United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2014 No. 36

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 4, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, As you are aware, the time previously appointed for the next meeting of the House is noon on Monday March 3, 2014. This is to notify you, pursuant to clause 12(c) of rule I, of an imminent impairment of the place of reconvening at that time. The impairment is due to the weather.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. IRVING,
Sergeant at Arms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 12(c) of rule I, the Speaker established this time for reconvening and notified Members accordingly.

PRAYER

Reverend Harvey Peters, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, by whose goodness we live and move and have our being, and to whom we regularly swear allegiance in pursuit of life, liberty, and justice for all, we turn to You and humbly ask You to hear our prayers.

We are privileged to exercise our civil freedoms and make decisions that reflect the high ideals of our Nation's Founders and the aspirations embedded in our history.

Protect us from delusions or discouragement in the demanding business of governance.

Make us keenly aware we are not alone, and beckoned or not, O God, You are always present as we discern how best to fulfill our high calling with honor.

Keep us mindful of Your presence through those who labor at our side, and on our behalf; those who daily share the joys and burdens of our calling to public service, our families, our staff, our colleagues, and a host of people who continue to pray and hope for the success of our best efforts.

For them and to You, Lord God, we offer our thanks today and always.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

WELCOMING REVEREND HARVEY PETERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I have the distinct honor of introducing the guest chaplain for the opening prayer, my father, Pastor Harvey Peters.

Harvey Peters is a retired Lutheran minister whose service in a nearly 40-year career included stops in Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, Wisconsin, and all the way to California.

While I was a kid, he was an active leader in the movement to desegregate housing in the Detroit suburbs, an effort that, while unpopular among some of our neighbors, instilled in me and my three sisters the values of courage, integrity, and equality that I have tried to carry into my own service.

While my dad ran the congregation, my mom, RuthAnn, who is in attendance today, ran the family and worked part time as the church secretary.

It is an honor to welcome Harvey Peters, a longtime advocate for civil rights and the poor, a community leader, and dedicated father and grandfather, to the United States House of Representatives today to give the opening prayer.

Printed on recycled paper.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we will finally vote on the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Times are still tough for many hardworking families. Federal agencies like FEMA should not be in the business of making things tougher. Yet that is exactly what FEMA's callous and impractical administration of the National Flood Insurance Program is doing. Homeowners in south Florida, and throughout our Nation, cannot afford the astronomically increased insurance premiums forced on them by FEMA.

Without action to correct this agency's abuse, many family budgets that are already at the breaking point will fall apart.

Although I support passage of this vital bill today to protect our families and the American Dream of homeownership, we absolutely must do more to help bring premiums down.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF NEWTOWN, CONNECTICUT, VFW POST 308

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate VFW Post 308 in Newtown, Connecticut, which celebrated its 75th anniversary this past Sunday.

Since 1939, the members of Post 308 have demonstrated a remarkable commitment to civic engagement and community service in everything they do, whether it is assisting tornado victims in Oklahoma, providing college scholarships to deserving high school graduates, or supporting families affected by the tragic shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School in their hometown.

The men and women of Post 308 serve their community, their State, and their country with distinction. I congratulate Post 308 on celebrating this milestone.

THE GROWING INEQUALITY IN THIS COUNTRY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today the Federal Register is four times larger than it was in 1970.

This weekend, columnist Peggy Noonan captured the feeling among everyday Americans:

> Voters and taxpayers feel bullied, burdened and jerked around which, again, is not new, but feels more intense every day. Rules, regulations, many of them stupid, from all the agencies, local, State, Federal, on the building of a house or the starting of a business. You can only employ so many before the new insurance rules kick in, so don't employ too many. Don't take a chance, which means don't grow.

Mr. Speaker, there is growing inequality in this country, between regulators and the regulated, between large businesses wielding government influence and smaller competitors attempting to grow, between established corporations with compliance departments and upstarts with energy and ideas.

This status inequality demands our attention. Last week's bipartisan passage of the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act is a good start, but much more must be done.

OUR VETERANS DESERVE OUR HELP

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, transitioning from military to civilian life can be challenging for our veterans. The skill sets learned while serving in the Armed Forces are highly valued, and competence is extraordinary of veterans, who have a proven work ethic.

With record unemployment, we need to work together for jobs. Yesterday, the office of the Second Congressional District conducted a veterans job fair, thoughtfully hosted by the Aiken Shrine Club, to support our brave men and women who have faithfully served our country.

The event was to better connect our veterans with the resources available to them. I am very thankful for the local businesses, schools, government agencies, and veterans organizations that were on hand to offer assistance.

As the son of a veteran, as a retired member of the South Carolina National Guard, and being the very grateful father of four sons currently serving in the military, I appreciate our veterans' dedication to protect our freedoms. It is my hope this veterans job fair will prove beneficial and recognize the service of our heroes.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our hopes and prayers are for the people of Ukraine.

OPPOSING THE ACA'S CUTS TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of health care choices for our seniors.

Nearly 30 percent of all seniors, 15 million Americans, choose Medicare Advantage. Individuals have testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that Medicare Advantage provides better results than traditional Medicare by embracing free-market principles.

Medicare Advantage focuses on preventive care. Before ObamaCare, competition in Medicare Advantage kept costs for beneficiaries low and choices for plans abundant. With ObamaCare, choices will be reduced and costs for seniors, unfortunately, will increase.

ObamaCare cuts Medicare by $700 billion. Medicare Advantage has been successful for its enrollees. These cuts will reduce the access seniors have to Medicare Advantage. This is unacceptable as far as I am concerned.

