Many treatments for addiction are modeled on peer support like Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, valuable and important organizations that provide a pathway to helping a person overcome an addiction through peer support, but peer support is only support. It is not the whole treatment.

In Time magazine, a parent whose son died of a drug overdose said:

> I did everything I could, but I failed him. Everything included eight residential treatment programs and four outpatient programs.

Addiction programs don't always do everything right. Ninety percent of those who enter treatment programs don't receive evidence-based treatment. The fact is there is a lack of mental health professionals, broken Federal policies, and a severe shortage of acute care facilities.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 3717. Let's get people the help they need.

□ 1230

CORPORAL G. ROBERT SMITH

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, from 1942 to 1949, the African American marines who trained at Montford Point Camp, North Carolina, fought intolerance and segregation, yet they continued to serve their Nation proudly.

I am honored to have one of these men, World War II veteran Corporal G. Robert Smith, amongst the ranks of constituents in Ohio's Second District.

I am personally grateful for Corporal Smith's service and dedication to our Nation, and I would like to offer my sincere congratulations for being recognized with the Congressional Gold Medal. Corporal Smith lives up to the high standards that characterize the United States Marine Corps. The statement ''once a marine, always a marine'' is a reminder that these standards carry on long after the uniform has been put away.

Corporal Smith, your fellow Americans take pride in your military service and your contributions to your community after that service.

The freedom and liberty that we enjoy today is due, in large part, to the sacrifices made by individuals like Corporal G. Robert Smith.

Corporal Smith, Semper Fi.

THE FOUR CHAPLAINS

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 71st anniversary of a dramatic sacrifice made by four U.S. Army chaplains during World War II on February 3, 1943. On that day, the USS *Dorchester* was torpedoed by a German submarine, and it sunk. Out of that tragedy came the story of the four chaplains.

Four U.S. Army chaplains of different faiths—one rabbi, one Roman Catholic priest, one Methodist, and one Baptist minister, Clark Poling, who was born in Columbus, Ohio—came together on that day on the *Dorchester*. As the *Dorchester* began sinking, they began to calm the men and organized an orderly evacuation, but it quickly became clear that there weren't enough life jackets.

In a true display of heroism and bravery, the four chaplains removed their own life jackets and gave them to others. They helped as many men as they could on lifeboats, and then they linked arms, recited prayers, and sung hymns as the ship went down. These heroic actions must never be forgotten.

I would like to thank the Wilmington, Ohio, American Legion post and the many American Legion posts and VFW posts across the country that helped tell this story this week. We must never forget.

BUREAUCRACY STANDING IN THE WAY OF PROGRESS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, Americans want us to work together to help our economy grow, to support job creation, and to create opportunity for every American to succeed, but far too often our own government gets in the way of American job opportunities—stifling innovation and hindering job creation.

The construction of the Keystone pipeline means thousands of jobs to Americans who are looking to get back to work—it means engineering, construction, energy, transportation, and manufacturing jobs—but our own government continues to stand in the way.

The Congressional Budget Office now says the administration's health care mandates will damage economic growth and will lead to as many as 2.3 million American workers losing their jobs because of what this government has decided to do to them. These are real consequences for real families.

Mr. Speaker, our economy isn't struggling because of the efforts of the American people. No. Our economy struggles because of bloated, expensive, and destructive bureaucracy that stands in the doorway of progress. As this government grows, opportunity shrinks. It is time that this Congress removes the weight of this government off the backs of the American people.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2954, PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3964, SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY EMERGENCY WATER DELIVERY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 472 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 472

Resolved, That at any time after 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. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance. 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-35. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after 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. 3964) to address certain water-related concerns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-34. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides a structured rule for the consideration of two separate bills: H.R. 2954, which is the Public Access and Lands Improvement Act, and H.R. 3964, which is the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act.

It provides for an hour of general debate, each measure equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule makes in order five amendments to H.R. 2954 and eight to H.R. 3964, and of those amendments made in order, nine are Democrat amendments. So this is a fair and generous rule. It will provide for a balanced and open debate on the merits of both of these important pieces of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have real problems facing our Nation. The measures before us today are partisan and have no chance of becoming law. My friends across the aisle would rather pick political battles than propose real solutions. We worked together on the farm bill, on the budget, and on the omnibus appropriations bill, and I hope that soon we will pass a bipartisan Water Resources Development Act conference report. Instead of continuing in a bipartisan manner, however, we are here once again considering partisan bills that will not become law. For example, H.R. 3964 is a far-reaching measure of drastic and immediate consequences for its chosen winners, yet the bill was introduced only a week ago and with only Republican cosponsors.

California is in the middle of a terrible drought. Some Californians are already reporting that no water comes out when they turn on their taps. They need a real solution. We have got our water issues in Florida. There is not enough of it in places that need it and too much of it where it is not needed. Yet my friends across the aisle have decided to handpick when states' rights don't matter and to take the opportunity to blast California's prerogative.

