of resources to properly administer the law and then complain that the IRS and CMS are not properly administering it.

The American public has a right to expect better from the people's House. Someday, they will get it.

## INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, although criminal forfeiture laws have been an important tool and a useful tool for law enforcement, civil asset forfeiture has been used too many times to seize, forfeit, and indeed profit off the property of Americans without even charging them with crimes—innocent until proven guilty.

The activity can be a boon for police budgets, as the Federal asset forfeiture fund exceeded $2 billion in 2013 and equitable sharing agreements between the Department of Justice and local police departments accounted for over $600 million.

While policing certainly is a vital element of an effective society, let's also be mindful of the fact that our Constitution emphasizes individual rights above all. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 5212, the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act, to limit the scope, the power, and the reach of the government to abuse their forfeiture powers in violation of individual rights guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

I urge all my colleagues to support this needed reform effort and to again assure our citizens of their civil liberties and the opportunity to defend innocence or prove guilt.

## IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, my press secretary has kept me pretty busy the last few days, talking about the President's decision to delay executive action on immigration, in two languages. I made it clear that from a political standpoint, in the short run and the long run, I think the President should have taken action before election day in order to be more transparent with the American people about the policy we all know is coming.

It makes the job harder for me to generate enthusiasm among Americans to vote at all, let alone enthusiasm for voting for Democrats when there are members of my own party asking the President to hold his pen and his phone in abeyance until after the voters vote.

From a policy standpoint, every week we delay is bad for our country. From a humanitarian perspective, deporting the parents of U.S. citizens is not in our national interest. Making it impossible for spouses of legal immigrants and citizens of the United States to pick up the visas that have already been issued to them is not in our national interest.

Keeping the fear of deportation hovering over immigrant communities, like Pilsen and Little Village in my district in Chicago, has a damaging impact on the fabric of our community. It dampens the economy along commercial thoroughfares, like 26th Street, a key engine of the Chicago economy and tax base.

Perhaps more important to those living outside of immigrant communities is to know that when the President acts, he will announce a tough but fair solution for millions of immigrants who do not have visas or any way of getting visas, but who have lived and worked here peacefully for years, even decades.

It would work something like this: if they come forward, if they submit their fingerprints at their own expense to the FBI, and if they pass a rigorous criminal background check and meet other requirements, we will issue them a biometric identification card that says that they are not a priority for deportation.

Not only do we get them in the system and on the books, but now they are in a program that needs to be renewed periodically with strict rules. This creates a huge incentive not to violate the rules of the program or the rules of our society.

I know the President has heard all of these arguments, and I don't think I will convince him to change his mind again and move forward with key improvements to our deportation policies before November 4, but let us be clear, I think he has already made two important decisions.

Number one, there is no longer any question that the President of the United States has the legal authority to act on immigration and deportations under current law. Even Republicans who have hired the best lawyers at taxpayers' expense to prepare their lawsuits against the President agreed and didn't include immigration in their farfetched list of Presidential ''overreaches.''

This is settled law, and despite the shouts of talk radio and a few on the Republican side, there is no real serious debate about the rock-solid legal ground from which the President can act and has already acted.

Secondly, I know the President has decided going big, going broad, going generous, and going quickly after the election is the right decision because he and Secretary Jeh Johnson have to set enforcement priorities about which people they will deport first and which people they will deport last based on national security and economic interests of this country.

He will act up to the limits of current law, and believe me, I can hear the cries from the other side, ''He can't act because we, Republicans, may try to do something on immigration in the lame-duck. The President can't act because we, Republicans, are going to put the bipartisan coalition back together again in the new 114th Congress, and we will get reform passed in both Houses; or, you know, we were just kidding when we said all that stuff about immigration after our defeat on election day in 2012.''

They will say, ''This time, we really mean it because 2016 and the electoral college are staring us in the face''—but no, I know the President and the Democrats will not fall for that again.

I don't see the President saying he will act if you don't act, as we have been saying for 2 years. This time, I see the President acting first, acting broadly, and acting generously, laying out a broad array of executive actions to mitigate the damage that is being done to our country by congressional inaction on immigration reform.

If the Republicans are so inclined, they can take legislative action. It is what we have been begging them to do for two decades on this issue. We may even work with you if you are serious about it, but it will no longer be accepted as a delaying tactic for action by the executive branch of government. It will be a response to Presidential action.

I think the President will have the courage to act, and then it is Congress' chance to act.

## THE RETIREMENT OF BILL SCHWERI

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend of southern and eastern Kentucky, Mr. Bill Schweri, upon his retirement as the director of Federal Relations at the University of Kentucky.

During his 42 years at the university, Bill has been a champion for progress in education, health care, and energy research across the State. Behind the scenes of Kentucky's highly esteemed flagship university, Bill has been a driving force, seeking out partnerships, programs, and funding to help the most distressed region of the Commonwealth. I am certain there is not a single resource that Bill hasn't researched for the benefit of southern and eastern Kentucky.

No one knows the value and power of creating and sustaining longtime partnerships like Bill. If the University of Kentucky needed a partner to improve education or access to health care, Bill ensured the connection was secured with his genuine, kind, and humble approach.

Most leaders seek recognition or credit for their own efforts, but that has never been the case with Bill Schweri. His work has led to exponential growth of UK's research enterprise and jump-started new research initiatives that have enabled the university to be successful in competing for Federal grants and contracts.