Medicare Advantage should be touted. Instead, seniors are facing an on-average 13 percent rate cut in 2014, compared to 2013. We should not be penalizing seniors and reducing their access to health care to pay for others.

Medicare Advantage is a successful program, and Congress should protect it from being gutted by the Obama administration and the Affordable Care Act.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 28, 2014, at 2:31 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies the Congress he has extended the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe, declared in Executive 13288 of March 6, 2003.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive

Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2014.

The threat constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 2014*.

□ 1415

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HOME HEATING EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE THROUGH TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4076) to address shortages and interruptions in the availability of propane and other home heating fuels in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4076

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Home Heating Emergency Assistance Through Transportation Act of 2014'' or the ''HHEATT Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. PROPANE AND HOME HEATING FUEL EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a covered emergency exemption issued by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration shall remain in effect until May 31, 2014, unless the Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Governors of affected States, determines that the emergency for which the exemption was provided ends before that date.

(b) COVERED EMERGENCY EXEMPTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered emergency exemption'' means an exemption issued under section 390.23 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, or extended under section 390.25 of such title that—

(1) was issued or extended during the period beginning on February 5, 2014, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) provided regulatory relief for commercial motor vehicle operations providing direct assistance supporting the delivery of propane and home heating fuels.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) may be construed to prohibit the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration from issuing or extending a covered emergency exemption beyond May 31, 2014, under other Federal law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4076.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I was proud to introduce H.R. 4076, the Home Heating Emergency Assistance Through Transportation Act of 2014. This bipartisan legislation will provide relief for millions of Americans suffering from the current propane and home heating fuel emergency.

An exceptionally cold winter has increased demand for propane, which is used for heating approximately 12 million homes in the United States, and for other home-heating fuels. In my district, more than 9,000 households rely on propane for home heating; and across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there are more than 200,000 households that do the same.

So according to the National Propane Gas Association, supplies are expected to remain tight through the end of the winter because the infrastructure to deliver propane to high-demand areas is insufficient.

On February 5, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration issued a temporary emergency declaration to allow tank truck operators delivering propane and other home heating fuels to drive longer hours in order to speed up deliveries to the affected States. However, these emergency declarations can only last 30 days at a time, creating great uncertainty and limited relief.

Extreme weather conditions are not expected to subside any time soon, threatening the lives and livelihoods of those with homes, farms, and businesses that depend on heat from propane and other home heating fuels. Just yesterday, we saw another severe winter storm.

H.R. 4076 provides a guaranteed extension of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's emergency declaration until May 31, 2014. This certainty is required to address the transportation distribution issues to give much needed relief to the affected States.

Should the crisis subside prior to May 31, 2014, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Governors of the affected States, can determine that the guaranteed extension is no longer needed.

I would like to thank the National Propane Gas Association and the New England Fuel Institute for supporting this legislation. I will be entering their letters of support into the RECORD.

This bill has strong bipartisan support, and I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 4076.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

NPGA,
February 25, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, On behalf of The National Propane Gas Association (NPGA), I write to share our strong support for your legislation, H.R. 4076, the Home Heating Emergency Assistance Through Transportation (HHEATT) Act of 2014.

NPGA is the national trade association of the propane industry, having a membership of about 3,000 companies, with 39 state and regional associations representing members in all 50 states. The single largest group of NPGA members is retail marketers of propane gas who deliver the fuel to the end user for space heating, water heating and agricultural crop drying, among other applications. NPGA membership also includes propane producers, transporters and wholesalers, as well as manufacturers and distributors of associated equipment and containers. While NPGA's membership covers a broad cross-section of categories, more than 90 percent are designated as small businesses.

As you know, this winter Americans have faced severe supply disruptions in many areas of the country. A convergence of conditions—late wet grain harvest, closed pipeline infrastructure, limited railcars due to alternate service demands—have caused difficulties in delivering propane to consumers during one of the most extreme winters on record.

While the overall supply of propane in the United States is sufficient to meet demand, the propane industry is facing challenges with distribution and transportation. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the U.S. has more than 42 million barrels of propane presently in stock, located predominantly in Mont Belvieu, Texas, where the largest propane storage facility in the world is located. Overcoming the distribution challenges has been most greatly alleviated by temporary emergency declarations issued by the Federal Motor Carrier Administration which provide relief from certain federal motor carrier safety regulations for the Midwest, Eastern, Southern, and portions of the Western Service Centers. Unfortunately, these emergency declarations can only last 30 days at a time which creates uncertainty for our propane suppliers and distributors.

Chairman Shuster, we thank you for your leadership on this bill, and trust Congress will take swift action to pass this important regulatory relief. Thank you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD ROLDAN,
President & Chief Executive Officer, National Propane Gas Association.

NEFI
February 28, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: We commend you for the introduction of the Home Heating Emergency Assistance through Transportation or ''HHEATT'' Act (H.R. 4076) and are writing to endorse this important legislation.

The New England Fuel Institute (NEFI) is the nation's largest independent trade association representing the retail home heating oil industry. Our membership includes more than 1,000 mostly small business home heating oil and Bioheat® dealers and related services companies. Many NEFI members also deliver propane and other home heating fuels and retain nearly around-the-clock drivers and service technicians ready to make emergency fuel deliveries or service home heating systems in the event of an outage.