California has a plan—the Bay Delta Conservation Plan—that has been worked on in a unanimously important way. Instead, this legislation has turned a legitimate crisis into a justification for a power grab, prioritizing junior water rights holders over those with senior rights. I respect my colleagues from California, but the Governor is responsible for the entire State, and he expressly rejects the measure before us today.

Mr. Speaker, Californians already have, as I have said, a water use plan in place. The plan is a result of long, detailed discussions and carefully crafted policy. Yet this bill would substitute—indeed, preempt—the will of the people with a reactionary Federal policy. Specifically, the bill preempts California law, eliminates Endangered Species Act protections for salmon and other fisheries, overturns existing Federal law, as well as undermines existing agreements and court orders related to water use in California.

Moreover, this bill will not fix the problem, which is simple—there is not enough water. H.R. 3964 will not end the drought. It will not create more water. Simply put, it will only decide who will go thirsty.

California's secretary for natural resources, John Laird, wrote to the relevant committees:

The bill falsely holds the promise of water relief that cannot be delivered because, in this drought, the water simply does not exist.

How and when to direct water is very similar to problems we face in the Everglades. Without an ongoing flush of water into the ocean, seawater intrudes upon the delta. You then wind up with saltwater inland, and then you might as well not have any water at all.

I didn't have to deliberate long to decide against this bill. California, the State the bill supposedly helps, is strongly opposed to it. Let me be very clear. That means the Governor and those who are critical to it are opposed. I understand that there are members of the California delegation who do support this matter, and I respect that. I can't say it any better myself. The only way we are going to help California is to realize that you can't play politics with a person's drinking water.

Turning now to the other piece of legislation, H.R. 2954 is no better either substantively or procedurally. My friends across the aisle continue to play fast and loose with their pledge to address one issue at a time. That is what they said. H.R. 2954 is 10 unrelated bills stitched together. Some of the provisions we are looking at today are not controversial, but rather than pass noncontroversial provisions through less contentious means, my friends have packaged them together with partisan measures for rank political purposes.

□ 1245

It is Frankenstein's parliamentary monster.

The other day at the Rules Committee, my friends across the aisle talked about how much they love national parks, and shared their experiences hiking and visiting the parks with their families. Yet they are still bringing H.R. 2954 to the floor, a bill that would greatly hamstring the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the United States Forest Service in their capabilities to protect public land and endangered species.

These 10 bills are designed to influence or dictate management decisions about the conveyance or disposal of Federal lands. They tie the hands of public land managers and give away millions of dollars worth of Federal land to local governments without ensuring the land is used in the public's best interest.

They include drastic changes to regulations related to grazing policy and waive or undermine existing environmental law. Some of these provisions would be significantly less controversial were it not for the unnecessary provisions waiving environmental protections. It is no secret my friends across the aisle look to undermine, if not eliminate, the National Environmental Policy Act at every chance they can.

These are the kinds of policies that leave 300,000 West Virginians without

water to drink or bathe. We don't know the effects of the chemicals that spilled into the drinking water for 300,000 West Virginians. We don't know yet how much or even specifically what was spilled. The lasting damage to West Virginia's water supply can't be predicted. That is why it should be an exemplar for why we need to have careful environmental regulations everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, week after week, my Republican colleagues continue to bring up partisan bills that offer no relief to hardworking Americans. I believe that this institution is better than that and must change course.

I am astounded that we haven't authorized unemployment insurance.

Let me repeat that. I am astounded that we have not reauthorized unemployment insurance for now what is 1.6 million Americans. With each passing day, more families face the threat of losing their homes. With each passing day, our roads, bridges, schools, parks, ports, airports, and railways continue to degrade due to lack of adequate investment. With each passing day, Americans burdened by long-term unemployment see little, if any, action in the House of Representatives to give them hope.

With so many Americans and their families enduring difficult times, we cannot afford to wait any longer. Americans deserve peace of mind and a government that functions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. My good friend from Florida was correct in at least one aspect. There are two bills that are involved in this particular rule, one which involves 10 different sections dealing with land issues that are critical to 10 States chagrined that they have to come to Congress for redressing their grievances. The other one deals with water issues.

To explain that water issue, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), the sponsor of that particular bill.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, as a farmer in the Central Valley, I grew up there—born and raised—on my own personal farm with my family. We have struggled with this water fight for years, even before I was born. This isn't a new issue. It is something that has been talked about for years. The problem is we have talked about it long enough. We have got to do something. We have got to make a difference for these people.

When they talk about unemployment benefits, these people in my district would rather have a job. You turn on that water and they will be back to work. We have got farmers in my district that are literally laying people off today, putting more people on the unemployment line, because of environmental regulations.

Yes, there is a drought going on. That has been going on. It has happened in the past. We have got at least 10 in our recorded history in California.

