United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2014 No. 148

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 8, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

NOTICE

If the 113th Congress, 2nd Session, adjourns sine die on or before December 24, 2014, a final issue of the *Congressional Record* for the 113th Congress, 2nd Session, will be published on Wednesday, December 31, 2014, to permit Members to insert statements.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT–59 or S–123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through Tuesday, December 30. The final issue will be dated Wednesday, December 31, 2014, and will be delivered on Monday, January 5, 2015.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the *Congressional Record* may contain subject matter, or relate to any event, that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be formatted according to the instructions at http://webster/secretary/cong__record.pdf, and submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Record@Sec.Senate.gov".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at https://housenet.house.gov/legislative/research-and-reference/transcripts-and-records/electronic-congressional-record-inserts. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, and signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT–59.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the *Congressional Record* may do so by contacting the Office of Congressional Publishing Services, at the Government Printing Office, on 512–0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER, *Chairman.*

THANKING THE PEOPLE OF AMERICAN SAMOA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank our fellow Americans and the people of American Samoa for the opportunity they gave me to serve them.

Having grown up in the small village of Vailoatai in American Samoa and having graduated from Kahuku High School in Hawaii, I never expected that the people of American Samoa would choose me to serve them in the U.S.

Printed on recycled paper.

House of Representatives from the time they first elected me in 1988 until 2014.

I pay special tribute to them and to the late Paramount Chief A.U. Fuimaono, who served as American Samoa's first elected representative to Washington, D.C. Paramount Chief Fuimaono gave me the opportunity to serve as his chief of staff from 1973 to 1975, and I am grateful for all he taught me.

From 1975 to 1981, it was my honor to serve with the late Congressman Phillip Burton, who was chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs. During my service as his chief counsel, he instructed me with drafting legislation providing for the first elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor of American Samoa and for American Samoa to be represented by a Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives. I will always be grateful and thankful for the opportunity that I had to participate in such an historic undertaking for and on behalf of the people of American Samoa.

After my service with Chairman Burton, the late Senate President, Paramount Chief Letuli Toloa encouraged me to come home and ai le pefu ma savali le ma'ama'a, which means, come back home to ''eat the dust and walk on the rocks'' so that I could feel the people's pains and sufferings and so that I might be able to serve them with more meaningful purpose.

I followed his advice, and as I look back over my life of service, had I not returned to American Samoa to live among our people, it would have been impossible for the people of American Samoa to have entrusted me to serve them for nearly four decades at home and abroad.

As I now leave this great institution, Mr. Speaker, I once more express my love for the people of American Samoa and to all my fellow Americans. I also want to express my love to my dear wife, Antonina Hinanui, who is from Tahiti, and our children for standing beside me throughout my years of service.

I express my love for my late father, Eni Fa'aua'a, Sr., and my dear mother, Taualaitufanuaimeaatamali'i. I also want to thank my siblings for their unwavering support.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I publicly want to thank my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, in the House and the U.S. Senate. We have worked together in close cooperation for many years, and I will always be grateful for their steadfast friendship, as well as their constant support for the initiatives I put forward on behalf of the people of American Samoa.

I especially want to thank our fellow Democratic leader NANCY PELOSI. My service with the late Congressman Phillip Burton, who was like a father to me, led to my friendship with Congresswoman PELOSI. Congresswoman PELOSI and I have been family since our Burton days, and I am grateful that she has been a part of my life for all these years.

I am also proud that Congresswoman PELOSI became the first woman in U.S. history to serve as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. Congresswoman PELOSI will always hold a special place in my heart.

I thank my friends from around the world, including diplomats and world leaders from Vietnam, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Malaysia, Cambodia, Laos, Taiwan, both North and South Korea, China, India, Hong Kong, and elsewhere, for their friendship and support.

I also want to thank my staff in Washington, D.C., and in American Samoa for their loyalty and dedication to me, to our Nation, and to the people of American Samoa.

Above all, I thank my Heavenly Father for his guidance and protection.

I go forward, Mr. Speaker, knowing that the best is yet to come and hoping that I will be remembered for trying my best. For the times I fell short, I ask for forgiveness.

To each of my colleagues and to you, Mr. Speaker, I extend my kindest and highest regards. May God be with you always. Fa'afetai ma ia Soifua, meaning, in the Samoan language, thank you, and may peace be with you always.

CRISES IN VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, stability in the Western Hemisphere is in jeopardy due to the political and economic pressures occurring in Venezuela. Misguided financial decisions, attacks on entrepreneurship, and socialist policies have led the economy in Venezuela to a free fall.

With oil prices continuing to decrease, Venezuela is suffering from large budget shortfalls due to its large dependency on oil sales. To try to make up for the deficiency, the Venezuelans have a foreign debt of over $100 billion and have had to cut its oil shipments to some Caribbean and Central American nations.

This paradigm shift can lead to an opening for the U.S. to get more involved in the region and deter the large democratic setbacks that we have experienced in recent years.

Venezuela's economic crisis is combined with its political problems and, Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge this body to stand in solidarity with the freedom-seeking people of Venezuela. Nicolas Maduro's intransigent, brutal regime continues to desperately and violently silence dissonant voices who believe in freedom, in democracy, and in respect for human rights.

Just last week, democracy advocate Maria Corina Machado was summoned to a kangaroo court in Caracas. This courageous woman was, until recently, a member of the Venezuelan National Assembly until she was illegally removed from her seat in Congress by the Venezuelan thugs. Why was she removed from that seat? Because she spoke up for the people of Venezuela.

Before she was removed unjustly from her legislative seat, she was physically assaulted on the floor of the National Assembly. Yes, on the floor of the Venezuelan Congress, she was beaten up.

Maria Corina, despite being banned from leaving her country, continues to use the power of her voice to spread awareness about the violence and the corrupt nature of Nicolas Maduro's brutal regime.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, her case is not an isolated incident. Earlier this year, savage repression met the thousands of students who peacefully demonstrated, seeking a better Venezuela. Maduro, in desperation, used his National Guard and paramilitary forces to savagely quash the protest. During that time, innocent people were injured, arrested, and even killed, unarmed demonstrators killed by Nicolas Maduro. Seventy-two of those students remain in prison today, as well as two mayors who are in prison and opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez, another brave voice for freedom like Maria Corina.

Here is Leopoldo Lopez. He remains in solitary confinement in Ramo Verde military prison under the poorest of conditions and without regular access to visitors and all denying his due process. His wife, children, family, and friends are not allowed to freely visit him, Mr. Speaker.

His case caused international outcry from Amnesty International, stating that the charges against him are politically motivated and an assault on dissent in Venezuela.

More recently, the United Nations working group on arbitrary detentions, along with that body's top human rights officials, demanded the release of Leopoldo Lopez as well as the release of all of those who have been detained for exercising their legitimate right to express themselves freely.

In response, the Venezuelan regime stated that the U.N. body's decision was nonbinding on them, and so these innocent civilians remain in prison.

The Venezuelan people have been met with intimidation, with violence, with imprisonment for simply calling for respect for human rights and democratic freedoms in their own country.

So the United States must stand with them in their struggle for freedom. That is why this body passed H.R. 4587, the Venezuelan Human Rights and Democracy Protection Act, in May, a bill that I authored. The bill targets Venezuelan officials by denying them visas to enter the United States, blocks their property, freezes their assets, and prohibits financial transactions of these thugs responsible for committing human rights abuses against the people of Venezuela.

I call on the Senate to pass the Venezuela sanctions legislation immediately to send a signal that these abusive tactics by the Maduro regime will have consequences.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Venezuela are sending us a distress signal, and the United States must stand ready to act for the cause of freedom, democracy of our own hemisphere. Democracy leaders like Leopoldo Lopez and Maria Corina Machado are counting on us.

HONORING HARRIET TUBMAN'S LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation's great history, the life of Harriet Ross Tubman is certainly a life worth recognition by this Congress and this country.

Harriet Tubman, born Araminta Ross in 1822, dedicated her life to the emancipation movement as a leader of the Underground Railroad that provided enslaved African Americans a pathway to freedom in the North. She served for the Union Army during the Civil War and as a caregiver for the elderly by establishing the Tubman Home for the Aged in Auburn, New York, where she lived out her life.

She suffered from traumatic brain injury throughout her life after she was hit as a teenager with a heavy weight by a slave overseer who was trying to subdue another enslaved person. She was an advocate for women's rights and worked to get women the vote. After settling in Auburn, she dedicated much of her life and effort to the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church there.

In 2008, the National Park Service completed a special resource study to determine the most appropriate way to recognize the life of Harriet Tubman. The Park Service eventually came to the conclusion that a park should include two geographically separate units. One would be a tightly clustered set of buildings in Auburn, New York, and the other would include large sections of landscape that are evocative of Tubman's life both as a slave and as a conductor of the Underground Railroad on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

The Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act, which I introduced, aims to further commemorate the life of Harriet Tubman by establishing the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Dorchester County, Maryland.

Harriet Tubman Historical Park is located in Auburn, New York, and the part of that that includes historical structures like the Tubman home, the Tubman Home for the Aged, the AME Zion Church that she went to, and the Fort Hill Cemetery where she is buried.

Mr. Speaker, last week this House passed legislation as part of the armed services authorization bill to establish a park in Tubman's honor. This week I hope the Senate will also pass this legislation and send it to President Obama for his signature.

It is completely appropriate that this provision should be included, for, though not as well known as her activity on the Underground Railroad, Harriet Tubman was one of our first African American women military veterans. She volunteered her time and efforts, traveling to the South to help the Union war effort by helping fugitives and serving as a nurse to Union soldiers in Port Royal, South Carolina.

□ 1215

Eventually she was leading bands of scouts through the land around Port Royal, where her ability to travel unseen and fool her adversaries made her an ideal spy. Her group, working under the orders of the Secretary of War, made maps and collected important intelligence that aided the Union capture of Jacksonville, Florida.

Subsequently, Tubman became the first woman to lead an armed assault during the Civil War. When Union Colonel James Montgomery and his troops attacked plantations along the Combahee River, Tubman went with them and guided three steamboats around confederate mines in the waters leading to the shore. More than 750 enslaved African Americans were rescued in the Combahee River raid and, according to the newspapers at the time, most of those newly liberated men went on to join the Union Army, largely due to Tubman's recruiting efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Harriet Tubman lived for freedom and worked hard to extend freedom to hundreds of others. In doing so, she earned the Nation's respect and honor. A century after her death, I am proud to have worked so hard to establish a fitting memorial to her.

I truly believe that Harriet Tubman's example of inner strength, persistence, her love of freedom, and her dedication to the Nation based on the principles of freedom makes her as relevant today as she was in her own time.

Mr. Speaker, our time is filled with too much cynicism and people feeling powerless to do much to better our society. We should look to the example of Harriet Tubman, a true American patriot. She was someone for whom liberty and freedom were not just concepts but were principles worth working for and fighting for.

According to Tubman's authorized biographer, Sarah Bradford, when Tubman had escaped from slavery in the Northern States, she said, ''I looked at my hands to see if I was the same person. There was such a glory over everything. The Sun came up like gold through the trees and over the fields, and I felt like I was in Heaven.''

We, Mr. Speaker, should look to Harriet Tubman, an enslaved African American woman of slight physical stature and suffering from head trauma, and realize that the glory and heaven that is American freedom is there for us all if we are willing to work for it and to fight for it and to believe in it, as Harriet Tubman did.

SOUTHERN PRESTIGE INTERNATIONAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in October, I had the privilege of visiting Southern Prestige International to view firsthand the company's creative and innovative manufacturing solutions.

Based in Statesville, North Carolina, Jim Wilson, one of the most creative and remarkable people I have ever met, started the company in March 1979 as Southern Prestige Industries. In 2013, this family-owned business joined with partners Jeff Eidson and Joey Chambers to form a new company, Southern Prestige International, and focus on future opportunities.

Currently, Southern Prestige International has two operating companies, ProEdge Precision and Specialty Perf. ProEdge Precision is an advanced manufacturer of precision machine components for the aerospace, defense, medical, energy, and commercial industries. Specialty Perf is a soft-goods perforator, producing specialty products for signage, advertising media, and food packaging, as well as one-way vision, energy diffusion/control, and medical products.

Although its business has taken on different forms over the years, today Southern Prestige International is a place where experience and confidence have prevailed to forge an advanced manufacturing business that understands the needs of its customers.

During my visit, I had the opportunity to meet with employees as well as local leaders in workforce development before touring the company's two manufacturing operations. ProEdge Precision currently employs about 35 people, and during the visit, Mr. Chambers told me he could see the company doubling its workforce in the next few years to keep up with increasing demand. However, he also said one of the company's greatest challenges is finding the qualified workforce it needs to be a competitive manufacturer in today's marketplace.

It is my hope that Southern Prestige International will have an easier time finding these employees with implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, which aims to close the skills gap by modernizing and reforming our country's workforce development system. By streamlining the jumble of paperwork and red tape that has been prevalent in Federal workforce education programs, this law will provide direct access to education and skills development for in-demand jobs.

During the tour, I saw firsthand the cutting-edge equipment and methods

used by Southern Prestige International and how they take advantage of industry innovations and develop proprietary advances of their own to give customers a competitive edge.

It is clear we need to stop Washington from telling employers every little jot and tittle of what to do and turn the American workforce loose to be productive and innovative, as it has been in the past.

The underlying philosophy of Southern Prestige International is that of customer service and high-quality products. It is clear that there is more wisdom in Iredell County than in Washington, D.C.

A PIECE OF HOME THIS CHRISTMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States has our military all over the world, and we have for a good number of years. In fact, the United States has been at war for a long, long time.

This year, as we approach Christmas, families across America will gather around to enjoy homemade apple pie and turkey and each other's company, but our men and women in uniform, those volunteers, are still all over the world, protecting and representing the United States. These are America's best. It is the best we have in our country.

In 2005, I had the opportunity to go over to Iraq and see our military during the Christmas season. But before I left, I decided I would ask local schoolchildren and their teachers to help make some homemade Christmas cards and holiday cards to give to our troops when I arrived in Iraq.

So that year, after I landed, I took about 5,000 handmade Christmas cards—made primarily by schoolchildren—to our servicemen and -women in Iraq and also in Kosovo. Since that time, children in southeast Texas have been making handmade Christmas cards and holiday cards for our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq and other parts of the world every year, and these cards are either taken overseas by me or they are shipped.

This year, the community in southeast Texas and the schools rallied, and the result is quite outstanding. I am proud to say that this holiday season we will be sending 96,000 handmade Christmas cards and holiday cards to our troops in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other parts of the world, primarily made by schoolkids in southeast Texas. Remember, Mr. Speaker, these are handmade cards. These are not storebought cards.

These cards were received from various Texas residents. Just to name a few: Kingwood High School, Sterling Middle School, Timberwood Middle School, Goose Creek Memorial High School, Alamo Elementary, Horace Mann Junior High, the Hi Neighbor Club in Kingwood, Houston Methodist Hospital, Baytown Chamber of Commerce, the Baytown school district, the Baytown Housing Authority, Victory Hospital, and Boy Scout and Girl Scout clubs in southeast Texas.

Mr. Speaker, 80,000 of these came from the city of Baytown alone. So a big ''thank you'' to Rikki Wheeler, the executive vice president of the Baytown Chamber of Commerce, as well as to the Baytown schools, hospitals, and organizations for their remarkable contribution and organizing and managing the collection of these cards.

The patriotic spirit of those folks in southeast Texas to me is quite heartwarming, and the outpouring of support from Texans, primarily schoolchildren, is quite exceptional.

I want to thank all of those who have taken the time to bring joy to our troops in lands that are far, far away, those troops who will be separated from their families this Christmas. It is because of the schools, the teachers, and the schoolchildren that this is all made possible every year.

This is a way that people in southeast Texas show appreciation to our troops who are separated from their families this time of the year. Remembering to thank them and send them special greetings is very important.

Many of these schoolchildren have family members overseas who are serving in the military, and this small gesture brings comfort and cheer to all of those involved. A piece of home will mean so much to those who are representing us overseas, and it is possible only because the community volunteers to do this each year.

The simple act of making a handmade card shows the connection between our warriors and our schoolchildren who are thinking about them this time of year. So this Christmas, as Americans celebrate, we remember to say a prayer for those who safeguard America's freedoms.

We thank our volunteers in uniform, and we thank our volunteers who made this season quite special for our military by making these cards.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I will also include for the RECORD a list of other groups who have made holiday cards for our troops.

Advanced Aromatics/GCM High/Chevron Phillips
Aramark/Stuart Career Ctr.-Culinary Arts
Awards & Engraving/St. Joseph's/Byt
Draft'g/Staff'g
Bayer/Clark Elementary
Baytown GMC/Bowie Elem.
Baytown Sun/GCCISD Public Relations
Beacon FCU/Ashbel Smith Elem.
CenterPoint/Gentry Jr.
Chevron Phillips/Crockett Elem.
CRCU/Lamar Elem.
Community Toyota/Highlands Jr.
Crespo & Jirrels/Peter Hyland (ALP)
ExxonMobil/RE Lee High
ExxonMobil/Walker Elem.
ExxonMobil/Travis Elem.
ExxonMobil/San Jacinto Elem.
ExxonMobil/Baytown Jr.
ExxonMobil/Cedar Bayou Jr.
Highlands C of C/Hopper Primary
Highlands Rotary/Highlands Elementary
Houston Methodist San Jac Hosp/RS
Sterling High
Kiwanis Club/Alamo Elem.
LCY/Harlem Elem.
Legacy/Point Alternative
Rotary/DeZavala Elem.
Shine Dental/Impact Early College High School
SNC-GDS/Horace Mann Jr.
Solvay/Carver Elem.
Texas First/SF Austin Elem.
GCCISD Special Olympics
Stuart Career Ctr.
Woodforest/Banuelos Elem.
BCA 2nd Grade Class

AMERICA'S SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for a moment that my colleagues imagine a situation. Imagine a few years down the road that a Republican President announces he has instructed the Justice Department to no longer enforce the Clean Air Act, that he has told the Justice Department to no longer prosecute violations of the Clean Air Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rise up with frustration and indignation. They would say the President has failed to faithfully execute the laws passed by Congress, as he has been constitutionally required to do, and they would be right to do so.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is happening in our country today. President Obama has chosen unilaterally not to enforce our Nation's longstanding immigration laws. He has made this decision without any consultation with Congress and entirely on his own.

Think for a moment about the precedent this action sets: that a President can alter longstanding law simply through an executive memo and his words, a President can simply say that he is not going to enforce the law. That would be frightening to all Americans, regardless of political belief.

Let's be clear what this action is not. It is not prosecutorial discretion.

No one doubts that the President has prosecutorial discretion. But this goes far beyond that power and enters into new territory that, frankly, has never before been touched.

I believe this issue was settled long ago, before our country was even founded. You see, in the 17th century in Britain, during this big fight between the King of England and Parliament, the King said that he had prerogative powers, the ability to override Parliament. And there were battles. There were wars in Britain about how this was going to be settled. And the Parliament determined, in consultation with the courts, that the King couldn't, on his own, do that, that he couldn't just simply say, I am going to dispense with the laws or suspend their operations for a period of time.

Our Founding Fathers knew this history well, and when they put together the Constitution of our country, in article II, they had that in their minds when they gave to the President the obligation—not the option—to faithfully execute the laws, all the laws of the United States, regardless of whether the President agrees with those laws or not.

I would say that this type of executive action is clearly not what the Founders had in mind when they drafted our Constitution. The main overriding goal of our forefathers was to prevent the executive from becoming too powerful, and they went to great efforts to ensure a strong system of checks and balances.

President Obama's executive action runs in the face of how our government was designed to operate. Let's also remember that earlier this year, President Obama said his policies—all of them—would be on the ballot in the mid-term elections. And the American people went to the polls and soundly rejected the President's policies. They made clear they were not supportive of more unilateral executive action. They wanted us to work together.

□ 1230

As a Congress, we warned the President not to go forward with this executive action.

Mr. Speaker, we need a solution to our Nation's immigration problem, but by using executive action, the President has made finding common ground far more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this House should rise above the actions of the President, and early next year, we should send the President real border security legislation, much like the border security legislation we passed in this House this past summer, yet the Senate wouldn't even take up.

This House should pass legislation to update and fix the worker visa program. This House should pass legislation to put in place E-Verify for all employers. This House should pass legislation to tighten internal security. Then, and only then, when we go through all of those pieces of legislation, should we even begin to discuss what we are going to do about the millions of people who are in this country illegally.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the more the President acts outside the bounds of his powers, the harder it becomes to actually achieve a solution. It leads me to wonder: Does President Obama actually want a long-term, lasting solution to immigration? His actions imply otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to rethink his approach to the immigration debate. I urge him to abandon this ill-conceived executive action and, instead, to come to the table and work with the Republicans and Democrats in the Congress and both Houses to find together the commonsense solutions that we need to find for these problems.

We are capable of doing that. That is how our Founders intended our government to operate, and anything other than that is a disservice to the American people.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 8, 2014 at 10:37 a.m.:

That the Senate passed H.R. 2366
That the Senate passed H.R. 4812
That the Senate passed H.R. 5108
That the Senate passed H.R. 5462
That the Senate passed H.R. 5739
That the Senate passed H. Con. Res. 120
That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 105
That the Senate passed S. 1447
That the Senate passed S. 1683
That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 45
Appointments:
Katherine Tobin of Virginia, United States-China Economic Security Review Commission.
Tom Girardi of California, Library of Congress Trust Fund Board.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Lieutenant Commander Robert Burns, Chaplain, United States Navy Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Plantation, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we praise You for You have blessed this land with a diverse multitude gathered from every nation, tribe, people, and language. You have bound us together with noble ideals of liberty, justice, equality, and yet we struggle to be one people, a unified Nation.

We pray for all the Members of this House, asking You to bless them with wisdom and discernment to lead our people to reconciliation, to rebuild our Nation's confidence in justice, to restore our sense of equality. Free them from the divisive distractions of any lesser ideals that they may more powerfully serve the people as a House in one accord, making every effort to keep the unity of the people through the bond of peace.

Bless also our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines deployed overseas as they continue to bring peace to this troubled world. We pray in Your Holy Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IMMIGRATION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, President Obama significantly overstepped the bounds of his constitutionally granted executive authority when he took steps to grant amnesty to millions of immigrants who are in the United States illegally.

Prior to his unilateral actions, the President himself acknowledged repeatedly that this is not how our democracy functions, and the way to reform this Nation's broken immigration system is legislatively. As they say in North Carolina, the President has ''gone to meddling.'' It is absolutely critical that we go on record against his unparalleled power grab, and Congress must do everything it can to stop his destructive actions.

As the granddaughter of Italian immigrants, I am thankful America has always opened her arms to people looking to build a better way for themselves and their families legally. However, breaking the law to enter the United States should not be rewarded. It is wrong to short-circuit the American immigration process in this manner when there are so many individuals who have waited years for the opportunity to come to this country the right way, the legal way.

RECOGNIZING FIU VP OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS STEVE SAULS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the career of Steve Sauls, who is retiring this month from Florida International University.

As vice president of government relations for Miami's public research university—and my alma mater—Steve has always aimed for a more beautiful day in south Florida.

Early in his career as a House staffer, Steve helped craft the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, opening the doors of opportunity to thousands of Cubans fleeing the oppression of Fidel Castro.

After moving to Miami, Steve was instrumental in creating the International Hurricane Research Center following Hurricane Andrew, helping advance research to make south Florida and the Nation more resilient to hurricanes.

Congratulations, Steve, on a fulfilling career and a well-deserved retirement, and please do enjoy your own fair share of beautiful days in south Florida.

RECOGNIZING PUEBLO EAST BOYS FOOTBALL TEAM

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Pueblo East High School football team and their coach, David Ramirez, who claimed their first Class 3A football title.

The Eagles and their opponents, the Rifle Bears, who had an impressive 12-win season, both showed great sportsmanship and determination in the final game, resulting in a 30–14 victory for the Eagles.

All year long Coach Ramirez and his staff instilled confidence in the Eagle team to work hard but most importantly believe in themselves and their quest for a championship. With grit and a long tradition of Eagle pride, a stellar season was realized in the culmination of a State football title. The city of Pueblo is extremely proud of this team. Each coach, player, and the staff of this Eagle football team will stand tall among the great athletic champions in Pueblo sports history.

Mr. Speaker, with Coach Ramirez's leadership and the team's hard work, Pueblo East captured their first football championship in school history while establishing a legacy of dedication and commitment to the game. There is no doubt that future Eagle teams will be inspired to do the same. We are very proud of them.

CORRECTION TO ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3979, PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, pursuant to House Resolution 770, the Clerk be instructed to make the correction I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 3050 of the House amendment, strike ''2013'' and insert ''2014''.

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

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 770, I call up the bill (H.R. 5781) to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the amendment printed in part C of House Report 113–646 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5781

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF

Sec. 101. Definitions.
Sec. 102. Emergency projects.
Sec. 103. Temporary operational flexibility for first few storms of the water year.
Sec. 104. Progress report.
Sec. 105. Status of surface storage studies.

TITLE II—PROTECTION OF THIRD-PARTY WATER RIGHTS

Sec. 201. Offset for State Water Project.
Sec. 202. Area of origin protections.
Sec. 203. No redirected adverse impacts.
Sec. 204. Allocations For Sacramento Valley Contractors.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Effect on existing obligations.
Sec. 302. Termination of authorities.

TITLE I—CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT.—The term ''Central Valley Project'' has the meaning given the term in section 3403 of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (106 Stat. 4707).

(2) DELTA.—The term ''Delta'' means the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and the Suisun Marsh, as defined in sections 12220 and 29101 of the California Public Resources Code.

(3) NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE LONG-TERM SURVIVAL.—The term ''negative impact on the long-term survival'' means to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species.

(4) SALMONID BIOLOGICAL OPINION.—The term ''salmonid biological opinion'' means the biological opinion issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service on June 4, 2009.

(5) SECRETARIES.—The term ''Secretaries'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Commerce; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) SMELT BIOLOGICAL OPINION.—The term ''smelt biological opinion'' means the biological opinion on the Long-Term Operational Criteria and Plan for coordination of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on December 15, 2008.

(7) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of California.

(8) STATE WATER PROJECT.—The term ''State Water Project'' means the water project described by California Water Code section 11550 et seq. and operated by the California Department of Water Resources.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the priority of individuals or entities, including those with Sacramento River Settlement Contracts, that have priority to the diversion and use of water over water rights held by the United States for operations of the Central Valley Project and over rights held by the State for operations of the State Water Project and the United States obligation to make a substitute supply of water available to the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors, the Secretaries shall direct the operations of the Central Valley Project and allow the State Water Project to provide the maximum quantity of water supplies possible to Central Valley Project agricultural, municipal and industrial, and refuge service and repayment contractors, and State Water Project contractors, by approving, consistent with applicable laws (including regulations)—

(1) any project or operations to provide additional water supplies if there is any possible way whatsoever that the Secretaries can do so unless the project or operations constitute a highly inefficient way of providing additional water supplies; and

(2) any projects or operations as quickly as possible based on available information to address the emergency conditions.

(b) MANDATE.—In carrying out subsection (a), the applicable Secretary shall—

(1) authorize and implement actions to ensure that the Delta Cross Channel Gates remain open to the maximum extent practicable using findings from the United States Geological Survey on diurnal behavior of juvenile salmonids, timed to maximize the peak flood tide period and provide water supply and water quality benefits, consistent with operational criteria and monitoring set forth in the California State Water Resources Control Board's Order Approving a Temporary Urgency Change in License and Permit Terms in Response to Drought Conditions, effective January 31, 2014, or a successor order;

(2)(A) implement turbidity control strategies that allow for increased water deliveries for the Central Valley Project and State Water Project while avoiding a negative impact on the long-term survival delta smelt

(Hypomesus transpacificus) due to entrainment at Central Valley Project and State Water Project pumping plants;

(B) operating within the ranges provided for in the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion to minimize water supply reductions for the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project, manage reverse flow in Old and Middle Rivers at −5,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) unless current scientific data indicate a less negative Old and Middle River flow is necessary to avoid a negative impact on the long-term survival of the listed species; and

(C) show in writing that any determination to manage OMR reverse flow at rates less negative than −5000 cubic feet per second is necessary to avoid a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of the Delta smelt, including an explanation of the data examined and the connection between those data and the choice made prior to reducing pumping to a rate less negative than −5000 cfs;

(3) adopt a 1:1 inflow to export ratio for the increment of increased flow of the San Joaquin River, as measured as a 3-day running average at Vernalis during the period from April 1 through May 31, resulting from voluntary sale, transfers, or exchanges of water from agencies with rights to divert water from the San Joaquin River or its tributaries on the condition that a proposed sale, transfer, or exchange under this paragraph may only proceed if the Secretary of the Interior determines that the environmental effects of the proposed sale, transfer, or exchange are consistent with effects permissible under applicable law (including regulations), and provided that Delta conditions are suitable to allow movement of the acquired, transferred, or exchanged water through the Delta consistent with the Central Valley Project's and the State Water Project's permitted water rights;

(4) issue all necessary permit decisions under the authority of the Secretaries within 30 days of receiving a completed application by the State to place and use temporary barriers or operable gates in Delta channels to improve water quantity and quality for Central Valley Project and State Water Project contractors and other water users, which barriers or gates should provide benefits for species protection and in-Delta water user water quality and shall be designed such that formal consultations under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) would not be necessary;

(5)(A) complete all requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) necessary to make final permit decisions on water transfer requests associated with voluntarily fallowing nonpermanent crops in the State, within 30 days of receiving such a request; and

(B) allow any water transfer request associated with fallowing to maximize the quantity of water supplies available for nonhabitat uses as long as the fallowing and associated water transfer are in compliance with applicable Federal laws (including regulations);

(6) allow any North of Delta agricultural water service contractor with unused Central Valley Project water to take delivery of such unused water through April 15, of the contract year immediately following the contract year in which such water was allocated, if—

(A) the contractor requests the extension; and

(B) the requesting contractor certifies that, without the extension, the contractor would have insufficient supplies to adequately meet water delivery obligations;

(7) to the maximum extent possible based on the availability and quality of groundwater and without causing land subsidence—

(A) meet the Level 2 and Level 4 water supply needs of units of the National Wildlife Refuge System in the Central Valley of California, the Gray Lodge, Los Banos, Volta, North Grasslands, and Mendota State wildlife management areas, and the Grasslands Resources Conservation District in the Central Valley of California through the improvement or installation of wells to use groundwater resources and the purchase of water from willing sellers; and

(B) make a quantity of Central Valley Project water obtained from the measures implemented under subparagraph (A) available to Central Valley Project water service contractors; and

(8) implement instream and offsite projects in the Delta and upstream in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin basins, in coordination with the California Department of Water Resources and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, that offset the effects on species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) due to actions taken under this Act.