The severely inclement weather we have experienced this winter has resulted in high residential consumption rates for heating oil. As a result, heating oil dealers are increasingly challenged to resupply customer tanks without interruption and have been in need of waivers from certain regulations such as federal hours-of-service requirements. Emergency declarations issued by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) help to provide this relief so that heating fuel distributors can move product to where it is needed and expedite deliveries to homes and businesses.

Unfortunately, these declarations are limited to 30 days. This can create uncertainty during extended emergencies such as the long stretch of extreme cold and snowy weather we are currently experiencing. The HHEATT Act would provide added relief and certainty by guaranteeing an extension of emergency declarations through May 31, 2014. The U.S. Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with state Governors, may terminate the guaranteed extension before May 31st only if current emergencies subside.

This bill would provide much needed relief to our member companies and their consumers. We hope for its immediate passage and enactment. Again, thank you for your hard work in this regard.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL C. TRUNZO,
President & CEO.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4076, a commonsense bill. I would also like to thank the chairman for always striking the proper balance between safety and the smooth operation of commerce, and the gentleman explained it very clearly.

For many of us, especially in rural areas of the Midwest, propane is the fuel of choice for heating their homes, and to get an idea of what happened here, regular folks on a regular budget would spend about $600 to fill up their tank during the winter.

They got a refill, got a bill, and saw that it was over $1,900 in some cases. The shock to them was one thing; but then the situation, as the gentleman so clearly stated, was exacerbated by the inability to deliver when we needed it.

And propane, while there are many factors at work here, is not like other commodities in terms of—it is not a nice-to-have thing. It is a necessity.

So the chairman's bill, this bipartisan piece of legislation addresses one of the issues here, making sure we have the trucks on the road to deliver the propane, making sure the supply is enough to start making sure these things are filled until the end of winter, and doing so in a safe manner.

I want to applaud the folks over at the FMCA that did do what they needed to do in issuing some of the waivers, but the gentleman is exactly right. A 30-day waiver is not long enough. Winter is still deep in the Midwest, and we don't need to have the waiver expire on March 15, go through it again, and have the uncertainty.

So this piece of legislation simply does as the gentleman stated. It allows an exemption without sacrificing safety to allow for the movement of propane into the markets where it is most needed, specifically the rural Midwest.

These trucks are coming from Texas. It keeps the people on the roads. It keeps the trucks running. It keeps the propane tanks full, as those things start to happen and the market starts to stabilize a little bit, and the prices will come down.

I do think the gentleman hit on a bigger point here. The infrastructure for the delivery of propane is something we need to look at. This is a short-term emergency measure that will address the problem this winter. We need to look further down the road on some of the long-term solutions on this.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense piece of legislation, support it for all the right reasons, and then join together as we move forward to look at some long-term solutions.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. First, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his kind remarks. I appreciate it greatly and look forward to continue working together with you on many other legislative endeavors.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank the chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for his solid work on this, his bipartisan work, as the gentleman from Minnesota mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Home Heating Emergency Assistance Through Transportation Act, H.R. 4076, which is a short-term, commonsense measure.

This long winter has really hit a lot of families in their wallets and on their budgets, and a shortage of propane has made the cost of home heating even worse for many West Virginians and residents in our surrounding States.

More than 31,000 West Virginia households rely on propane for their heating. More than two-thirds of the propane sold in West Virginia is for residential use, meaning that high prices have a direct impact on our family budgets.

Local suppliers have been forced to short-fill their customers' tanks in order to spread the limited supply of propane among customers in need. Today's legislation will allow these suppliers to operate more efficiently through this spring, allowing them to make more frequent deliveries, and ensure that their customers have an adequate and affordable supply of propane to get them through the rest of the winter.

This bill is the first of five separate pieces of energy legislation the House will consider this week, all having one common thread, to make sure American families have access to affordable and reliable supplies of electricity and heating fuel.

I urge my colleagues to support the HHEATT Act and the other energy bills on the floor this week.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), an important new member of the committee and someone who really knows about infrastructure firsthand because he actually builds it out there in Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. I thank the chairman for this opportunity to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of concern for thousands of Americans struggling to heat their homes this winter. The bitter cold has caused an unwelcome rise in heating costs that has resulted in smaller paychecks and financial strain for individuals and organizations across Oklahoma's Second District.

Money is not going as far, especially among low-income families that already find themselves under tight budgets.

Areas that are in dire need of propane to heat their homes are left out in the cold—literally—due to a lack of adequate infrastructure. It is critical that we pass today's HHEATT Act to ensure the issues with heating fuel transportation and distribution are resolved and that relief is finally available.

Fuel costs aren't just numbers on a page. They are factors that critically impact our neighbors, our families, and our friends. The fact is we have a responsibility to maintain our Nation's public safety.

I urge my colleagues to remember your fellow Americans today and help pass this commonsense solution that will provide certainty and will quickly address a critical need.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this act. It is really just common sense, is it not? And I think it

best exemplifies how America handles crises. They adjust. They make an adjustment.

This certainly could be called a heated debate because we are trying to make sure that our constituents have that ability, to heat their homes during one of the longest winters. We don't use the term ''polar vortex'' back in Pennsylvania. We just call it winter.

It has been a long, long winter, and we are looking at the adjustment that would take place. It is just about transportation. It is about allowing these people that deliver this energy, this propane to these homes.

In Pennsylvania, we have over 180,000 people who rely on the delivery of this product to keep their homes heated. That is not a difficult thing to understand. I think for this body to be able to just on the run—on the fly, as it were—make sure that our constituents have the ability to heat their homes, this is so fundamentally basic, and it is just common sense.