When you look at what our forefathers have done, they created an infrastructure to allow us to prepare for those droughts, and what these regulations have done is allowed water to go out into the ocean and not be in place to prevent us from this disastrous situation we face today.

That is what we are fighting over today. We want to make sure that that infrastructure is used and our taxpayer money is put in place so that when those projects are there, we have water to supply our farms and our communities.

Over the last year, as a Member of Congress, and the 2 years before that as a member of the State house, and before that as a farmer, I have always dealt with and talked with my locals—and especially my local elected officials. My city councils, my city managers, my board of supervisors all come to me with the same issue:

What are we going to do? We have got 40 percent of our water this year for our city; we have got 50 percent of our water for our city; we have got 20 percent of our water for our farmers. How are we going to take care of our communities? How are we going to take care of these people. How are we going to allow them to be successful?

This is one of the solutions.

When we talk about solutions, I am fine and happy to work with Members on long-term solutions like the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, as long as it delivers water. I am fine talking about the water bond, as long as it delivers water infrastructure for our Valley.

We have to make sure that the crisis that we are facing today is addressed. Because it is a crisis; it is affecting people today. We are seeing people being laid off. Yes, that is putting a huge dent in our resources because we have to pay these people because they are not working because of a program, because of regulations that were put into place that allowed that water to go out into the ocean for absolutely no good reason.

So this has had an impact on my district. We are going to continue to fight, and yes, this is a solution. If the other side has a solution to bring to the table and be part of the conversation, I am happy to hear it and happy to negotiate. Until then, we are going to continue to fight on our side and push this forward.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a former member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. I wish to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3964.

California is currently experiencing a record drought. Up until just last Thursday, it had been 54 days without rain in my district of Sacramento. That is almost 2 months. To put this in context, Sacramento is experiencing a 130-year record for low rainfall, a record that dates back to 1884.

With 2013 being the driest year on record since the Gold Rush, and 2014 being the third year of a drought cycle, we are being pushed to make do with less water than ever before.

A statewide drought emergency has been declared, and my district of Sacramento is doing its part by instituting a mandatory reduction in water use. My constituents are required by law now to reduce their water use 20 to 30 percent. Fines for multiple offenders will reach $1,000.

Moreover, in the Sacramento region, the Folsom Reservoir is at dangerously low levels and is currently only at 17 percent of capacity.

Unfortunately, there is no silver bullet to solving California's water issues. The issue of water in California has been debated for so many decades because it is such a critical issue for the State. As a daughter of a Central Valley farmer who grew up on a farm, I deeply understand the value of and the controversy over water.

In northern California, we have done our best to balance our watershed to provide water for our farms, cities, and habitat.

To say this bill will help the drought is grossly misleading and, frankly, irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, even if we pumped as much water south as possible, it still wouldn't be enough. The problem is a lack of rain. There is simply no more water to pump from the Delta.

Mr. Speaker, instead of working together, this bill only further divides our State. My district, the city of Sacramento, the Sacramento region, and northern California as a whole, strongly oppose this bill. Some of the concerns include the loss of the State's right to manage its own water, the decimation of environmental protections for our Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the ability to manage Folsom Reservoir for the benefit of the Sacramento metropolitan area and, most importantly, the overall instability that this bill would create in California.

We cannot afford to give up California's right to control its own water future. The stakes are much too high. I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MCNERNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by stating that I am strongly opposed to H.R. 3964, for a variety of reasons, but primarily because it does nothing to address California's drought. However, I would like to raise two points about the bill's process and debate.

I offered an amendment that would sunset provisions of this bill in the 2015

water year. I did this because the bill's authors stated that the bill is intended to be a short-term measure. Yet my amendment to limit the duration of the bill was prevented from coming to the floor for a debate.

I offered another amendment, which was actually proposed by the bill's authors. A few weeks ago, the Speaker, the majority whip, and the bill's authors held a press conference in California, where they bemoaned the fact that the Senate would not come to the negotiating table to address long-term water shortage issues.

I agree with them that a bipartisan discussion in both Houses of Congress is appropriate. That is why I offered an amendment, using their own suggestions, to establish a joint select committee to address drought issues in the West. It would be comprised of 10 Members, just as the bill's author recommended, and would work out a comprehensive solution.

That proposal, too, was rejected, as was a similar amendment by my California Valley colleague, Mr. COSTA. We wanted to bring the House and the Senate to the table but are being denied the tools we need to do just that. How can the bill's authors claim they want a bicameral discussion, yet deny a vote on this issue—one which they just advocated for?

I am trying to establish a set of guidelines with what the bill's authors say they want, but they won't even allow it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman's frustration. Those very proposals were offered by Chairman LUCAS in the farm bill and rejected by the Senate.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), with whom I served previously on the Intelligence Committee and who is as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in fierce opposition to the bill that is being considered because it throws decades of State and Federal water law out the window, and, in the process, it would kill thousands of jobs in the Bay area and elsewhere on the west coast, while pitting water users against one another.