(c) OTHER AGENCIES.—To the extent that a Federal agency other than agencies headed by the Secretaries has a role in approving projects described in subsections (a) and (b), the provisions of this section shall apply to those Federal agencies.

(d) ACCELERATED PROJECT DECISION AND ELEVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the State, the heads of Federal agencies shall use the expedited procedures under this subsection to make final decisions relating to a Federal project or operation to provide additional water supplies or address emergency drought conditions pursuant to subsections (a) and (b).

(2) REQUEST FOR RESOLUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the State, the head of an agency referred to in subsection (a), or the head of another Federal agency responsible for carrying out a review of a project, as applicable, the Secretary of the Interior shall convene a final project decision meeting with the heads of all relevant Federal agencies to decide whether to approve a project to provide emergency water supplies.

(B) MEETING.—The Secretary of the Interior shall convene a meeting requested under subparagraph (A) not later than 7 days after receiving the meeting request.

(3) NOTIFICATION.—Upon receipt of a request for a meeting under this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior shall notify the heads of all relevant Federal agencies of the request, including the project to be reviewed and the date for the meeting.

(4) DECISION.—Not later than 10 days after the date on which a meeting is requested under paragraph (2), the head of the relevant Federal agency shall issue a final decision on the project in writing.

(5) MEETING CONVENED BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior may convene a final project decision meeting under this subsection at any time, at the discretion of the Secretary, regardless of whether a meeting is requested under paragraph (2).

SEC. 103. TEMPORARY OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY FOR FIRST FEW STORMS OF THE WATER YEAR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with avoiding a negative impact on the long-term survival in the short-term upon listed fish species beyond the range of those authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and other environmental protections under subsection (d), the Secretaries shall authorize the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project, combined, to operate at levels that result in negative Old and Middle River flows at −7500 cubic feet per second (based on United States Geological Survey gauges on Old and Middle Rivers) daily average for 28 cumulative days after October 1, as described in subsection (b).

(b) DAYS OF TEMPORARY OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY.—The temporary operational flexibility described in subsection (a) shall be authorized on days that the California Department of Water Resources determines the daily average river flow of the Sacramento River is at, or above, 17,000 cubic feet per second as measured at the Sacramento River at Freeport gauge maintained by the United States Geologic Survey.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH ESA AUTHORIZATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretaries may continue to impose any requirements under the smelt and salmonid biological opinions during any period of temporary operational flexibility as they determine are reasonably necessary to avoid additional negative impacts on the long-term survival of a listed fish species beyond the range of those authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(d) OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS.—

(1) The Secretaries' actions under this section shall be consistent with applicable regulatory requirements under state law, including State Water Resources Control Board Decision 1641, as it may be implemented in any given year.

(2) During the first flush of sediment out of the Delta in each water year, and provided that such determination is based upon objective evidence, OMR flow may be managed at rates less negative than −5000 cubic feet per second for a minimum duration to avoid movement of adult Delta smelt (Hypomesus transpacificus) to areas in the southern Delta that would be likely to increase entrainment at Central Valley Project and State Water Project pumping plants.

(3) This section shall not affect the application of the salmonid biological opinion from April 1 to May 31, unless the Secretary of Commerce finds that some or all of such applicable requirements may be adjusted during this time period to provide emergency water supply relief without resulting in additional adverse effects beyond those authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. In addition to any other actions to benefit water supply, the Secretary and the Secretary of Commerce shall consider allowing through-Delta water transfers to occur during this period.

(4) During operations under this section, the Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with the Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, shall undertake a monitoring program and other data gathering to ensure incidental take levels are not exceeded, and to identify potential negative impacts and actions, if any, necessary to mitigate impacts of the temporary operational flexibility to species listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(e) TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS TO TARGET PERIOD.—If, before temporary operational flexibility has been implemented on 28 cumulative days, the Secretaries operate the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project combined at levels that result in Old and Middle River flows less negative than −7500 cubic feet per second during days of temporary operational flexibility as defined in subsection (b), the duration of such operation shall not be counted toward the 28 cumulative days specified in subsection (a).

(f) EMERGENCY CONSULTATION; EFFECT ON RUNNING AVERAGES.—

(1) If necessary to implement the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the emergency consultation

procedures under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and its implementing regulation at section 402.05, title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to temporarily adjust the operating criteria under the biological opinions, solely for the 28 cumulative days of temporary operational flexibility—

(A) no more than necessary to achieve the purposes of this section consistent with the environmental protections in subsections (c) and (d); and

(B) including, as appropriate, adjustments to ensure that the actual flow rates during the periods of temporary operational flexibility do not count toward the 5-day and 14-day running averages of tidally filtered daily Old and Middle River flow requirements under the biological opinions.

(2) At the conclusion of the 28 cumulative days of temporary operational flexibility, the Secretary of the Interior shall not reinitiate consultation on these adjusted operations, and no mitigation shall be required, if the effects on listed fish species of these operations under this section remain within the range of those authorized under the Endangered Species Act. If the Secretary of the Interior reinitiates consultation, no mitigation measures shall be required.

(g) LEVEL OF DETAIL REQUIRED FOR ANALYSIS.—In articulating the determinations required under this section, the Secretaries shall fully satisfy the requirements herein but shall not be expected to provide a greater level of supporting detail for the analysis than feasible to provide within the short time frame permitted for timely decision-making in response to changing conditions in the Delta.

SEC. 104. PROGRESS REPORT.

Ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretaries shall provide a progress report describing the implementation of sections 101, 102, and 103 to the Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate.

SEC. 105. STATUS OF SURFACE STORAGE STUDIES.

One year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide a progress report on the status of feasibility studies undertaken pursuant to section 103(d)(1) to the Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate. The report shall include timelines for study completion, draft environmental impact statements, final environmental impact statements, and Records of Decision.

TITLE II—PROTECTION OF THIRD-PARTY WATER RIGHTS

SEC. 201. OFFSET FOR STATE WATER PROJECT.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION IMPACTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall confer with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in connection with the implementation of this Act on potential impacts to any consistency determination for operations of the State Water Project issued pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1.

(b) ADDITIONAL YIELD.—If, as a result of the application of this Act, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife—

(1) revokes the consistency determinations pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1 that are applicable to the State Water Project;

(2) amends or issues one or more new consistency determinations pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1 in a manner that directly or indirectly results in reduced water supply to the State Water Project as compared with the water supply available under the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion; or

(3) requires take authorization under section 2081 for operation of the State Water Project in a manner that directly or indirectly results in reduced water supply to the State Water Project as compared with the water supply available under the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion,

and as a consequence of the Department's action, Central Valley Project yield is greater than it would have been absent the Department's actions, then that additional yield shall be made available to the State Water Project for delivery to State Water Project contractors to offset losses resulting from the Department's action.

(c) NOTIFICATION RELATED TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall immediately notify the Director of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in writing if the Secretary of the Interior determines that implementation of the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion consistent with this Act reduces environmental protections for any species covered by the opinions.

SEC. 202. AREA OF ORIGIN PROTECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior is directed, in the operation of the Central Valley Project, to adhere to California's water rights laws governing water rights priorities and to honor water rights senior to those held by the United States for operation of the Central Valley Project, regardless of the source of priority, including any appropriative water rights initiated prior to December 19, 1914, as well as water rights and other priorities perfected or to be perfected pursuant to California Water Code Part 2 of Division 2. Article 1.7 (commencing with section 1215 of chapter 1 of part 2 of division 2, sections 10505, 10505.5, 11128, 11460, 11461, 11462, and 11463, and sections 12200 to 12220, inclusive).

(b) DIVERSIONS.—Any action undertaken by the Secretaries pursuant to both this Act and section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531, et seq.) that requires that diversions from the Sacramento River or the San Joaquin River watersheds upstream of the Delta be bypassed shall not be undertaken in a manner that alters the water rights priorities established by California law.

(c) ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.—Nothing in this title alters the existing authorities provided to and obligations placed upon the Federal Government under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531, et seq.), as amended.

(d) CONTRACTS.—With respect to individuals and entities with water rights on the Sacramento River, the mandates of this section may be met, in whole or in part, through a contract with the Secretary executed pursuant to section 14 of Public Law 76–260, 53 Stat. 1187 (43 U.S.C. 389) that is in conformance with the Sacramento River Settlement Contracts renewed by the Secretary in 2005.

SEC. 203. NO REDIRECTED ADVERSE IMPACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that, except as otherwise provided for in a water service or repayment contract, actions taken in compliance with legal obligations imposed pursuant to or as a result of this Act, including such actions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and other applicable Federal and State laws, shall not directly or indirectly—

(1) result in the involuntary reduction of water supply or fiscal impacts to individuals or districts who receive water from either the State Water Project or the United States under water rights settlement contracts, exchange contracts, water service contracts, repayment contracts, or water supply contracts; or

(2) cause redirected adverse water supply or fiscal impacts to those within the Sacramento River watershed, the San Joaquin River watershed or the State Water Project service area.

(b) COSTS.—To the extent that costs are incurred solely pursuant to or as a result of this Act and would not otherwise have been incurred by any entity or public or local agency or subdivision of the State of California, such costs shall not be borne by any such entity, agency, or subdivision of the State of California, unless such costs are incurred on a voluntary basis.

(c) RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS NOT MODIFIED OR AMENDED.—Nothing in this Act shall modify or amend the rights and obligations of the parties to any existing—

(1) water service, repayment, settlement, purchase, or exchange contract with the United States, including the obligation to satisfy exchange contracts and settlement contracts prior to the allocation of any other Central Valley Project water; or

(2) State Water Project water supply or settlement contract with the State.

SEC. 204. ALLOCATIONS FOR SACRAMENTO VALLEY CONTRACTORS.

(a) ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior is directed, in the operation of the Central Valley Project, to allocate water provided for irrigation purposes to existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed in compliance with the following:

(A) Not less than 100 percent of their contract quantities in a ''Wet'' year.

(B) Not less than 100 percent of their contract quantities in an ''Above Normal'' year.

(C) Not less than 100 percent of their contract quantities in a ''Below Normal'' year that is preceded by an ''Above Normal'' or a ''Wet'' year.

(D) Not less than 50 percent of their contract quantities in a ''Dry'' year that is preceded by a ''Below Normal,'' an ''Above Normal,'' or a ''Wet'' year.

(E) In all other years not identified herein, the allocation percentage for existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed shall not be less than twice the allocation percentage to south-of-Delta Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors, up to 100 percent; provided, that nothing herein shall preclude an allocation to existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed that is greater than twice the allocation percentage to South-of-Delta Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors.

(2) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary's actions under paragraph (a) shall be subject to—

(A) the priority of individuals or entities with Sacramento River water rights, including those with Sacramento River Settlement Contracts, that have priority to the diversion and use of Sacramento River water over water rights held by the United States for operations of the Central Valley Project;

(B) the United States obligation to make a substitute supply of water available to the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors; and

(C) the Secretary's obligation to make water available to managed wetlands pursuant to section 3406(d) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Public Law 102–575).

(b) PROTECTION OF MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL SUPPLIES.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be deemed to—

(1) modify any provision of a water service contract that addresses municipal and industrial water shortage policies of the Secretary;

(2) affect or limit the authority of the Secretary to adopt or modify municipal and industrial water shortage policies;

(3) affect or limit the authority of the Secretary to implement municipal and industrial water shortage policies; or

(4) affect allocations to Central Valley Project municipal and industrial contractors pursuant to such policies

Neither subsection (a) nor the Secretary's implementation of subsection (a) shall constrain, govern or affect, directly or indirectly, the operations of the Central Valley Project's American River Division or any deliveries from that Division, its units or its facilities.

(c) NO EFFECT ON ALLOCATIONS.—This section shall not—

(1) affect the allocation of water to Friant Division contractors; or

(2) result in the involuntary reduction in contract water allocations to individuals or entities with contracts to receive water from the Friant Division.

(d) PROGRAM FOR WATER RESCHEDULING.—The Secretary of the Interior shall develop and implement a program, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, to provide for the opportunity for existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed to reschedule water, provided for under their Central Valley Project water service contracts, from one year to the next.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed'' means water service contractors within the Shasta, Trinity, and Sacramento River Divisions of the Central Valley Project, that have a water service contract in effect, on the date of the enactment of this section, that provides water for irrigation.

(2) The year type terms used in subsection (a) have the meaning given those year types in the Sacramento Valley Water Year Type (40–30–30) Index.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. EFFECT ON EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.

Nothing in this Act preempts or modifies any existing obligation of the United States under Federal reclamation law to operate the Central Valley Project in conformity with State law, including established water rights priorities.

SEC. 302. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITIES.

This Act shall expire on September 30, 2016, or the date on which the Governor of the State suspends the state of drought emergency declaration, whichever is later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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).

GENERAL LEAVE

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 H.R. 5781.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, as introduced by our colleague from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Today the House meets once again to provide a solution to the ongoing water crisis in California. The House has been on record twice to provide solutions, and here we are, and we must act again. Although this bill is different from the two prior attempts and reflects significant bipartisan progress towards enacting a solution, we must provide relief, even if it is short-term relief before this Congress adjourns. It is unacceptable for us to give up when Californians are starving and their communities are literally drying up.

Like California, my central Washington district is heavily dependent on irrigated water to support our local economy and our agriculture industry. I understand the importance of having a stable, reliable water source, and I also understand the economic devastation that is caused when the water supply is shut off, particularly when the shutoff is avoidable.

California is in an emergency situation. For years San Joaquin Valley farmers have been fighting against Federal regulations and environmental lawsuits that have diverted water supplies in order to help a 3-inch fish. In 2009 there was a deliberate diversion of over 300 billion—Mr. Speaker, that is billion with a B—gallons of water away from farmers.

Mr. Speaker, let me equate that: 300 billion gallons of water is nearly 1 million acre-feet of water. What is an acre-foot? An acre-foot of water—for 1 year, that is 12 inches of water for a year that was diverted from these farmers.

As a result, thousands of farmworkers lost their jobs, unemployment reached 40 percent in some communities, and thousands of acres of fertile farmland dried up. The same thing is happening today.

As chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, I have traveled to Fresno, California, twice and have seen the effects of natural and manmade drought firsthand. We have held multiple hearings and heard the pleas of communities that simply want the water turned back on and their livelihoods restored.

We have seen farmers who normally help feed the Nation being sent to wait in line at food banks and, in some cases, Mr. Speaker, being served carrots imported from China.

I want to stress that this crisis does not just impact California, but it has a rippling effect across the entire Nation.

California's San Joaquin Valley is the salad bowl for the world and provides a significant share of fruits and vegetables for our country.

Food grows where water flows. When there is no water, our food supply suffers, resulting in higher food prices across the country, higher unemployment, and increased reliance on foreign food sources.

Unlike the last time this body acted on this issue, the Senate did pass its version of the bill in June of this year. I commend Senator FEINSTEIN for her efforts to pass that short-term bill. However, since the bills were so different in their scope, those interested in productive conversations to bridge differences have negotiated in good faith over the last 6 months.

We got very close to a resolution but more time was necessary on agreeing to a long-term bill. In the interim, the measure before us today reflects much of what the Senate passed earlier this year and agreed to in our negotiations to bring some short-term water supply relief to many of those communities in need.

This bill simply allows us to capture some water from storms in this and the next water year and improves data quality when it comes to the existing biological opinions on smelt and salmon. It also protects those communities in the north that are in relatively abundant water areas.

The entire bill, Mr. Speaker, sunsets in September of 2016 to allow more time to negotiate a longer-term solution that not only could help California but other States in the West as well.

This bill is not perfect, but it is a short-term bridge based on productive negotiations between those who want sensible solutions to the California water crisis. This bill, while very limited in scope, helps protect the jobs and economic livelihoods of farm families and workers and communities that are in dire need of water.

The people of the San Joaquin Valley cannot wait any longer for Congress to act. As the title of this bill suggests, it is truly an emergency for many, and time is running out. Those communities facing massive unemployment deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues in the last two Congresses for working together to get us this solution. This is the latest iteration of that, and I want to commend them.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, Congressman VALADAO's bill, H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, is a northern California drought relief bill; it isn't a California drought relief act.

It was introduced last week without hearings, without markups, without consultation with the House Democrats, and without any consultation or input from local water agencies, State agencies, cities, and/or tribes.

This bill is being rushed to the floor without the input of critical California leaders throughout the State. It focuses primarily on providing more Bay-

Delta water to Central Valley farmers at the expense of other users. This bill would require mandatory increases in pumping to Central Valley agriculture, which could force water managers throughout the State to cut water deliveries to southern California, to other urban water users, and, of course, to fisheries, which is a mainstay of many of the tribes in California.

□ 1415

This could also lead to less fresh water in the delta and higher levels of salt and contamination in the water being pumped down to southern California.

The White House states the President will veto this bill because ''it fails to equitably address critical elements of California's complex water challenges,'' and ''the bill appears to include a number of potentially conflicting mandates which can cause confusion and undermine environmental laws, making it ripe for future litigation.''

Senator BOXER says she opposes the bill because ''it could reignite the water wars by overriding critical State and Federal protections of all of California.''

Mr. Speaker, I have some of the statements of opposition. One of them is The Sacramento Bee who has come out opposing the bill because ''any legislation affecting California water policy deserves a full hearing with input from the varied interests in northern California, the Central Valley, and the south.''

Mr. Speaker, we must work in a bipartisan manner to address this drought crisis for the whole State and certainly not in secret and behind closed doors.

I have introduced H.R. 5363, the Water in the 21st Century Act, and Representative HUFFMAN has introduced H.R. 4239, which would provide drought relief to all of California with its water conservation programs, its water recycling projects, its groundwater improvement operations and storm water capture solutions, including desalination and title XVI.

House Democratic proposals have been excluded from this bill, H.R. 5781. There have been past attempts in past Congresses to pass certainly some proposals our legislation has proposed today, and it has failed.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD statements of opposition to this bill from the White House, from Senator BOXER, The Sacramento Bee, American Rivers, the League of Conservation Voters, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the Nature Conservancy, the Pacific Fishery Management Council, the Golden Gate Salmon Association, the Golden Gate Fishermen's Association, and the California Environmental Water Caucus, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us not to pass this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, December 5, 2014.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5781—THE CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Valadao, R–CA, and 6 cosponsors)

The Administration opposes H.R. 5781 because it fails to equitably address critical elements of California's complex water challenges. The Administration appreciates the efforts by the bill authors to address concerns raised by the Administration regarding H.R. 3964, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act. However, because H.R. 5781 makes operational determinations regarding the use of limited water resources during the ongoing drought, and contains many new provisions that could lead to unintended consequences or further litigation, the Administration cannot support the bill in its current form.

The Administration takes seriously the ongoing drought that has affected communities, producers and water users across much of the country, including the especially hard hit State of California. Since the President's visit to Fresno, California earlier this year the Administration has undertaken a number of steps to help those most affected by drought. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has directed millions of dollars in food, conservation and emergency water assistance to tens of thousands of residents in areas hardest hit by drought. The Bureau of Reclamation has provided cost-share assistance for nine water reclamation and reuse projects in the State as well as millions of dollars in grants to build long-term resiliency to drought.

Moreover, the President has directed Federal agencies to work with state and local officials in real-time to maximize limited water supplies, prioritize public health and safety, meet state water quality requirements, and ensure a balanced approach to providing for the water needs of people, agriculture, businesses, power, imperiled species and the environment. Among other things, these efforts took form in a 2014 Drought Operations Plan, prepared in close coordination with the State, and the Administration is already taking steps to prepare a new drought plan for 2015 based on lessons learned and the best available science during the current year.

H.R. 5781 was introduced on December 2 and is being considered in the few remaining days of this session without a hearing or opportunity for the public to review and provide comment. In particular, the bill appears to include a number of potentially conflicting mandates which can create confusion and undermine environmental laws, making it ripe for future litigation. Given the complexity of California water issues, policy determinations over the use of scarce water resources should be developed in an open and transparent manner, with an ability for the public, affected stakeholders, and Federal, state and local officials to review and provide comment and feedback. The Administration stands ready to work with Congress in this regard.

For these reasons, if the President were presented with H.R. 5781, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

SENATOR BARBARA BOXER, D–CALIFORNIA

H.R. 5781

''I have carefully studied the Republican water bill and I am dismayed that this measure could reignite the water wars by overriding critical state and federal protections for California. The GOP's proposal would dictate specific pumping levels—regardless of the opinions of scientists—which could jeopardize our state's salmon fishing industry.

''We have communities across the state that are hurting from this drought, so we need a balanced approach that doesn't pit one stakeholder against another, and meets the needs of all of California's water users.''

[From The Sacramento Bee]

EMERGENCY DROUGHT BILL DESERVES TO DIE

(By the Editorial Board)

House Republicans intend to jam through a California drought-relief bill early next week that would suspend some state water rights and environmental law to maximize water diversions from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

This is no way to address an issue as important to California as water. It is doomed to fail in the Senate and deserves to die. California's congressional delegation should be working on a compromise that involves all interested parties, not ramming through a bill during the final days of the lame-duck session.

Late Friday, the Obama administration came out in opposition to the bill, saying in a statement that ''it fails to equitably address critical elements of California's complex water challenges'' and ''the bill appears to include a number of potentially conflicting mandates which can create confusion and undermine environmental laws, making it ripe for future litigation.''

Central Valley Republicans have proposed the bill, HR 5781, and plan to bring it to a vote as early as Monday without going through committee hearings. The new bill deserves a full public hearing so that we know its full implications for California.

The House Rules Committee won't allow amendments to this problematic bill, which is unfortunate. The 26-page bill is replete with technical language, directed at environmental laws and regulations governing California water policy.

Rep. Jared Huffman, D–San Rafael, told the Rules Committee that the bill, like a previous version, would micromanage the state's water system without input from federal, state or local water officials. He warned that it would violate state environmental laws, misstates federal water contract law, and would have negative implications for fisheries and Indian water rights.

Rep. David Valadao, R–Hanford, who introduced the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, claimed the bill has bipartisan support and approval of California's Sens. Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer.

Boxer, however, made clear she opposes the bill, saying in an emailed statement to The Bee: ''The problem here is that Republicans insisted on a secretive process, and only bad things can happen when your process is secretive . . . and now they are trying jam through legislation that will only reignite California's water wars.''

On Friday, Feinstein said in an email to The Bee, ''There are some provisions in HR 5781 I support and there are some provisions I don't support, so we'll have to wait and see what action the House takes.''

Feinstein dropped talks with House Republicans in November and said she would reopen negotiations in January. That is a reasonable approach. Any legislation affecting California water policy deserves a full hearing with input from the varied interest in Northern California, the Central Valley and the south.

The bill is backed by House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R–Bakersfield, Rep. Tom McClintock; R–Elk Grove; Rep. Doug LaMalfa, R–Richvale, and others who would export water to Central Valley and Southern

California at the expense of the environment and other water users.

The drought is hurting farmers and cities; it is challenging for all of us. However, a near-unanimous California Legislature approved placing a $7.5 billion water bond measure before voters, showing that changes in state water policy can be achieved through consensus.

But trying to remedy the problem for some Californians while excluding others from the discussion will, like Boxer said, reignite water wars.

AUDUBON CALIFORNIA, AMERICAN RIVERS, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, CALIFORNIA WATERFOWL ASSOCIATION, CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, CLEAN WATER ACTION, CONSERVATIVES FOR RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP, EARTHJUSTICE, ENDANGERED SPECIES COALITION, EPIC-ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION INFORMATION CENTER ENVIRONMENT AMERICA, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, GREENPEACE, INSTITUTE FOR FISHERIES RESOURCES, KLAMATH FOREST ALLIANCE, LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE ASSOCIATION, NORTHCOAST ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER, PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION OF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS, SIERRA CLUB, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS,

December 5, 2014.

PLEASE OPPOSE H.R. 5781

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to urge you to oppose H.R. 5781, (Valadao, R–CA), a bill that would dramatically weaken protections for salmon, migratory birds, and other fish and wildlife in California's Bay-Delta estuary, and the thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on the health of these species.

This legislation would roll back environmental protections for salmon, migratory birds, endangered fish and wildlife, and other native species in California's Bay-Delta watershed, in order to significantly increase water exports out of the largest estuary on the West Coast. The bill would revise and override protections required under the Endangered Species Act and substitute political judgment for existing scientific determinations. It would undermine protections for migratory birds, expediting water transfers that could harm wildlife habitat and undermining water supply for the state and federal wildlife refuges. This complex legislation could greatly interfere with state water rights and cripple the ability of state and federal agencies to manage limited water resources for all beneficial uses, yet it has never been subject to a single committee hearing or input from the State, hunting organizations, sport and commercial fishermen, tribes, and conservation groups.

California's ongoing drought—not federal environmental laws protecting salmon and other fish and wildlife—is the reason for low water supplies across the state. H.R. 5781 attempts to scapegoat environmental protections for the lack of rain and snow, and it threatens thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on healthy salmon runs from the Bay-Delta. The closure of the salmon fishery in 2008 and 2009 resulted in thousands of lost jobs in these states. The livelihoods of commercial and recreational salmon fishermen, Delta farmers, fishing guides, tackle shops, and communities across California and along the West Coast depend on the environmental protections that H R. 5781 would eliminate.

California has already lost more than 90 percent of its existing wetlands and in the current drought conditions, migratory birds are crowding onto the small remaining habitat areas, suffering from decreased food and increased risk of disease. H.R. 5781 would further exacerbate the extremely difficult conditions facing migratory birds in California by threatening the minimal water supply and degrading conditions on federal and state wildlife refuges, and impacting the important private lands that these birds rely upon as they migrate up and down the Pacific Flyway.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to oppose H.R. 5781 and any other last-minute attempts to undercut the existing balance of rights among the users of the California Bay-Delta watershed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), the author of the previous bill that I had mentioned in my opening remarks.

Mr. VALADAO. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of my legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since taking office, ensuring the Central Valley has reliable access to clean, high-quality water has been my number one priority. My constituents are suffering through a drought, and they have suffered more these last few years because of the laws that are in place today.

We have got regulations that require that we basically send water that should be going to communities, to homes, and to farms that create jobs and grow food, and that water is being diverted out to the ocean all in the name of a fish.

We have got so many different people living in this valley, from farm workers, to farmers, and to business owners, all different types of folks that represent this, and this has affected every single one of them. It has affected everybody down to their just regular daily lives.

When you think about how simple it is for someone to just turn on the faucet, be able to take water, put it in a cup, and put it in their coffeepot in the morning, that is what we are talking about today.

We have had wells go dry. We have got communities in my district today that are literally watching and in the process of looking to drill four, five, sometimes six wells, just to get enough water into the household. It is something that is very frustrating.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is a very, very simple patch. It is a short-term bill. As the chairman mentioned, the bill expires at the end of September next year, or when the Governor decides the drought declaration is over.

The bill is simple, and it is very specific that it does keep in place all protections of the Endangered Species Act, the biological opinions and others that have been put in place to protect the environment, but this does give a little more flexibility to those agencies to allow some pumping to help these poor communities.

We have got people in food lines today. We have got people who are trying to feed their families and trying to earn an honest day's wage, and this is actually hurting those people, the people that my friends across the aisle always claim to want to help the most.

This is a simple, very small piece of legislation, the majority of which was introduced by a Democrat in the Senate, with just a few provisions that were changed. This isn't a surprise legislation that we passed out of the House, a lot more complicated, a lot more comprehensive. It covers the issue, and it creates a long-term solution. Again, this is a short-term solution that helps provide some security.

The bill helps all Californians, especially those south of the delta, including those in southern California, because there is about 20 million Californians that rely on water from northern California. Across the board, this is a piece of legislation that helps all people in California be successful, feed their families, and take care of their daily life. It is something that I feel is very reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, we work across the aisle as much as we can. We have worked on this issue for 6 months now, but it is a complicated issue, and we have a lot of outside interests that want to see this prevented, but it is all, again, over a few bad laws that need to be changed.

All we are asking today is for a short-term fix, give us enough time to give these people a little bit of breathing room, a little bit of fresh water for their houses, and something that could really, truly make a difference in their lives, and they are trying to stop it. It truly is sad. We are here at the last possible minute.

The most important aspect to this bill and the reason why it is so important that we pass it today is, if we don't get something done this week, we have to wait for the next Congress. The next Congress starts in January. From there, we have got to wait a few more weeks before a bill gets introduced, passed, and goes through the process again, and we start all over.

In that time, we will miss out on all the rain that could possibly—we are in a drought, but we did have some rain last week. We could have some more rain in the next 2 weeks, maybe a month, and that is an opportunity that we will be wasting if we don't take care of this legislation today and get this passed.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from northern California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

May I add that I am very thankful for his many years of service to this House and to the Nation, especially the State of California on water issues.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we find ourselves in a situation where a group of people in the Central Valley—a small number of farmers in the Central Valley—have decided that if they can't have it their way, they are just going to roll over the process.

Now, we are confronted with a piece of legislation that was, in fact, much of it was withdrawn by the Senator from California because it became apparent to all of the interests in the State that there were no public hearings, there was no public participation, and it was a very narrow group of people sitting in the back room in the Capitol of the United States drafting legislation, where essentially everybody except the people in that room take a hit. The people in the room get a benefit.

How do they get the benefit? Because they extract more water than you can currently extract and still keep the State whole. They extract more water from a vibrant, commercial fishing industry. That is why the Senators in Oregon and the Pacific Fisheries Association are against this legislation.

This is a fishing industry that is worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and they are at risk if you operate under this legislation because this legislation overrides what the State agencies, what the Governor, what the Federal agencies, and what the Secretary of the Interior did this last time.

Mr. Speaker, when we got two surprise storms in March of this year, we went back to the drawing table, and we figured out how we could get more water out of this system to help these farmers in the Central Valley. That was a good faith effort. That was done within the law.

Now, what they want to do is eviscerate that law, take away those safeguards, and say, ''We are going to take additional water out this system.'' When they take that additional water out of the system, they take that additional water out of the water quality of hundreds of thousands of people who drink the water from the delta and rely on a fresh water supply.

We are quite aware of what happens in these dry years, and if you keep turning the pumps on, those people are going to start sucking—those water districts are going to start taking saltwater out of the delta. They take it at the expense of the delta farmers who pump water in the delta. That water will become saltier and saltier, and they will not be able to plant their crops. They have limited time to plant their crops, as it is, under these droughts.