So I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward. It makes sense to everybody back where I live, as they bundle up and continue to worry about when spring is finally going to get here.

We are able to release that now, change the transportation laws a bit, just so they can get there, and we are saying let's do it until May 31. Let's not do it the way we are doing it now.

Chances are, by May 31, that crisis will be gone, but the ability to get propane to their homes is very critical right now.

So I thank the chairman and ranking member for what they are doing. We are doing things that make sense for the American people, and every single American citizen benefits from this.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the chairman for a smart piece of legislation. It is simple. It strikes that proper balance between safety on our roads and a smooth flow of commerce.

This is a matter of life and death. It has been a bitter cold winter, as you have heard. 21 people in Minnesota have died as a direct result of the weather. We have 250,000 people who get their heat from propane. Many of them are in rural areas.

I have been in homes across southern Minnesota. These are folks doing everything right, paying the bills, working hard. If they can afford to get the propane, that is one thing. They simply can't get the propane, in some cases.

So this is one first step. Alleviate the crisis. Do it in a safe manner. Get it out there. Start to balance things out. Then move forward because, as we said, again, keeping stability in the heating oil markets is absolutely critical, and we can get this right.

So with that, I congratulate the chairman. I thank him for bringing this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his work on this.

I also thank the original cosponsor on this bill, Mr. RYAN from Ohio, who may be stuck in the snow out there, or maybe it has slowed down his progress to get to Washington; but the gentleman hails from eastern Ohio, right on the Pennsylvania border.

I know that this is going to impact his district, and I was glad that he and I were able to work together on this commonsense piece of legislation that is going to help hundreds of thousands of people—if not millions of people—all up and down these corridors who have had a very, very difficult winter.

I know that, looking at The Weather Channel or one of the weather stations out in Minnesota, they may need propane until the end of May because of the kind of winter they have had up there. There have been very, very, very cold, extreme weather conditions.

Again, H.R. 4076 provides the ability of the Transportation Department to extend this and help with this crisis and, as we have all said here today, strong bipartisan support; so I would urge all my colleagues today to vote on H.R. 4076.

I now yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from northwestern Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue not only to northwest Ohio, but to the entire Midwest, so I rise today in support of H.R. 4076, the Home Heating Emergency Assistance Through Transportation Act. This legislation will ensure the trucks carrying emergency supplies of propane can be delivered to communities most in need as fast as possible.

My constituents have been at the forefront of the shortage, as many rely on propane to heat their homes and maintain important farming operations. In the face of extreme winter weather, with prolonged periods of negative degree temperatures, access to heat is not a product of comfort, but is a requirement for survival.

Further frustrating is the resulting high prices that are putting pressure on already strained family budgets. While many supply companies are urging customers to take voluntary conservation measures, many families living in my district don't have the option of reducing home heat.

Last Friday when I did get home, I found this letter in my mailbox from a constituent I have known for my entire life. The letter was written by the wife explaining the situation. Her husband, who is almost 96 years old, needs to have their home warmer this winter since he is on a blood thinner.

During the last couple of weeks, they have kept their thermostat at 69 degrees. He has been fully dressed with a hat, gloves, bathrobe, and blankets while at their home. She explains in the letter that they have not had many pleasant days, but they have made it through it.

Another constituent is a young mother with children at home and one on the way. She cannot keep their home colder, even though it would help save on their next energy bill.

Finally, a small business owner who delivers propane to customers in northwest Ohio has been working day and night to find enough propane to ensure his customers can heat their homes.

□ 1430

In cases where he simply cannot provide enough propane, he has distributed plug-in electric heaters. These actions will keep them warm but will not help when they receive their next energy bill.

These are just a few examples of what is happening throughout the Midwest. The propane shortage has created a very serious crisis that is impacting the most vulnerable members of our society. H.R. 4076 is a step towards providing short-term relief to the communities, families, and small business owners most in need.

I thank the chairman for his leadership on this legislation, and I support the legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and encourage all Members to support H.R. 4076, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4076, the HHEATT Act, that would allow propane to expeditiously move across our country and be delivered to the hundreds of thousands of people who rely on this resource to heat their homes.

It is estimated that 250,000 people in my home state of Wisconsin rely on propane to heat their homes. Today, the temperature in my hometown of Fond du Lac is 11 degrees, with a high of 20 and a low of 6 degrees. The wind chill brings these temperatures down to the single digits and below zero. This is the way it's been for much of the winter during this exceptionally cold winter.

Don't get me wrong, I'm from Wisconsin, we're used to the cold.

But when you get home from work and you are unable to afford or even obtain the propane needed to heat your home, we have a serious problem. There are many factors that have contributed to the propane shortage we're now facing, and I am not here to list them all.

My home state of Wisconsin and the utility companies that serve us have been going to great lengths to assist those who are running low on propane and seek out additional supplies as far south as Texas to get them to the people that need them.

The U.S. Department of Transportation has temporarily suspended hours-of-service regulations for truck drivers carrying propane so supplies can make it where they need to go in an expedited manner. But these suspensions han been renewed in 30 day increments.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply continues the emergency suspension of federal hours-of-service requirements for truck drivers carrying propane through the end of May. It allows the transportation of propane to continue uninterrupted by federal rules that could literally be the difference between someone sleeping in a house with heat or without it. We are making progress in resolving this shortage, but this legislation would provide certainty for thousands in my district through the rest of the

cold season that they will be able to receive this valuable resource to heat their home.