Salmon fishing is one of California's oldest industries. Today, the Bay-Delta salmon fishery is not nearly as healthy as it once was, but it still supports thousands of jobs up and down the entire west coast. This bill would dry up what is left of the once legendary salmon fishery industry.

Here are some of the laws that this bill would gut or override. I think everyone should fasten their seatbelts:

The California Constitution;

The Reclamation Act of 1902;

The Central Valley Project Improvement Act;

The State and Federal Endangered Species Act;

The National Environmental Policy Act;

The San Joaquin River Settlement Act;

The Wild & Scenic River Act protections for the Merced River.

If that is not enough for everyone in the House to know, then there isn't anything else to know.

Vote against this bill. It is horrible.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the last time California had a severe multiyear drought, something very different happened. Democrats and Republicans, people from the northern part of the State, the southern part, and inland came together around a historic bipartisan set of water reforms.

I was fortunate to help author some of that. I chaired the Water Committee in the State legislature. National newspapers like The New York Times called it the most important thing California had done for water in 60 years.

This bill repeals it. Full stop.

□ 1300

To offer this as a solution would be laughable if it weren't such a serious offense to real solutions in California water.

The Bay Delta Conservation Plan which my friend referenced is over if this bill passes because the premise of that plan is coequal goals for the environment and water supply reliability; and when you preempt that and repeal it, there is no basis for that plan to move forward at all.

You had better include, in fact, some funding for the Federal courts if this bill passes because, instead of a solution, you are going to be unleashing a wave of litigation unlike anything the State of California has ever seen.

It is going to hurt the San Joaquin Valley, and it is going to hurt every other part of the State that needs constructive solutions, not a new water war.

We have over 100 years, Mr. Speaker, of deference by the Federal Government to the State of California and to all other Western States in administering our water rights system. That was made very clear by Chief Justice Rehnquist in California v. The United States in the 1970s.

The principle of State administration of water rights under the public trust doctrine is part of the California Constitution, and the California Supreme Court has made it clear that that is a bedrock of California water law.

The California Legislature, in that historic 2009 package, called that the fundamental principle of California water, and it is repealed by this vastly overreaching expansion of Federal authority offered cynically today as a solution.

I know some people across the aisle like to talk about the 10th Amendment. They like to rail against expansion of Federal authority and Federal overreach. Well, we are living in a very glass house here today, Mr. Speaker, because this is the most overreaching expansion of Federal authority that I could ever imagine on something as basic as water rights in the Western United States.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who is a member of the Education and Workforce Committee and a former chair of the relevant committee having to do with the environment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank my colleagues who have spoken out against this legislation.

This legislation is in no way a solution to the problems that we have in California with the continuing drought. This legislation is simply a legislative temper tantrum.

They don't want to nuance what has to be nuanced. They don't want to have each area of origin be taken into consideration. They don't want to balance urban/rural. They don't want to balance agriculture/technology.

This is what the Governor is having to do. This is what the resource agency is having to do. This is what the entire State legislature is focusing on, trying to figure out how all of California survives the drought.

This one just says what we will do is we will kick over the barn upstate there. We will take their water and we will be okay.

Well, why doesn't San Diego look up north and say, you know what? We will kick over the barn. We will take their water, and we will be okay.

This is the greatest intrusion into State water rights that we have seen in this legislature, and that is why Governors of other Western States understand the principles that are engaged here are an absolute attack on their States also. That is why Representatives from those States opposed this legislation last time it was presented, and they will oppose it again this time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

So you have a bipartisan coalition in the States trying to work this out, from every economic sector, from every environmental sector, for the benefit of the State of California.

This drought doesn't have to end in this rainy season. It can go on another year and another year.

This legislation is destructive, destructive of our trying to make sure that every facet of the California society and its economy survive, and that is why this bill should be rejected. It is an assault on fundamental states' rights that every other Western Governor recognized the moment this bill was introduced, and that is why they oppose it. They join the Governor of California, the resource agency of California, in opposition to this bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we gave the House an opportunity to consider flood insurance reform which the Senate has already adopted, but unfortunately it was denied. As incongruous as it might be, we consider it such an important issue, while we are here talking about an equally important issue, drought, to bring up this measure having to do with flood insurance. It is an important issue for families across the Nation, so today we will provide that opportunity again.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to this rule to bring up a bill that will delay flood insurance premium hikes and provide financial relief to thousands of American families and, specifically, families in Florida.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), my good friend.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and allow us to vote on legislation to address the Nation's concerns about flood insurance and to come up with a comprehensive water plan to address our drought.

Last month, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to approve the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act. And the headline of the American Banker article says it all: ''House GOP Blocks Vote on Senate-Passed Flood Insurance Bill.''