Everybody in this State is paying a price for this drought, but now, in the eleventh hour of this Congress, this group of farmers, these very powerful, small people—these very powerful, small people—have decided they are going to do it this way. We have seen this before.

We have worked year after year to get agreement, and when they can't get their way, they go off to a private meeting, they draft legislation, and that collapses all those talks, and then we start over again. This is about the third or fourth time we have been here because it is their way or the highway, and they absolutely expect that they can take water.

These are people who have a contract right. They have a contract right that is variable because they have the lowest water rights in the State, and so what they are trying to do is to say they get to get in line in front of everybody else in the State in exercising their water rights.

The fact of the matter is we understand exactly what this is going to do. That is why The Sacramento Bee, the Central Valley newspaper, the Fresno Central Valley newspaper said that this bill deserves to die. This bill deserves to die.

Mr. Speaker, I want to praise Senator BOXER for alerting the Members—they talked about working across the aisle. They worked across the aisle, but not with members of the House delegation who represent this impacted area who stand to lose these jobs and who stand to lose millions of dollars of economic activity.

I am not suggesting things are right for the people in the Central Valley or right for people in the State. Our whole State is suffering from a drought, but now, this is an eleventh hour attempt to say that we don't like the way you are coming together to do this, and we are going to take ours first.

This is contrary to what the State legislature did on a bipartisan basis and with the participation of legislatures from the Central Valley, from Southern California, from the Imperial Valley, and from north California.

This is contrary to what the State and Federal agencies did to try and work out and to get additional water, as we did in March. This is contrary. This is contrary to what the State legislature said about these being coequal values.

You have to protect the northern delta region, the origins of this water, and you have to try to have sustainable water deliveries to southern California. The legislature, again, on a bipartisan basis agreed to that.

Then, on the bond issue, overwhelmingly, State legislatures voted to put a bond on to try to deal with the drought, a rather remarkable issue, with the support of the Governor. Legislatures from southern California, from the Central Valley, and from north California voted to put it on the ballot.

The public across the State—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents from every region of the State—voted overwhelmingly to support the bond issue, and now, in the eleventh hour, this small group of people think that they can come and turn those expressions of State legislative intent, of State law, of Federal law, and of State environmental quality laws.

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

Ms. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this happen. The suggestion is that, somehow, there is free water floating around out in that system and somebody is denying it. All of the water in this current system, especially in this drought, is for purposes to try to maintain a great Pacific coast salmon run that is tens and tens and tens—hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity from the mouth of San Francisco Bay almost to Santa Barbara and from the mouth of San Francisco Bay almost to the Washington-Oregon border.

This impacts across State lines and the economy that that generates, the economy that that generates in the hospitality industry and the tourism industry, and the economy that generates in the delta. Yes, there have been cutbacks. There have been cutbacks. We have all had cutbacks, all of us; but now, you just don't get to go take your neighbor's water. You don't get to go do that.

We will try and try again, and with these storms, I assume there is going to be a renewal of the effort that was successful. It was successful for the Central Valley, it was successful for the biological opinions, and it was successful for the delta farmer; yet we moved a little additional water that we hadn't anticipated.

Now, with these storms, hopefully, we will be able to do the same things, but to write into the law that all of that water must always be moved as long as this law is in place is absolutely contrary to the interests of the rest of the State of California, whether they are in northern California or whether they are in the Central Valley or whether they are in southern California.

That is how we try to move this policy forward. It is a much better policy today than it has been in the past, but we have got to have this open hearing. We have got to discuss this among all of the members of the California delegation, among all of those who represent the taxpayers of this Nation.

The idea that you can just go into a room in the eleventh hour because you know the session is ending, and you are going to say, ''we have greater merit than anybody else, we are going to change this law,'' that is not the democratic process.

That is not the proper representation of the people we represent in the State of California, and it is absolutely contrary to what the State government has done and accomplished, what they have done and accomplished together with the Federal agencies, to try and make this work recognizing the incredible hardship that every region in our State is under.

The State is investing billions of dollars, and the private sector is investing billions of dollars to try to make us water efficient, to try to capture more

water and anticipate the building of dams.

All of these things are being done, but the idea that you can just come in and say: Well, you know what, we are tired with the process, we are impatient, even though we just voted for the bond issue, we are going to take our water now, and you do the best you can.

□ 1430

They are saying: You do the best you can. You do the best you can if that is your drinking water in towns across Alameda County. You do the best you can if that is the water you farm with. You just do the best you can. If it is too salty and raises health concerns and you can't grow your crops, that is tough because we are coming in line first. We are going to step in front of everyone else.

What you are going to ignite here with the passage of this bill, you are going to take us all back in time. As Senator BOXER pointed out, this reignites the California water wars, something that we tried to move away from, and we have made progress. I appreciate that those who are impatient and who think that they are given a greater right than in fact they are to water, that they believe now that they can just take it from their neighbor—just take it from their neighbor—that is an unacceptable process.

That is why Senator FEINSTEIN withdrew from these negotiations, said she would come back next year and go through regular order and have the hearings that the people of California are entitled to so they know what is going on. And those of us who represent very disparate parts of the State will be able to participate and have hearings and understand how California together cannot only solve the current problem in terms of impacts, but also prepare the State for what most people tell us will be a series of droughts by changing the manner in which we manage water.

Everybody has to put into that pot, but this is somebody just reaching into the pot and saying: I am taking mine first and you all do whatever you want because we have changed the laws of the State, we have changed the laws of this Nation, we have overwritten the biological opinions from the courts, and we have overwritten the basic environmental laws of the State and the Nation. So we are going to get ours first, and then you do the best you can after that.

Those ramifications ripple across billions of dollars in our economy, just as this drought has rippled across billions of dollars in our economy because of the hardships in agriculture and the shortening of seasons in fishing.

I urge my colleagues not to support this legislation and demand that we have an open process and that we do not cave in to the same group of people who have been trying to do this for 50 years.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, California's regulatory drought was causing enormous economic damage and human hardship long before the historic natural drought that has now stricken the State. And through all of those years, the House has passed legislation repeatedly to address it.

Finally, after years of inaction, the Senate produced a modest measure to provide very limited flexibility for water managers to deal with it. This bill largely reflects those provisions. It is a temporary, stopgap measure that suspends no environmental laws and no regulations. It simply tasks Federal water managers to conserve our water for beneficial human use to the maximum extent possible once all State and Federal environmental and water rights laws have been fulfilled. Let me repeat: the bill explicitly requires all environmental laws and regulations to be adhered to. All the House added to the Senate bill are provisions to strengthen water rights for areas of origin by adding Federal protection over these rights.

During the worst drought in California's history, we continue to release billions of gallons of water from our dams just to adjust river temperatures for the fish. Sadly, this bill doesn't even affect this wasteful practice. But during the next year and a half, it does give limited flexibility to water managers within these laws. That is important because we are getting some rainfall this season, and once all of the environmental laws have been fulfilled, we desperately need to store what surplus remains for what could be another very dry year.

To take that surplus above and beyond what is needed to meet all of our environmental mandates and dump it into the Pacific Ocean, as my colleagues on the left suggest we should do, is nothing short of lunacy. The fact that this very modest bill has evoked such apoplexy from the left is a measure of just how extreme and out of touch they have become. I wish this bill did much more, but it is a start.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the opportunity to speak on H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act.

Mr. Speaker, we have been here before, and we will be here again until Congress acts to provide authority for increased operational flexibility for California's water projects. The American Geophysical Union released a report last week that indicates, according to some of the measures they are taking, that the 2012–2014 drought affecting California is the worst in 1,200 years. The 2014 drought is responsible for part of the greatest absolute reduction to water availability to agriculture that we have ever seen. But we can operate the projects differently for different outcomes.

The water modeling experts in the area I represent have indicated to me that without additional authority to move water, unless California receives 150 percent of its normal average rainfall this year, which is unlikely, the water allocation on both the east side and the west side of the San Joaquin Valley will be zero. Last year it was zero, and next year it will be zero.

But urban users in the bay area and southern California, they will get water. The fish, they will get water. But the folks on the east and west side of the San Joaquin Valley will get a zero water allocation unless we exceed 150 percent of normal. I would like the House to think about that. We are talking about 2 years without surface water that forms the basis of the economy of the region. The results are an immediate impact to farmworkers and their families, to farmers, and to the farm communities. This isn't some esoteric discussion about precedent; this is about people's lives and their livelihoods that are at stake.

Economists at UC Davis estimated that in 2013 the California economy lost $2.2 billion in economic output as a result of this drought. For my friends whose primary concern is environmental protection, the loss of surface water supplies for the valley means that farmers are forced to turn to groundwater, and they are overdrafting that groundwater in substantial manner.

This is a crisis. The situation this year has been devastating, and if we do nothing, next year it will become catastrophic.

H.R. 5781 is not perfect nor is it a bill that will solve all of California's problems. We need to fix a broken water system. However, it is a bill that provides, for 18 months, the flexibility for the movement of water which is now not being moved. And it does so responsibly by preserving the Secretary's discretion to reduce pumping to prevent additional harm to endangered species. It will only take advantage when we have storms. It does not change the biological opinions, and it does nothing to move water rights in front of someone else, as the previous speaker said. It has a sunset on it.

There will be debate about others ways to assist in drought recovery, but this is the measure we have before us now.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It will help the San Joaquin Valley. It will help all of California to get by during the devastating effects this drought is having. It is not a panacea. And yes, we need to work together, but as far as igniting water wars, gee, I don't think they have ever subsided. There are still historic differences.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The fault lines on water in California everybody on this floor knows. They are deep and they are historic and they have existed for decades. It is because we have this broken water system. We have a water system designed for 20 million people. We now have 38 million people.

To provide water for the people, for the environment, and to maintain agriculture, of which we are the largest agricultural State, we need to work. We need to work together.

There were some comments about the secret meetings. Gee, if this has been a secret as we have been working together for 8 months now, it is one of the worst-kept secrets in Washington this year, I think. The fact is this provides us a modicum of relief. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, but we need to do much more.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service to this House and this country. You will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank those who have worked so diligently on this bill, like Congressman DAVID VALADAO. He understands the need. And we are not here today because we haven't thought that we might have this problem. I have stood in this well before with Congressman DEVIN NUNES, looking ahead, trying to be prepared so we can have water throughout California, looking prepared that government, creating a drought when we still have rain and snowpack.

Do you realize 4 years ago we had 170 percent of snowpack, but only 80 percent of the water was allocated to come down through the valley? The valley not just feeds California, not just feeds the Nation, but feeds the world.

When the valley does not get water, the price of food goes up to all. But you know what is even more important? Those that go out of work. I have watched many elected officials come to this well and talk about unemployment. They say unemployment is below 6 percent. Let me tell you what unemployment is throughout the valley today. There are some cities that have more than 30 percent unemployment. The number one factor—water. So what does the world look like today even though not just this Congress but the Congress before it moved legislation to deal with this issue. We are now at a 1,200-year drought. That is much longer than the entire life of this Nation.

So if we are at this time, why do we bring this bill before us? I think we should have honesty in this bill. This is not the bill I would write. This is not the bill I would bring forward. This is a bipartisan bill where people on both sides of the aisle sat down. We said we need a temporary bill that lives within these means.

So do we change endangered species? No, we do not. What does this bill do? It says, in the rainy season when the flood waters are high, can we not move water down through the valley. That is what this bill does. It also has a safeguard that, if the fish are harmed, to stop.

Does this bill go on forever? No. It goes the length of September or to the length of what the Governor has declared within the drought.

Now, I know government cannot make it rain, but government can stop the government policies that pick fish over people. Government can prepare ahead of time that, if we are going to have a rainy season coming, we allow the water to have the best use of where it goes, that it protects the fish while at the time allocates water to the valley so everyone wins in the process. That is why it was bipartisan. That is why we sat together. That is why it is temporary. That is why this bill is brought before us today.

I would like to thank everybody on both sides of the aisle that worked for it. But what is unfortunate, some people will say things it is not. The most important thing we should do in this House is make sure fairness is provided. I think the greatest fairness that should be provided is being prepared for when water comes. But what is even more important is looking at the faces of the 30 percent unemployed, looking at the faces throughout that valley and saying it does not have to be that way. Government can make a difference if both sides would work together as we did to craft this bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Now, why would an Oregonian insert himself into the perpetual water wars in California? Well, first off, this bill has had no hearings. As you can see from the debate here on the floor, there is extraordinary disagreement over the potential impacts of this legislation. That is not just critical to Californians, it is critical to Oregonians.

I have a letter here from the Pacific Fishery Management Council. They believe that this could have a hugely detrimental impact on some audit species which compose about 80 percent of the California fishery and about 50 percent of the fishery in Oregon.

We went through this before about a decade ago where there were inadequate outflows. There were problems with the forge fish, the smelt, and the returning salmon, and we had a season that was closed for 2 years. It put many, many Oregonians out of work. There was impact beyond commercial fisheries and coastal communities on recreational fisheries. It cost us hundreds of millions of dollars. We got a couple of hundred million dollars in Federal relief.

□ 1445

The experts, the Pacific Fishery Management Council and their lawyers who have read this bill, believe it does change the management of the water in ways that are detrimental and would void the biological opinion and would probably put us back into another couple of ''no fishing'' years a few years down the road given the cycle of salmon, particularly, section 103(d)(2) and section 103(c).

I have heard here on the floor, despite the fact no hearing has been held—the bill just burbled up very recently—that on one side they are saying, ''No, don't worry, it will not have a detrimental environmental impact, and, if it does, well, we will stop doing it.''

But I just looked at that section of the bill and it doesn't quite say that definitively. In fact, it changes the standards, and then it says, ''If additional negative impacts might happen, then the Secretary could suspend some of the provisions of this bill.'' Not exactly certainty, and we need some certainty here for our fisheries.

We have been hurting for years. Last year, we had a good year, thankfully. We are still dealing with buybacks because of reducing the size of the fleets from past problems. Fishermen are burdened with the buyback year in, year out. I just got the terms of that adjusted in the NDAA. They had a payday loan from the Federal Government. Now we got them a reasonable loan from the Federal Government. The government didn't even pay for their buyback. Heck, in the Northeast, they paid for a couple of buybacks. No, we had to pay for our own with a payday loan. Now we are going to jeopardize the fleet 1, 2, or 3 years out because we won't have the returns with the endangered species.

So this is a bad idea to do in the waning days of a Congress, to bring forward a bill which is controversial, over which there is disagreement on the actual language in the provisions of the bill, and which my experts, the Pacific Fishery Management Council, say would be detrimental and would cause those problems.

PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL,
Portland, OR, December 6, 2014.

Hon. JARED HUFFMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HUFFMAN: Thank you for your letter of November 17 and follow-up on December 3 requesting Pacific Fishery Management Council (Pacific Council) comment on

legislation related to operation of the State Water Project and Central Valley Project in California (HR 5781) and its potential impacts to fisheries. Although the timing of the bill did not allow for full Council deliberation, we present the following concerns, which are consistent with previous comments the Council has made on similar legislation. Absent changes in the legislation to address these concerns, the Pacific Council does not support HR 5781 moving forward.

HR 5781 would override Endangered Species Act protections for salmon, steelhead, and other species in the Bay-Delta in order to allow increased pumping from the Delta in excess of scientifically justified levels. These measures also protect salmon stocks not currently listed under the ESA, which are a primary source of healthy sport and commercial fisheries from Central California to Northern Oregon. The bill introduces a new standard for implementing the Endangered Species Act concerning Central Valley salmon and Delta smelt, a keystone species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem. (See Sec 101(3), and 102(b)(2)(a).) It is unclear how severe the negative effects of this new standard might be, but it would certainly impact current water management policy that protects ESA listed salmon stocks from further decline and helps prevent currently healthy stocks from becoming listed under the ESA.

The bill contains several provisions that override the salmon and Delta smelt biological opinions (for example Section 103(d)(2), Section 103(c), and others). Section 103 could result in dramatically higher pumping than is authorized under the biological opinions, and would cause significant harm to migrating salmon and steelhead and other native species. The 1:1 inflow to export ratio for the San Joaquin at Vernalis overrides the 'reasonable and prudent alternatives' to standard operations that were set out in the 2009 Central Valley biological opinion in order to protect Sacramento River winter-run Chinook and other salmonid species. Further degradation of salmon habitat is contrary to the provisions of the Magnuson Stevens Act (Sec. 305(b)(1)(D)) and something the Pacific Council strongly opposes.

Section 103(f)(2) provides exemptions for mitigation of negative effects on listed fish species, which alleviates the project from compensating fisheries for negative effects of its operations; it is unclear if there is an exemption for mitigation of negative effect on non-listed salmon stocks. Exempting mitigation responsibility for harm to salmon populations provides the exact opposite incentive to the kind of salmon protection and enhancement advocated by the Council, and essentially amounts to redistributing the value of salmon fisheries to agricultural or municipal interests, as well as increasing the risk to ESA listed fish stocks threatened with extinction. Additionally, the Pacific Council is concerned about whether Central Valley projects are achieving their current mitigation responsibility, and providing these exemptions could preclude seeking remedy. If this bill moves forward, it should provide direct mitigation for the proposed actions and risks to which it would subject fish populations and fishing communities, not avoiding this appropriate responsibility.

In 2008 and 2009. $158 million in Congressional aid was provided to deal with the disaster of the closure of ocean salmon fisheries off California and Oregon south of Cape Falcon due to a collapse of the Sacramento River salmon stocks. These fisheries are an important source of jobs for coastal communities, which cannot be replaced simply through disaster relief. Without adjustments to this bill, we fear such a disaster could be repeated in the reasonably near future.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this legislation; please don't hesitate to contact me or Ms. Jennifer Gilden of the Pacific Council office if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

D.O. MCISAAC, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), author of the original, long-term bill that passed in the last Congress.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, listening to the rhetoric that is coming from the other side, I am reminded of the old saying about the Soviet Union: if you tell a lie long enough, eventually people will believe you.

There is hardly anything coming from the other side of the aisle that is even remotely close to the truth. I don't have enough time to go through it all, but let me just hit the high points.

Number one, let's start with the facts on the table. Most of the population in California lives in the Greater San Francisco Bay Area or Los Angeles, which mostly Democrats represent, and which is the home of the 1 percent in California. The poor people that they continue to make more poor are my constituents because they have taken their water and dumped our water out into the ocean.

Let's take the example of San Francisco in the Greater Bay Area. They get their water not only from the delta, but also the United States Congress passed legislation in the early part of last century that allows water to be piped over from Yosemite National Park directly over to the Bay Area.

This is our water. This water should be going to the San Joaquin Valley. They have given up none of that. You have a Member who has been here for 40-some years who made the claim that some people are reaching in and taking their water. Well, no, it is the opposite. Once again, if you tell a lie long enough, I guess you think eventually people will agree with you or believe you.

This is about San Francisco and Los Angeles getting all of their water, never giving up one drop, and they have taken the water from our communities. As the majority leader said, we have communities that continue to suffer 20, 30, or 40 percent unemployment while the 1 percent on the coast say nothing, do nothing. They complain about it. They give big subsidies to their salmon fishery buddies and the environmental community. We have other people on the other side of the aisle who made their whole careers making millions of dollars off of lawsuits, bringing lawsuits against the farms, that remain undisclosed in the dark today.

So, Mr. Speaker, we need to get the truth out on the table here.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. NUNES. So what we are doing here now is, we have been working diligently with Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BOXER, but you have one of the Senators decide that she didn't want to come up with a solution. We got the bill from being permanent down to just an 18-month temporary bill. We have floodwaters today that are not being pumped that historically were pumped. We have communities that are completely out of water, 100 percent out of water, yet the 1 percent, they don't care.

I have heard a lot about the 1 percent around this place. The rhetoric from the other side, that rhetoric represents the 1 percent. We represent the people that are unemployed because of their 1 percent policies.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can get back to the truth. If we can get this bill passed, it gives the Senate an opportunity to amend the bill, send it back in the waning days of this Congress. If they cannot, then we have to start back in January with new legislation.

But, in the meantime, people are out of work, cities are out of water, towns are out of water, rural homes are out of water, schools are out of water, churches are out of water, because the folks on the other side of the aisle spent 40 years taking water away and keeping it for themselves.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the impassioned speech, but it is not our water. It is California water.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the ranking member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

This is always a difficult issue. It is a California issue, and I want to point out that the California delegation is not evenly split on this. It is unevenly split. The reason is the gentleman just talked about what he called ''facts.'' His points of what he was making are not true.

As the ranking member indicated, the chair, she indicated that this is public water, public water that is transported in the State by publicly financed canals, both by the Federal Government and by the State government. This is water that is supposed to balance for all California. It is all publicly owned and distributed, mostly to the private sector in the San Joaquin Valley.

Now, we have a drought. Everybody knows it. It is a disaster. The President declared it that. What we ought to be doing in Congress is paying for that disaster, like we pay for every other disaster. This bill doesn't do it. I was a coauthor of the original bill, but I am not cosponsoring this one, and I am not supporting this one because what this does is not deal with the problem of getting money to California to build the infrastructure that we need for offstream storage and things like that.

What it does is disrupt a balanced system that has flexibility. We have been through the worst drought, and there have been flexible releases given this year. We solved it administratively. But to put it in law I think is very harmful. It is going to cause more lawsuits, more dissension, and we are back to, as Senator BOXER indicated, square one and not being able to find resolution.

Now, you argue that, well, we are the leading ag State. I am the leading ag county: $4.8 billion worth of agriculture. We don't get a drop of this water. We find our own water in our own county. Frankly, we are reducing the amount of use in agriculture tremendously by drip irrigation and other forms of agricultural use.

So I think that the danger here is in the last minute of this Congress we are taking a bill that is extremely controversial and trying to pass it in the last minutes when we really need to resolve this thing so it is a balance for all of California, not just a few.

I think this is very harmful for our State, and I hope that those who are not from California will oppose the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HASTINGS, and a special thanks to my friend and colleague Mr. VALADAO for introducing this legislation.

Why is somebody from Illinois standing on the floor of the House to talk about a bill that affects California? Well, this chart says it all: California crops, 99 percent of the almonds, 99 percent of the figs. Go down this chart and you can see how it impacts every single family that I represent in central Illinois. 800,000 people in my congressional district go buy these products in our stores. The cost of not doing something to affect this historic drought is costing them and their families more to eat these products, healthy products, that come from the Central Valley of California.

When you have over 800,000 acre-feet of water being released, fresh water being released into the ocean, that is enough water for 800,000 families to use for a year. We are simply asking for flexibility that has a direct impact on every single family in this country. It has an impact on my families that I represent, and that is why I am so proud to stand here and support this legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time that is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Some of our colleagues from other States may be experiencing a sense of deja vu right now. Yes, this is the second time this year that the House has voted on a California water bill that would harm northern California fisheries, tribes, and communities; that would undermine State law; that would deprive water managers of the flexibility they need; and it would micromanage the complex water system of California.

To make sure we are all dealing with the same facts, I want to remind my colleagues that the State and Federal water export pumps in the delta right now are operating at more than 5,000 cubic feet per second.

The only reason they are not pumping even faster is not to protect fish and wildlife, not because of the Endangered Species Act, none of the other bogeymen that we hear as a justification for this bill. No, the reason those pumps are not going even faster is because of standards set by the State of California to protect water quality from municipal and industrial and agricultural and other uses in the system.

So the only way that this bill could deliver more water today—well, there is no way it could deliver more water today—and the only way it could deliver more water in other times of the year is by taking it away from other water users and other beneficial uses in our State.

With that inconvenient fact out of the way, let's talk about the process that brought us here today. H.R. 5781 has never been reviewed by the authorizing committee, let alone marked up in open session. Nor have we received the input of State or Federal agencies that have the responsibility over clean water and fisheries management. Nor have we received the input of affected local water agencies, of commercial and recreational fishing interests, of tribes—including ones that I represent—or other communities that will surely be impacted negatively if this were to become law.

The proponents of this bill say that it is the result of bipartisan collaboration. Really? Those of us who represent northern California's fishing industries, tribes, farmers, and communities have been systematically kept out of the room and even kept out of the conversation.

Last month, we learned that members of our State's Republican delegation refused to even brief Senator BARBARA BOXER if northern California Democrats like me were even in the room.

This is no way to negotiate something this important. It is a terrible precedent for other States as well, and that is why I am glad that Senator BOXER has been so clear in stating her opposition to it, that it would ignite water wars in California, not solve problems, and I am glad that over the weekend we received a veto recommendation from the Obama administration.

Now, on Saturday, the Pacific Fishery Management Council sent me a letter about the bill. I asked them how they felt it would affect western fisheries in this country. Here is what they said:

H.R. 5781 would override Endangered Species Act protections for salmon, steelhead, and other species in the Bay Delta in order to allow increased pumping from the delta in excess of scientifically justified levels.

In 2008 and 2009, $158 million in congressional aid was provided to deal with the disaster of the closure of ocean salmon fisheries off California and Oregon south of Cape Falcon due to a collapse of the Sacramento River salmon stocks. These fisheries are an important source of jobs for coastal communities, which cannot be replaced simply through disaster relief. Without adjustments to this bill, we fear such a disaster could be repeated in the reasonably near future.

Mr. Speaker, I will include this letter in the RECORD at this time.

PACIFIC FISHERY
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL,
Portland, OR, December 6, 2014.

Hon. JARED HUFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HUFFMAN: Thank you for your letter of November 17 and follow-up on December 3 requesting Pacific Fishery Management Council (Pacific Council) comment on legislation related to operation of the State Water Project and Central Valley Project in California (HR 5781) and its potential impacts to fisheries. Although the timing of the bill did not allow for full Council deliberation, we present the following concerns, which are consistent with previous comments the Council has made on similar legislation. Absent changes in the legislation to address these concerns, the Pacific Council does not support HR 5781 moving forward.

HR 5781 would override Endangered Species Act protections for salmon, steelhead, and other species in the Bay-Delta in order to allow increased pumping from the Delta in excess of scientifically justified levels. These measures also protect salmon stocks not currently listed under the ESA, which are a primary source of healthy sport and commercial fisheries from Central California to Northern Oregon. The bill introduces a new standard for implementing the Endangered Species Act concerning Central Valley salmon and Delta smelt, a keystone species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem. (See Sec 101(3), and 102(b)(2)(a).) It is unclear how severe the negative effects of this new standard might be, but it would certainly impact current water management policy that protects ESA listed salmon stocks from further decline and helps prevent currently healthy stocks from becoming listed under the ESA.

The bill contains several provisions that override the salmon and Delta smelt biological opinions (for example Section 103(d)(2), Section 103(c), and others). Section 103 could result in dramatically higher pumping than is authorized under the biological opinions, and would cause significant harm to migrating salmon and steelhead and other native species. The 1:1 inflow to export ratio for the San Joaquin at Vernalis overrides the 'reasonable and prudent alternatives' to standard operations that were set out in the 2009 Central Valley biological opinion in order to protect Sacramento River winter-run Chinook and other salmonid species. Further degradation of salmon habitat is contrary to the provisions of the Magnuson Stevens Act

(Sec. 305(b)(1)(D)) and something the Pacific Council strongly opposes.

Section 103(f)(2) provides exemptions for mitigation of negative effects on listed fish species, which alleviates the project from compensating fisheries for negative effects of its operations; it is unclear if there is an exemption for mitigation of negative effect on non-listed salmon stocks. Exempting mitigation responsibility for harm to salmon populations provides the exact opposite incentive to the kind of salmon protection and enhancement advocated by the Council, and essentially amounts to redistributing the value of salmon fisheries to agricultural or municipal interests, as well as increasing the risk to ESA listed fish stocks threatened with extinction. Additionally, the Pacific Council is concerned about whether Central Valley projects are achieving their current mitigation responsibility, and providing these exemptions could preclude seeking remedy. If this bill moves forward, it should provide direct mitigation for the proposed actions and risks to which it would subject fish populations and fishing communities, not avoiding this appropriate responsibility.

In 2008 and 2009 $158 million in Congressional aid was provided to deal with the disaster of the closure of ocean salmon fisheries off California and Oregon south of Cape Falcon due to a collapse of the Sacramento River salmon stocks. These fisheries are an important source of jobs for coastal communities, which cannot be replaced simply through disaster relief. Without adjustments to this bill, we fear such a disaster could be repeated in the reasonably near future.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this legislation; please don't hesitate to contact me or Ms. Jennifer Gilden of the Pacific Council office if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

D.O. MCISAAC, Ph.D.,
Executive Director.

Mr. HUFFMAN. In addition, California's recreational and commercial fishing interests sent a letter on Friday with their concerns that this legislation would ''harm, potentially disastrously, the communities, families, and thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on the health of the Bay Delta and its salmon runs.''

Mr. Speaker, I will include their letter in the RECORD at this time as well.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 5781

DECEMBER 5, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to urge you to oppose H.R. 5781 (Valadao, R-CA), a bill that would dramatically weaken protections for salmon and other fish and wildlife in California's Bay-Delta estuary and its tributaries. This legislation would harm, potentially disastrously, the communities, families and thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on the health of the Bay-Delta and its salmon runs.

H.R. 5781 would undermine existing legal protections for salmon, endangered species, and other species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem, in order to pump more water out of the most important salmon producing system south of the Columbia River. For example, the bill would rewrite and override protections required under the Endangered Species Act and replace the best available science with political micro-management. Those ESA protections also benefit fall run Chinook salmon, the backbone of the salmon fishery. This legislation would also undermine existing federal law, which establishes fish and wildlife protection and salmon restoration as a co-equal goal of the Central Valley Project. It would attempt to redirect water dedicated by law to restoring fisheries and ecosystem heath. By requiring a massive new groundwater development project, this legislation has the potential to divert tens of millions of dollars away from ecosystem restoration, including salmon restoration projects. Such groundwater development would likely also reduce surface waters needed by salmon.

This damaging legislation has never been subject to a single committee hearing or input from the State, hunting organizations, sport and commercial fishermen, tribes, and conservation groups. Frankly put, this last-minute legislation is a cynical water grab. It doesn't address the cause of the drought, nor does it offer solutions. Instead, it is simply an effort to legislate the destruction of the environment and the salmon industry.

The very real water shortages experienced in parts of California this year are a result of three dry years, not environmental protections. Real solutions to the impacts of the drought include agricultural and urban water use efficiency, water recycling and other tools that can meet our needs and that don't sacrifice our environment and fisheries. This legislation addresses none of those solutions.

