sent to the White House the right way, the way that I have fought for since I have been in Congress. This is a piece of legislation that has gone through committee, has been negotiated, has been debated, has gone back and forth between both Chambers, and we were able to pass this single-subject legislation all the way through with unanimous support in this body and in the Senate. It is something I am very, very proud of, and it is past time that we finally fulfill the promise that the Federal Government made to the communities I represent in Colorado. I urge my colleagues to support this override to finish the Arkansas Valley Conduit.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time. I support this bill for many reasons. I support it for the reasons that were articulated by the sponsor, my colleague from Colorado, Ms. BOEBERT; by the ranking member; and by the chairman. I think they have ably explained why this water infrastructure project for southeastern Colorado is so critical, a project 60 years in the making.

I support it because, as was noted, there are no cogent issues with this bill as were purportedly articulated in the veto message from President Trump. Far from it, this bill will cost taxpayers virtually nothing as was referenced. It makes good on a promise to the people of rural Colorado.

I support the bill because I believe that the people of Otero County and Bent County and Crowley County deserve access to clean water just as every citizen of the great State that I serve and that Ms. BOEBERT serves, that Mr. HURD serves, and my other colleagues in the Colorado congressional delegation deserve.

□ 1340

I think what is perhaps missing from this debate, and it is important for us to level with the American people, is: Why are we here? Why, despite all the reasons that this bill makes a whole lot of sense? Why, despite the fact that this bill passed unanimously in the House and in the Senate, Mr. Speaker? Why did the President veto this bill?

We are here, unfortunately and profoundly, because the President has declared war on our State. In the last 40 days, he has taken step after step to harm the people whom I serve and whom I represent. He is denying disaster assistance for folks in Rio Blanco County and down south in La Plata County. He is freezing childcare assistance and food assistance for hungry families across our State and trying to dismantle a scientific institution in my district. Now, he is denying access to clean water to 50,000 people in southeastern Colorado.

It is unconscionable.

Now, I am speaking to my Democratic colleagues. To be clear, it is important in this moment for Members to support this override and ensure that this promise that was made to the people of southeastern Colorado is not impaired and is not abrogated by the President’s retaliation against the State of Colorado. We cannot let that become the new normal.

I will say to all of my colleagues: As you consider where you land on this particular vote, let me be abundantly clear. It does not matter if your community supported Donald Trump politically. If we don’t take this step, then, trust me, no town is safe, no county is safe, and no State is safe from political retaliation by the administration. We will be back here on the floor debating a veto for a project in Arkansas or in Texas or in Ohio.

The House has an opportunity, in my view, to do the right thing on the merits and to support this important legislation that Ms. BOEBERT has introduced and that she has fought for with our colleagues in the Senate, Senator BENNET and Senator HICKENLOOPER.

I am urging every Member of this body: Put aside political differences. Recognize that this is a bill you already supported as recently as last month. Recognize that it is going to

have a dramatic and consequential impact on a lot of hardworking Americans in the rural parts of our country. Vote in the affirmative on the override.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 131, the Finish the Arkansas Valley Conduit Act.

This is not a symbolic vote. It is not messaging. It is not partisan. This is a test of whether Congress keeps its word not just to southeastern Colorado but to every community in every State and district that depends on Federal commitments being honored.

For those of us who represent the American West, this vote is personal. In the West, water means survival. It means whether communities grow or disappear, whether agriculture survives, and whether moms can trust the water they give their kids out of the tap. Westerners understand something instinctively: When the government makes a water promise, it should keep it.

In 1962, Congress authorized the Arkansas Valley Conduit to deliver safe drinking water to rural communities in southeastern Colorado. These communities grow amazing watermelons, cantaloupes, and chilies, and support families who ranch and raise livestock.

When we talk about honoring Federal commitments, we are talking about whether the people who grow our food can have clean water.

Decades later, that promise remains unfinished. More than 50,000 Coloradans, across a distance spanning more than some Eastern States, still rely on contaminated and radioactive groundwater. Eighteen systems are under enforcement orders for violating EPA standards. These are real families, real towns, and real public health consequences.

Rural Colorado and rural America more broadly voted overwhelmingly for this President and for an agenda that promised they would not be forgotten. They expected Washington to keep its word, not abandon them midway.