''Florida Governor Scott Urges Speaker Boehner to Take Up Flood Insurance Fix,'' by the Palm Beach Post.

This bipartisan legislation provides a 4-year timeout on rate increases triggered by a property's sale or a flood map update for a property with previously grandfathered rates. The bill also creates a flood insurance advocate to investigate homeowner complaints of rate quotes.

During a recent trip back to my home State in Nevada, my constituents told me that these increases can be excessive and unfair. It is a problem that they want addressed now.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and to allow us to bring up this previous question and offer an alternative.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, before I go into complete pivot to nongermane issues, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) to talk about how the first bill deals with water diversions, not water consumption.

Mr. NUNES. I want to thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, today we are going to hear, Mr. Speaker, a lot of falsehoods. But we need to get to the bottom of why are we hearing those falsehoods, because, for 40 years in this body, people have made a career of using water as a weapon.

Why? Because they never liked the fact that farmers and farm workers were making what was once a dry area of the State the Garden of Eden of this world. They never liked that.

Why? Because they don't want to have to admit to themselves, when they live in their beautiful cities of Hollywood and San Francisco and all these great cities that are on the coast of California, beautiful areas, it is a desert. They don't have any water either.

So they wanted to keep our area, where I grew up, they wanted to keep it as a desert because they feel bad about the destruction that they have done on the coast of California. So if they can keep inland California in its original state, they would be happy with that.

But for the farmers and the farmworkers that are losing their farms, farmworkers are out of jobs. We are going to lose 30,000 jobs probably this year. It is an inconvenient truth that for 40 years this body has been preempting State law and taking water away from one region and dumping it and wasting it out to the ocean.

You started with the Endangered Species Act, State preemption. In 1992, a lot of talk about how we are gutting the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. That bill was a State preemption. We have no way to fix the problems in California because of all the State preemptions that have been done by the left in this body over four decades.

So I found it fascinating the Members of Congress that were getting up to speak about how we are going to kill the fish, and this water is so important for these fish; and the little Delta smelt, we have got to keep them and keep the habitat.

Well, there is a little more truth to that, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell you what they are really hiding.

And I apologize to the viewers at home. This is what they are hiding: sewer discharge into the delta, killing their precious little fish. Every one of the cities in the San Francisco Bay, Sacramento, the delta, sewage runs right into the waterway, kills the little fish.

It is pretty startling, isn't it?

They don't talk about that, do they?

The other little thing that they don't talk about is, where does their water come from? Because they live in a desert, too. People don't realize that. You go visit San Francisco, visit Silicon Valley, people think, oh, that is a beautiful area. Green lawns, people water their lawns. They don't have any water, Mr. Speaker, either, because, conveniently, this body preempted State law, took water from our area in the Sierra Nevadas, which is about 200 miles away. But worse than that, they went into a national park to take the water.

What national park? Yosemite National Park. They went to Yosemite, one of the treasures of our national park system, and they took this valley, and they put a dam so that they could create this lake.

Now, look, I want the people of San Francisco and the bay area to have water. I don't want them to be like our communities and not have any water. But we have to tell the truth, Mr. Speaker. They dammed up this valley to create this water, but then it doesn't go to the delta to protect their little fish that they care so much about. No, Mr. Speaker. It gets piped over to San Francisco. Here is the pipe. This is the Sierra Nevadas. They catch the water. They pipe it all over the bay area, Silicon Valley, San Francisco, discharge their sewer into the bay, take pristine water from our area to feed their families, grow their grass.

I don't see any of them up here saying that they are going to tear down this system, dump this water into the bay to protect their stupid little fish, their little delta smelt that they care about. We don't see that, Mr. Speaker, because they don't want to tell the truth. This isn't about truth telling. This is about money and power, millions of dollars.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NUNES. So all of the radical environmental groups that were created in this country started where? In that little epicenter of Hollywood and San Francisco on the west coast of California.

Lawsuits, lawsuit after lawsuit after lawsuit, millions of dollars went to trial lawyers. But you know what, Mr. Speaker? Those millions of dollars that came from my community to pay off these rich lawyers, we don't know how many millions it was because it is hidden from the taxpayer. It is hidden from the American people, sealed by court order. Why don't they come out and tell us how much money they made?

Millionaires off of government, used the government to make millions. Used the government to dump sewage into the water to kill the fish; dam up Yosemite to bring the water from Yosemite for fresh water while our people, farmers and farmworkers, lose their jobs.

It is an inconvenient truth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), my good friend.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, anyone watching this debate, I think, understands why the American public is so turned off by this Congress. This is a bill which was brought to the floor in a hyperpartisan process, bypassing the committee, hyperdivisive, and it is going absolutely nowhere. In the meantime, we have an economy which needs this Congress to act.