This legislation could not come at a more damaging time. 2015 represents the first year that drought affected salmon year classes will return as spawning adults. We anticipate a significant, perhaps dramatic, reduction in returning salmon during 2015–2017. The coming three years will be a critical time for the salmon industry. This is not a theoretical concern. In 2008–2009, three years after record diversions from the Bay-Delta, low salmon populations led to the complete closure of the salmon fishery. This legislation could help lead to a repeat of that disastrous closure. The standards protecting salmon today are too low already. Further rollbacks could have a devastating impact on salmon runs that have already been harmed by drought.

Our salmon industry is valued at $1.4 billion in economic activity annually. The industry employs tens of thousands of people from Santa Barbara to northern Oregon, including in California's Central Valley. This industry consists of commercial fishermen, recreational fishermen, fish processors, marinas, coastal communities, equipment manufacturers, tackle shops, the hotel and food industry, tribes, and the salmon fishing industry at large. All of these economic sectors and individuals could be harmed by damaging federal legislation. We all respectfully request your leadership to protect our future.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to oppose H.R. 5781 and any other last-minute attempts to undercut the existing balance of rights and protections among the users of the California Bay-Delta watershed. California's drought requires real solutions, not a return to the imbalanced policies of the 1940s and 1950s.

Thank you for your consideration.

JOHN MCMANUS,
Golden Gate Salmon Association.

ZEKE GRADER,
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations.

DICK POOL,
Water4Fish.

ROGER THOMAS,
Golden Gate Fishermen's Association.

MARK GORELNICK,
Coastside Fishing Club.

LARRY COLLINS,
San Francisco Crab Boat Association.

□ 1500

At the Rules Committee debate, I raised a series of important technical questions about flaws in this bill. Unfortunately, the House majority has decided that it cannot be amended through an open rule.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HUFFMAN. If we did have the benefit of a hearing or even just an opportunity to amend through an open rule, we may be able to address some of these, but so far, nobody has answered some of these key technical questions.

First, does the bill allow the State water board, basically, to do its job if we head into a fourth year of a critical drought, doing things like issuing curtailment orders and possibly rationing orders? These are tough calls that our State's water referee has to make. This bill does not appear to allow them the flexibility to do that.

Does the bill, which directs the Federal Government to ''provide the maximum quantity of water supplies possible'' next year, allow the Federal Government to do other things necessary to operate the system, like filling reservoirs, holding water for public health purposes, or—when it might be needed—even for other water contractors?

Does the bill put additional pressure on the Trinity River, which I represent, and the tribes that have depended on it for their traditions and their subsistence on healthy salmon populations for millennia?

There are many other questions that are unanswered about this bill. It is not ready for prime time, it is not good policy, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for working with me in this committee on this important topic.

Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer in northern California, and when I hear talk of the water wars being reignited, it has been a one-sided war, with the amount of farmers and people that work in the Valley. They haven't had the bullets to be in a water war because we have been losing for a long time.

Hundreds of thousands of acre-feet that have been diverted already in the past adds up to millions over the years for other uses, besides what has been going in the North Valley, South Valley, and Central Valley.

I heard this comment a while ago. Powerful, small people were how legislators looked at us in the valley—powerful, small people. Do these folks

standing in the unemployment line look powerful to you? Do the farmers who have been fighting against this for years and years look powerful when we keep losing these battles one after another? To build more storage, we would have water for everybody in California.

This measure here today would help everybody in California that is part of State water projects or the Central Valley Project. Twenty million people in California would see additional benefit by taking—and here's the concept here, folks—excess water during high flows that now would be just flowing out to the Pacific.

We are not taking water during the middle of the season any more than what would already be in the established regime. This is the excess water you would see during flood periods or the high flows that do happen when we have rainfall and water thundering down the Sacramento River, the Feather River, and San Joaquin River during those high flows. We are taking that excess water and reprogramming it, so it can benefit more people. It doesn't take anything from the fish regime or any of that type of concern.

We hear the stuff coming from the other side of the aisle that has continued, whether it has been for 40 years or just recently, to distort what we are trying to do here to make more water for California, which is in its third year of a huge drought—as Mr. MCCARTHY said, what looks like a 1,200-year record for droughts—and about stopping this temporary measure that would help to cause a little bit of excess water be retained to help the people like this to have jobs.

We hear we need jobs in California. We are talking about immigration bills. Let's help people have jobs to live the dream. What about the people that are already here? What about the people standing in that line that have conditions that look like this, with the crops in our State being left fallow, these trees and these vines being stumped or completely pushed out because we can't have a vision, all because we have the typical rhetoric, which I have been listening to as a farmer when I was outside of this place and now today on this floor—and probably many more times—that says we can't build any storage because of this?

It is a new regime which respects the already-established protocols. This doesn't take away the power from the State water board or the other boards in place. If you would actually read the bill, you would see in it those provisions are kept in place by the Governor and by the water boards. All the entities that have authority over it can step in and say, ''We think this is going to affect the fish, the water regime, or any of the others.''

I urge that we support this measure today, and I ask that we listen to what is in the bill and not listen to the rhetoric and the lies.

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

I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water and Power, and I read this information in the newspaper. Nobody ever contacted me. I had no idea the formulation of this particular bill was going on.

When we talk about unemployment, it is nice to trot out pictures and show what the effect is, but I see nothing in this bill that is going to help the farm workers themselves, nothing that is going to provide more wet water, create water, whether it is through recycling, desalination, or conservation—all the things that southern California has been doing.

Let's not forget that 80 percent of the water used is for agriculture and 20 percent is for industrial, commercial, and residential; so there is a little bit of a disparity there, my friends.

I really am looking at how we move towards working on a bipartisan basis. We don't want to argue. We want to make resolutions by working together, and that is not happening. Maybe it is something that I have said—I am not sure, Mr. Speaker—but I am more than willing to sit down between now and next year when we have this bill come to the light of the day, if it is reintroduced, and we can have an honest discussion about the effects it has.

Also, when we talk about California's 35 million residents, only 12 million reside in L.A. County, part of the county that I represent. That is not including San Bernardino, Riverside, or San Diego, so we talk about the boaters in southern California getting the shaft for not getting the water and paying more for that water.

When we are looking at water distribution, I suggest that we sit and actually work openly and transparently. We oppose this secretly written Central Valley-focused legislation. We hope that we are going to continue the dialogue because, yes, California, is a donor State. We need to be able to continue providing that for the rest of the Nation, so that we can have a better economy and a growth in our agricultural area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5781, the so-called California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, which should be called the CVP California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of points here before I yield back my time. This has been a very interesting debate. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I attended two hearings in Fresno, California, particularly on this issue, and saw firsthand the impact of what the natural drought and the manmade drought has done to the San Joaquin Valley.

My friends on the other side of the aisle stated a number of newspapers that editorialized against this. Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a Fresno Bee editorial of December 6 saying that the Valadao bill, which is H.R. 5781, should be passed.

[From The Fresno Bee, Dec. 6, 2014]

FACTS SUPPORT PASSAGE OF DROUGHT RELIEF LEGISLATION

One of the oldest rules in politics is, when the facts are on your side, you cite the facts; when the facts aren't on your side, you pound the table.

Over the last few days, opponents of The California Emergency Drought Relief Act, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, have been yelling about water grabs, protesting the timing of the bill's introduction and doing all they can to divert attention from the facts—both pertaining to this legislation and to the cruel realities of our state's prolonged drought.

So, let's start with the facts.

This drought is the worst that California has experienced in at least 1,200 years. So says a study published by the American Geophysical Union and cited by a Washington Post blog Thursday. Not only have we received little rain, but the lack of precipitation has been intensified by record-breaking high temperatures. Moreover, the fertile agricultural fields of the San Joaquin Valley are suffering through an ''exceptional drought,'' the most severe classification.

Yes, it has rained lately in California. Thank goodness it has. But much more rain is needed to restore our aquifers, fill our reservoirs reverse the economic hardship inflicted on our state and, in particular, the Valley, by the drought.

The bill (H.R. 5781) introduced by Rep. David Valadao, R-Hanford and supported by GOP leadership provides the flexibility and resources to give farmers in the Valley and elsewhere a fighting chance to grow their crops and put people back to work in 2015. In a nutshell, the bill would allow the Bureau of Reclamation the freedom to hold more winter rain and snow and then distribute it to areas in need. Not only would this flexibility help farmers and rural communities, but it would benefit the environment as well.

This legislation is the product of months of talks and negotiations earlier this year involving Republican and Democrats in both the House and the U.S. Senate and is the result of thoughtful compromise. The bill doesn't amend the Endangered Species Act or existing biological opinions. It leaves decision-making about habitat, protected species and water quality to federal environmental agencies. But it would reduce the flow of water through the Sacramento-Joaquin River Delta to the Pacific Ocean and pump more water to the south—as long as that pumping doesn't harm protected fish such as delta smelt, salmon and steelhead.

Moreover, these changes would be temporary, as they would end in September of 2016 or upon the governor ending California's drought declaration.

Opponents are trying to paint this bill as detrimental to the environment and the result of secret negotiations. Again, let's examine the facts. In a phone interview with The Editorial Board on Friday, Rep. Jim Costa, D-Fresno, pointed out that this proposal is similar to Sen. Dianne Feinstein's bill that was passed under unanimous consent by the Senate in February.

Passage of Feinstein's Emergency Drought Relief Act then set the stage for negotiations—and compromise—with Valadao, who

earlier had received partisan House approval of a bill that was extreme and over the top. Early on, Northern California Democrats, many of which are supported by environmentalist, were involved in the negotiations. But they drew firm lines in the sand and quit the talk.

Valadao's bill is reasonable and much needed. It deserves the support of Sen. Feinstein and Sen. Barbara Boxer and the California delegation in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Let me address another issue.

We heard a number of times from the speakers on the other side of the aisle that there has been no hearing on this bill; it came out of the blue, blah, blah, blah. We heard that over and over. Maybe it is because when my friends on the other side of the aisle were in the majority, they didn't follow regular order, so let me say this as slowly or plainly as I can.

In the last Congress, Congressman NUNES introduced a long-term bill that we had a number of hearings on in the National Resources Committee. We marked up the bill in the Resources Committee, and we had it on the floor, where there were amendments that were offered to that bill; and, finally, in the last Congress, it passed with bipartisan support.

That was in the last Congress, Mr. NUNES' bill. In this Congress, Mr. VALADAO took that bill, dusted it off, and made two minor changes. We brought it to the floor, and once again, it passed with bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty good example of what regular order is, and all we said, by the way, is, ''Okay. This is our position. This is the House's position. If the Senate has a different position, pass a bill.'' There was nothing complex about that, and to the credit of Senator FEINSTEIN, primarily, there was a bill that passed with unanimous consent.

I might add, however, Mr. Speaker, that there were no hearings held on the Senate bill in the Senate. There were no hearings held on the Senate bill; however, because of the drought in California, many Western senators—primarily, Republican Western senators—when asked, presumably by Senator FEINSTEIN, if this bill could go by unanimous consent, they said, ''Yes, but there are some conditions that we ought to look at before it finally becomes law.'' Their principal concern was in the area of the Endangered Species Act.

Now, in the 20 years that I have been here, I have been a vocal critic of how the Endangered Species Act has been implemented, and I hope that we have made some movement in that with the passage of three bills that we did later on.

My point is this, Mr. Speaker: the Senate then passed their bill. The normal process under regular order is when the House has a position and the Senate has a position, then you get together to negotiate the differences.

Now, there are a lot of differences between those two bills, and for the last 6 months, there has been a good faith effort to try to negotiate the difference.

A week ago, Senator FEINSTEIN said: We just can't get it done at this point; and, at that point, my colleagues here in the House—Mr. VALADAO, principally, but the other colleagues that spoke—said: I think what we ought to do is to put into bill form what we had principally agreed to in this conference—although it wasn't a formal conference, it was an informal conference—and put it in bill form.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say what we have before us is legislation that has been largely agreed to in this informal conference that has been going on for some time with the California water issue.

This isn't something that came out of the dark. As a matter of fact, in the 4 years that my colleagues controlled this House, there was no California water legislation whatsoever. So to come up here and talk and say there are other things and they should be involved, of course, they should be involved. They were involved with the Senate action on the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this is good legislation. It represents a broad consensus that could be done in the informal conference, so I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation. Hopefully, the Senate can take it up before we adjourn. If we don't, the consequences are that we are going to have to start all over again in the next Congress.

There has been so much work that has been done in the informal conference that to let that go and not have some positive action on it, I think, would be wrong for us to do.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 5781, yet another California water-grab bill. If enacted, H.R. 5781 would dictate specific actions for water management agencies' experts to take while undermining state water rights and state environmental laws. These directives would eliminate flexibility in the system by making it more difficult for state and federal agencies to make real-time, science-based decisions to address the drought.

In addition to my colleagues speaking out against the bill today, the Administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy on the bill which states:

H.R. 5781 makes operational determinations regarding the use of limited water resources during the ongoing drought, and contains many new provisions that could lead to unintended consequences or further litigation, the Administration cannot support the bill in its current form.

Further, the Administration highlighted its ongoing work to address the drought:

The United States Department of Agriculture has directed millions of dollars in food, conservation, and emergency water assistance to tens of thousands of residents in areas hardest hit by drought. The Bureau of Reclamation has provided cost-share assistance for nine water reclamation and reuse projects in the State as well as millions of dollars in grants to build long-term resiliency to drought. . . . The President has directed Federal agencies to work with state and local officials in real-time to maximize limited water supplies, prioritize public health and safety, meet state water quality requirements, and ensure a balanced approach to providing for the water needs of people, agriculture, businesses, power, imperiled species and the environment.

Instead of legislating how the current dwindling supply of water should be moved within the state, we should follow the Administration's lead and fund conservation, recycling, and storage projects to create new water.

Additionally, over 30 environmental, natural resource, and fishing groups sent letters of opposition to H.R. 5781 to Congress. Fishing industry groups oppose the bill because:

The bill would undermine existing legal protections for salmon, endangered species, and other species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem, in order to pump more water out of the most important salmon producing system south of the Columbia River. For example, the bill would rewrite and override protections required under the Endangered Species Act and replace the best available science with political micro-management.''

Authors of H.R. 5781 believe it will boost the economy in part of California, but in this haphazard attempt at amelioration, they risk eliminating jobs in the $1.4 billion salmon industry by, jobs in the Delta tourism industry, and jobs in Northern California agriculture.

Natural resource and bird organizations oppose the bill because of the devastating impact it could have on migratory birds and other fish and wildlife in the Bay-Delta estuary. According to these groups:

California has already lost more than 90 percent of its existing wetlands and in the current drought conditions, migratory birds are crowding onto the small remaining habitat areas, suffering from decreased food and increased risk of disease.

With at least a billion birds migrating along the Pacific Flyway each year, we cannot afford to eliminate even more habitat. We must ensure water supplies are properly balanced for all needs and mandating exports to water users south of the Delta will not achieve this balance.

In addition to being deeply flawed, this bill is being rammed through at the last minute. Introduced just last week, this bill is circumventing all regular order and will be voted on despite having no hearings and no mark-ups. As the Sacramento Bee states, ''The new bill deserves a full public hearing so that we know its full implications for California.''

As I have stated before, this drought is caused by nature—something so painfully obvious, it can be seen from space. Circumventing science and legislating how to operate a water system is irresponsible and we must find ways to add to our water supply instead of taking water from one group and giving to another for political gain. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5781, a bill that was written in secret, would destroy jobs, ignores established science, and does nothing to address the drought.

Unfortunately, I am unable to participate in this debate today due to the House Majority's last minute scheduling. Not only were we not given time for Congressional hearings or public input on this legislation, we were not even

given enough time to plan to be here to debate the bill after it was rushed to the floor. I was home working in district when this debate was scheduled and by the time I received notice of the floor debate, no flights were available other than the one I was originally on.

Ten months ago this House considered and passed a similarly horrible bill. Neither bill will solve the drought because neither bill can make it rain.

Instead of spending the last ten months working across the aisle with all stakeholders at the table to come up with legislation that actually addresses the statewide drought, the Majority has negotiated this bill in secret with only a select group of farming interests in the Central Valley.

Everyone in California is affected by the ongoing statewide drought and Congress should not be picking winners and losers. Unfortunately, this bill does just that.

H.R. 5781 is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to use the drought as an excuse to steal water from the Bay Delta—and to do so with zero regard for the folks who depend on that water for their livelihoods.

The Delta supports thousands of jobs in farming, fishing and tourism, and has an economic output of more than $4 billion a year.

Millions also rely on the Delta for drinking water. When clean water is pumped south, the level of salt water in the Delta increases. Folks can't drink seawater.

The entire state of California is in a drought. It's not due to a lack of pumping. It's due to a lack of snow and rain.

If the Majority was interested in actually addressing the drought, there are things we could do to help. Congress can invest in more water conservation, more water recycling, and more water storage.

With investments like these, we can collect millions of gallons of new water, help farmers better plan, and create good jobs.

This bill does none of that. Our people deserve better than this politically driven bill. They deserve solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 5781.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5781 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

□ 1515

SGT. AMANDA N. PINSON POST OFFICE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5385) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5385

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

SECTION 1. SGT. AMANDA N. PINSON POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the ''Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5385, sponsored by Representative ANN WAGNER of Missouri, to designate the Post Office located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office.

Army Sergeant Amanda Pinson died on March 16, 2006, while serving during Operation Iraqi Freedom. She, along with a fellow soldier, were killed when a mortar round detonated. She was only 21 years old.

Sergeant Pinson enlisted in the Army after graduating from high school and was known as a model soldier, a ''breath of fresh air,'' and wanted to attend college after the military to become a CIA or FBI agent.

Mr. Speaker, this courageous young woman served her country with honor and gave her life in defense of our country. It is my honor and privilege to stand before this body and pay tribute to Sergeant Pinson's memory and sacrifice. I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5385.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I support this, and I can't add to the excellent words of my colleague from North Carolina.

It is an amazing thing when we are naming post offices to hear about the brave lives—in this case of a very young woman with a bright future who gave her life for her country. So I am delighted to join in Representative WAGNER's legislation to make this name permanent so that we can all remember and revere the memory of this brave soldier.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for his support.

I yield as much time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend and colleague from North Carolina for yielding me this time, and the gentleman from Vermont also for his tremendous support and commitment to honoring our fallen heroes.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of a great American hero. On March 16, 2006, Missouri's Second District lost a brave young woman when United States Army Sergeant Amanda N. Pinson was killed in a mortar attack while serving during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the life of this young patriot.

Army Sergeant Amanda Pinson was a signals intelligence analyst assigned to the 101st Military Intelligence Detachment of the 101st Airborne Division based in Fort Campbell, Kentucky.

On a personal note, I have to say that the Screaming Eagles are very personal to me, as my oldest son is presently serving as an Army officer in the 101st.

Amanda is survived by her mother, Chris; her father, Tony; and her younger brother, Bryan.

Growing up in Lemay, Missouri, Amanda enlisted in the Army after graduating from Hancock Place High School, where she won several scholarships and was on the basketball and the softball teams.

Amanda was always concerned about helping others. In high school, she started her own group called HELP, the Hancock Environmental Leadership Program. She enlisted all of her friends to join, and Amanda and the HELP group planted trees at local parks and volunteered with local seniors.

The group also planted and maintained flowers at the entrance of Jefferson Barracks Park. The park where she used to plant flowers is adjoined to Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, where Amanda is laid to rest.

Amanda also had the respect and admiration of her fellow soldiers. She was described, indeed, as a model soldier and ''a breath of fresh air'' by Lieutenant Colonel Lucinda Lane, who spoke at her service.

Upon her death, Sergeant Pinson was awarded a Bronze Star, a Good Conduct Medal, a Global War on Terrorism Medal, and a Purple Heart.

Her impact on the people privileged to know her during her life is evidenced by the many memorials honoring Amanda. In 2006, the U.S. Army honored Amanda by dedicating the building where she worked in Tikrit, Iraq, naming it ''Pinson Hall.'' A pink willow tree was planted in her honor at her alma mater, Hancock High School, in 2006. And now, the Amanda N. Pinson Post Office will join these memorials as a testament to the bravery, valor, and kindness of this American hero who gave the ultimate sacrifice for her country.

It is my honor to sponsor H.R. 5385, a bill that names the Affton branch, Grasso Plaza post office after such a courageous young woman, immortalizing a hero who gave up her life in service to the Nation she loved. May it bring comfort to her family and friends and give witness to Sergeant Pinson's bravery and her sacrifice.

To quote the phrase that adorns so many of the tributes and memorials to Amanda: ''If love could have saved you, you would have lived forever.''

So today, on behalf of a grateful nation, I say: ''Thank you, Amanda, and you are, indeed, loved.''

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for her words, and I would say that it represents her heart. Whether it is here in Washington, D.C., or anywhere else, she is always looking to really recognize those who serve their country.

Certainly, in this honor today, I would urge all our Members to join me in support of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5385.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. ZACHARY M. FISHER POST OFFICE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5794) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the ''Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5794

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

SECTION 1. SGT. ZACHARY M. FISHER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the ''Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5794, introduced by Representative ANN WAGNER of Missouri, to designate the post office located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office.

Army Sergeant Zachary Fisher, a native of Ballwin, Missouri, was killed on July 14, 2010, at Forward Operating Base Lagman in Afghanistan. He died of wounds sustained when insurgents attacked his vehicle and detonated an improvised explosive device. Sergeant Fisher was only 24 years old.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fisher was a brave young man. He decided to join the Army Reserve, and then courageously volunteered to become a member of the Active Duty military. Sergeant Fisher chose to put himself in harm's way in order to protect the freedoms that we, as Americans, enjoy every day. We owe him a great debt of gratitude for making the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf.

I ask my colleagues to honor and memorialize Zachary M. Fisher's service by supporting H.R. 5794.

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

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

Again, it is a combination of humility and pride when we hear about the lives of these brave young Americans. That is the second wonderful person from Missouri, but all of us, in our States, have people that have served America this way.

What strikes me here is Sergeant Fisher went from Iraq to Afghanistan—he didn't have to do that, but he had a need to serve—and the inspiring story about his selfless commitment to serving this country when he had behind a loving family and a wife, and he sacrificed all.

If he were here and were asked the question, ''Was it worth it?'' you know he would say it was because he loved his family, he loved his country, and he was willing and did give his life for his country.

So as a person here standing on the floor, as an American hearing about the bravery of this young man, I want to thank Representative WAGNER for bringing this to the collective attention of the House of Representatives, and we fully support this legislation. It is a small honor for a large sacrifice.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding the time and the gentleman from Vermont for his always kind and compassionate words about our fallen heroes and these great opportunities that we have to represent them and give living testament to their bravery and their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a great American hero, Sergeant Zachary M. Fisher, of my hometown of Ballwin, Missouri.

On July 14, 2010, Missouri's Second District lost a brave young man when United States Army Sergeant Zach Fisher was killed by an IED while serving during Operation Enduring Freedom.

Sergeant Fisher was assigned to the 27th Engineer Battalion of the 20th Engineer Brigade based out of Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He was, indeed, 24 years old when he died at Forward Operating Base Lagman in Afghanistan.

Zach was, again, from my hometown of Ballwin, Missouri, and he graduated in 2004 from Marquette High School, where his history teacher remembered him as a patriotic student with an interest in how the United States developed as a country.

Zach met his beautiful and loving wife, Jessica, just before his earlier deployment in Iraq. At the time of his death, they had been married for just 2 years.

Zach is survived by his parents, Sue and Jim Jacobs and Bob and Alicia Fisher; three brothers, Andrew, Clayton, and Alexander; and two sisters, Emily and Zoe.

Zach initially enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserves, and when he told his parents that he wanted to report for Active Duty, they asked him to give two good reasons why he would choose to put himself in harm's way for the service of his country. His reply said a lot about the character of the man, Zach Fisher. First, he wanted to join the Army because he wanted the discipline it would provide, and, more importantly, he wanted to be a part of something bigger than himself.

Although the United States of America can never fully repay the priceless debt we owe to Sergeant Fisher, we can do our part to ensure that his memory lives on. Therefore, it is my honor to

sponsor H.R. 5794, a bill that names the Chesterfield main post office after such a courageous young man, immortalizing a hero who gave up his life in service to the Nation that he loved.

All of Zachary's friends would say that Zach was their best friend. He was a dedicated warrior whose commitment to family, friends, and country will be long remembered.

I am proud that this legislation will serve as a testament to the dedication and sacrifice of Sergeant Zachary Fisher, standing as a physical reminder of the bravery of one American from Missouri's Second Congressional District who chose to serve a cause greater than oneself.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5794, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5794.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

FATHER RICHARD MARQUESS-BARRY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4030) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the ''Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4030

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

SECTION 1. FATHER RICHARD MARQUESS-BARRY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, shall be known and designated as the ''Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 4030, introduced by FREDERICA WILSON of Florida, to designate the post office located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building.

The Reverend Canon Richard Livingston Marquess-Barry has led a remarkable life—one of courage, service, and strong faith.

Father Marquess-Barry has been an ordained priest in the Episcopalian church for 39 years. He currently serves as the pastor of the Historic Saint Agnes Episcopal Church in Miami, Florida. In this capacity, Father Marquess-Barry has contributed to bettering the lives of those in his congregation and community, and he has earned a well-respected reputation for bridging the divide between people of different races and religions and of uplifting the downtrodden and underprivileged. The projects and ministries of his church are numerous—among them, spearheading an affordable housing project for low- and moderate-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the dedication and selflessness that Father Marquess-Barry has shown throughout his life, and I urge the support for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I fully support this legislation.

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida, Representative WILSON, and I thank her for sponsoring this legislation.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WELCH for yielding me time as well as Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their support in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4030, a bill to designate the post office at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami Gardens, Florida, as the Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building.

The Reverend Canon Richard Livingston Marquess-Barry was born on November 14, 1940, in Miami, Florida, to Bahamian immigrants. Raised by his grandparents, Reverend Barry attended the Miami-Dade County Public Schools system while working as a garbage collector every morning before school and as a dishwasher after school.

Reverend Barry earned his Bachelor of Arts at St. Augustine College in Raleigh, North Carolina, in 1962. That same year, he married Virla Rolle, his college sweetheart. The couple has been married for 52 years and has one daughter and two grandsons.

Reverend Barry's lifelong devotion to the church began in 1965 when he became the only person of color enrolled at the Virginia Theological Seminary. Three years later, he earned a master's in divinity, and in 1989, he was the youngest person to earn a doctor of divinity degree in the 200-year history of the Virginia Theological Seminary. He has been a visiting fellow at the University of Munich in Germany as well as at Oxford University in England.

In 1977, Reverend Barry took a pay cut in order to lead the Saint Agnes Episcopal Church, the largest and oldest Episcopal congregation for people of color in south Florida. Not only did he transform Saint Agnes and leave it with an endowment upon his retirement, he also worked tirelessly to improve the Overtown community where Saint Agnes is located.

As a young priest, Reverend Barry served his community religiously and also dedicated himself to furthering civil rights despite numerous assassination attempts. He led the effort to integrate the St. Lucie County public school system. He also pressured the city of Fort Pierce and St. Lucie County to adopt fair hiring and promotion practices within the police and fire departments and within all other government agencies. He has also been a champion of improving housing options for underprivileged people in our community.

Among his many awards, Reverend Barry is currently the holder of two keys to Miami-Dade County and of one key to the city of Miami for his many years of devotion and advocacy to the south Florida community. He has been recognized for his work by Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, the NAACP, the Florida State Senate, and President Obama.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Reverend Barry for his decades of service to our community, and I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to designate the Miami post office the Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 4030, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4030.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SCOTT J. WILLIAMS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5562) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, as the ''Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5562

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

SECTION 1. FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SCOTT J. WILLIAMS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, shall be known and designated as the ''Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 5562, which is sponsored by Representative LOIS CAPPS of California, to designate the post office located at 801 West Ocean Avenue, in Lompoc, California, as the Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building.

Senior Officer Specialist Scott J. Williams was killed in the line of duty on April 3 of 1997. While performing routine supervision duties at the U.S. penitentiary in Lompoc, California, an inmate senselessly and brutally attacked Officer Williams, tragically taking his life. Officer Williams was a marine veteran, a former Marine of the Year, who served in Operation Desert Storm. He is survived by his wife and two daughters.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5562 and ensure that this fallen hero is never forgotten.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am in full support of this postal naming.

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California, Representative CAPPS, the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from Vermont for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5562, which would designate the United States Postal Service facility in Lompoc, California, as the Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building.

This is an important bill not only for the community of Lompoc, which resides in my congressional district on the central coast of California, but for the memory of a public servant we lost way too soon. Naming the Lompoc post office in honor of Scott J. Williams is a very fitting tribute.

Scott was a veteran, a civil servant, and a beloved family man who dedicated his life to public service. As a youth, he attended Lompoc High School and Allan Hancock College, both in the 24th Congressional District of California.

His tradition of service began in the Persian Gulf war, with distinction and valor, rising to the rank of corporal in the United States Marine Corps. During his military career, Scott was widely respected by his colleagues and was credited with saving many lives during combat. In fact, his outstanding work as a decorated veteran has been recognized through multiple awards, including being honored as Marine of the Year in 1989. Upon returning home to Lompoc, Scott continued his services to our Nation and began a career in law enforcement as a correctional officer. After 4 years of service at the United States Bureau of Prisons, Scott was tragically killed in the line of duty in 1997.

We are still saddened by the loss of this local hero and this family man. He is sincerely missed by the people of Los Alamos, California, and by the entire Lompoc, California, community.

After years of selfless service to our Nation and to the local community, the naming of the Lompoc Post Office after Officer Scott Williams is a fitting tribute. This recognition would complement the memorial park and the State highway in his name, and it would continue to honor a man whose selfless career was dedicated to keeping our Nation, as well as his own community, safe.

Scott is survived by his wife, Kristy, and their two daughters, Kaitlin and Kallee. This bill also honors them because they have sacrificed as well, and they have shown great perseverance in the face of terrible tragedy.

I thank you for the privilege of speaking on the family's behalf. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to author this bill and to see it here on the floor today. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5562.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD POST OFFICE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5687) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, as the ''Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5687

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

SECTION 1. JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, shall be known and designated as the ''Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 5687, introduced by Representative JANICE HAHN of California, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office.

Juanita Millender-McDonald represented California's 37th District in the House of Representatives for over a decade, serving from 1996 until her untimely death. During her time in Congress, she was known for her commitment to protecting international human rights, and she worked to aid victims of genocide and human trafficking. Representative Millender-McDonald was also the first African American woman to chair the House Administration Committee. Sadly, she passed away on April 22, 2007, at age 68, due to colon cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in memorializing Juanita Millender-McDonald's public service by supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from

California, Representative HAHN, the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today about a friend and predecessor who served some of the same communities that I now represent.