I thank my colleague and Transportation Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4076.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF VENEZUELA AS THEY PROTEST PEACEFULLY FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 488) supporting the people of Venezuela as they protest peacefully for democratic change and calling to end the violence, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 488

Whereas the United States Government should support the rule of law, and free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela, condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition, and calling for dialogue between all political actors in the country;

Whereas, on February 12, 2014, also known in Venezuela as the National Youth Day, students began protesting in several cities Venezuelan leader Nicolas Maduro's inability to stem violent crime, his undemocratic actions, and a rapidly deteriorating economy marked by high inflation and shortages of consumer goods;

Whereas, on February 12, 2014, a judge issued an arrest warrant for Leopoldo López, leader of the opposition party Voluntad Popular, for unfounded allegations in connection with the student protests;

Whereas, on February 17, 2014, the Government of Venezuela notified the United States Department of State that it had declared 3 consular officers at the United States Embassy in Venezuela personae non gratae;

Whereas over the last year, the Government of Venezuela has expelled a total of 8 United States Government officials from Venezuela;

Whereas, on February 18, 2014, opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez turned himself in to Venezuelan authorities, was arrested, and charged with criminal incitement, conspiracy, arson, and intent to damage property;

Whereas Leopoldo Lopez is currently being held in a prison at a military facility;

Whereas nongovernmental human rights organizations have alleged that the charges brought against Venezuelan opposition leader Leopoldo López appear to be a politically motivated attempt to silence dissent in the country;

Whereas the Venezuelan Government has blocked users' online images as opposition groups marched through Caracas;

Whereas the Venezuelan people have been protesting economic, social, and political concerns facing their country, including corruption, rising inflation rates, shortages of everyday products, increasing crime rates, and the erosion of human rights and respect for political dissent;

Whereas, on February 19, 2014, President Barack Obama criticized the Venezuelan Government for arresting protesters, called for their release, and urged the government to focus on the ''legitimate grievances of the Venezuelan people'';

Whereas, as of February 26, 2014, there have been 14 people killed, over 100 injured, and many persons unjustly detained in relation to pro-democracy demonstrations throughout Venezuela;

Whereas Venezuelan leader Nicolas Maduro threatened to expel the United States news network CNN from Venezuela and has taken off the air the Colombian news channel NTN 24, which transmits in Venezuela, after news outlets reported on the nation-wide protests;

Whereas the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights released a statement on February 14, 2014, which ''expresses its concern over the serious incidents of violence that have taken place in the context of protest demonstrations in Venezuela, as well as other complaints concerning acts of censorship against media outlets, attacks on organizations that defend human rights, and acts of alleged political persecution''; and

Whereas as a member of the Organization of American States and signatory to the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Government of Venezuela has agreed to abide by the principles of constitutional, representative democracy, which include free and fair elections and adherence to its own constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly to promote democratic principles in Venezuela;

(2) deplores acts which constitute a disregard for the rule of law, the inexcusable violence perpetrated against opposition leaders and protesters in Venezuela, and the growing efforts to use politically motivated criminal charges to intimidate the country's political opposition;

(3) urges responsible nations throughout the international community to stand in solidarity with the people of Venezuela and to actively encourage a process of dialogue between the Government of Venezuela and the political opposition to end the violence;

(4) urges the United States Department of State to work in concert with other countries in the Americas to take meaningful steps to ensure that basic fundamental freedoms in Venezuela are in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter and to strengthen the ability of the Organization of American States (OAS) to respond to the erosion of democratic norms and institutions in Venezuela;

(5) urges the Organization of American States and its Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to utilize its good offices and all mechanisms at its disposal to seek the most effective way to expeditiously end the violence in Venezuela in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter; and

(6) supports efforts by international and multilateral organizations to urge the Venezuelan Government to adopt measures to guarantee the rights to life, humane treatment, and security, and the political freedoms of assembly, association, and expression to all of the people of Venezuela.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 488 signals U.S. support for the people of Venezuela as they protest peacefully for democracy in the face of Nicolas Maduro's violent repression and his crackdown on those who express their opposition to his regime's failed policies.

We must take a clear stand because the Maduro regime has responded in a deeply undemocratic manner by forcibly repressing protesters, attempting to silence critics by blocking media outlets, and even authorizing the arrests of key opposition leaders such as Leopoldo Lopez.

As protests have swelled throughout the country, the actions of regime forces have led to the deaths of at least 15 and to the unjust detention of more than 100 freedom seekers.

It is incumbent upon the Organization of American States, the OAS, to act according to the principles of its Inter-American Democratic Charter and address this crisis of democracy. Yet recent history has shown us that the Secretary General of the OAS will not lead the way in this important effort. Thus, in the absence of his leadership, responsible nations in the hemisphere must act. They cannot remain silent.

The Panamanians have stepped up to the plate. They have proposed a ministerial meeting at the OAS, but regrettably, Mr. Speaker, that proposal has not moved forward. This resolution will send a clear message to the OAS and to Nicolas Maduro that the United States condemns these undemocratic actions.

We see the plight of the people of Venezuela, and we stand on their side in the struggle for democratic change. We stand together with the Women for Life, Mujeres por la Vida, who march clad in white through the streets of Venezuela peacefully, like their companions in the struggle for freedom in Cuba—Las Damas de Blanco, the Ladies in White.