A few days ago, the Senate did act on a bipartisan basis to pass the Menendez-Isakson Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, which will help coastal properties that are now locking up because of skyrocketing flood insurance premiums which the Senate bill will fix.

Again, 182 cosponsors in the House, bipartisan. We have the support of the Bankers Association, Realtors, housing advocates, a broad consensus, broad bipartisan support. It will help the real estate market, which will drive this recovery in a positive direction.

Let's act on that, amend the rule. Let's bring up the flood insurance relief program and put this underlying bill back to committee where it belongs, where many of these thorny issues can be worked out by Members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the State of California.

Pass the flood insurance.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COURTNEY. Let's pass this flood insurance measure. In southeastern Connecticut, coastal properties, again, if you talk to the Realtors, you talk to the bankers, these properties are locking up because of the increase in flood insurance premiums.

We can change that today, right now. Get this bill to the President for signature. Let's get this recovery moving. Let's listen to the American people who want to see bipartisan action that is focused on the number one issue facing this country, which is getting a strong economic recovery.

□ 1315

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If the Speaker would forgive me for trying to get us back on the subject matter of the bill in front of us, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) to talk about the water bill.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition has erupted into a veritable Mount Vesuvius of misinformation on the California water bill, and I would like to address a couple of the major points that they have raised.

This does not preempt State water rights. It specifically invokes and protects the water rights against infringement by any bureaucracy—local, State, or Federal. This is a legitimate constitutional function of the Federal Government that dates back to the 14th Amendment, and it is made essential by the unique relationship between the Federal and State governments with respect to California water policy, the mixture of both the Central Valley project and the State water project.

To the ridiculous comment that this is a theft of northern California water and that northern California is united in its opposition, nothing could be further from the truth. On the contrary, this bill protects the north from any attempt to override established California water rights law in reallocating water from the north.

Just to illustrate this, I would point out that it was these provisions in the last session of Congress that the California Association of Water Agencies specifically pointed to in support. They said this: The bill, if enacted, now contains provisions that would not only protect the interests of senior water rights holders in the Sacramento Valley but would also provide significant material water policy improvements to current Federal law. The bill, if enacted, would provide an unprecedented Federal statutory express recognition of and commitment to California's State water rights priority system and area of origin protections.

Finally, to the argument that we cannot make it rain, there is not enough water to go around. Well, that is true. One of the reasons is because in this third year of drought, we have dumped a total of 1.6 million acre-feet of water into the Pacific Ocean that was desperately needed to support the threatened human population of California.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my good friend.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we may immediately consider H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Mr. Speaker, communities in my home State say, We cannot wait for relief from steep flood insurance rate increases. Rhode Island families have told me that they are facing flood insurance rates upwards of $35,000, and they are scared of losing their homes. If these rates fully go into effect, in many cases, families are going to be paying more for flood insurance than they are for their mortgage. Unless we act, we could potentially see whole middle class neighborhoods wiped out because they will drown not because of a flood but because they will drown under the weight of the cost of flood insurance. This is simply unconscionable.

Implementing a delay in rate increases, Mr. Speaker, will give FEMA time to complete an affordability study and develop recommendations to help homeowners afford their premiums. Without it, thousands of middle class homeowners will continue to suffer from the uncertainty of not knowing whether the cost of flood insurance will make homeownership unaffordable.

This legislation passed the Senate Thursday with a strong bipartisan vote. The House companion has 182 bipartisan cosponsors. I urge my colleagues to support consideration of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act to provide immediate relief for our families and our communities.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

I wish to make clear to my friend on the other side who continues to say that he wants to bring us back to the subject matter of this underlying bill that the minority has been granted a motion to recommit, and that motion to recommit is just as relevant as the underlying bill.

To speak to this issue, then, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for allowing me to take some time to be on this floor to plead with my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle to join with us in support of our middle class citizens who now have their homes at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with the opposite side of the aisle to join with what is a bipartisan piece of legislation, a bicameral piece of legislation, legislation that was passed out by the Senate that would correct the unintended consequences of the Biggert-Waters Act.

Why am I so passionate about this? First of all, I was a coauthor of the Biggert-Waters Act. It was a bill that we got together on where we tried to reduce the debt that we are confronted with, providing assistance and subsidies to our homeowners.

Many of our homeowners, as you know, across this country are put at risk. Their homes are destroyed through natural disasters. We have to be available to them through this kind of insurance program, the National Flood Insurance Program.

So we have the Senate, we have Republicans, we have Democrats who have all joined in with us to do something very simple: delay this for a time period. Delay this for 4 years so we can get on FEMA, and FEMA can get it right.

FEMA messed up the Biggert-Waters bill. We said, You have to do an affordability study. They did not do that. We said, You have to get your mapping and your remapping right. They have not done that. We said, Get a credible database. They have not done that.