Today, we are voting on a piece of legislation that will recognize the life and legacy of the late Congresswoman, Juanita Millender-McDonald, by designating the United States Postal Service facility located at 101 East Market Street, in Long Beach, as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office.

Many of my colleagues in the House had the opportunity to serve alongside Congresswoman Millender-McDonald. They remember her forceful personality and her unyielding advocacy on behalf of her constituents. However, Juanita, who left us so suddenly and too early, was a remarkable woman who broke barriers and who had many impressive achievements even before entering Congress.

□ 1545

By age 26, Juanita Millender-McDonald was a mother of five. She was already in her forties when, after raising her children, Valerie, Angela, Sherryll, Michael, and R. Keith, she went back to school and earned both her bachelor's and master's degrees with the support of her loving husband, James.

She became a teacher in the Los Angeles Unified School District and later became the manuscript editor for Images, a textbook aimed at promoting the self-esteem of young women, and the director of gender equality programs for the school district.

She broke down barriers for women and minorities and made history by becoming the first African American woman elected to the Carson City Council and, in 2007, became the first African American woman to chair a congressional committee, the Committee on House Administration.

While serving for more than a decade in the House of Representatives, she also served on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Small Business Committee, the committees on which I now currently serve, and she was an active member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

From her days in the California Assembly to serving here in the House, Juanita Millender-McDonald dedicated her career to advocating for the Los Angeles public school system, job training, women's equality, women's health, and combating the drug epidemic that was tearing apart her community. Her advocacy on behalf of the victims of genocide and human trafficking serves as a lasting testament to her dedication to creating a better world.

Congresswoman Millender-McDonald worked tirelessly for her constituents, taking only a week of leave before she succumbed to cancer.

By designating a United States Postal Service facility in my district as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office, we honor an exemplary woman with an incredible public service record.

It is my hope that honoring her now will allow her life and accomplishments to inspire further residents, not only of Long Beach but Americans across the land.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today about a friend and predecessor who served some of the same communities that I now represent.

Today we are voting on a piece of legislation that will recognize the life and legacy of the late Congresswoman Juanita Millender-McDonald, by designating the United States Postal Service facility located at 101 E. Market Street in Long Beach, as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office.

Many of my colleagues in the House had the opportunity to serve alongside Congresswoman Millender-McDonald and remember her forceful personality and her unyielding advocacy on behalf of her constituents.

However, Juanita, who left us so suddenly and too early, was a remarkable woman who broke barriers and had many impressive achievements even before entering Congress.

By age 26, Juanita Millender-McDonald was a mother of five. She was already in her forties, when, after raising her children, she went back to school and subsequently earned bachelor's and master's degrees and did additional studies towards a PhD.

She became a teacher in L.A. USD and later the manuscript editor for Images, a textbook aimed at promoting the self-esteem of young women, and the director of gender equity programs for the school district.

She broke down barriers for women and minorities and made history by becoming the first African-American woman elected to the Carson City Council, and in 2007 became the first African-American woman to chair a Congressional Committee—the House Administration Committee.

While serving for more than a decade in the House of Representatives, she also served on the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee and the Small Business Committee—the committees on which I now serve—and was an active member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

From her days in the California Assembly to serving here in the House, Juanita Millender-McDonald dedicated her career to advocating for the Los Angeles public school system, job training, women's equality and women's health, and combating the drug epidemic that was tearing apart her community. Her advocacy on behalf of the victims of genocide and human trafficking serves as a lasting testament to her dedication to creating a better world.

Congresswoman Millender-McDonald worked tirelessly for her constituents, taking only a week of leave before she succumbed to cancer.

By designating a United States Postal Service facility in my district as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office, we honor an exemplary woman with an incredible public service record.

I know her family, including her husband James McDonald, Jr.; children, Valerie, Angela, Sherryll, Michael and R. Keith; and grandchildren, Ayanna, Myles, Ramia, Blair and Diamond, are so proud of her great legacy.

It is my hope that honoring her now will allow her life and accomplishments to inspire further residents not only of Long Beach but Americans across the land.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), my good friend who is the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of legislation naming this facility after Ms. Juanita Millender-McDonald, a wonderful lady. She served this institution well up until her final moments. Most of us were not aware of the terminal illness she had. She served with grace, dignity, and honor, and our respect. She will be missed.

Mr. WELCH. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5687.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. JESS BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 579) to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 579

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed

to be a reference to the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. 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 H.R. 579.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 579 designates the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. Brown was a civil rights lawyer who worked against racial discrimination and was credited in the 1950s with filing the first civil rights lawsuit in the State of Mississippi.

A native of Oklahoma, Mr. Brown attended Illinois State University, Indiana University, and the Texas Southern University Law School. In the 1960s, he was one of only four African American lawyers in the State of Mississippi and one of three who took civil rights cases.

In 1962, he worked on behalf of James Meredith, whose successful lawsuit allowed him to be the first African American student to enroll at Ole Miss. Later, Mr. Brown worked to fight against discrimination in transportation and other public accommodations.

Given his dedication to the law and his work in civil rights, it is appropriate to name this courthouse after him.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by yielding such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of this bill, H.R. 579, a bill to designate the United States courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Jess Brown was born on September 12, 1912, in Coffeyville, Kansas. His parents, Ernestine and Joe Brown, were jazz musicians and performed in and managed a local theater.

R. Jess Brown received a bachelor's of science in industrial arts from Illinois State Normal University and a master's of science in industrial education from Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana.

After teaching at Alcorn State University, R. Jess Brown moved to Jackson, Mississippi, where he taught industrial arts at Lanier High School, the only Black high school in the city at the time. While teaching at Lanier, R. Jess Brown became an intervening plaintiff in a lawsuit that sought equal pay for Black teachers in Jackson.

After teaching in Jackson, Jess attended Texas Southern University law school. Jess left the law school before receiving his juris doctorate but was able to return to Mississippi and pass the Mississippi Bar in 1953.

Beginning his career in Vicksburg, Mississippi, R. Jess Brown confined his practice to cases involving divorces, deeds, land titles, and other practices that did not agitate White members of the bar. However, after the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka ruling in 1954, Jess felt compelled to defend the civil rights of African Americans.

In the fall of 1955, the conditions and hardships endured by Black lawyers in the courts led Mr. Brown and seven other Black attorneys to establish the Magnolia Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, R. Jess Brown is credited with filing the first civil suit on behalf of African Americans in the State of Mississippi. That lawsuit, on behalf of a Jefferson County minister, challenged laws that prevented Blacks from voting.

Mr. Speaker, Jess Brown has an extensive record as a civil rights lawyer. His list of clients included Clyde Kennard, who was charged with and convicted of a fictitious crime while attempting to desegregate the University of Southern Mississippi; James H. Meredith, whose litigation ultimately led to the integration of the University of Mississippi; Dr. Gilbert Mason, who led the effort to end racial segregation on the beaches of Biloxi, Mississippi; and civil rights icons Medgar Wiley Evers and Dr. Aaron Henry.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brown was admitted to practice law before all Mississippi court systems, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court, and the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Brown also served on the executive board of the National Bar Association for approximately 15 years.

On December 3, 1989, R. Jess Brown died of cancer in Jackson, Mississippi, at the age of 77.

Mr. Speaker, R. Jess Brown is well deserving of this honor, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 579.

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

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

I too rise in support of H.R. 579, to designate the United States courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

R. Jess Brown was a towering figure in the history of the civil rights movement in the South and especially in the State of Mississippi. He was a native son of Kansas, born in Coffeyville, Kansas, and raised in Muskogee, Oklahoma. He attended law school at Texas Southern University and practiced law in Mississippi, starting in 1953 and continuing throughout the latter civil rights era.

As associate counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Mr. Brown filed the first civil rights suit in Mississippi in the 1950s. The suit, filed in Jefferson Davis County, sought the enforcement of the right of Black citizens to become registered voters.

In 1961, Brown represented James Meredith in his suit to be allowed to enter the University of Mississippi. His victory in this case opened the doors of that university to all of Mississippi's citizens. While working with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Brown played a major role in fighting discrimination in the areas of transportation and other public accommodations.

During his lifetime, he received numerous awards and honors, including the NAACP's Lawyer of the Year Award; the National Bar Association C. Francis Stradford Award, which is the Bar Association's highest award; and the Mississippi Teachers Association's award for extraordinary service to education in Mississippi.

R. Jess Brown will be remembered as more than a brilliant attorney and civil rights leader; he will also be remembered as a great American. As such, it is fitting that the United States courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, be designated the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

I support this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 579.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 579.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4926) to designate the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway'' and the ''James L. Oberstar National Scenic Byway'' in the State of Minnesota, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4926

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The segment of Interstate Route 35 between milepost 133 at Forest Lake, Minnesota, and milepost 259 at Duluth, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the segment of Interstate Route 35 referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. 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 before us, H.R. 4926.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4926. This bill designates the segment of Interstate Route 35 between mile post 133 at Forest Lake, Minnesota, and mile post 259 at Duluth, Minnesota, as the James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway.

This is a small but well-deserved and fitting tribute to a former colleague, a leader for many years, first on the staff of the Transportation Committee in the House of Representatives, where he was an aide, and then later succeeded his predecessor in the House of Representatives, the Honorable John Blatnik, who represented the Iron Range for many years, and I think who also has a bridge and some other important locations named after him, and then of course who served on the Transportation Committee as an active member, chairman of many of its subcommittees and, ultimately, chairman of the full committee for many, many years.

I got to know Jim Oberstar personally, and we were competitors on a lot of issues, but we were also very much friends. He was a person with strong family values and a great sense of obligation to the working people of the Iron Range in northern Minnesota.

His father had worked on the mines, one of many who came over from what is now Yugoslavia to work in northern Minnesota, creating enormous wealth for our country, helping to build the steel industry, and arm our Nation and also build the railroads, materials and all the rest, and who shared in that, but only modestly, compared with many, many others.

He was a very interesting man with many, many sterling qualities, a natural linguist. I have been at meetings with Jim Oberstar where the French Ambassador would say, ''Now, where did you learn French? You must have lived in France.'' ''It was at the University of Minnesota,'' that is where he learned French.

He also became a very good speaker of the dialect that people speak down in Haiti. He knew three or four other languages. He had a natural facility for languages.

Jim also had a great interest in transportation policy and in history, and I think, as someone said at his memorial service, he felt everyone that he talked with shared the great love he had for all the details and history and facts of different situations, but he was wrong, but if you were interested, it was fascinating to spend time with Jim Oberstar.

He loved the outdoors. He fought to make sure that the lakes and rivers of northern Minnesota and the Boundary Waters and so on were, to the extent possible, properly managed for the environment, but also available for the working people of that area for their recreation and all the rest, rather than just a few.

He was an example for many of us who served in this House of dedication and putting country and his citizens before self, and he liked to have fun. I had many opportunities to share his love for the outdoors on bicycle trips and other occasions. He was kind enough to come to my district on a number of occasions to help encourage support for different facilities in our area.

He was always a real gentleman, so far as I was concerned in dealing with him, and an example of people who serve in this House from varying backgrounds who have definite and strong feelings, but also who try to make sure that, at the end of the day, they work with people with whom they disagree in order to accomplish something good for our country, and so Jim is sorely missed.

This is a small but fitting memorial for him, and I am sure that he and his wife, Jean, appreciate the fact that the Congress is taking this action today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Wisconsin for his kind words on behalf of not just the Oberstar family, but all the citizens of Minnesota—very kind, very appropriate, and greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield, to begin with, to the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative COLLIN PETERSON, a senior member of the Minnesota congressional delegation and our distinguished colleague.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and also want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his kind words on behalf of the family and the people of the State.

Jim Oberstar passed away this year, as we all know, and we lost a great advocate for transportation and infrastructure. He and I served together for many years in this Congress, and we worked closely together as representatives of rural districts in Minnesota. One thing that I really admired about Congressman Oberstar, he wasn't afraid to take tough positions and do what he thought was right.

As chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, he supported an increase in the gas tax, so that we could ensure long-term sustainable funding for our Nation's transportation needs. That is one thing he and I both agreed on, and I know he met strong resistance for expressing those views.

Beyond his work on the committee, Congressman Oberstar was passionate about his district and the people he represented. He was a tireless advocate, and he made sure that the Eighth District had a voice through his leadership and in the caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the legacy of Jim Oberstar will live on in Minnesota and across the country for decades to come, and I know that he would be proud to have this highway and national scenic byway in Minnesota named in his memory, and as has been indicated, we will all miss his tremendous expertise and advocacy for transportation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of stories we could tell about the Jim Oberstar, and I think it is probably not fully appropriate to do that at this time but just to say that he was a self-made person, he had great intellectual abilities, and he used them well on behalf of his constituents, his State, and our country.

He had an ability, I think, to work very well with people with whom he would disagree on some issues. He was a man of faith and believed that, at the end of the day, we are all sinners, we couldn't expect perfection. There is going to be a certain disagreement there, but, at the other hand, there are some redeeming qualities in us human beings too, and let's look for those and work with others.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank my colleagues for bringing this legislation forward. I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I thank my good friend, Mr. PETRI, whom I deeply regret seeing leave the Congress, as well, because he has contributed so very much to this Congress,

particularly in the field of which we speak today.

Of very few Members can it be said that they grew up in the Congress. One could almost say that about Jim Oberstar who came here as a legislative assistant to the Public Works Committee, then ultimately became its chief of staff, and then decided that he could do the whole thing and become a Member of Congress from the Eighth District of Minnesota.

By the time Jim came to the Congress, he had such an early start that he already knew probably all anyone would expect any Member to know. This early start led to what can only be called breathtaking knowledge and, ultimately, achievements in the transportation and infrastructure field.

He became not only my mentor but, literally, the personal mentor of every Member on each side of the aisle and, ultimately, a mentor to any Member of Congress who wanted to know anything about the Nation's transportation and infrastructure.

At the bottom, Mr. Speaker, transportation and infrastructure is a very technical and specialized field. It takes hard work and brilliance to become a master of the roads, bridges, infrastructure, and bike and running trails of this country, let alone the complexities of intermodalism. It was a marvel to see Jim go at intermodalism. I had the opportunity to see him offer visionary leadership on intermodalism here with Union Station in Washington, D.C., and around the country.

Mr. Speaker, Jim came to subcommittee hearings almost all the time and participated in these hearings with the same depth as the chair of the subcommittee. He never let his encyclopedic knowledge wither.

Mr. Speaker, I have been on the committee ever since I came to Congress in 1991. I can say without any compunction that, if you were around Jim, no matter where you sat in the committee room, you could not avoid his kindness, his warmth, and his depth. Sometimes Jim may have told you more than you wanted to know about transportation and infrastructure, but at the end of the day, you were glad that you listened because you heard him speak, sometimes playfully, in French—he always understood you had better keep using what you once had—but always offering the benefits of his knowledge, and using his great intellectual and personal gifts to bring us all in to the field he had mastered. No wonder Minnesota elected him to serve so long that he became the longest serving Member from the State.

As we struggle still for a highway bill, I hope we will not forget this great Member who began as an ironworker, worked himself through college as an ironworker, organized unions, and never forgot the roots from which he came, and yet came to this Congress and made himself a friend of anyone who would listen.

I am pleased to be associated with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring former Congressman James Louis ''Jim'' Oberstar, my friend and mentor, and mentor to thousands. Jim represented the 8th district of Minnesota for 18 terms, from 1975 until 2011, but his breathtaking knowledge and achievements on transportation and infrastructure made him the nation's mentor on these issues.

Born in Chisholm, Minnesota in 1934, Jim was the son of an iron miner and shirt factory worker. He learned at an early age the power of organizing workers to fight for fair wages and safe workplaces, and never forgot his roots in the working class and in the organizations they asked to represent them at the bargaining table. Jim worked in the Minnesota mines to fund his college education, graduating from the College at St. Thomas in St. Paul with degrees in French and political science.

In 1963, Jim started his career on the Capitol Hill. He worked as legislative assistant and chief of staff for former Congressman John Blatnik, who represented Minnesota's 8th district at the time. He also served as chief of staff of the House Committee on Transportation and Public Works for many years. In 1974, Jim was elected to the House, where he was fully prepared to use his already well-developed knowledge of transportation and infrastructure as a member on the House Committee on Transportation and Public Works.

Jim contributed to the work of building and rebuilding the nation's transportation systems—its road and bridge networks, and, as a cyclist himself, its bike and running trails. Jim's encyclopedic knowledge of the field led him to master the complexities associated with intermodalism, the transportation wave of the future. His work, for example, to make the District of Columbia's Union Station truly intermodal, still in progress, will always be emblematic of his visionary leadership.

From the moment I joined the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, in 1991, I learned from Jim Oberstar and felt his warmth, kindness and depth. Jim not only led us, he nurtured us. Whether smiling as he playfully spoke French or offering the benefits of his commonsense knowledge, Jim's intellectual and personal gifts left us admiring him as a person and in awe of his knowledge and understanding of the field as a professional. Jim's outstanding work in the Congress led the people of Minnesota to make him the longest serving House member from their state, and Jim served the nation with special distinction at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in honoring Jim Oberstar for his many accomplishments for the 8th district of Minnesota and for his devotion to our nation's transportation and infrastructure.

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

It is truly a great honor for me to present to the House this bill to name the stretch of Interstate Highway I–35 from Forest Lake, Minnesota, to Duluth, Minnesota, on behalf of the late former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, James Oberstar.

I do so in the spirit of bipartisanship that Jim epitomized on behalf of the entire Minnesota delegation, all of whom have sponsored this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I will never forget the moment in January 2013 when Jim entered this Chamber for the first time as a former Member of the Congress. He walked quietly through the side door here, and one by one, his colleagues here in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans alike, noticed him and began to spontaneously applaud Jim Oberstar in welcoming him back to the Congress.

I, quite frankly, have never seen anything quite like it, and this gesture of appreciation for the way Jim Oberstar brought us together through his bipartisan leadership and example was one of the more heartwarming and important experiences that I have seen take place here in this Chamber.

□ 1615

Jim was an idea guy. As TOM mentioned, it didn't matter to him if an idea came from a Republican or a Democrat. The only thing that mattered to him was whether or not it was a good idea. If you had an idea, Jim wanted to hear it, and he was ready to work with you to make it happen if he thought it was a good idea.

And that was particularly true with respect to the building and rebuilding and expanding our interstate highway system that he had worked on, as it was pointed out here, as a staff member to that committee earlier in his life for the sole purpose of connecting every corner of this great Nation together from border to border and from sea to sea.

Through recessions, through budget deficits, through gas shortages and challenges of every kind, Jim Oberstar never wavered in his support for the interstate highway system because he understood how vital it is to our ability to create good jobs, to literally drive our economy forward and create the atmosphere for successful business and job creation.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to honor Jim Oberstar by naming the stretch of I–35 that serves as the gateway to the district he so ably represented for 36 years and designate it as the James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4926, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota as the 'James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH F. WEIS JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5146) to designate the United States courthouse located as 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5146

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. 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 before us, H.R. 5146.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5146 designates the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse.

Joseph F. Weis, Jr., served as a Federal judge on the United States Court of Appeals on the Third Circuit from 1973 until assuming senior status in 1988, and he served in that capacity until his death earlier this year in 2014. Prior to his appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Judge Weis was appointed to the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. Prior to his appointment to the Federal bench, he served as a judge on the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County and was in the private practice of law.

Judge Weis also served as a captain in the United States Army during the Second World War and is interred in Arlington National Cemetery. Given Judge Weis' service and dedication to the law, it is fitting to name this courthouse after him.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his support of the legislation during consideration in the committee. I also want to thank every member of the Pennsylvania delegation who cosponsored this bill with me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5146, legislation which would officially designate the Federal courthouse in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, my home district, as the Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse.

This would be fitting recognition for an individual who served his country so well, first as a soldier and then as an outstanding jurist. Throughout his 91 years of life, Joseph F. Weis, Jr., served our country with humility, integrity, and an unfailing sense of duty. As a young man, he enlisted in the Army shortly after Pearl Harbor. Reflecting on that decision later in life, he said plainly: ''It was the thing to do. The country was at war, and I felt I should be out there doing my share.''

He was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor and a Purple Heart with oakleaf cluster after sustaining multiple injuries over the course of his service.

Upon returning back home, Joe Weis pursued a legal career, joining his father's practice after graduating from the University of Pittsburgh Law School in 1950. After becoming a respected trial lawyer, he was elected to the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas in 1968 as the first choice on both the Democratic and Republican ballots. As a judge, he quickly developed a reputation for patience and hard work. He always strove to improve our judicial system, advocating for innovative courthouse technologies and enforcement of judicial ethics.

Two years later, Judge Weis was appointed to the Federal bench, and in 1973 he was appointed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, one step below the Supreme Court. He served on that court for 40 years, retiring just last year when he was 90 years old. He was recognized for his outstanding service on the bench with the Devitt Award, the highest honor given to Federal judges.

Amidst this remarkable list of accomplishments, he was known perhaps most of all for the strength of his character. ''He is, if anything, an overly modest and unassuming individual,'' said the University of Pittsburgh chancellor at his Devitt Award ceremony.

Joe Weis was equally beloved by his colleagues and his law clerks, who to this day still call themselves the ''Weis guys.''

The life of Joseph F. Weis, Jr., is a model that all public servants should aspire to emulate. Naming this Federal courthouse in his honor is a fitting way to recognize his long, faithful, and extremely capable service to our country, to inspire trust in the Federal justice system which he served for so long and with great integrity, and to provide future generations with an outstanding example of a great public servant. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to name the Federal courthouse in Pittsburgh in his honor.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and thank Congressman DOYLE for that fitting tribute to Judge Weis. Because of Judge Weis' dedicated service to the legal community and his exemplary time as a jurist in Pittsburgh, it is fitting to name the courthouse in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 5146.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge all of my colleagues to support the legislation before us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5146.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2901) to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2901

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Sense of Congress.
Sec. 4. Purpose.
Sec. 5. Improving coordination and oversight of safe water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities.

Sec. 6. Increasing sustainability of safe water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities.
Sec. 7. United States complimentary strategies to increase sustainable, affordable, and equitable access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene.
Sec. 8. Transparency and monitoring and evaluation.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533)—

(A) makes access to affordable, equitable, and sustainable clean water, sanitation, and hygiene for developing countries a specific policy objective of United States foreign assistance programs;

(B) requires the United States Government to—

(i) develop a strategy to elevate and further the United States foreign policy and foreign assistance objective to provide affordable and equitable access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in developing countries; and

(ii) improve the effectiveness and targeting of United States assistance programs undertaken in support of that strategy;

(C) codifies Target 10 of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals; and

(D) seeks to reduce by half between 1990 (the baseline year) and 2015—

(i) the proportion of people who are unable to reach or afford safe drinking water; and

(ii) the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation.

(2) For maximum effectiveness of assistance, safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene must be coordinated with and reflected in programs and strategies for food security, global health, environment, education, gender equality, and conflict prevention and mitigation.

(3) On February 2, 2012, the United States national intelligence community released a National Intelligence Estimate on Global Water Security, which found that—

(A) over the next decade, countries of strategic importance to the United States will experience water shortages, poor water quality, or floods, that will risk instability or state failure and increase regional tensions;

(B) water problems may pose a risk to global food markets and economic growth, and may harm the economic performance of important trading partners;

(C) water stresses compound existing problems, such as poverty, social tension, and ill-health and without good management of water food supplies will be reduced and water borne diseases will increase; and

(D) pressure will arise for a more engaged United States to make water a global priority and to support major development projects.

(4) On August 1, 2008, Congress passed House Concurrent Resolution 318, which—

(A) supports the goals and ideals of the International Year of Sanitation; and

(B) recognizes the importance of sanitation on public health, poverty reduction, economic and social development, and the environment.

(5) According to the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, commissioned by the United Nations, more than one-fifth of the world's population relies on freshwater sources that are either polluted or excessively withdrawn. Healthy ecosystems provide multiple water-related services, such as flood control and water purification, upon which human security, health and well-being depend. Therefore, measures aiming to maintain or restore those services ensure the long-term sustainability of strategies to secure safe and reliable access to water and sanitation.

(6) While progress is being made on safe water and sanitation efforts—

(A) more than 783,000,000 people throughout the world lack access to safe drinking water; and

(B) approximately 35 percent of the total global population does not have access to basic sanitation services.

(7) A lack of access to clean water and adequate sanitation has disproportionate, and too often deadly impacts on children:

(A) Water and sanitation-related disease, despite being preventable, remains one of the most significant child health problems worldwide. Diarrhea is the most serious of these diseases, alone killing over 3,000 children each day, and is the second biggest cause of death in children in the post neonatal period, aged one month to 5 years. Ninety percent of all people that die from diarrheal disease are children under the age of 5. Eighty-eight percent of diarrheal disease is attributed to unsafe drinking water, inadequate sanitation and poor hygiene.

(B) Even when bouts of diarrhea don't kill, these episodes can physically and mentally stunt children, affecting them for the rest of their lives.

(C) Having adequate and appropriate water supply and sanitation facilities in schools is a major factor influencing whether children, and especially adolescent girls, attend school.

(D) Adequate sanitation facilities and practices contributes to reducing malnutrition in children, improves the quality of life and dignity of girls and women, protects the environment, and generates economic benefits for communities and nations.

(8) The health and environmental consequences of unsafe drinking water and poor sanitation are significant, accounting for nearly 10 percent of the global burden of disease, and as further indicated by the following:

(A) At any given time, half of the hospital beds in developing countries are occupied by patients suffering from diseases associated with lack of access to safe drinking water, inadequate sanitation, and poor hygiene.

(B) More than 3,575,000 people die each year from water-related disease.

(C) Chronic or acute diarrhea can lead to cognitive delays, with severe repercussions for economic development.

(D) Lack of adequate sanitation contaminates rivers worldwide, as one of the most significant sources of water pollution. Every day, 2,000,000 tons of untreated sewage and industrial and agricultural waste are discharged into the world's freshwaters.

(9) Clean water and sanitation are among the most powerful drivers for human development. They extend opportunity, enhance dignity, and help create a virtuous cycle of improving health and rising wealth.

(10) Diseases linked to unsafe water and poor sanitation, as well as the time and energy women often devote to collecting water, significantly reduce economic productivity in less developed countries and promote lifecycles of disadvantage.

(11) Expanding access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene, while protecting the natural infrastructures that store, deliver, and purify water for nature and people, are essential steps in reducing the global burden of disease, advancing sustainable economic and social development, protecting basic human rights, preventing violence against girls and women, and mitigating sources of conflict associated with water scarcity, mass migration, and water related disasters, both within and between countries.

(12) Nearly 1,000,000,000 people across the globe still suffer from chronic hunger. Water scarcity and poor water management reduce agricultural productivity and add pressures on valuable fisheries, posing a major threat to food security and local livelihoods, and limits the ability of the world to provide the resources necessary for the doubling of food production that will be required to meet the demands of a projected population of 9,000,000,000 people by 2050.

(13) 2.8 billion people in more than 48 countries are expected to face severe and chronic water shortages by 2025, with major impacts on energy and food security, development, livelihoods, human health, and natural infrastructure.

(14) Agriculture consumes 70 percent of all freshwater withdrawn globally. Global increases in the efficiency and productivity of both irrigated and rain-fed agriculture will be needed to meet future food production requirements.

(15) Approximately half the world's population lives in cities, often in slums characterized by unsafe water, poor sanitation, lack of basic services, overcrowding, inferior construction and insecure tenure.

(16) According to the United Nations, women make up 70 percent of the world's poor. Yet, the time they spend collecting water prevents them from undertaking other activities, such as generating income or attending school.

(17) A lack of access to safe water and improved sanitation close to home and at school can impact girls' educational attainment and retention, limiting their ability to break the cycle of poverty. Research has found increases in girls' school enrollment when clean water points were installed closer to home, and increases in girls' school attendance when separate latrines for boys and girls were provided on site. Meeting Target 10 of the Millennium Development Goals for water and sanitation would provide an estimated 272,000,000 additional school days per year.

(18) A lack of water points close to home or safe, private latrines can put women and girls in isolated situations, making them more vulnerable to sexual and physical violence. Violence against women and girls has consequences ranging from psychosocial trauma to heightened risk of HIV/AIDS.

(19) Faith communities and nonprofit development and conservation organizations across the United States contribute significantly to the improvement of water, sanitation, and hygiene in developing countries. By applying their expertise, providing services, building the capacity of local organizations, establishing long-term partnerships with local communities, empowering marginalized groups, supporting sustainable water management and serving as a voice for the poor, faith-based and nonprofit organizations complement and leverage assistance provided by the United States Government.

(20) United States businesses have developed key technologies, donated goods and services, partnered with private and public sector entities, and invested their capital to improve water and sanitation and freshwater sources in many developing countries. Corporate actors have also partnered with other stakeholders to implement sustainable water management and water use efficiency within their plants and throughout their supply chain.

(21) Implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 must be significantly strengthened if the purposes of section 135 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2152h; relating to assistance to provide safe water and sanitation), as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul

Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, are to be met.

(22) The monitoring and evaluation of the performance of United States foreign assistance programs and their contribution to policy, strategies, projects, program goals, and priorities undertaken by the Federal Government is essential to improving aid effectiveness.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In May 2013, the United States Agency for International Development released a Water and Development Strategy, whose goal is ''to save lives and advance development through improvements in water supply, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) programs, and through sound management and use of water for food security.''.

(2) The Water and Development Strategy states that it supports the efforts of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 ''by advancing many activities consistent with the goals of the Act.''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the initial United States Agency for International Development's Water and Development Strategy, released in May 2013—

(A) is a significant accomplishment and improves the Agency's capacity to provide sustainable and effective water, sanitation, and hygiene assistance;

(B) is supportive of and should continue to reinforce the United States foreign policy and development objectives for clean water, sanitation, and hygiene;

(C) should be refined and expanded by the United States Agency for International Development as often as necessary to ensure best practices are used and the purposes of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533) and this Act are met, should target the world's poorest and those suffering from the lowest levels of access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene, and should be updated by the Agency not later than every 5 years, to more fully meet the requirements and spirit of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and section 135 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2152h), as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005; and

(D) is not, on its own, the holistic United States water strategy required by the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, but instead addresses components of a comprehensive strategy for how the United States plans to support the United States foreign policy and development objectives and measure its success towards the objectives required by the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act, and must be complimented by the development of a whole-of-government United States Government global water strategy aimed at creating an enabling environment through diplomatic channels for the Agency's water, sanitation, and hygiene programming that will better allow the Agency to succeed in its mission; and

(2) the Secretary of State, acting through the Special Advisor for Water Resources (established by 136(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961), as added by section 5(a)(2)(C) of this Act, and in collaboration and consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, should develop a Global Water Resources Strategy relating to United States foreign policy objectives for water, pursuant to section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, as added by section 7 of this Act, that—

(A) articulates a vision for the role played by the Department of State, including in its power as a convener, in addressing the foreign policy and national security issues identified in the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act, the 2012 National Intelligence Estimate on Global Water Security, and other relevant whole-of-government assessments, strategies, and approaches;

(B) is an ambitious United States foreign policy framework that advances the objectives of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act to provide sustainable access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to poor and marginalized people through improved United States diplomatic efforts to build political will and coordination across the Federal Government to better enable United States Government agencies and partners to meet their international development objectives;

(C) is complementary to, supportive of, and does not inhibit, the Water and Development Strategy, and establishes clear roles and responsibilities insofar as possible among Federal agencies and departments responsible for jointly carrying out the strategy, as required by section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, as added by section 7 of this Act.

SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act and the amendments made by this Act is to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533) by—

(1) improving coordination and oversight of international water, sanitation, hygiene, and sustainable water management programs within and between United States Government agencies;

(2) increasing the sustainability of United States Government-supported water, sanitation, and hygiene programs, including in terms of affordability, accountability, and financial, operational, institutional, and environmental sustainability;

(3) enhancing water, sanitation, and hygiene expertise within the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State, which shall include a whole of agency approach to establish a learning agenda aimed at increasing the quality, effectiveness, and sustainability of the United States Government-supported water, sanitation, and hygiene programs; and

(4) ensuring water, sanitation, and hygiene programs and strategies are reflected in and supported by other development initiatives such as food security, global health, environment, education, gender quality, and conflict prevention and mitigation within and between countries, with the goal of meeting the needs of the poorest and most marginalized people.

SEC. 5. IMPROVING COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT OF SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 135, as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2536; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as section 136; and

(2) in section 136, as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section—

(A) in the section heading, by striking ''AND SANITATION'' and inserting '', SANITATION, AND HYGIENE'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''and sanitation'' and inserting '', sanitation, and hygiene''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(e) GLOBAL WATER COORDINATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) shall designate a senior advisor to coordinate and oversee the Agency's programs in developing countries that seek to provide affordable and equitable access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, who shall be known as the 'Global Water Coordinator', who shall administer and oversee an office to be known as the Office of Water, Sanitation, and Development, and who shall report directly to the Administrator and the Assistant Administrator overseeing water programs.

''(2) DUTIES.—The Global Water Coordinator shall—

''(A) oversee implementation of this section, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013;

''(B) oversee the buildup of capacity and expertise within USAID to implement this section, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, including—

''(i) by appointing USAID mission water advisors in each high priority country, who—

''(I) shall have or be given the opportunity to fully develop their technical skills and competencies necessary to provide appropriate guidance to technical and program staff to ensure the Water and Development Strategy can be successfully implemented; and

''(II) shall ensure water, sanitation, and hygiene objectives and indicators are reflected throughout program planning and budgeting documents;

''(ii) work with USAID regional bureaus, who shall be the primary liaisons between the Global Water Coordinator and mission water advisors, to ensure water, sanitation, and hygiene projects are reflected in country-specific multiyear strategies, multiyear sector strategies, and project designs in each high priority country; and

''(iii) ensure that water, sanitation, hygiene and water management issues are incorporated into all relevant Agency training programs at the office, regional, and mission levels;

''(C) lead the implementation of the Water and Development Strategy and oversee the review and development no later than every 5 years of an updated Water and Development Strategy such that it more clearly meets the requirements of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act;

''(D) assist and monitor the development of country-specific and, where appropriate, regional water strategies, whether independent, or as part of broader USAID country-specific or regional strategies, in coordination with relevant USAID mission directors, other appropriate personnel, and pursuant to the interagency consultation and coordination process as required by section 5(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, ensuring such strategies reflect best practices as they relate to increasing access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene activities, and sustainable water management;

''(E) ensure sustainable and equitable access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene are reflected in strategies and broader USAID policies or strategies, including policies or strategies relating to food security,

global health, environment, education, gender equality, and conflict prevention and mitigation;

''(F) develop appropriate benchmarks, measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for water, sanitation, and hygiene programs in accordance with and as required by sections 6 and 7 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note);

''(G) ensure programming for sustainable water management, and equitable access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene are reflected across USAID programming in a manner consistent with the long-term sustainability of service outcomes and freshwater sources; and

''(H) foster the development, dissemination, and increased and consistent use of low-cost and sustainable technologies, public and private partnerships, credit guarantees and other financing arrangements that leverage non-Federal funds for impact on equitable access to affordable water, sanitation, and hygiene services that will provide long-term benefits to the world's poorest communities.

''(3) STAFF.—The Administrator shall ensure that a sufficient number of employees with appropriate experience or expertise are reassigned or detailed from within USAID to assist the Global Water Coordinator in carrying out the duties of paragraph (2).

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'high priority country' means a low-income or lower-middle income country designated pursuant to section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) and enumerated in the strategy required by such Act, the first iteration of which was released by USAID in May 2013; and

''(B) the term 'Water and Development Strategy' means the strategy released by USAID in May 2013 and its revisions, required to be developed as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter under section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note).

''(f) SPECIAL ADVISOR FOR WATER RESOURCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall designate a senior advisor to develop, coordinate, and oversee United States foreign policy relating to freshwater resources and policies complementary to, and in support of, the United States Agency for International Development's Water and Development Strategy, who shall be known as the 'Special Advisor for Water Resources', and who shall report directly to the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary overseeing water programs.

''(2) DUTIES.—The Special Advisor for Water Resources shall—

''(A) oversee and coordinate the development and implementation of approaches to increasing political will and government support in partner countries in accordance with United States foreign policy on drinking water, sanitation, hygiene, water resource management, and transboundary water, including—

''(i) working with partner countries and other stakeholders to develop, sustain, and leverage political and financial commitments that would improve access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene, and sustainable water management over the long term;

''(ii) assisting and encouraging other countries and international organizations to plan and manage water resources in an efficient, transparent, equitable, inclusive, and environmentally sustainable manner, taking into account the interdependence among water, food, energy, and sustainable development;

''(iii) fostering regional and cross-border cooperation for integrated management, use and protection of internationally shared rivers, lakes, and aquifer systems;

''(iv) preventing and mitigating intra- and trans-boundary conflict over water resources, including through efforts to strengthen international water law and institutions as tools for facilitating cooperation;

''(v) working with partner countries, international organizations, and other stakeholders to manage water resources in ways that reduce risk and impact from potential water-related shocks such as, but not limited to, droughts or floods, including for improved global food security; and

''(vi) fostering increased agricultural and urban productivity of water resources;

''(B) promote and be the representative for United States policy relating to global freshwater issues in key diplomatic and scientific forums; and

''(C) lead the development and implementation of the Global Water Resources Strategy required by section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) and oversee the review of and update to not later than every 5 years the Global Water Resources Strategy to reflect pressing global challenges and changes.

''(3) STAFF.—The Secretary of State shall ensure that a sufficient number of employees of the Department of State with appropriate experience or expertise are reassigned or detailed from within the Department of State to assist the Special Advisor for Water Resources in carrying out the duties of paragraph (2).

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'Water and Development Strategy' means the strategy released by USAID in May 2013 and its revisions, required to be developed as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter under section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note); and

''(B) the term 'Global Water Resources Strategy' means the strategy required under section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note).''.

(b) INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of State shall develop and implement a process to ensure regular consultation and coordination between the Global Water Coordinator and the Special Advisor for Water Resources so that their efforts are complimentary and in support of the implementation, and subsequent revision not later than every 5 years, of the Global Water Resources Strategy and the Water and Development Strategy.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The process required under paragraph (1) should include jointly convened meetings with any Federal department or agency administering United States water, sanitation, and hygiene programs to evaluate progress in carrying out the strategies described in paragraph (1), or the revision to any such strategy, as required by section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term ''Global Water Coordinator'' means the Global Water Coordinator designated under section 136(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section;

(B) the term ''Global Water Resources Strategy'' means the strategy required under section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act;

(C) the term ''Special Advisor for Water Resources'' means the Special Advisor for Water Resources designated under section 136(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section; and

(D) the term ''Water and Development Strategy'' means the strategy released by USAID in May 2013 and its revisions, required to be developed as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter under section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act.

SEC. 6. INCREASING SUSTAINABILITY OF SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) PRINCIPLES.—In order to ensure that water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities of the United States Agency for International Development carried out under the authorities of section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by section 5 of this Act, and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by this Act, achieve maximum impact and continue to deliver lasting benefits after completion, such projects and activities shall be carried out in accordance with, and monitored and evaluated against the following principles:

(1) Projects and activities should be targeted to the poorest and most vulnerable countries and communities, including women and girls, displaced persons and refugees, and other marginalized populations.

(2) Projects and activities should be designed in consultation with a broad range of local and national stakeholders, including communities directly affected by a lack of access to clean water, sanitation or hygiene, nongovernmental organizations, cooperatives, foundations, universities, private sector entities, and women-focused organizations.

(3) Projects and activities to provide services for the poor should be designed wherever possible to be financially or commercially viable over the long term, focusing on local ownership and sustainability, and undertaken in conjunction with relevant public institutions or private enterprise so long as they can provide access to water, sanitation, and hygiene in such a way that strengthens social equity of access and keeps these services affordable to all, especially the poorest of the poor.

(4) Governments of countries in which projects and activities are carried out should identify revenue streams sufficient to cover the costs of maintaining public equipment and services with respect to such projects and activities over the long term.

(5) Projects and activities should provide for a functioning management and maintenance system comprising tools, supply chains, transport, equipment, training and individuals or institutions with clear responsibilities for achieving sustainability.

(6) With respect to projects and activities that are managed by communities or institutions, effective external support should be provided to such communities or institutions.

(7) Projects should be designed to provide access to water, sanitation, and hygiene, and sustainable water management through joint programs and other coordinated mechanisms and policies, in order to ensure the long-term sustainability of the results achieved, to mitigate any negative environmental impacts, and to ensure the resilience of natural and man-made infrastructure to floods, droughts, and other water-related disasters.

(8) Access to water and sanitation should be expanded in an equitable manner and on the basis of need, without regard to race, gender, religion, or ethnic origin.

(b) LOCAL OWNERSHIP.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall establish guidelines and procedures to ensure that—

(1) a broad range of local and national stakeholders is consulted in the development of any country-specific water strategy;

(2) any water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities authorized under each such strategy are designed to address the specific needs of women and girls; and

(3) local civil society organizations, including nonprofit organizations as well as businesses, are full participants in the selection and design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities.

(c) LOCAL PROCUREMENT.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—In providing assistance under the authorities of section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by section 5 of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to award contracts and other acquisition instruments on a noncompetitive basis to local entities in high priority countries to carry out safe water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities in such countries.

(2) LIMITATION.—A contract or other instrument described in paragraph (1) may not have a value that exceeds $5,000,000.

(3) SUPERSEDES OTHER LAWS.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development may exercise the authority of paragraph (1) notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term ''high priority country'' means a low-income or lower-middle income country designated pursuant to section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act; and

(B) the term ''local entity'' means an individual, corporation, or other entity that—

(i) is organized under the laws of the high priority country;

(ii) has its principal place of business or operations in such country; and

(iii) is owned or controlled by citizens of such country.

(5) FUNDING.—Funds made available to carry out the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) for any fiscal year are authorized to be made available to carry out this subsection.

(d) RETENTION OF INTEREST.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—In providing assistance under the authorities of section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by section 5 of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to enter into agreements with indigenous local private or public groups, associations, or other entities in high priority countries to provide for the retention by such group, association, or other entity, without deposit in the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by law, of interest earned on such assistance so provided.

(2) LIMITATION.—An agreement described in paragraph (1) may not have a value that exceeds $5,000,000.

(3) USE OF INTEREST.—Any interest earned on the advance of funds under an agreement authorized under paragraph (1) may be used only for the purposes for which the agreement is made.

(4) AUDITS.—The Administrator shall, on a regular and recurring basis, audit interest earned on advance funds under an agreement authorized under paragraph (1) to ensure that the requirements of paragraph (3) are met.

(5) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''high priority country'' means a low-income or lower-middle income country designated pursuant to section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act.

SEC. 7. UNITED STATES COMPLIMENTARY STRATEGIES TO INCREASE SUSTAINABLE, AFFORDABLE, AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE.

Section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 6. UNITED STATES COMPLIMENTARY STRATEGIES TO INCREASE SUSTAINABLE, AFFORDABLE, AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE.

''(a) GLOBAL WATER RESOURCES STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, and every 5 years thereafter, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, shall develop a strategy to further the United States foreign policy objective to provide affordable and equitable access to safe water and sanitation in developing countries, as described in section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and by the Agency's Water and Development Strategy required under subsection (b).

''(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) articulate the United States foreign policy framework that will drive the implementation of the United States foreign policy objectives on increasing access to equitable, clean drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene for the world's poorest, water resource management, transboundary water and prevention of conflict over water resources; and

''(B) address ways in which United States foreign policy efforts will promote global water security by building political will and partnerships, and support for national level planning processes, in conjunction with the United States Agency for International Development and other Federal agencies, and leveraging expertise, knowledge, technology and resources that will increase the likelihood that the world's poor receive or continue to have the water they need, when and where they need it, in a sustainable, equitable and conflict-free manner.

''(3) CONSULTATION.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall be developed in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies, international organizations, international financial institutions, recipient governments, United States and international nongovernmental organizations, indigenous civil society, and other appropriate entities, and shall be complimentary to, or ultimately joined with, the Agency's Water and Development Strategy required under subsection (b) and subsequent revisions thereto.

''(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Under Secretary of State who has responsibility to oversee water programs and the Special Advisor for Water Resources, shall implement the strategy required under paragraph (1). The strategy may also be implemented in part by other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate.

''(5) CONSISTENT WITH SAFE WATER AND SANITATION POLICY.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall be consistent with the policy stated in section 3 of this Act.

''(6) CONTENT.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, and timetables to achieve the objective described in paragraph (1);

''(B) an assessment of the level of funding and other assistance for United States water and sanitation programs needed each by the United States Department of State year to achieve the goals, benchmarks, and timetables described in subparagraph (A);

''(C) methods to coordinate and integrate United States water, water resources and sanitation assistance carried out by the Department of State with water, sanitation, hygiene and water resource development programs carried out by the United States Agency for International Development and other Federal agencies to achieve the objective described in paragraph (1);

''(D) methods to better coordinate United States water and sanitation assistance programs with programs of other donor countries and entities to achieve the objective described in paragraph (1); and

''(E) an assessment of the commitment of governments of countries that receive assistance under section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to policies or policy reforms that support affordable and equitable access by the people of such countries to safe water and sanitation.

''(b) WATER AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, acting through the Global Water Coordinator and in consultation with the Special Advisor for Water Resources, shall develop a strategy, to be known as the 'Water and Development Strategy', to further, through the United States Agency for International Development, the United States foreign assistance objective to provide affordable, equitable, and sustainable access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene in developing countries, as described in section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Such strategy shall be complimentary to the United States foreign policy objectives of the safe water and sanitation strategy required under subsection (a) and shall be transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and made publicly available on the Internet.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall provide an ambitious vision for leadership of the international development objectives of this Act and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013 and meet the following requirements:

''(A) CONSISTENCY WITH SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE POLICY.—The strategy shall be consistent with the policy stated in section 3 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note).

''(B) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—The strategy shall identify low-income and lower-middle income countries with a severe lack of access to affordable, equitable, and sustainable safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene, by assessing—

''(i) the government or nongovernmental organizational capacity or commitment to manage and implement affordable, equitable, and sustainable solutions, in accordance with section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013;

''(ii) opportunities to leverage existing indigenous public sector, local, donor or private sector investments in the water, sanitation and water resource management sector;

''(iii) the number of people and percent of the population without access to an improved source of safe drinking water in or close to home, disaggregated by rural, peri-urban, or urban geographic location;

''(iv) the number of people and percent of the population without access to an improved source of sanitation in or close to home, disaggregated by rural, peri-urban, or urban geographic location;

''(v) the mortality rate and number of deaths of children under 5 years old due to diarrhea;

''(vi) the mortality rate and number of deaths of children under 5 years old due to pneumonia;

''(vii) the number and proportion of children under 5 years old who are under-nourished;

''(viii) the average time burden of water collection in rural areas;

''(ix) the coexistence in a single geographic area of two or more diseases categorized as a neglected tropical disease spread in whole or in part due to lack of access to safe drinking water, sanitation or hygiene, as defined by the Agency; and

''(x) the degree to which water, sanitation, and hygiene programs are identified as a priority by a beneficiary government, region, or community, as identified in national plans and strategies and the country-specific multiyear strategies as developed by the Agency mission in consultation with the national government and civil society.

''(C) DESIGNATING HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—The strategy shall select 10 to 20 of the eligible countries identified through the assessment required by subparagraph (B) and identify such countries as 'high priority countries'.

''(D) REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—Each country selected as a high priority country shall be the focus of the Agency's water, sanitation, and hygiene programming, and the strategy shall develop comprehensive and holistic individual country plans for each high priority country so as to meet the objectives of paragraph (1). Such plans shall include—

''(i) a results framework, in accordance with the sustainability principles identified in section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, and monitoring and evaluation principles identified in section 7 of this Act, which shall include indicators composed of those criteria used in paragraph (2) to identify high priority countries, that shall be used to measure the long-term impacts and sustainability of programs, including the ongoing commitment of host-country institutions, or lack thereof, and increased access to water, sanitation, and hygiene projects, programs and services provided directly or leveraged by the United States Government; and

''(ii) a clearly described process by which the strategy shall be aligned, coordinated, and leveraged with United States development strategies, policies, and international development initiatives that operate within the high priority country, to include coordination with and reflected in the high priority country's comprehensive strategy for United States Government-supported development assistance.

''(E) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—For each high priority country, the Agency's mission director for such country shall—

''(i) designate sustainably increasing access to safe drinking water and sanitation as a strategic objective, reflected in country-specific strategies that incorporate sustainable water management goals and targets in accordance with this Act; and

''(ii) ensure, where complimentary, that the benefits of safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene are reflected in other development initiatives.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO INITIAL STRATEGY.—The Agency's Water and Development Strategy, issued in May 2013, shall be deemed to be the initial strategy required under paragraph (1) and shall be updated in a timely manner as required by paragraph (1).

''(4) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of transmission of the initial strategy required under paragraph (1), the Global Water Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an implementation plan detailing how the United States Agency for International Development will institutionalize the strategy, including—

''(A) the budget resources needed to achieve the goals, benchmarks, and timetables described in this subsection, and an assessment of what will likely be achieved at current funding levels; and

''(B) the number, types, and levels of specialists and generalists currently employed, and projected to be needed, in each functional and geographic area, including support, management, and administrative functions, to carry out the strategy.

''(5) COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In developing the strategy required under paragraph (1)), and the implementation plan required under paragraph (4), the Global Water Coordinator shall—

''(i) consult with relevant Executive agencies;

''(ii) consult with the Special Advisor for Water Resources;

''(iii) consult with the Interagency Consultation and Coordination process as required by section 5(b) of the Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013; and

''(iv) consult with representatives of civil society and multi-lateral organizations with demonstrated experience in addressing the lack of access to affordable, equitable and sustainable safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene in developing countries.

''(B) PUBLIC COMMENT.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(D), the Global Water Coordinator shall allow public comments to be submitted for consideration through a mechanism of the Global Water Coordinator's choosing, except that such comment period shall last not less than 45 days.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) GLOBAL WATER COORDINATOR.—The term 'Global Water Coordinator' means the Global Water Coordinator designated under section 136(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

''(2) SPECIAL ADVISOR FOR WATER RESOURCES.—The term 'Special Advisor for Water Resources' means the Special Advisor for Water Resources designated under section 136(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.''.

SEC. 8. TRANSPARENCY AND MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

Section 7 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 7. TRANSPARENCY AND MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

''(a) TRANSPARENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall, as part of the Agency's Internet Web site, establish and maintain a Web page to make publicly available comprehensive, timely, comparable, and accessible information on United States water, sanitation, and hygiene foreign assistance programs. The head of each Federal department or agency that administers such programs shall on a quarterly basis publish and update on the Web page such information with respect to programs of the department or agency.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To ensure transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of United States water, sanitation, and hygiene foreign assistance programs, the information required by paragraph (1) shall include—

''(i) the strategy required by section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note);

''(ii) a list of countries that meet the criteria outlined in section 6(b)(2)(B) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005;

''(iii) an identification of each country designated as a high priority country under section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, including a fully articulated rationale of why each country received the designation;

''(iv) for each fiscal year, information on the amount of funds expended in each country or program to carry out this Act and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, disaggregated by purpose of assistance, including information on capital investments, and the source of such funds by account; and

''(v) evaluations of water, sanitation, and hygiene programs.

''(B) POSTING REQUIREMENTS.—Such information shall be published on the Web page not later than 30 days after the date of issuance of the information and shall be continuously updated.

''(C) REPORT IN LIEU OF INCLUSION.—If the head of a Federal department or agency described in paragraph (1) makes a determination that the inclusion of a required item of information on the Web page would jeopardize the health or security of an implementing partner or program beneficiary or would be detrimental to the national interests of the United States, such item of information may be submitted to Congress in a written report in lieu of including it on the Web page, along with the reasons for not including it on the Web page.

''(3) DATABASE.—The Web page shall also contain a link to a searchable database available to the public containing such information relating to the current fiscal year and, as available, for each prior fiscal year dating to and including fiscal year 2006.

''(4) FORM.—Such information shall be published on the Web page in unclassified form. Any information determined to be classified information may be submitted to Congress

in classified form and an unclassified summary of such information shall be published on the Web page.

''(b) MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With regard to water, sanitation, and hygiene programming, the Global Water Coordinator shall ensure that the Agency monitors and evaluates projects and activities carried out under such programs, including carrying out assessments of impact where appropriate, and ensuring results of evaluations are used to inform the design of such projects and activities. Such monitoring and evaluations shall—

''(A) be carried out in accordance with, and measured against the principles described in section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and, where appropriate, the goals established section 6(b)(2)(D) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005; and

''(B) conduct longer term monitoring and evaluation of its water activities in order to assess sustainability beyond the typical Agency program cycle and to enable reasonable support to issues that arise post implementation.

''(2) MANDATORY SET-ASIDE FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—Each water, sanitation, and hygiene project shall be planned and budgeted to include funding for both short- and long-term monitoring and evaluation so that the United States Government and other stakeholders can ascertain the long-term return on investment of United States assistance funds and to enable learning about the sustainability of assistance programs and projects that shall inform future projects and programs.

''(3) WHEN TO CONDUCT EVALUATIONS.—The evaluation of water, sanitation, and hygiene projects should include measurable goals and performance metrics, to be tracked against an established baseline at the outset. Such evaluations should occur immediately following the completion of a project, and no fewer than half of all water, sanitation, and hygiene projects shall be reevaluated 5 years after the completion of the project, all in accordance with the requirements and metrics enumerated in paragraph (1).

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) MONITORING.—The term 'monitoring' means, with respect to a United States water, sanitation, or hygiene foreign assistance program, a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

''(B) EVALUATION.—The term 'evaluation' means, with respect to a United States water, sanitation, or hygiene foreign assistance program, the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of the program and projects under the program as a basis for judgments, to improve effectiveness, and to inform decisions about current and future programming, including an explanation of the reasons for or causes of the observed results.''.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) water and sanitation are critically important resources that impact many other aspects of human life; and

(2) the United States should be a global leader in helping provide sustainable access to clean water and sanitation for the world's most vulnerable populations.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE SAFE WATER AND SANITATION TO INCLUDE HYGIENE.

Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 135 (22 U.S.C. 2152h), as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as section 136; and

(2) in section 136, as redesignated—

(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**AND SANITATION**'' and inserting ''**, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE**''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''and sanitation'' and inserting '', sanitation, and hygiene''.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT OF SAFE WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT.—

''(1) USAID GLOBAL WATER COORDINATOR.—

''(A) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this paragraph as 'USAID') or the Administrator's designee, who shall be a current USAID employee serving in a career or non-career position in the Senior Executive Service or at the level of a Deputy Assistant Administrator or higher, shall serve concurrently as the USAID Global Water Coordinator (referred to in this subsection as the 'Coordinator').

''(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall—

''(i) provide direction and guidance to, coordinate, and oversee the projects and programs of USAID authorized under this section;

''(ii) lead the implementation and revision, not less frequently than once every 5 years, of USAID's portion of the Global Water Strategy required under subsection (j);

''(iii) seek—

''(I) to expand the capacity of USAID, subject to the availability of appropriations, including through the designation of a lead subject matter expert selected from among USAID staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h);

''(II) to implement such programs and activities;

''(III) to take advantage of economies of scale; and

''(IV) to conduct more efficient and effective projects and programs;

''(iv) coordinate with the Department of State and USAID staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h) to ensure that USAID activities and projects, USAID program planning and budgeting documents, and USAID country development strategies reflect and seek to implement—

''(I) the safe water, sanitation, and hygiene objectives established in the strategy required under subsection (j), including objectives relating to the management of water resources; and

''(II) international best practices relating to—

''(aa) increasing access to safe water and sanitation;

''(bb) conducting hygiene-related activities; and

''(cc) ensuring appropriate management of water resources; and

''(v) develop appropriate benchmarks, measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for USAID projects and programs authorized under this section.

''(2) DEPARTMENT OF STATE SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR WATER RESOURCES.—

''(A) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of State or the Secretary's designee, who shall be a current employee of the Department of State serving in a career or non-career position in the Senior Executive Service or at the level of a Deputy Assistant Secretary or higher, shall serve concurrently as the Department of State Special Advisor for Water Resources (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Special Advisor').

''(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Special Advisor shall—

''(i) provide direction and guidance to, coordinate, and oversee the projects and programs of the Department of State authorized under this section;

''(ii) lead the implementation and revision, not less than every 5 years, of the Department of State's portion of the Global Water Strategy required under subsection (j);

''(iii) prioritize and coordinate the Department of State's international engagement on the allocation, distribution, and access to global fresh water resources and policies related to such matters;

''(iv) coordinate with United States Agency for International Development and Department of State staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h) to ensure that United States diplomatic efforts related to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including efforts related to management of water resources and watersheds and the resolution of intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources, are consistent with United States national interests; and

''(v) represent the views of the United States Government on the allocation, distribution, and access to global fresh water resources and policies related to such matters in key international fora, including key diplomatic, development-related, and scientific organizations.

''(3) ADDITIONAL NATURE OF DUTIES AND RESTRICTION ON ADDITIONAL OR SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION.—The responsibilities and specific duties of the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (or the Administrator's designee) and the Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee) under paragraph (2) or (3), respectively, shall be in addition to any other responsibilities or specific duties assigned to such individuals. Such individuals shall receive no additional or supplemental compensation as a result of carrying out such responsibilities and specific duties under such paragraphs.''.

SEC. 5. PROMOTING THE MAXIMUM IMPACT AND LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF USAID SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE-RELATED PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.

Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) PRIORITIES AND CRITERIA FOR MAXIMUM IMPACT AND LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that the Agency for International Development's projects and programs authorized under this section are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability by—

''(1) prioritizing countries on the basis of the following clearly defined criteria and indicators, to the extent sufficient empirical data are available—

''(A) the proportion of the population using an unimproved drinking water source;

''(B) the total population using an unimproved drinking water source;

''(C) the proportion of the population without piped water access;

''(D) the proportion of the population using shared or other unimproved sanitation facilities;

''(E) the total population using shared or other unimproved sanitation facilities;

''(F) the proportion of the population practicing open defecation;

''(G) the total number of children younger than 5 years of age who died from diarrheal disease;

''(H) the proportion of all deaths of children younger than 5 years of age resulting from diarrheal disease;

''(I) the national government's capacity, capability, and commitment to work with the United States to improve access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including—

''(i) the government's capacity and commitment to developing the indigenous capacity to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors; and

''(ii) the degree to which such government—

''(I) identifies such efforts as a priority; and

''(II) allocates resources to such efforts;

''(J) the availability of opportunities to leverage existing public, private, or other donor investments in the water, sanitation, and hygiene sectors, including investments in the management of water resources; and

''(K) the likelihood of making significant improvements on a per capita basis on the health and educational opportunities available to women as a result of increased access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including access to appropriate facilities at primary and secondary educational institutions seeking to ensure that communities benefitting from such projects and activities develop the indigenous capacity to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors;

''(2) prioritizing and measuring, including through rigorous monitoring and evaluating mechanisms, the extent to which such project or program—

''(A) furthers significant improvements in—

''(i) the criteria set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1);

''(ii) the health and educational opportunities available to women as a result of increased access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including access to appropriate facilities at primary and secondary educational institutions; and

''(iii) the indigenous capacity of the host nation or community to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors;

''(B) is designed, as part of the provision of safe water and sanitation to the local community—

''(i) to be financially independent over the long term, focusing on local ownership and sustainability;

''(ii) to be undertaken in conjunction with relevant public institutions or private enterprises;

''(iii) to identify and empower local individuals or institutions to be responsible for the effective management and maintenance of such project or program; and

''(iv) to provide safe water or expertise or capacity building to those identified parties or institutions for the purposes of developing a plan and clear responsibilities for the effective management and maintenance of such project or program;

''(C) leverages existing public, private, or other donor investments in the water, sanitation, and hygiene sectors, including investments in the management of water resources;

''(D) avoids duplication of efforts with other United States Government agencies or departments or those of other nations or nongovernmental organizations;

''(E) coordinates such efforts with the efforts of other United States Government agencies or departments or those of other nations or nongovernmental organizations directed at assisting refugees and other displaced individuals; and

''(F) involves consultation with appropriate stakeholders, including communities directly affected by the lack of access to clean water, sanitation or hygiene, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations; and

''(3) seeking to further the strategy required under subsection (j) after 2018.

''(g) USE OF CURRENT AND IMPROVED EMPIRICAL DATA COLLECTION AND REVIEW OF NEW STANDARDIZED INDICATORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to use current and improved empirical data collection—

''(A) to meet the health-based prioritization criteria established pursuant to subsection (f)(1); and

''(B) to review new standardized indicators in evaluating progress towards meeting such criteria.

''(2) CONSULTATION AND NOTICE.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) regularly consult with the appropriate congressional committees; and

''(B) notify such committees not later than 30 days before using current or improved empirical data collection for the review of any new standardized indicators under paragraph (1) for the purposes of carrying out this section.