H.R. 131 doesn't expand this drinking water project, authorize new construction, increase the Federal share, or create any new entitlement. It doesn't bail out any mismanagement. It simply gives rural communities more time and flexibility to repay the Federal Government. It extends the repayment period and lowers the interest rate in cases of economic hardship. It prevents hundreds of millions of dollars from being stranded mid-construction. It lets communities doing their part and repaying the government finally access clean water.

This bill passed both Houses unanimously. Republicans and Democrats from across the entire country all agreed: This is a project worth completing, not abandoning.

Mr. Speaker, veto overrides are rare, and they should be. However, the Con-

stitution gave Congress this authority for moments exactly like this: when the legislative branch speaks with unity and clarity, and the executive branch says no anyway.

In modern congressional history, it is extraordinarily rare, and perhaps unprecedented, for a President to veto a bill that passed both Chambers unanimously while his party holds unified control of the government. That should give every Member pause.

If Congress cannot keep a clear, long-standing, bipartisan commitment like this, then what message does that send to communities in every State and every district relying on similar commitments? What certainty do they have that our word means anything?

Yesterday, the administration issued a statement opposing this override, claiming it continues failed policies of the past and burdens taxpayers with a local water project. This is not a new water project. It is a federally authorized water system underway for decades with consistent bipartisan congressional support. This exact project was previously celebrated by this President himself. On October 3, 2020, President Trump's Department of the Interior issued a press release titled: "Trump administration breaks ground on long-awaited Arkansas Valley Conduit to bring safe, clean water to rural Colorado communities."

Earlier that year, the President visited Colorado and praised the Arkansas Valley Conduit. He said that we got the money to begin construction. His own Secretary of the Interior broke ground on this project.

If the project was worth supporting in a campaign rally and celebrating at a groundbreaking, then surely it is worth finishing. It was the right position then, and it is the right position now.

Mr. Speaker, if a bill that passed unanimously that costs almost nothing and fulfills a 60-year Federal promise and protects public health can be vetoed under these circumstances, then bipartisan work in this institution is at risk.

I ask my colleagues: How would you feel if a project like this in your district that was passed unanimously and fulfilled a decades-long promise was vetoed anyway? That is what these rural communities are facing.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are watching, and your constituents are watching, to see whether Congress means what it says. This vote is not about defying a President. It is about defending Congress. It is about strengthening this institution and standing for the people who trust us to fight for them.

For those of us who represent the West, this is also about standing together. Western water projects are long-term, complex, and federally driven by necessity. If Congress walks away from a 60-year commitment mid-project, then no Western project is truly secure, and no district anywhere

in the country can trust that a Federal infrastructure promise will be kept.

I ran for Congress to fight for my district, even when it is difficult, even when it is uncomfortable, and even when the outcome is uncertain. This is one of those moments.

□ 1350

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues may be feeling pressure today to accept the veto. I get it. However, I would ask every Member to consider the pressure felt by the communities they represent, especially those in rural America who need infrastructure built, who need clean water, and who need Washington to mean what it says.

What does it say to them, to all of our constituents, if this institution makes this kind of commitment and walks away when it matters most?

This override is about finishing what we started, honoring commitments, protecting taxpayer dollars, and standing by rural communities. Yes, it is also about protecting this institution.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote to override the veto of H.R. 131.

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

I really, in this moment, could care less about Ms. BOEBERT's politics or Mr. HURD's politics. What I see before us is a piece of legislation that does an awful lot of good for people, a bill that was carefully negotiated, is bipartisan, and is common sense.

It is a water infrastructure bill, and every Member of this House looked past their political differences and did the right thing when we passed this unanimously out of the House of Representatives. That was Congress just doing its job.

If a noncontroversial, bipartisan, good bill like this can be taken hostage and become a weapon for settling political scores, well, it may not be in your State, it may not be in your district, but that could happen and will happen to any of us.

Mr. Speaker, this may seem like a little water infrastructure bill, but this is a bigger moment than that. This is a bit of a Spartacus moment for the Members of this body because any of us could face this, and we are about to find out.

I hope the people of this country are watching. I know history is actually going to be watching what happens here because if Congress is able to override this veto, it is a statement that even in a moment of extreme polarization, dysfunction, and conflict, we were able to get some work done. That would be Congress doing its job. If we fail to override this veto, that would say something much, much more troubling.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I respect the administration's views on this legislation, and I respect my colleagues from Colorado's passion for their districts and for their State.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings will be postponed.