This riveting scientific research on cancer, fossil energy, transportation, and agriculture is blazing new trails in every aspect of our everyday life in our country, to say nothing of how our State is better off for it.

□ 1015

He has fought for legislation that is important to UK and student financial aid. Bill has been a leader in the Science Coalition and actively involved in the Council on Governmental Affairs and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. Over the years, he has deservedly gained the utmost respect of his peers in Federal relations.

As he departs his post, Mr. Speaker, at the University of Kentucky, it is my intention to ensure Bill Schweri receives the recognition that is due him for his tireless efforts on behalf of students and families all across Kentucky, and specifically living in Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District. We hope he knows he always has the thanks of a grateful Big Blue Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me as we honor my friend Bill Schweri as we bid him a joy-filled retirement.

## POTABLE WATER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just last month, hundreds of thousands of residents in Toledo, Ohio, were left without access to potable water and faced an extended drinking water ban, after unsafe toxin levels, likely caused by a Lake Erie algal bloom, were found at a city water treatment plant. In January, Charleston, West Virginia, residents faced a similar ban on their drinking water after a chemical spill.

George Bernard Shaw once said:

> Success does not consist in never making mistakes, but in never making the same one a second time.

One would think, after two new incidents that left hundreds of thousands of Americans without access to clean drinking water, this body would jump into action to prevent this from ever happening again. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the House hasn't only refused to act, yesterday we actually voted to prevent the administration from acting.

Again and again my colleagues continue to introduce bills and riders that would endanger our drinking water while ignoring basic scientific principles in the process. Today more than 117 million Americans get their drinking water from systems that rely on rivers, streams, and wetlands which, at this very moment, are not clearly protected under the Clean Water Act. Let me say that again: 117 million Americans are getting their drinking water from bodies of water that may not be protected from pollution or destruction.

American families deserve clarity, and that is exactly what the administration is trying to provide with their proposed Clean Water Act rule; and, unbelievably enough, that is exactly what the House voted to prevent yesterday.

For years we relied on the Clean Water Act to protect the Nation's waters. For my constituents back home in Chicago, that meant everything from the wetlands on the shores of Lake Michigan to the inland streams that flow across the Great Lakes region. But two Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 changed all that, leaving us with a confusing, time-consuming, and frustrating process for determining which of the Nation's waters are now protected under Federal law and which are not.

It is imperative that we close what has become a harmful loophole, and that is what the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers are trying to do with their proposed rule clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act.

Let's be clear: The EPA and the Corps of Engineers are acting within the authority granted them by Congress under the Clean Water Act to legally clarify the statute's jurisdiction. This clarity is desperately needed, especially in the Great Lakes Basin. Half the streams in the Greats Lakes States lack clear water protection simply because they do not all flow all year.

This lack of protection has taken its toll, slowing permitting decisions for responsible development and reducing protections for drinking water supplies and critical habitats. The EPA and Army Corps' proposed rule would restore Clean Water Act protections to wetlands and tributary streams because the science clearly shows that these water bodies are connected.

Before proposing its rule, the EPA analyzed more than 1,000 peer-reviewed scientific articles, and the findings are irrefutable. Tributary streams and wetlands are clearly connected to downstream waters. Pollution is carried down the river, polluting bigger and bigger waterways.

Healthy wetlands improve water quality by filtering polluted runoff from farm fields and city streets that otherwise would flow into rivers, streams, and great water bodies across the country. Wetlands and tributaries provide vital habitat to wildlife, waterfowl and fish, reduce flooding, and replenish groundwater supplies.

We cannot protect and restore the Great Lakes and our drinking water supplies without first protecting and restoring the wetlands and upstream waters that feed into them. Congress passed the Clean Water Act with the intention of protecting our waterways, and that is what it did for almost 30 years. Now this administration is trying to bring back these protections this House has undermined.

Let's not make the same mistake twice. Let's let the experts do their job.

## HONORING THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS ON 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO VETERANS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay special tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also known as the VFW, on the 100th anniversary of its organization in September 1914. The Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was also organized in 1914.

Over the past century, members of the VFW have worked tirelessly to ensure that veterans receive the respect, honor, and support they deserve. The VFW was formed when the American Veterans of Foreign Service and the National Society of the Army of the Philippines merged during a conference at the former Schenley Hotel, which is now the William Pitt Union at the University of Pittsburgh.

A Pennsylvania Historic Society marker that sits between the Soldiers and Sailors Hall and the William Pitt Union commemorating the occasion reads:

> The Veterans of Foreign Wars organized September 14–17, 1914, at the former Schenley Hotel near here. Veterans who had served in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and China were among its founders.

Since its founding, the VFW has done tremendous work to serve veterans and family members. The organization played a central role in the creation of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the GI Bill. In addition, the VFW helped spearhead the creation of the Vietnam War, Korean War, World War II, and Women in Military Service Memorials.

It continues this legacy of service by helping veterans and their family members secure VA benefits, including disability claims and pensions. The VFW continues to play an important role as Iraq and Afghanistan veterans return home and adjust to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join us in recognizing and expressing sincere gratitude for the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the important work they have done and continue to do to stand with those who have stood for us.

## SOCORRO, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, as we continue our journey through the 23rd District of Texas, I would like to highlight the historic city of Socorro, in El Paso County. It is located in the center of El Paso's Mission Valley, a valley named for three historic missions founded by Spanish priests, soldiers, and colonists.

Socorro is also home to the Socorro High School Bulldogs. They are known for many things, but particularly they are known for their prowess in baseball. Socorro High is a former State