We have got to correct FEMA. There is no reason why people should be having their premiums increased by 500

percent. This is wrong. We can do something about it. Don't stand in the way of coming to the assistance of American citizens who depend on us in their time of trouble.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) who is a dear personal friend of mine. He and I share concerns about issues related to Florida as well as this Nation, as it pertains to flood insurance.

Mr. GARCIA. I would like to thank my colleague from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the words of the previous speaker. Like the gentleman, though, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can take up a more important vote, so we can take up the strongly bipartisan Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

During this Congress, we have spent far, far too much time on issues that divide us rather than on bipartisan issues that unite us. The Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act is just that kind of bipartisan legislation that should be at the top of the House's agenda. It would relieve homeowners of crushing premium rate increases, strengthen our housing market, and support economic recovery. That is why this legislation has such strong bipartisan support.

The Senate passed this bill by a 67–32 margin. The House companion bill has 182 cosponsors, including 56 Republican cosponsors.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in voting to take up the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act today. It just can't wait. It is time to make a difference. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can take up this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, because of rising flood insurance rates, people are literally walking away from their homes. I recently heard from Robin and Derek, a South Florida couple whose landlord had increased their rent to cover the property's rising flood insurance rates. The rent increase made staying in their home too expensive for Robin and Derek. Despite searching, they were unable to find another affordable house in the area. After nine years of calling South Florida home, they were forced to leave Florida and move north to Pennsylvania. The couple had to find new jobs in a new town. Their young daughter had to be pulled from her childhood home, her school, and all of her friends.

Mr. Speaker, this is not right. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing that by voting to take up the Homeowners Flood Insurance Affordability Act today. This can't wait. We have to act to protect hardworking Americans from these exorbitant rate increases before anyone else is forced to walk away from their home.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can pass this bipartisan, commonsense solution and provide much-needed relief for homeowners in South Florida and across America.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 30 seconds to my good friend from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. There is great concern in the real estate community. It is very difficult to acquire flood insurance at some of the prices that are being quoted.

I think it is exceedingly important that we adhere to the words of Ranking Member WATERS: What is the rush? Why not get the study? Why not do that which we intended to do before we arrived at this position in our history?

My hope is that we will heed her words.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that my friends across the aisle have failed to recognize the irony in bringing these bills together to the floor at the same time.

The California water bill is an acknowledgement of how important clean water is, while the public lands bill undermines our ability keep that water clean. It would be funny if it weren't the absolute truth of the matter.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, meteorologists are calling the high-pressure zone at the root of the drought in California ''the ridiculously resilient ridge.'' In that spirit, one could say that the Republicans' resistance to extending unemployment insurance, fixing our aging infrastructure, raising the debt ceiling, fixing flood insurance, and passing comprehensive immigration reform is also a resilience worthy of the same adverb.

I believe that it is time for Congress to get serious about moving our country forward. The motion to recommit is particularly relevant to all of us in this Nation as it pertains to flood insurance, and this underlying bill, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) said earlier, is horrible.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I have appreciated the tone and the tenor of today's discussion and all the words that have been said on all the bills that are before us.

We have the opportunity of making the desert bloom if we do things in the appropriate way. We have done it in the past. We can do it in the future.

I recognize that most of the debate has been on the one bill in this particular issue which deals with the issue of water in California. Totally ignored was the other issue that is equally significant, especially to the 10 States that have an interest in that, dealing with land policy.

You see, there is a role for government if government is efficient and effective and compassionate and uses common sense. As I have worked with individuals, both on the ground from the Forest Service and the BLM, who live in the communities and know those people, they are usually fair, efficient, and effective people. They get it. But the further they ascend or are removed from the people and go up into the hierarchy of the administration, as they tend towards Washington, D.C., they tend to forget people and the importance of helping people, and they become hamstrung, as agencies, with a blind obedience to policy and to regulation so that the agencies become inefficient and ineffective. They lack compassion, and they are certainly devoid of common sense.

For example, we have one of the titles here that deals with islands off the coast of Florida, in 1946, given to those counties. They were told, as they had done that, that they could not sell the land, they could only lease it, which means that homeowners and businesses on this island that had been Federal property can now pay no property tax that helps the entire community to defend not only those areas but also keep the public lands open. It is an unfair situation.

Now think of this: This is property the Federal Government does not own, they do not need, they do not use, and yet they still control, by policy, what they are doing on that land which, I am sorry, is a silly policy that simply hurts the people.

□ 1330

We have the same thing across the country in Alaska. In Anchorage, there are 3 acres—3 measly acres—in the middle of the city, a city surrounded by Federal land, and you have to come to Congress because the rules and policy of the administration—the agencies—hurt people and lack common sense by denying Anchorage the ability to use that land efficiently, as they wish. Once again, this is land the Federal Government does not own, they don't need, and they don't use, but they still control what the local government can do with that particular piece of property.