We stand with the students who take to the streets demanding the release of their fellow students who have been unjustly detained, only to be met with the clubs and the teargas of Maduro's henchmen. And we stand together, Mr. Speaker, united with the people of Venezuela who wish to cast the yoke of repression and oppression and the influence of the Castro regime, which has

been more than eager to help Maduro silence the oppression in Venezuela because it fears that the movement will sweep over the island of Cuba.

We must stand together and support those who seek freedom: freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, and the freedom from government abuse and government oppression. We must speak with a unified voice, Mr. Speaker, about the crisis of democracy in Venezuela and stand in solidarity with the Venezuelan people in their spirited struggle.

But in the face of a determined autocrat who disregards expectations of right conduct and who is willing to use violence to impose his will on free citizens, well, Mr. Speaker, words are just not nearly enough. We must act, and we must act now. We must support those who are pleading for respect for democratic principles and for human rights in Venezuela.

I want to thank the chairman of our important committee, Chairman ROYCE, and my good friend, also, Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, for getting this measure to the floor so quickly. I also want to thank their exceptional staff. I want to thank Congressmen ALBIO SIRES and MARIO DIAZ-BALART, who have supported this resolution from the very beginning. Mr. Speaker, we have worked closely together in a bipartisan and a bicameral way, including with the State Department, to ensure that this is a strong, bipartisan resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 488, a resolution supporting the people of Venezuela as they protest peacefully and calling for an end to recent violence, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to recognize my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN) for offering this important resolution, but more so for her dedication for so many years to these important issues. It has been a pleasure working with her through the years.

The eyes of the world are on Venezuela as President Nicolas Maduro and his security forces crack down on peaceful protesters. It is an absolute tragedy that 17 people have been killed and 261 people have been injured during recent protests throughout the country. It sounds a little bit like Ukraine, doesn't it?

I was particularly disturbed when the government issued an arrest warrant for opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez on trumped-up charges. Mr. Lopez turned himself in on February 18 and is currently being held in a prison at a military facility.

And, by the way, the elections that supposedly elected Mr. Maduro, as far as I am concerned, are in question because there never was a real recount. The ballots were destroyed before there could be a recount.

I am so deeply troubled by the crackdown on press freedom in Venezuela. The Colombian news network NTN24 was recently taken off the air after it broadcast footage of the protests. Journalists from CNN were also threatened with expulsion.

Today's resolution makes it clear that Congress stands with the Venezuelan people and against all acts of violence and undemocratic actions. I am pleased that President Obama and Secretary Kerry have also spoken out forcefully in condemning violence in Venezuela.

Let me be clear. It is not just the United States that has been taking notice of recent events in Venezuela. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights released a statement on February 14 which ''expresses its concern over the serious incidents of violence that have taken place in the context of protest demonstrations in Venezuela, as well as other complaints concerning acts of censorship against media outlets . . . and acts of alleged political persecution.''

Last week, the European Parliament passed a resolution calling on the Venezuelan Government to release jailed opposition members and protesters and to end the violence.

I hope all member states of the OAS, the Organization of American States, will similarly call on the Venezuelan Government to abide by the OAS Convention on Human Rights and the Inter-American Democratic Charter.

Finally, let me say that the only way out of this crisis is through dialogue. Our resolution makes this absolutely clear by encouraging ''a process of dialogue between the Government of Venezuela and the political opposition to end the violence.''

I stand with the people of Venezuela in calling for an end to the senseless violence, and I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 488, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), our colleague who is on the Appropriations Committee who has been a leader in this fight for freedom and liberty for the Venezuelan people.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this House resolution introduced by my dear friend and one of the great leaders and champions for freedom around the world, Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, speaking of folks who believe in freedom and are always looking out for those who are repressed.

For the last several weeks, Mr. Speaker, the people of Venezuela have risen up to protest the corruption, the food shortages, the soaring crime rates, and, most important of all, the increased and alarming repression by the Maduro regime. In response to those legitimate protests—those peaceful protests—the Venezuelan regime has ordered security forces to, frankly, brutally crack down on the opposition.

Since the protests began, Mr. Speaker, more than 500 people have been arrested. Those are the ones that we can document. Approximately 150 have been injured, and more than a dozen—more than a dozen—have been killed.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the Maduro regime has instituted something which should not surprise us, a virtual media blackout. They have blocked out images. They tried to block out images over the Internet. They even closed down, in certain parts of the country where they had the ability to do so, parts of the Internet, including Twitter. They have thrown out independent news organizations like CNN and NTN.

Why? Why are they doing this? They are doing this because the Venezuelan people are fed up with the corruption; they are fed up with, as my father would have said, this so-called ''decaffeinated dictatorship.'' And why would he have said a ''decaffeinated dictatorship''? It is a dictatorship that got there, arguably, through democratic means that then has done everything to eliminate all semblance of democracy, all semblance of human rights, all semblance of freedom of the press, and all semblance of the basic institutions of democracy.

And not only that, Mr. Speaker, there are reports of thousands of Cuban special operation forces and also intel forces that are helping the Maduro regime in the crackdown of the Venezuelan people. So at a time when a lot of the so-called international community, particularly in our hemisphere, stays quiet to the reality of the Venezuelan people's struggle for freedom, I am so proud of this Congress—this Congress, this House—that once again is standing with those who are oppressed and standing with those who are struggling for freedom. This is a House that traditionally has done that. This is a House that traditionally, in a bipartisan way, has done that, which is why I am, again, so grateful, particularly to the chairwoman, to my, I would say, younger but wiser sister, Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, to the chairman and to the ranking member; for when others are silent, they are demonstrating that the United States House of Representatives will not stay silent. We will continue to support the Venezuelan people. We will stand with the heroic Venezuelan people, those students who have hit the streets demanding their freedom.