''(h) DESIGNATION OF HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—

''(1) INITIAL DESIGNATION.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the President shall—

''(A) designate, on the basis of the criteria set forth in subsection (f)(1) not fewer than 10 countries as high priority countries to be the primary recipients of United States Government assistance authorized under this section during fiscal year 2016; and

''(B) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such designations.

''(2) ANNUAL DESIGNATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President shall annually make new designations pursuant to the criteria set forth in paragraph (1).

''(B) DESIGNATIONS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2018.—Beginning with fiscal year 2019, designations under paragraph (1) shall be made—

''(i) based upon the criteria set forth in subsection (f)(1); and

''(ii) in furtherance of the strategy required under subsection (j).

''(i) TARGETING OF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS TO AREAS OF GREATEST NEED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days before the obligation of any funds for water, sanitation, or hygiene projects or programs pursuant to this section in countries that are not ranked in the top 50 countries based upon the WASH Needs Index, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the planned obligation of such funds.

''(2) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection and in subsection (j), the term 'WASH Needs Index' means the needs index for water, sanitation, or hygiene projects or programs authorized under this section that has been developed using the criteria and indicators described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (f)(1).''.

SEC. 6. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO INCREASE APPROPRIATE LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCESS TO SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) GLOBAL WATER STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2017, October 1, 2022, and October 1, 2027, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, shall submit a single government-wide Global Water Strategy to the appropriate congressional committees that provides a detailed description of how the United States intends—

''(A) to increase access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in high priority countries designated pursuant to subsection (h), including a summary of the WASH Needs Index and the specific weighting of empirical data and other definitions used to develop and rank countries on the WASH Needs Index;

''(B) to improve the management of water resources and watersheds in such countries; and

''(C) to work to prevent and resolve, to the greatest degree possible, both intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources in such countries.

''(2) AGENCY-SPECIFIC PLANS.—The Global Water Strategy shall include an agency-specific plan—

''(A) from the United States Agency for International Development that describes specifically how the Agency for International Development will—

''(i) carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Global Water Coordinator under subsection (e)(1);

''(ii) ensure that the Agency for International Development's projects and programs authorized under this section are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability, including by implementing the requirements described in subsection (f); and

''(iii) increase access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in high priority countries designated pursuant to subsection (h);

''(B) from the Department of State that describes specifically how the Department of State will—

''(i) carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Special Coordinator for Water Resources under subsection (e)(2); and

''(ii) ensure that the Department's activities authorized under this section are designed—

''(I) to improve management of water resources and watersheds in countries designated pursuant to subsection (h); and

''(II) to prevent and resolve, to the greatest degree possible, both intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources in such countries; and

''(C) from other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, that describes the contributions of the departments and agencies to implementing the Global Water Strategy.

''(3) INDIVIDUALIZED PLANS FOR HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—For each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall—

''(A) develop a costed, evidence-based, and results-oriented plan that—

''(i) seeks to achieve the purposes of this section; and

''(ii) meets the requirements under subsection (f); and

''(B) include such plan in an appendix to the Global Water Strategy required under paragraph (1).

''(4) FIRST TIME ACCESS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Global Water Strategy shall specifically describe the target percentage of funding for each fiscal year covered by such strategy to be directed toward projects aimed at providing first-time access to safe water and sanitation.

''(5) PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—The Global Water Strategy shall include specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, performance metrics, timetables, and monitoring and evaluation plans required to be developed by the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B)(v).

''(6) CONSULTATION AND BEST PRACTICES.—The Global Water Strategy shall—

''(A) be developed in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies; and

''(B) incorporate best practices from the international development community.

''(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

''(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

''(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

''(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

''(2) the term 'long-term sustainability' refers to the ability of a service delivery system, community, partner, or beneficiary to maintain, over time, any water, sanitation, or hygiene project that receives funding pursuant to the amendments made by the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2014.''.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE AGENCY-SPECIFIC PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit an agency-specific plan to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 136(k) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a)) that meets the requirements of section 136(j)(2)(B) of such Act, as added by subsection (a).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) is repealed.

Mr. POE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD J. SEITZ COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1434) to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1434

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

SECTION 1. LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD J. SEITZ COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz served as the cadet commander of a unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Leavenworth High School in Leavenworth, Kansas, where he earned the American Legion Cup as an outstanding cadet;

(2) while attending Kansas State University, Lieutenant General Seitz accepted a commission as a second lieutenant in the Army and was called into active duty in 1940;

(3) Lieutenant General Seitz volunteered to be one of the first paratroopers in the United States;

(4) at age 25, Lieutenant General Seitz as a major, was given command of the 2nd Battalion of the 517th Parachute Infantry Regimental Combat Team, becoming the youngest battalion commander in the Army;

(5) along with the 7th Armored Division, the battalion commanded by Lieutenant General Seitz formed what became known as Task Force Seitz at the Battle of the Bulge with the mission to plug the gaps on the north slope of the Bulge when the Germans attempted to break out;

(6) the service of Lieutenant General Seitz earned him the Silver Star, 2 Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, and many other acknowledgments during his 37-year career in the Army;

(7) after victory in Europe, Lieutenant General Seitz remained in the Army, commanding the 2nd Airborne Battle Group, 503rd Infantry Regiment, and the 82nd Airborne Division;

(8) on retiring in 1978, Lieutenant General Seitz settled in Junction City, Kansas, near Ft. Riley, where he would greet deploying and returning units from Iraq and Afghanistan at all times of the day;

(9) Lieutenant General Seitz remained active in the wider community, working with the Coronado Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, the Fort Riley National Bank, Rotary International, and the Association of the United States Army and serving on the board of the Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum;

(10) Lieutenant General Seitz had a passion for mentoring young officers and noncommissioned officers at Fort Riley, never ceasing to be a soldier, according to his son, Richard M. Seitz;

(11) Lieutenant General Seitz was named an Outstanding Citizen of Kansas;

(12) in 2012 an elementary school at Fort Riley was named in honor of Lieutenant General Seitz, which is meaningful because he believed the fate of the United States relied on young children and the teachers who inspire them;

(13) during visits to the elementary school, Lieutenant General Seitz would talk with the students about what it meant to be a ''proud and great American'' and his message was always to ''respect the teachers and be a learner'';

(14) the family and friends of Lieutenant General Seitz have described him as a gentleman, compassionate, respected, full of integrity, gracious, giving, and a remarkable individual; and

(15) Lieutenant General Seitz lived each day to its fullest and his commitment to his fellow man serves as an inspiration to all the people of the United States.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the ''Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic''.

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic referred to in subsection (b) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill, S. 1434.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 1434 which would name the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

Following completion of the Army ROTC program at Kansas State University, Lieutenant General Seitz served with distinction in World War II. Lieutenant General Seitz participated in the invasion of Italy and the Battle of the Bulge as one of the youngest battalion commanders of the war at the age of 25. After the victory in Europe, Lieutenant General Seitz remained in the Army commanding at many levels, culminating with command of the 82nd Airborne Division.

During his service, Lieutenant General Seitz earned the Silver Star, two Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit and the French Croix de Guerre and Legion of Honor.

After Lieutenant General Seitz retired, he settled in Junction City and served the Fort Riley community. He would greet deploying and returning units from Iraq and Afghanistan at all times of the day, and he mentored young officers and noncommissioned officers stationed there.

Beyond this service, he also volunteered his time with the Boy Scouts of America, Rotary International, and the Association of the United States Army.

In recognition of Lieutenant General Seitz's service to both his country and his community, naming the Junction City CBOC after him is a fitting and

appropriate honor. It is my pleasure to support S. 1434, and I am grateful for the leadership and support of Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, Senator MORAN, and the entire Kansas delegation. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 1434.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1434, which designates the Junction City, Kansas, Community-Based Outpatient Clinic in Junction City as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

General Seitz served in the Army for 37 years. Among the medals and commendations he was awarded are the Silver Star, two Bronze Stars, and the Purple Heart. After he retired, he was awarded the Creighton Abrams Medal. In September 2011, he was given France's highest distinction, the Legion of Honor.

In World War II, joined by a company of 7th Armored Division tanks, General Seitz was in command of a battalion of paratroopers who won two decisive attacks during the Battle of the Bulge. Seitz was only 28 years old at the time. He continued to serve in command roles after World War II, earning his first general's star in 1963, his second star in 1967, and finished his distinguished career in 1978 as a three-star general.

□ 1630

Following his retirement, General Seitz stayed dedicated to those who served. He remained passionate for mentoring commissioned and noncommissioned officers, and frequently visited Fort Riley to greet deploying and returning units bound for the Middle East.

As a native of Leavenworth, Kansas, General Seitz returned to Kansas in 1978 and settled in Junction City.

Joining his name to the community-based outpatient clinic in Junction City, Kansas, would be a fitting way to honor General Seitz in his commitment to duty and valor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support S. 1434, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and, once again, I encourage all Members to support S. 1434.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1434.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORPORAL MICHAEL J. CRESCENZ ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 229) to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the ''Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 229

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. CORPORAL MICHAEL J. CRESCENZ DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the ''Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the medical center referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 229.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 229, which would name the VA Medical Center located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

Corporal Crescenz was the only Philadelphia native to earn the Medal of Honor during the Vietnam war. His posthumous award of the Medal of Honor resulted from an act of heroism in the Republic of Vietnam on November 20, 1968.

Reading from Corporal Crescenz's Medal of Honor citation:

In the morning, his unit engaged a large, well-entrenched force of the North Vietnamese Army whose initial burst of fire pinned down the lead squad and killed the two point men, halting the advance of Company A.

Immediately, Corporal Crescenz left the relative safety of his own position, seized a nearby machinegun and, with complete disregard for his own safety, charged 100 meters up a slope toward the enemy's bunkers, which he effectively silenced, killing two occupants in each.

Undaunted by the withering machinegun fire around him, Corporal Crescenz courageously moved forward toward a third bunker, which he also succeeded in silencing, killing two more of the enemy and momentarily clearing the route of advance for his comrades.

As a direct result of his heroic actions, his company was able to maneuver freely with minimal danger and complete its mission, defeating the enemy.

Corporal Crescenz's bravery and extraordinary heroism at the cost of his life are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Naming the Philadelphia VA Medical Center after this American hero is a tribute to his legacy and to all residents who served with our Nation during the Vietnam war.

It is my pleasure to support S. 229, and I am grateful for the leadership and support of Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, Senator TOOMEY, and the entire Pennsylvania delegation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this hero by supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

We have come to this floor on any number of occasions honoring people, but I think this may be the noblest moment that I have risen on the floor, because, in this instance, it is not to name a stamp after Wilt Chamberlain from Philadelphia or the train station after Congressman Gray, but this is to acknowledge a young man who graduated from high school in 1966 and, within a year or so, joined, enlisted, and went off to war on behalf of his country in a faraway place.

He finished at Cardinal Dougherty High School. He played varsity baseball there. He played basketball in a summer league at Simons Recreation Center. He grew up in West Oak Lane in my district, on the 7400 block of Thouron Avenue.

But the Corporal Crescenz whom we honor today is someone who, even though he was only in country for just a mere few months, when this attack took place, he grabbed a machinegun and he went towards the fire. It has been recounted when President Nixon awarded him the Medal of Honor, he took out one machinegun nest, he took out another, he then took out a third. Then when a camouflaged artillery post opened up, he charged at it, and that is when he took this mortal round.

But this is a young man who really, I think, represents everything that is important about American ideals because he lived a life of service on behalf of his country. He took it on himself to

face challenge in a faraway place. He honors us even in his death, which was a long, long time ago, by giving us the honor to be able to rise and to acknowledge his courage.

Our city lost a lot of people in the Vietnam war. This is the only soldier to earn the Medal of Honor.

I want to thank Councilman David Oh, who is a member of the Republican Party on our city council—it is hard to be a Republican and get elected in Philadelphia—but who helped to raise this issue locally.

I want to thank all of the Pennsylvania Members. We introduced a bill, H.R. 454. Every single Member of the Pennsylvania delegation supported this.

I have visited the Philadelphia VA. I have talked to veterans there who are getting care, all of whom are proud to have served our country. I think that they will be proud that the name of the medical center will be named after this young corporal who didn't make it in the headlines but, today, he is at the very forefront of the work of the United States Congress as we honor his service and we honor his family by this naming bill.

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

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

I have no further speakers at this time.

The veterans of Philadelphia have for some time been trying to gain recognition for their brother in arms, and I thank the Pennsylvania delegation for their work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 229, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, PAT MEEHAN, my friend.

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

I also thank my colleague from Philadelphia, the distinguished gentleman, who has been a strong supporter of this important bill. I rise in strong support of S. 229, which is the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Act of 2013.

As has been identified, the legislation would rename the Woodland Avenue Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Philadelphia after Corporal Crescenz. As has been identified, he is Philadelphia's only Medal of Honor recipient from the Vietnam era from Cardinal Dougherty High School, which had contributed more young men who gave their lives in the service of their country during the Vietnam war than any high school in the Nation, so this is quite a distinction.

I visited, as have my colleagues, numerous times the veterans medical center, making sure that it ensures the veterans receive the care they deserve.

But I think one of the things that is important about this kind of a recognition is not only that it has been earned with valor, but the veterans who walk in and out of there each day, many of them Vietnam veterans themselves, want to hear the story about Corporal Crescenz. His name will be enshrined, people will know about it, and his heroism will live and continue to live.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I missed the opportunity, and I should acknowledge the strong contribution of Congressman BOB BRADY in this effort, along with yourself and Congressman FITZPATRICK. I neglected in my early remarks to do so, so if I could lay that on the RECORD. This would not have happened without Congressman BRADY's support.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I also want to express my appreciation. I think it is one of the endearing factors. While we from time to time may have strong disagreements about issues, we actually have had many more that we have been able to work together on. This is one that I am proud to support.

I will conclude by saying that this was undoubtedly an act in which he not only acted selflessly for himself, but he saved his fellow warfighters from harm.

I would like to commend those who have worked tirelessly on renaming this facility, and I hope that my colleagues will support this measure.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, MICHAEL FITZPATRICK, my friend, to speak on this issue.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I also am very pleased to join with my colleagues in both the House and the Senate in advancing legislation which will, we hope, appear on the President's desk to honor the service and sacrifice, the very significant sacrifice, of Corporal Michael Crescenz, whom, as we have heard many times here today, was Philadelphia's sole Medal of Honor winner during the Vietnam war.

I want to also thank my friend, Mr. FATTAH, for his work in getting the bill to the floor here today.

Corporal Crescenz received a Medal of Honor for his actions on November 20, 1968, in Vietnam's Hiep Duc Valley. His citation states—and I know the citation was already quoted here today, but I think it bears repeating, at least in part—that Corporal Crescenz gave his life when he ''left the relative safety of his own position, seized a nearby machinegun and, with complete disregard for his safety, charged 100 meters up a slope toward the enemy's bunkers, which he effectively silenced. As a direct result of his heroic actions, his company was able to maneuver freely with minimal danger and to complete its mission, defeating the enemy.''

By moving to rename the Philadelphia Veterans Affairs Medical Center the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, we immortalize the legacy of Corporal Crescenz and remember his sacrifice in the defense of our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia region has a long and proud tradition of selfless sacrifice to our Nation dating back to the Revolution. Generations of military members have called our area home, and they continue to serve today. We must continue to recognize those who sacrifice and those who gave their lives at the altar of freedom.

Corporal Crescenz continues to have many friends, led by Joe Griffies and his friends at the Welcome Home Veterans radio program, who have never forgotten Michael Crescenz and have fought tirelessly as well for this legislation.

Mr. FATTAH's Corporal Michael J. Crescenz's Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center legislation reminds us all that the contributions of our Nation's veterans should never be forgotten.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I will close by saying I can't think of anything more appropriate than naming this VA medical center after this Medal of Honor winner. I am a Vietnam-era veteran, lost a lot of friends in the war in Vietnam. It is difficult for me to even talk about it. I can't think of anything more appropriate than naming this great medical center after this hero from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support S. 229.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Act of 2013, to rename the Philadelphia VA Medical Center in honor of Medal of Honor recipient and Philadelphia native Corporal Michael Crescenz.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that we are able to bring this long overdue honor to a great Philadelphian and a worthy American hero. I have been working to accomplish this renaming since I first drafted legislation in 2012, and I am thankful that my colleagues Congressman FATTAH and Senator TOOMEY, as well as the rest of the Pennsylvania delegation, have joined me in this important endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, Corporal Michael J. Crescenz is the only Philadelphia-born recipient of the Medal of Honor, our nation's highest military honor, from the Vietnam War. Born on January 14, 1949 to Mary Ann and Charles Crescenz, Michael grew up in the West Oak Lane neighborhood of Philadelphia and went on to graduate from Cardinal Dougherty High School Class of 1966. He enlisted in the US Army in September 1968, the same month that his older brother Charles was discharged from active duty.

According to his Medal of Honor citation, 19-year old Cpl. Crescenz's platoon came under attack on November 20, 1968, in Vietnam's Hiep Duc Valley. Rather than remain in the relative safety of his position, Cpl. Crescenz seized a nearby machine gun,

charged toward the enemy's position, and silenced two bunkers. He then courageously advanced toward a third bunker, which he also silenced, clearing a route for his comrades. Shortly thereafter, gunfire emerged from a fourth, unseen bunker, and in order to protect his fellow soldiers, Cpl. Crescenz advanced on the position, firing with his machine gun. He was mortally wounded when he was just 5 meters away from the camouflaged bunker. His selfless actions allowed his company to maneuver freely to complete its mission, ultimately defeating the enemy.

President Nixon posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor to Cpl. Crescenz in April, 1970 for his gallantry and intrepidity in action. Now, 46 years after his heroic stand, we again humbly recognize the sacrifice of Cpl. Crescenz, along with the sacrifice of all those who paid the ultimate price in Vietnam and in all wars in defense of our nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 229.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1645

LANE A. EVANS VA COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2921) to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the ''Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2921

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

SECTION 1. LANE A. EVANS VA COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the community based outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2921.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2921, which would name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic at 310 Home Boulevard, Galesburg, Illinois, as the Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic.

We are here today to honor the life and service of the late Congressman Lane Evans by naming the new VA community-based outpatient clinic in Illinois after him. Congressman Evans represented Illinois' 17th District for more than 20 years, was a champion of veterans' issues throughout his time in Congress, and served as the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for a decade.

Congressman Evans passed away this year, at the age of 63, following a long battle with Parkinson's disease. One way to honor Congressman Evans is to recognize his legacy of service to veterans in the community. It is in that thought that we believe naming this facility after him is a fitting tribute.

It is my pleasure to support S. 2921, and I am grateful for the leadership and support of Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, Senator DURBIN, and the entire Illinois delegation. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this great public servant by supporting this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of bipartisan legislation that I introduced last month to name the Galesburg VA community-based outpatient clinic in honor of former Congressman Lane Evans, who passed away just last month. Lane served the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, the district I now have the honor and privilege of representing. He served it with honor, humility, and hard work for more than two decades.

A Marine Corps veteran himself, Lane was a steadfast champion for our men and women in uniform. A veteran of the Vietnam war era, he served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee from his arrival in Washington to his position as the committee's ranking member, a post he held for more than 10 years.

Lane Evans' record on behalf of veterans earned him the praise and respect from veterans service organizations and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of former Congressman Lane Evans by designating the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic located in Galesburg, Illinois, as the Lane A. Evans Community Based Outpatient Clinic.

I first got to know Lane when I was a young newspaper reporter covering our region. Lane was always warm, accessible, and friendly to me. I interviewed him many times about a number of different topics.

While he was young, with his trademark boyish haircut, his quiet courage and drive made him seem much older than his age. Through my interactions with him over the years and with those who worked with him and those who he touched through his service, I learned a lot about the man and what he stood for.

A proud native of Rock Island, the son of a firefighter and a nurse, and an Alleman High School and Augustana College graduate, Lane truly represented everything that is right about public service. He will be sorely missed by all those he touched, and the legacy of service that he provided will never be forgotten.

The dedication of a veterans' facility in the heart of the district he represented is a fitting tribute and acknowledgment of his career-long fight to ensure that all veterans get the care and the benefits that they have earned and deserve.

I would like to thank the entire Illinois delegation and the many Members who served with Lane for supporting this effort. In particular, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD of the Veterans' Affairs Committee here in the House and their counterparts in the Senate, Chairman SANDERS and Ranking Member BURR, for bringing this forward. I would also like to thank Senators KIRK and DURBIN from Illinois for shepherding this bill through the Senate.

By renaming this VA clinic, we can ensure that Lane Evans' strong legacy of service to our men and women in uniform lives on in a facility that serves them today. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this bipartisan legislation in honor of the memory of Lane Evans.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Dr. ROE, for yielding and also for helping bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2921, which would designate the VA community-based outpatient clinic in Galesburg, Illinois, as the Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic.

As a cosponsor of the House version of the bill, I appreciate the work that both the House and Senate VA Committees have done and the leadership of both Chambers to bring this bill to the floor. I especially want to thank Senator DURBIN for authorizing this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for 24 years, Lane Evans served with distinction as the Representative of Illinois' 17th Congressional District. We mourn his tragic

passing last month at the age of 63. Even as he suffered from Parkinson's disease, Mr. Speaker, Lane Evans heroically and tenaciously fought for veterans in the years leading up to his retirement in 2007.

When Congressman Evans retired, the Vietnam Veterans of America said:

> Lane's compassion for his fellow veterans and his commitment to do right by them has come right from the heart.

As ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee during my tenure as chairman of the committee, I saw firsthand how he turned his knowledge, compassion, and expertise—his heart—into effective advocacy and how he worked to make a tangible difference in the lives of veterans and their families around the country.

Mr. Speaker, during our tenure as chair and ranking member, we were able to craft and shepherd into law numerous bills that expanded care and service for our Nation's veterans, including expansion of the GI Bill and assistance to homeless veterans.

Lane's commitment to ensuring that men and women who wore the uniform had timely access to world class medical treatment that they have earned was, in a word, extraordinary.

Of particular interest to Lane, a Vietnam veteran himself, was health care for veterans exposed to agent orange during their service in Vietnam. Throughout the 1980s, it was an honor to work side by side with Lane and others, like Congressman Tom Daschle, in an effort to convince a highly reluctant Department of Veterans Affairs and Pentagon that agent orange severely injured many who served in Vietnam.

In 1991, Lane introduced the Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1991, which became part of the Agent Orange Act, to provide presumptive service-connected disability assistance to veterans with diseases linked to agent orange; thus the gentleman from Illinois helped ensure that veterans received the care and the compensation they deserved, while not being saddled with the onerous burden of proof for injuries due to exposure to a herbicide that was laced with dioxin.

It is, therefore, highly fitting to name a community-based outpatient clinic after a remarkable lawmaker who fought hard for veterans, health care, and compensation during his time in Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me and all the leadership here on the floor in supporting S. 2921 to honor the legacy of Congressman Evans as a remarkable veterans' advocate.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 2921 in honoring the life of our former friend and colleague, Lane Evans, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support S. 2921.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2921.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN TOM LATHAM ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. 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 subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, we are here today under a Special Order because at this time of year—at the end of a session—we have Members that are retiring, Members that deserve recognition, and Members that other Members of the House would like to talk about for a few minutes.

Today, we have one of the best that, unfortunately, is retiring at the end of this year. He is a gentleman that I have known since I came to Congress and have become good friends with. We have had many entertaining times.

I am sorry to say that the thing that people in Washington are going to miss the most, probably, is a rendition of Roy Orbison duets by Mr. LATHAM and myself. I don't know how, but we certainly had fun with those at various events.

Before I say anything else, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

□ 1700

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON. I didn't know that you did ''Oh, Pretty Woman'' and all these other songs. I can't wait, TOM, to see you back in Iowa.

Madam Speaker, it is really an honor for me to be up here tonight to speak for and about TOM LATHAM. When I got elected in 2006, TOM had been here for some time, not a long period of time, but for 12 years. I knew about TOM from what I had read. I didn't know him personally. I was one of those folks who came to Congress with no one expecting me to get here, so I didn't know that many folks in this body certainly before I got elected.

When I got elected, one of the first things I did was try to find out as much as I could about TOM LATHAM and meet with TOM LATHAM and work with him on a number of issues because I knew he had a reputation for working across the aisle. I also knew that he was very good friends at the time with Mr. BOEHNER, who subsequently became Speaker of the House, so I knew it was probably in my interest to get to know TOM LATHAM if I wanted to get things done for Iowa, even though Speaker PELOSI took over when I came.

My job since I have been here, I believe, has been to work with both sides of the aisle, and TOM LATHAM is a model, as far as I am concerned, for doing exactly that.

When I first came, you know, we had a lot of tough issues to deal with here in the U.S. Congress, and one of the things that happened very early on when I first got elected was the issue of the National Guard came up, and I was on Armed Services. A lot of those Guard folks were being deployed multiple times, and it was very, very difficult for their families.

A number of us recognized that what we needed to do was build facilities, more facilities, upgrade facilities, get rid of those old National Guard armories and replace them with readiness centers that would be there to train and equip our troops in the event that we had to send them overseas on a mission, which we did many, many times, and Iowans proudly have served over the years, over these many years, in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places.

We needed to construct those facilities also for their families, for their spouses, and for their children. So on the Armed Services Committee I did what I could in terms of authorization to make sure that the funds were there, and on the Appropriations Committee, of course, what TOM LATHAM did was make sure that we had the funding to make sure that we built those facilities as well. So we were able to work on that issue together.

Then when the floods, the great flood of 2008 hit across Iowa, but mainly across the eastern half of Iowa—and it would include a lot of TOM LATHAM's district—a lot of it included my district, about half the damage was in my district alone. But I worked with TOM, I worked with STEVE KING, BRUCE BRALEY, and Leonard Boswell. We really did a great job working on a bipartisan basis to make sure that what we needed in Iowa we got. So we worked very hard on that.

Then also on veterans issues. When we heard about the scandal in Phoenix, the first thing I did was I contacted TOM LATHAM and said, ''Hey, we need to go to Des Moines together if that is okay with you. I know it is your congressional district—it is not mine—but let's go to Des Moines together and talk to the folks there about the Des Moines facility.''

I have been to the VA facility in Iowa City in my district many, many times, but I wanted to go to Des Moines, and I wanted to go with TOM, and I knew that he would work together with me on that to make sure that everything

is right, and if it isn't right that we fix it.

So he was very much open to that. He didn't hesitate for a second. That is the kind of person he is. That has been the kind of legislator he is, even at a time—and in this body we have seen a lot of ugliness over the years. It seems as though our politics in America has just gotten uglier by the day sometimes, and even in the middle of all that, when that has happened, TOM LATHAM has stood tall, he has stood proud as an Iowan. He has got a lot of common sense, like most Iowans do, and he works with the other side because he knows that the job is to get things done. That is what TOM LATHAM does. He has gotten things done.

We are going to miss you, TOM, there is no question about that, and I think you know that probably better than we do. We are going to miss you. I know you have heard that from a lot of folks.

TOM LATHAM, he is a humble Iowa guy, that is what he is. He has been able to get a tremendous amount done for his district, for my alma mater, Iowa State, before he lost that to Congressman KING, and for any other number of folks in his congressional district over the years. I honor you. I honor Kathy. I am looking forward to seeing you later tonight, and thank you for everything, TOM. Farewell and good luck with whatever you end up doing.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his statement. Now I would like to yield to another gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Idaho for yielding to the gentleman from Iowa. There are about four people on the floor right now that do know the difference.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, to give a great message of gratitude and thanks to Congressman TOM LATHAM. I want to tell a little bit of the narrative about how this unfolds from the perspective of Iowa, and that is this: we are all politics all the time. There is no off season for us. You are always on season. When the Iowa caucuses emerge, there is a big focus on Presidential politics.

If you are on the State Central Committee, you are in the middle of that arena. That is where I first met TOM LATHAM and first became aware of his commitment to the political arena and to conservatism. I would want to let the body know, Madam Speaker, that TOM LATHAM didn't come from a place that was a big magnificent megalopolis, unless you would want to describe Alexander, Iowa, with 160-some people, as a big megalopolis. 168 people would be the population of Alexander, Iowa, rooted in now a three-generation seed company, and rooted in the soil. I don't have to explain this to the people from either Idaho or Iowa, but all new wealth comes from the land, and it regenerates itself every year in the form of corn in our neighborhood and soybeans and potatoes in Mr. SIMPSON's neighborhood.

When you see where their origin of wealth comes every year, and you see the families that came across the prairie and turned the sod for the first time and maybe built their house out of it and put their roots down into that soil, and then took the family farm that raised the wealth and boiled that out of there and over from the farm to the town to the city, and you see a family business with multiple brothers engaged in it, and three generations now, you know that they are tied to the heart of the heartland and the good of what is good about Iowa and America.

That is what TOM LATHAM brought to the political arena from the State Central Committee to a primary and to the United States Congress in 1994, and then catching that wave, that 1994 wave and being elected to the United States Congress 20 years ago.

I take a look at him now, and I think he is no worse for wear. It is the same TOM LATHAM that came here 20 years ago that is going off into retirement today, or shortly here at the end of this Congress, and he hasn't lost his enthusiasm.

Here is what I see—this is a STEVE KING perspective, Madam Speaker—and that is that everybody that comes to this place has their own style and their own way of getting things done.

But the people that have worked with TOM LATHAM for these years know that it isn't always an issue that is run up the flagpole. It doesn't come necessarily with lights and blaring horns, but it gets done. It gets done in a quiet way, it gets done, sometimes with just a slow persuasion. It gets done with building a network of people that want to help and want to get things done.

So when I was elected to come to this Congress in 2003 and inherited a lot of the real estate that had formerly been represented and the constituents that had formerly been represented by TOM LATHAM, I noticed that there were ribbon-cutting ceremonies taking place in my district, and I wasn't necessarily the lead guy when it came to the ribbon-cutting because TOM LATHAM had laid the groundwork for that for years, and they knew it, and they still know it.

The friends and the relationships that were built by doing a good job of representing constituents throughout those years are still there. They still exist. And it has been an easy thing for me to step into that neighborhood because they were well taken care of and well represented.

So, now, after moving from Agriculture over to the Appropriations Committee, I would just remind the body that TOM LATHAM, today, is the only Iowa member on the House Appropriations Committee. He has done a good number of things with projects, not only the transportation projects, but the Iowa National Guard, ag, economic development, small business development, and he is currently chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, and he serves on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug, and also on Homeland Security.

That is an influential footprint in this Congress, and the people that arrive here as freshmen and sophomores recognize that.

But I recognize, also, this man that is rooted in Iowa soil, who is the continuation of the family farm and the family business that relies upon the very foundation of our economy, that all new wealth comes from the land, and that there is a core of family and faith and neighbors and neighborhood that TOM LATHAM has brought to this Congress.

Wherever he ends up in his retirement, we all want to congratulate him and say to TOM LATHAM, ''Congratulations, you have earned it. You have picked your time, you have done it your way.''

There are only about three ways to leave this Congress: one of them is to get beat, one of them is to die in office, and the other one is to choose your time to retire.

I am glad that you are fit and vigorous and prepared for a fit and vigorous retirement.

But it wouldn't be appropriate, Madam Speaker, for me to conclude my portion of this without saying into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a deep and heartfelt thank you to Kathy Latham. It is from me personally, as well as, for a lot of reasons, across this Hill that with the work that she has done, you got, oftentimes, two for the price of one with TOM and Kathy Latham.

She sacrificed a number of times and made my life easier and made things work better for Iowa, for the House of Representatives, and for this country, and I think that the best interests of all of us have always been what made the decisions in the Latham family, which, by the way, now ranks up in about the top three of Iowa political families.

So pay attention, Madam Speaker, to the Latham family going forward. They are not done yet, but they do have a patriarch that is going to ride off into retirement.

Thank you a lot, TOM LATHAM, for serving our country. God bless you.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, that Mr. KING just mentioned the difference between Iowa and Idaho. I will tell you a funny story.

When I was first elected, TOM had been here for 4 years. When I got elected, they used to have a function with a lot of the D.C. reporters and political reporters in town at the Washington Hilton, and they would select a freshman Republican and Democrat from both the House and the Senate to give little speeches, and they were supposed to be kind of funny speeches and stuff.

So I didn't know what to do. They selected me as one of them. So I decided

that I was going to explain the difference between Iowa and Idaho because there is a difference. So I went through all the differences in Idaho and Iowa.

Of course I recorded it, and I got home and turned it on to see how I had done. Underneath, and this is on C–SPAN, underneath it said, Congressman MIKE SIMPSON, Republican, Ohio. So we not only get mixed up with Idaho and Iowa also, but also between Ohio and Idaho and Iowa. So that has always made it a little more challenging.

But TOM and I have served together on the Appropriations Committee for, I guess the last 12 years that I have been on it, and he was on it before that. He has been, as was mentioned, the chairman of the Transportation Committee and chairman of the Energy and Water Committee, both committees very important to both Idaho and Iowa and to the country. We have been able to work cooperatively to try to address issues that affect the country and our respective States.

The thing I have always noticed most about TOM, and both speakers have already mentioned it, is the way he works, the way he gets things done. I have always noticed that TOM takes the job that he was elected to do very seriously, but he never takes himself too seriously, which is an important characteristic, I think.

Others have enjoyed working with him on both sides of the aisle. I have certainly enjoyed working with him. And again, we are going to miss him.

At the end of the each session, some people, as STEVE KING mentioned, decide that it is time to retire, and TOM has decided that. Not only are we, in Congress, as friends, going to miss him but, frankly, the country is going to miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho, my good friend. I just want to echo what you were saying, Mr. SIMPSON, that TOM LATHAM actually is a guy who came here, doesn't seek the limelight, but seeks to get things done.

It is tough for me to say this about him because he is my good friend and he is going to rib me about this later. But he really does try to get things done. You don't see him running out to the TV, to the news shows. You don't see him running out holding press conferences. But what you do see is someone who works.

I can tell you that when I first arrived here in Washington, TOM was one of the first people who came up to me and talked to me about—asked if he could help me in any way. He was a farmer from, obviously, the great State of Iowa, and he knew that I was a farmer from the great State of California. We shared what we had in common, and then he asked how he could be helpful.

From day one, TOM has been one of my best friends here, and I don't think there has ever been a day that we have been in Congress that I haven't spoke to TOM. And then, we always talk over the time that we are not here also.

□ 1715

I have had numerous times when TOM has come out to California to visit my district and to do some good, quality work in meeting with some of my constituents. At the same time, in talking about TOM's work ethic, TOM has had me out to his district in Iowa several times. Typically, you think you are going to do a short, little meeting with some folks, but I can tell you that, when I went out there, TOM actually put me to work. We had to spend a full day working.

I remember, TOM, that you put on a conference for all of your community leaders—your business leaders and your government leaders. You had people from all over the State of Iowa who came there for a full day's session about how your office, its being the last link to the Federal Government, could better serve your constituents.

That is really what this is about, Madam Speaker. TOM worked very hard for his constituents. He didn't try to get press out of it, and he didn't try to make a big deal about it; but you could tell, when I was on the ground there—the several times I was there—that it was about working. It was about working with people, working with his constituents, and about trying to represent them here in Washington the best way that he could. I know the people of Iowa will miss him.

I think you have represented almost the entire State of Iowa at one point or another.

His district has moved around so much over the years.

TOM's family, obviously, great people. His wife, Kathy, deserves a lot of praise for having to deal with him over all of these years that he has been in Washington, traveling back and forth. It takes a special person, and Kathy really is a special, special person to not only deal with TOM but also to put up with having to deal with the tough things that people say. Mr. LATHAM has been through many tough elections, and it takes a very tough person to have to deal with the things that come out in political campaigns, as we are all familiar with.

I know TOM is very proud of his children and grandchildren, and I know that is part of the reason he is leaving us—because he has served his country, and he did the best that he could do for the time that he was here. I think he has a long tradition of serving the people of Iowa—just like his parents, who were community leaders in northern Iowa there, and also his brothers.

I think you had at least one or two brothers who served with distinction in Vietnam, as I remember. I have met all of them, I think, over the years.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, it is kind of a sad day for me to be down here on the floor of the House but also, I think, a happy day for TOM and his family because he will be able to spend time with his children and grandchildren, which we know, when we are here in Washington, is tough to do.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from California.

The gentleman from California mentioned something that is very important that a lot of people don't realize: it takes a special individual and a special relationship with your spouse, be it husband or wife, to be able to serve in this place. Most people don't realize how many nights you spend away from your family when you are here. I am certain that with most spouses—when I look at mine and when I look at TOM's Kathy—this was not something that they had planned on when they got married. To be able to, I want to say, put up with that and the separation that it causes and the pressure it puts on a family is extremely difficult. Kathy is, truly, a person who is special and has put up with him for 20 years in the House and 39 years of marriage. She has really put up with him for a long time, and we are honored to have spouses like that who support us and keep us going.

The reason I asked for unanimous consent at the first of this Special Order—for people to insert their comments—was that tonight is the White House Christmas reception for Members of Congress, so there are going to be a lot of people getting ready to go down to the White House. Now, one of those individuals who had some responsibilities tonight but who wanted to be here was the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, who is one of TOM's best friends. They have been together ever since I have come, and, consequently, I have been allowed to associate with him—I don't know why—but we have gotten along and have done some great things.

We are going to miss TOM, but this process goes on. People will get elected—whether it is any of us—who will replace us, and they will step up to the plate and do the job. It is an amazing system that we have been given by our forefathers.

At this point, I yield to my good friend from Iowa, TOM LATHAM.

Mr. LATHAM. First of all, I will say ''thank you'' to Mr. SIMPSON—a great, great friend—for doing this this evening; to Mr. NUNES, who is still on the floor here; to STEVE KING and DAVE LOEBSACK, who were down here. I am not going to sing—we will pass that by—but, again, thank you very, very much for the honor you have bestowed on me and for the kind words here tonight.

Madam Speaker, I will just say the thing I will miss most are my good friends here. That part of it really is hard because it becomes an extended family over time—people whom you know, whom you work with, whom you trust on a day-to-day basis. I will miss that. Now, there is a lot of other stuff I won't miss here, but I will miss the personal relationships and friendships.

Mr. SIMPSON mentioned the Speaker. I will just tell you that there is no one who could be a better friend and someone I owe so much to. John and Debbie Boehner, Kathy and I owe them so much. They are great, great friends. We love them, and we will continue that friendship as we will with all of the colleagues here we have come to know and love.

Anyone who does this job for any period of time understands you are never going to be successful or accomplish anything without the great work of your staff. I have been blessed both in Iowa and here in Washington with tremendous people who have worked so hard for me, who have committed themselves to the people of Iowa—to the service to them and to this country. All of them are very, very special to me. One person, my chief of staff, James Carstensen, who happens to be in the Chamber tonight, has been with me since day one—actually, a year before I got elected, working on the campaign. So 21 years he has had to put up with me.

Thank you very much.

Thanks to all of the members of my staff. It has been a pleasure for me—a great, great honor to have the privilege of serving with them—because we have all done it on a cumulative basis, and we have tried to do the best job possible for the people of Iowa.

I have to say ''thank you,'' obviously, to the Iowans. As Mr. NUNES said, I have represented a lot of the State in having the different districts, starting with the Fifth District, then the Fourth District, and now the Third District—moving from northwest Iowa to northeast Iowa to southwest Iowa. It is the honor of my life to serve the people of Iowa and to have that opportunity to be their Representative in Washington to try to accomplish things for their good and for the good of the country. Again, I just say ''thank you.''

Everybody who is in Congress knows the sacrifice of your family. My parents, who were such great role models for me, taught me so much. They are gone now. I have got four brothers and their families. I have my son, Justin; Lynnae; Emerson and Jack; my daughter Jennifer; her husband, Brian; and Keaton, Mason, and Carson; and my daughter Jill and her husband, Nick, and their son, Will. I love them, and what they have done to support me over the years is tremendous and will always be appreciated.

Obviously, there is one person. You could never be successful if you didn't have the support of your spouse. Kathy has been just exceptional in putting up with all the back-and-forth—having two residences and having had to travel here and keep everything going at home while I am away. For the first 19 years we were married, I was on the road with our family business. For the last 20 years, I have been gone, being in Congress. So, obviously, her love and her support has meant everything in the world to me.

Thank you, Dear.

Let me just say, in closing, that it has been an amazing ride for 20 years. For a kid, like Mr. SIMPSON said or Mr. KING said, who grew up in Alexander, Iowa—who grew up on a farm outside of a big town of 168 people—to come to Washington to be able to represent Iowa here is, obviously, a huge, huge honor from that background.

I will honestly say to any Member listening, if you ever get to the point when you walk across the street and don't look up at that dome and get that chill up your spine about something much bigger than you are, you probably should go home. Now, I still get that chill, but I think it is time for me and my family to go a different course.

I am extraordinarily proud to have served here. This is a great, great body. It is something that is an incredible institution. It is truly a slice of America when you come here and you meet the different folks and all you learn about this great country. Having to take into consideration a lot of different views and constituencies from all over the country is an amazing experience. I am very, very proud of that, and I will always feel that my time was well spent here. More so today I am excited about the future because we are going to have an opportunity to spend more time with the family—with Kathy, with the kids and grandchildren. We are going to be able to do some things we have never been able to do before. So I am proud of the past and am excited about the future, and I just thank God that I have had the opportunities I have had to grow up in a State like Iowa and in a community like I grew up in, with parents like I had and brothers and the support of the family.

This is the greatest country in the world. It will always be because of our system of government. As hard as it is to get something done, it is very difficult, but it is the right way to do things, and we need to get back to everyone listening to each other. There is one thing I will say: I never learn a thing when I am talking. You learn things when you are listening to other folks. I think we should all, maybe, step back and listen to each other more, and I think, maybe, we would be better off.

With that, I will just say ''thank you'' to everyone. It is a great country. God bless America. I am excited about the future.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

Again, TOM, we are going to miss you. We have become good friends. Don't become a stranger. You still have another week or two to serve before we sine die, and there are some important votes to cast.

Now that you qualify for Medicare, I wish you and Kathy the best in the next part of this journey of life, and I am sure you will do fantastic. Make sure you get out to Idaho when you get an opportunity, and we will take some famous Idaho potatoes and some famous Iowa corn, and we will put them together with some steak and have a little barbecue.

I thank you for your service to this institution, to the State of Iowa, and to the country. We will miss you.

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

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, let me offer my congratulations to those who have served our country in the Congress who now will be retiring and moving on. All of us will get there sometime.

This is a noble job if we make it such, and many people who have served here have done great things for the United States of America. Why? Because they, number one, believe in the principles of the United States, what were set down by our Founding Fathers. Even more than that, what we have had here and what we need more of in America are leaders who care specifically about the American people and what impact they are having on the American people and what impact those policies that they advocate will have on the American people.

□ 1730

All too often, people come to Washington, and pretty soon, what they care about is this or that specific special interest. Or they have a special idea, special interest or special ideas. They have a philosophy. They have a vision that goes beyond what the benefit to the American people is, what they are going to establish because of this philosophical commitment to some ideal.

Well, both of those are enemies of the well-being of the people of the United States. If people who are elected by the population come here and are loyal to special interests that have to make a profit in a specific area, even though it might be detrimental to the American people as a whole, or people come here and they don't care about the American people—they want to see their dream come true, their intellectual and philosophical ideal put into place—well, the American people get left out with that type of leadership.

And what we are doing today, one of the most important issues that we have been facing for almost a decade now, with constant pressure to do something about—what? About immigration policy in the United States. And what we do, what we finally do on this issue will tell us whom we care about and what are our ideals and who we care about more. Do we care about special interests? Do we care about some ideal notion that is not so tangible? Or do we care about what policy

will do specifically to the American people?

For years—and especially on this election year—we have heard repeatedly about the plight of the people who are here in this country illegally, over and over again about how these poor souls, how we need to give them legal status. We need to reach out and do something for them because they are in a bad situation. And, yes, they came here because there was a desperate situation in that land from which they came.

Unfortunately, when you hear people constantly talking about how we are going to help these illegal immigrants who are here in our midst, you don't hear about how what is being recommended to help the illegal immigrants will impact the American people. This is what we should be talking about. This is what needs to be discussed. The people elected by the American people should talk about what is going to happen to the American people if this policy that is being recommended is put into place.

Yes. We would like to help people who have come here illegally, and we would like to help people all over the world. There is no reason not to, if we care about the people who have come here illegally, thumbing their nose at our law, but they are human beings, and we care about them.

By the way, they are also people whom we can identify with because if we were in their spot, we would do the same. We care about them.

But you know what? We have to care more about the American people. We have to care about them if they care about the things that we are doing here. Or maybe they will just write off their government because their government is more concerned about a foreigner who has come here illegally than about the well-being of the American family and the American working people.

We hear this word ''comprehensive.'' Over and over again, we have heard, We have to have comprehensive immigration reform. ''Comprehensive immigration reform,'' what does that mean? Why do we hear that over and over again?

Because they can't use the word ''amnesty.'' And they know that, really, comprehensive immigration reform means one thing and one thing only because there is really not any type of a real argument about making our system better. But to them, when they say ''comprehensive immigration reform,'' they mean changing the status, legalizing the status of those millions of people who are here illegally.

They claim that there are 11 million. That is an old number, and that number has not been updated. And almost everyone I talk to believes that it is more like 20 million illegals who are here, not 11 million.

So there is not any real problem on our part with the idea of ''comprehensive reform,'' if we were to say, let's make the system more effective. Yes, we need border control, for example, and we need to restructure the visa system because there are a lot of people who are not only coming across the border illegally but who come here and overstay their visas. In fact, the largest number of illegals now—people keep thinking that we are talking about just people from Latin America. No. We have got people coming in from all over the world—many of them on visas, many of them sneaking across the border—who have come here illegally and are currently residing here. That number of people have an impact on the well-being of the American people.

So, yes, let's make the system better. But let's realize that we are not talking about things that we disagree on. It has all been about whether you legalize the status of people who are here illegally.

But let's just note this: We have no apologies to make about the generosity of the American people with our current system of immigration. Yes, it needs to be reformed and made more efficient. But we provide for over a million immigrants to come into our country legally every year.

To put that into perspective, that is more than all of the legal immigration into other countries, into every country of the world, combined. So we permit more legal immigration than every other country of the world combined. But yet over and over again, we are made to feel guilty, that we in some way should feel guilty about our immigration system and about the fact that you have people who are here illegally and we won't legalize their status.

Well, what would legalizing their status do? What would it do? We know what it would do for them. These people who are here illegally, if they have illegal status, they would then be able to perhaps be eligible for government programs, maybe as part of that. Certainly their relatives would be or their children would be.

Right now, even the people who are here illegally are the recipients of government benefits. Of the people who are here receiving—for example, their children have health care, emergency health care. And then, of course, an emergency becomes anything that someone is sick with. And they also, of course, are here, and their children are educated here. And we have government benefits that people have managed, if they end up coming here illegally and have one child—one child then justifies a wide variety of Federal assistance and other welfare assistance programs to these individuals who are basically here illegally.

Well, what does that mean? At a time when we are $500 billion more in debt every year, we are borrowing money from overseas in order to take care of these people who have come here illegally? That doesn't make any sense at all. And it especially doesn't make any sense when we know that our own government programs, our own government programs today, we are struggling to make ends meet, to make sure these programs stay vital, to make sure that they have money to function and do their jobs efficiently.

The Veterans Administration, we have heard so many problems about how the Veterans Administration had not been doing its job. Well, the money that we spend on people who come here illegally comes right out of the pool of money that should be going to Americans or should at least be going to reduce our debt so that in the future, our American children aren't going to have to pay it off.

Now, we have nothing to be ashamed of in terms of the overall number of people coming here legally. But even now, when the people who are here illegally, their impact is incredibly detrimental, as I just said, in terms of how much money is being spent by the government on services to them rather than services to the American people.

And we also know that illegals, of course, do take jobs. They are working at jobs, most of them. And they are hardworking, good people. But what impact are they having on the jobs that American people want?

They have actually taken jobs that should be—well, let's say Americans wouldn't want to work at that pay level. But the pay level that we are talking about is the pay level that happens when you have tens of millions of illegals in the country willing to work for a pittance. They have come to our country and bent down the wages of America's lower-income people. They have bent them down and taken jobs that should have gone to Americans.

For example, I know that the hotel and restaurant industry is very upset with the idea of not legalizing the status of these people. And let me just note that once you legalize the status of these 20 million illegals that are in our country, well, what will happen, of course, is that they aren't going to work for the pittance wages anymore. And they will start making more wages. And then there will be another wave of illegals that will come in and underbid them. So these particular people will earn more money, but the American people will earn less and less.

And right now, there are many women in the United States who are single mothers, many urban women who have families and live around big hotels, but the hotels hire people who have come here illegally to clean the rooms when there are many thousands of single mothers who would love to drop their child off at school, clean that room in the middle of the day—which are the hours that they need them at the hotel—and come back by the end of the day to pick up their child. But they are not willing to do it now because those people who work in those hotels, if they are illegals, are paid a pittance. And the American people—no, they won't work for a pittance. And they shouldn't.

And it will be a good thing if it increases the price of a hotel room by $10 a night in order to make sure that we have American citizens who are paid well and are able to take care of their families. Yes, that is the policy we should have.

We shouldn't have a policy that, instead, brings down the cost of that hotel room by a certain amount, increases the profit of the hotel by a certain amount, and is paid for by the fact that American women no longer can take those jobs because there isn't enough being paid for them to take care of their family.

Now, of course, if you live as many illegals live—three or four families to a home—they might be able to succeed or at least survive. That is not the kind of society we need to build here. That is not what America was all about. And what our policy should be is aimed at people who are American citizens who would like those jobs. And if we don't permit this illegal flood into our country, wages will go up, as compared to if we don't. And, yes, we should be happy that American people are making more money.

Over the last 20 years, we have actually seen the wages of the American people in real terms go down as we have had illegals pouring into our country. Well, whose side are we on? Who do we care for? And that is what this is all about. We are being told that we are heartless because we don't care enough about the people who are illegally in our country to legalize their status when, in fact, we need to make sure that we are not doing anything that will hurt the American people who are struggling right now.

And what will happen if we legalize the status of those people who have come here illegally? What will happen? Let's say there are 20 million here. I know officially it is only 11 million. But every one of those people that we legalize the status for are then going to be eligible for family reunification. There are tens of millions of others who are going to pour in.

It is estimated, from just the legal people coming in after the amnesty, that we are talking about 40 million new people, mainly poor foreigners coming to our country. Does anyone think that it is not going to have a huge impact on the economy of our country, on our economic system, on our neighborhoods, on our schools and the well-being of working people? Does anyone think that 40 million foreigners—

And that is what is going to happen.

When you hear ''comprehensive immigration reform,'' think legalizing the status, which will then eventually bring into our country 40 million new foreigners, mainly poor people. Well, that is what this debate is all about.

I would submit that it is not wrong for people, and it is not hateful, it is not being too concerned about money and material things to think in our hearts about our own people before we think about the well-being of foreigners.

What keeps America together? Look, we don't have one race. We don't have one religion. We don't have one ethnic group here. What we have got are people who have come here and are a part of the American family.

□ 1745

We have to care about what happens within the American family because we don't have that sharing of one race or one religion or one ethnic group. What is it going to do if we bring in 40 million foreigners now to those people who are now part of our American family?

Well, someone says that we should expand the American family. Well, yes, we could just say: Hey, anybody in the world who wants to get here, we are going to make them an American and just forget about what that does to the 300 million Americans who are out there depending on their government to watch out for their interests.

What would happen if we have that situation? We will have a very harmful decline in the well-being in their communities, in their jobs, and in the government services that they are able to collect of the American family.

Again, that doesn't mean that illegals who are here are bad people—they aren't—nor are the poor people around the world who will flood into our country—because, if we legalize the status of those who are here, you will see a flood into the country.

Just think about this, just the discussion of what they call this act that was being aimed at legalizing the status of people who were brought here when they were younger, just that discussion of that issue brought 50,0000 to 60,000 people swarming in. They sent their children to the border.

Whatever happened to those kids, by the way? What happened to those 60,000 kids who were down on the border? Well, they are all over the United States now. And do you know what? In schools in California, we have children coming in illegally from other countries, and some of them are carrying diseases. This is a horror story.

Who is watching out for our children? We do care about those 60,000 kids that were there and the millions more kids that will come in if we legalize the status of our own illegal immigrants here. We care about our own kids first, and there is nothing wrong with that. We don't have to apologize about it, and we don't have to apologize also that we have the most generous legal system in the world.

By the way, for those people who always talk about, Well, immigration really helps our country and helps our economy, if you look at the statistics that are being presented, often what you are being told about are the effect of legal immigrants, which is true. They do add, and I personally would like to go on the record in saying that I believe in legal immigration.

I believe that our million people, we can absorb that, 300 million people, we certainly can absorb 1 million more legal immigrants, we should refine our system, so that those legals that are coming in are people that have a means and a skill or an education level, so they will be contributing to the wealth of the country rather than consuming it.

There are a lot of businesses that say they need some specialists. Yes, let's try to structure the legal immigrants in that way so it meets the needs of America, as well as brings in very highly-educated people into our country.

When we bring in people who are not that, when we bring in people who are not producing wealth, but instead are consumers, that means there is less wealth in our society, and that means that especially America's lower-income people are worse off.

Now, when I was a kid, I mowed the lawns in my neighborhood. It was a good thing. You get a work ethic when you are mowing the lawns. I actually painted houses and dug fence posts. I was an ice-cream scooper at Marineland snack bar, and those are the jobs kids did, but today, one of the factors of illegal immigration—and especially if we legalize the status and draw even more illegals in because now, all over the world, they know, Hey, all we have to do is get here, and we can outweigh them—all these entry-level positions, these positions that are actually giving young people a chance to get some work experience, many of these jobs are being taken by people who are here illegally.

They are willing to work at a very low level, and they don't just become entry-level jobs. That is the job they stick with. That means that job is no longer available to an American kid who wants to get some experience in the workplace, a box boy or someone who works at a fast-food restaurant or something like that.

We are actually hurting our young people, we are hurting our poor people, the people at the lowest end of the scale, and of course, we are hurting the people who are dependent on government programs.

Before I go on to that, there are a group of people in our country that would like to be self-sufficient. They have skills, but they have some sort of physical disability. Those people are struggling to come out and have some self-dignity in earning their own living.

Those people are being replaced by people because, Oh, well, we will just hire this illegal, even if we can hire a disabled person, we can get an able-bodied illegal in here for the same amount, so why have someone who has a physical disability?

The people at the very lowest level—where is unemployment the highest? In our black community and in the Hispanic American community. These are the people who will be the worst hit if we legalize the status of those who are here illegally.

If there are tens of millions more who pour into our country—and as I

say, it will be at least 40 million—and then when the word goes out all over the world that we have this surrender of our borders, you can bet there will be even more than that. It will be a massive betrayal of the regular people and lower-income people in the United States, of American citizens—again, the disabled people, lower-income people.

What about those people who have worked all of their lives for government, who made sure that they pay their taxes, knowing that the government is going to have certain things to back them up as they got older or whether there are things that they would need in cases of emergency, or how about the education of their family and things such as that?

No, these programs will have so many tens of millions of more illegals come in because we have legalized the status of those who are already here, those programs now which are suffering, some of them will break down.

So how can, with a straight face, people in this body say they are backing the President's efforts to provide 5 million—this is his first step now—5 million work permits to people who are here illegally?

This is at a time of high unemployment. We are defining who we care for. We have already defined who we are as a Nation on how we have set down a rule of law and whether we try to be fair. We are an imperfect society. We know that. We know we have got some real problems we have to solve and work together on.

We are a multiracial, multiethnic society, but our society as it is will disintegrate if we have tens of millions of illegals pouring into our country. That is just the way it is.

Again, the poorest of the poor will be hurt, and when we give 5 million work permits at a time when we have such high unemployment, when we give 5 million work permits to people who are here illegally, we are actually betraying the American people who are struggling at the lower end of the economic scale. We are betraying them. It is something we all need to think about.

We need to say to the American people: we are on your side, and we want to do things that are right for you. I have been dismayed by that element of just sort of, not disdain, but a frivolous overlooking of the well-being of the American people when those people are advocating comprehensive immigration reform.

Let us also just note that immigration is something that is on our agenda. We keep hearing about it, but there are special interests at stake here. The reason why it is being pushed is not just this humanitarian special ideal, this humanitarian philosophical thing which I say we have to make sure that those special ideas that they think they become more human, to give our money away to various peoples of the world, that it doesn't hurt Americans, but there are also special interests who are profiting from this.

It is not only a bad idea and a bad ideal that is driving this toward these decisions, but we have special interests that want cheap labor. We have people in the business community that want cheap labor. Now, don't tell me that Americans can no longer work as carpenters or as plumbers or as roofers. The construction industry slowly, but surely, now is evolving into where they are hiring illegals. That is wrong. There are people who can do these jobs, but they will take the lower pay alternative—of course they will.

There are people that claim that they have to hire illegals because they can't hire Americans at that. No. If people were being paid more money, they could hire Americans at those jobs, but we have special interests that want lower pay, and we have special interests on that side of the aisle who want political pawns to come into this country to serve them when election day comes in the future and you have got 40 million new people here over a 20-year period that they will be voting for their political party.

That is just how cynical it is. Low wages and political pawns are being pushed. That is the factor that is pushing this comprehensive program that will be dramatically harmful to the well-being of the American people.

I would hope that we postpone any decision on that until next year when we Republicans can debate this issue, go to the American people, and get their guidance on what policy that they want our country to have when it comes to immigration into our country.

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

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1447. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4812. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5108. An act to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 4, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2203. To provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8163. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-78; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0051; Sequence No. 6] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8164. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0747; FRL-9919-83-Region 5] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8165. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County's Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Four Industry Categories for Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0475; FRL-9919-66-Region 3] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8166. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia's Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan of the West Virginia Portion of the Martinsburg-Hagerstown, WV-MD Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0690; FRL-9919-65-Region 3] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8167. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; 2014 Iowa State Implementation Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0550; FRL-9919-87-Region 7] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8168. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Availability of Data on Allocations of Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Allowances to Existing Electricity Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9919-91-OAR] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8169. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: 2014 Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems; Final Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0512; FRL-9918-95-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR96) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8170. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion [EPA-R07-RCRA-2014-0452; FRL-9919-72-Region 7] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8171. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0074; FRL-9919-74-Region 6] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8172. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Rulemaking to Amend Dates in Federal Implementation Plans Addressing Interstate Transport of Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9919-71-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS40) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8173. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 13-14, informing the Congress of the Department's intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Communications and Information Organisation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8174. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Taiwan Relations Act, agreements concluded by the American Institute and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8175. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8176. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report to the Congress on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8177. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8178. A letter from the Acting Chief Management Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8179. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to the Congress for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8180. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a separate management report for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8181. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the semiannual report to the Congress on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8182. A letter from the Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's report entitled ''Federal Student Loan Repayment Program CY 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4309. A bill to amend the Sikes Act to make certain improvements to the administration of cooperative agreements for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–647 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4489. A bill to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces and World War I, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–648 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a surface danger zone over the Guam National Wildlife Refuge or any portion thereof to support the operation of a live-fire training range complex; with an amendment (Rept. 113–649 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5683. A bill to ensure appropriate judicial review of Federal Government actions by amending the prohibition on the exercise of jurisdiction by the United States Court of Federal Claims of certain claims pending in other courts (Rept. 113–650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4309. The Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

H.R. 4402. The Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

H.R. 4489. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 5803. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 5804. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing hazardous humanitarian services in West Africa to combat the spread of the 2014 Ebola virus outbreak shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 5805. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to expanding access for breakthrough drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 5806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent certain expiring provisions related to charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 5807. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high quality assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5808. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to strengthen rules applied in case of competition for diabetic testing strips, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5809. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 5810. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H. Res. 772. A resolution directing the House of Representatives to bring a civil action for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge certain policies and actions taken by the executive branch relating to immigration; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Res. 773. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that localities should observe Halloween on the last Saturday of October and communicate to the public that trick-or-treating and other public observances of the holiday will take place on that day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 774. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini and expressing condolences on his passing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 5803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV; Section 3: the Authority of Congress to make all rules regarding the territories.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 5804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress ''to provide for the common Defence'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8: ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . .''

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 5806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 5808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 5810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (''The Congress shall have the power To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States'')

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (''To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes'')

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof'')

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 310: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 366: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1074: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1250: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1339: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1761: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1816: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1981: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2224: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2955: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2994: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3116: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 3571: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4077: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4551: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 4740: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4837: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 4957: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 5033: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 5059: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 5178: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 5185: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 5403: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5505: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 5589: Mr. POLIS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. FATTAH,

H.R. 5644: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 5646: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 5655: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5656: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 5741: Mr. COOPER and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5764: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 5768: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 5778: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5781: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 5783: Ms. FUDGE.

H. Res. 109: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 711: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. LEWIS.

H. Res. 757: Mr. SMITH of Texas.