In Nevada, Fernley, Nevada, they are willing to pay the government just to leave them alone. All the land they

want is within the city boundaries of Fernley. Once again, in this case, the Federal Government does not need this property, and they don't use this property. They simply insist on controlling it. What we need to do is simply get them out of the way so we can help the community to move forward.

It seems amazing that at many of our land agencies we simply have a gridlock as we have a highly centralized bureaucracy that values power over the principle of actually helping people. If Congress has to be involved in moving 3 acres in the middle of one community, that is a preposterous situation which we find.

I recently read a book that dealt with my church members living in Communist East Germany who had a very difficult time finding places in which they could build chapels so they could worship. If they found an area, simply a vacant space, they had to find equivalent private property to give to the state because the state government in East Germany insisted there was no net loss of property by the state. What I find amazing is we in America, with these land agencies, have that exact same philosophy: there can be no net loss of property to the government. That means either we are wrong today or Communist East Germany was correct back then, and I really don't think it is the latter.

We have another piece of property in North Carolina. In 2007, the government came up with a management plan. It was agreed to by the community, not happily, but they agreed to it. They did a biological survey and they found out that this plan does nothing to impede or harm any of the species available at Cape Hatteras. Yet the next year there was a lawsuit, and the land agencies, instead of fighting for what they knew was right and they had agreed to, caved, in a sue-and-settle settlement, which harmed the people living in that area. It hurt those people who were making their livelihood after the tourism going to Cape Hatteras.

Yes, in this case, the Federal Government owns the property and uses the property, but their control of the property is a total lack of common sense and a total lack of compassion and hurts the people who live there.

During the Clinton administration, the Clinton administration identified land in the Federal Government control that was not needed and that was useless. However, trying to find what those lands are requires you to go to 150 different sites to look in 150 different books. Why would they not put that on a computerized system so that anyone can have access to it and there is transparency in what we do and do not have? Yet the agency simply says that, even though that is a good idea, they are simply quite too busy to actually accomplish that task. In a response that makes the rollout of ObamaCare look well-managed, why do we need to understand where these lands are?

I will take a simple example. The Forest Service had land in one of my communities that they had owned for 40 years and did not know they actually had; and when the community wanted to expand their cemetery and did the title search, we finally found out this actually was Forest Service land. Needless to say, even though the locals wanted this land transferred and they didn't need it and they hadn't used it in decades, it still took 4 years to try and get this Congress to actually authorize it to take place, and then the Forest Service still charged the community $6,000 to do the paperwork to transfer the land over.

We have, in the middle of one of our National Guard units, BLM land that they don't need and they don't use, and yet we are still trying to get them to transfer the land over to the State of Utah so they can build needed infrastructure on a National Guard base that is still owned technically by the BLM.

That is why we need to understand what this is. We have a simple system, but we have bureaucratic lethargy in this country.

We have a mountain lookout, a historical site in Washington that was historic before wilderness was created in that particular area, and to try to shore up that lookout so it doesn't collapse, they were then sued by an agency. And some judge back on the west coast decided you have to send helicopters in there to tear it down because you couldn't actually make those kinds of improvements in a wilderness area on a piece of property that is revered by that community and they want to keep it there. Even the environmental community uses that as a staging point for their hikes and trails in that area. But this is a decision that is silly, and we have to make that decision by this summer to save that historic site.

In Yosemite National Park in California, a horrific fire destroyed both public and private lands. We now look at the fact that most of the private lands are now 60 percent recovered. They have gone through to take out the dead wood and the dead timber. They are starting the reforestation process. But on the public side of that land, we are still going through an evaluation process that even under an expedited system simply means that it will be until late summer before they can actually finish that, and then the lawsuits get to start.

Now, look, if you don't remove that dead timber, that burned timber within a year, it is totally useless, and all it does is become infested and becomes a source and a fuel for a future fire in a State that we have already heard is in their third year of drought and desperately needs the water for other things rather than fighting a fire.

These bills in this section of land try and solve these problems so we finally force the agencies to do that which helps people instead of hindering people's process. We find a situation where the agencies, today, of our government are inefficient, they are ineffective, and they lack compassion, which actually hurts constituents, hurts people, and they do not have common sense. That is why this package is so important, and it is important to do it now to help people.

It is simply sad that we are in a situation where Congress has to push the agencies to do the right thing. We should be better than that. We can do better than that, and that is what these bills attempt to do.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate that this rule is fair, it is appropriate, as appropriate and as fair as are the underlying measures that are being presented to Congress in this rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 472 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3370) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3370.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—196

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Amodei
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Fincher
Gosar
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz

□ 1405

Messrs. FARR and DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. BLUMENAUER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 190, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy

Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Amodei
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Cohen
Gosar
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Miller, Gary
Nugent
Pingree (ME)
Rush
Schwartz

□ 1413

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 470 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3590.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1415

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, February 4, 2013, amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 113–339, offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–339 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for each electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 237, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

AYES—185

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao