

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

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

WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

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

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

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

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

ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION

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

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

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

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

SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RELIABILITY ACT

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

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

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

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

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

ACCESS TO WOMEN'S HEALTH SAVES LIVES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 566

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