I urge every single one of our colleagues to express solidarity with those like over 200 years ago, how people in our country went out and struggled for freedom. Now we see that the Venezuelan young people, that the students, are doing the same thing. How proud of this House, how proud I am to see this House stand with those heroic Venezuelan people, the heirs of Simon Bolivar—los herederos de Bolivar—who

are trying and will succeed in recapturing their sovereignty, their freedom, and their democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

□ 1445

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 488, supporting the Democratic aspirations of the people of Venezuela.

I would like to thank my friend, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, for her leadership and for always fighting for democratic principles. I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for working to bring this resolution to the floor.

I strongly condemn the violence used by the Maduro regime: 17 dead and 261 injured in the recent protest. Peaceful assembly should never be met with the use of deadly force. This government has resorted to political intimidation and free media censorship to squash the voices of the people.

I join my colleagues today in support of the people of Venezuela to determine their own political future. It is their democratic right to seek government policies that put their country on a path to democratic and economic prosperity for all Venezuelans.

By passing this resolution, Congress will send a clear message to the people of Venezuela—and to all those around the world struggling to achieve true democracy and freedom—that we stand with you. We support your most democratic rights of free expression and peaceful assembly. Any true democracy must be accountable to its people. We call on the Maduro government to work with the people, not against them, to end the violence, and to find a political resolution.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes clear to the Venezuelan people and to the Maduro regime that the United States stands for freedom and democracy, and that the human rights of the Venezuelan people matter to the American people, and they must be defended. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me. I also thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), our chairman emeritus, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) the ranking member, for their working together to craft this bipartisan resolution, a resolution that is focused on supporting Venezuelans, supporting their right to free expression, their right to democracy, their right for those who yearn to return to the rule of law, and, frankly, not just democratic norms, but just the most basic respect for human beings.

In recent weeks, Venezuela has been rocked by nationwide protests against the government of the late Hugo Chavez's hand-picked successor, Nicolas Maduro. I as I watched events unfold on CNN, they began as student protests. Students were going through the streets explaining that they were against rampant street crime, and they wanted the protections of the state rather than the predatory nature of what was happening with these armed gangs. Those protests have since evolved into a referendum on the government's statist policies, their destructive economic policies, the government's near elimination of civil society's freedoms in Venezuela.

Maduro's heavy-handed response, frankly, I think all of us see this now as having really worsened this crisis. We are in a situation now where more than a dozen Venezuelans have been killed, and many students have been grievously wounded. Even more than that have been jailed. The leading opposition figure right now is in prison.

These parliamentary gangs that we talked about that are so predatory, that roam the streets and commit these crimes, now they threaten civilians who are trying to peacefully express opposition. The President of the country has threatened to release, in his words, all of the military force of the country against those who oppose him, against the opposition. Even one sitting governor who had long allied himself with Hugo Chavez was driven to say that the government has gone too far. He took to the radio and said:

> I am against putting down a peaceful protest with weapons.

Precisely. Precisely—and that, of course, is why the international community is concerned and we are concerned here today.

All of this, of course, is taking place in our own Western Hemisphere, just a 3-hour flight from the United States. As a major energy producer positioned along drug trafficking routes, Venezuela's instability harms the interests of all in the Western Hemisphere.

Venezuela once had a strong democratic tradition. We would like to see that democratic tradition returned. We think the right of free expression is an important human right. Speaking out in support of those who share this vision, as we are doing today, I think is an important step in realizing that goal, and that is why I again commend Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and Ranking Member ENGEL for this resolution that they have brought forward.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 488, and I thank my south Florida colleague and friend, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, for her leadership in introducing this measure and giving us an opportunity to stand with the people of Venezuela.

I stand in solidarity with my colleagues and the people of Venezuela to condemn the deplorable, horrific, and inexcusable violence the Maduro regime has perpetrated against its own citizens. Brave activists have taken to the streets in Venezuela to demand basic freedoms from an increasingly repressive government. These are students, lawyers, and average citizens simply asking their government to respect their basic human and democratic rights.

Since his election, President Maduro's economic and political policies have driven Venezuela's economy into the ground. His attempts to silence these outcries have not worked, and they will not work. Despite jailing leading opposition voices and expelling independent media voices, the world is watching and listening, and we still hear the calls loud and clear for democracy, for governance, and reform.

President Maduro's ridiculous accusations about United States involvement in fomenting unrest will prove to be a grossly failed attempt to distract from his own shortcomings in serving his people. We will not allow his rhetoric to try to blame the United States for what is a clear struggle between his repressive policies and the legitimate demands of his people.

My hometown of Weston is often affectionately known as ''Westonzuela.'' Just yesterday, I spoke with community leaders in south Florida—many of them my neighbors, my friends, my constituents—about the fear and horrors that family members and their friends are experiencing.

This resolution calls upon the government of Venezuela to respect the principles enshrined in its own governing documents as well as those in the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights—including freedoms of speech and the press.

This resolution affirms what we know to be true: that the best way to address the legitimate grievances of the people is through genuine dialogue between all parties involved. It calls for our country to work with our partners in the Western Hemisphere and through regional organizations to help facilitate this dialogue and, importantly, to do everything possible to cease this senseless violence and create the space for peace. This resolution reflects that we stand in solidarity with the people of Venezuela.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution can only be the first step to hold Maduro and his fellow regime thugs accountable for their terrible and violent response, and their abuse of Venezuelan people's liberties and human rights.