MICCOSUKEE RESERVED AREA AMENDMENTS ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 2, 2026, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 504) to amend the Miccosukee Reserved Area Act to authorize the expansion of the Miccosukee Reserved Area and to carry out activities to protect structures within the Osceola Camp from flooding, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of January 2, 2026, at page H6136.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), the ranking member of the House Committee on Natural Resources, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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 veto message of the President of the United States to the bill H.R. 504.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today as President Trump has returned H.R. 504, the Miccosukee Reserved Area Amendments Act, to the House of Representatives without his approval.

H.R. 504, sponsored by Representative GIMENEZ, would amend the Miccosukee Reserved Area Act, or MRAA, to include the Osceola Camp, a Tribal village within the Everglades, as part of the Miccosukee Reserved Area. It also

directs the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Tribe, to safeguard structures within the Osceola Camp from flooding events.

The Miccosukee Tribe is currently located in the Greater Everglades in southern Florida. Following Federal recognition of the Tribe in 1962, the Miccosukee's northernmost villages within what became Everglades National Park were managed under a special use permit until 1998, when Congress placed that permit framework with the MRAA, authorizing the Tribe's use of the area and noting it as Indian Country.

The original law did not include Osceola Camp. H.R. 504 would include the Osceola Camp in the Miccosukee Reserved Area and formalize a partnership between the Tribe and the Federal Government to address flooding risk in the area.

H.R. 504 passed the House Committee on Natural Resources in June 2025 and the House of Representatives in July 2025.

However, I respect the President's views on this legislation and his commitment to fiscal responsibility, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Natural Resources Committee is entrusted with working on behalf of Indian Country. While we don't always agree on everything, we have a long history of bipartisan work and a shared commitment to advancing legislation that benefits Tribal communities. H.R. 504 is one clear example of this. It addresses longstanding challenges caused by past Federal policies, and it is an opportunity—I would argue, an obligation—to support the Miccosukee Tribe in their efforts to protect their homelands.

President Trump has undermined that work, vetoing this bill based on unrelated policy disputes and a fundamental misunderstanding of Tribal sovereignty.

H.R. 504 would expand the Miccosukee Reserved Area to include Osceola Camp, which would strengthen the Tribe's ability to self-govern and, importantly, to address serious flooding concerns facing the village. This bipartisan bill is narrow, targeted, and respects Tribal sovereignty.

After reviewing the President's statement regarding his veto, it is very clear that this decision was not limited to the merits of the bill or to any particular policy. Instead, his statement criticizes the Tribe for actions taken to protect the Everglades, their homelands, from environmental risks. It even takes issue with the Tribe's opposition to his administration's unpopular immigration policies.

Moreover, the statement reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of Tribal Nations and the obligations that the United States has to those sovereign governments. Let me be clear: Tribes are not special interests. They are not seeking special treatment. They are

sovereign nations with legal and moral responsibilities to protect the well-being of their citizens, their homelands, and the United States has a government-to-government responsibility to work with them. Unrelated policy disagreements should never be used to undermine that relationship.

The Miccosukee Tribe has worked for generations to protect their homelands within the Everglades. H.R. 504 would ensure that a historic Tribal village is protected, while allowing for critical restoration efforts to move forward without displacing the community.

It is pretty straightforward. It is noncontroversial. It was broadly universally bipartisan. It never should have been vetoed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 504. Vote "yes" on overriding this veto. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. I am prepared to close, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that I must rise to support this veto override of the Miccosukee Reserved Area Amendments Act.

It is a very commonsense bill, as our unanimous vote in both houses of Congress clearly demonstrated. It is simple. This act would absorb the Osceola Camp into the Miccosukee Reservation and directs the Tribe and Department of the Interior to jointly protect the camp from flooding.

□ 1400

This work is already underway, as we speak, but let's address the erroneous reasons that it was vetoed.

First, it does not appropriate or authorize any new spending. The Congressional Budget Office verified that.

This bill in no way bestows special treatment, as it was alleged in the veto message, because the site wasn't authorized when it was inhabited.

On these points, it appears the President's staff gave him bad advice, bad facts, or both.

The reality is, the Tribe came to the Everglades after being driven from their homes in the early 1800s. As the Miccosukee moved to what is now Everglades National Park, they formed temporary camps on tree islands. The water that flows through our River of Grass was a source of food, water, and a means of transit.

Depot Tiger settled on a tree island at the turn of the 20th century. Her son, John Tiger Poole, was born there and later helped found the Osceola Camp. However, the construction of a new major roadway split their camp, and it dried up the water that they relied upon, forcing the family to move to a different part of their camp.