I have already begun circulating a letter amongst my colleagues in the House addressed to President Obama asking him to take immediate action against Maduro and other Venezuelan officials who are responsible for violations of their people's human rights.

We are calling for the President to enact immediate sanctions against those officials under authorities granted to him under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, including denying them visas to enter the United States, blocking their property, freezing their assets in the U.S., as well as prohibiting them from making any financial transactions in the U.S. This letter already enjoys bipartisan support. I invite my colleagues to join me in signing this letter, and I hope that the President will recognize the severity of this issue and do the right thing and take these important steps.

However, Mr. Speaker, I will file a bill this week that would force the implementation of these sanctions even if the President chooses not to use these authorities granted to him under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

Now is not the time to dither or sit on the fence. The United States must stand up for the people of Venezuela and for the American ideals of freedom, democracy, of the rule of law, of respect for human rights. Failure to hold Maduro and his officials accountable would be irresponsible and a failure of leadership.

On the resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic that the U.S. House will pass my bill expressing support for the people of Venezuela as they protest peacefully for democracy. I hope that it will pass so that we can send a swift and strong message to Maduro that the United States House of Representatives has taken notice of the developments in Venezuela and that we will not allow these transgressions to pass by quietly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to repeat what I said before, that I hope all member states of the Organization of American States will similarly call on the Venezuelan government to abide by their OAS Convention on Human Rights and the Inter-American Democratic Charter.

This is a very bipartisan resolution. I agree with everything that the gentlewoman from Florida said. In fact, I agree with everything that all of the speakers on both sides of the aisle have said.

The United States stands for freedom in the world, and I think it is very important that the Congress of the United States speaks out loudly and clearly when people's rights are being trampled on, as is the situation in Venezuela today.

So again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE, who once again has shown in such a bipartisan way that members of the Foreign Affairs Committee work closely together because both parties share a love of freedom and democracy. Both parties care very much that freedom and democracy around the world takes root. I can think of nothing more bipartisan than to stand up for freedom and democracy all over the world, and when a country has its rights trampled by the government that is supposed to protect it, it is time that we in the United States Congress say enough: we are not going to sweep this under the rug. We are going to speak out loudly and forcefully against it.

I again thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Chairman ROYCE.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my strong thanks to the chairman of our committee, Mr. ROYCE, and to our esteemed ranking member, Mr. ENGEL. Both of them have been very present and very energized on the United States House of Representatives speaking in a clear voice in favor of democracy, the rule of law, freedom, and liberties being respected by the Maduro regime, and so far we have seen the opposite be true.

I want to again suggest to my colleagues that passing this resolution of solidarity with the peaceful protesters of Venezuela is an important first step, and we hope that those who support this cause will follow-up with my office and sign the letter to President Obama asking for economic sanctions against human rights violators and also cosponsor my bill that follows and tracks that same letter.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 488, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1500

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 938) to strengthen the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 938

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Declaration of policy.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC ALLIANCE

Sec. 101. Amendments to the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012.
Sec. 102. Authorization of assistance for Israel.
Sec. 103. United States-Israel cooperation on cyber-security.
Sec. 104. Statement of United States Policy Regarding Israel's defense systems.
Sec. 105. Report on other matters.
Sec. 106. Statement of policy.
Sec. 107. Sense of Congress.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY COOPERATION

Sec. 201. United States-Israel energy cooperation.

TITLE III—OFFSET

Sec. 301. Offset.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The turmoil in the Middle East poses a serious threat to United States national security interests and requires cooperation with allies that are willing to work with the United States in pursuit of shared objectives.

(2) The October 31, 1998, Memorandum of Agreement signed by President Clinton and Prime Minister Netanyahu commits the United States to working jointly with Israel towards enhancing Israel's defensive and deterrent capabilities and upgrading the framework of the United States-Israel strategic and military relationships, as well as the technological cooperation between both countries.

(3) On August 16, 2007, the United States and Israel signed a Memorandum of Understanding reaffirming United States commitment to the security of Israel and establishing a 10-year framework for incremental increases in United States military assistance to Israel.

(4) The Memorandum of Understanding signed two years later on January 16, 2009 reaffirmed the United States commitment and noted ''the security, military and intelligence cooperation between the United States and Israel''.

(5) The United States and Israel conduct a semi-annual Strategic Dialogue. The Department of State, in a statement following the July 12, 2012, meeting of the Strategic Dialogue, noted that the discussions focused on such issues of mutual concern as ''Iran's continued quest to develop nuclear weapons, which the United States and Israel are both determined to prevent'' and ''how the continued violence of the Syrian regime against its citizens [assisted by Iran and Hezbollah] could also lead to severe consequences for the entire region''.

SEC. 3. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

Congress declares that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC ALLIANCE

SEC. 101. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION ACT OF 2012.

(a) UNITED STATES ACTIONS TO ASSIST IN THE DEFENSE OF ISRAEL AND PROTECT UNITED STATES INTERESTS.—Section 4 of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–150; 22 U.S.C. 8603) is amended—

(1) by striking ''It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should''

and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President should, to the maximum extent practicable,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section.''.

(b) EXTENSION OF WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AUTHORITY.—Section 5(a) of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–150) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) EXTENSION OF WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AUTHORITY.—

''(1) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005.—Section 12001(d) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287; 118 Stat. 1011), is amended by striking 'more than 10 years after' and inserting 'more than 11 years after'.

''(2) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 514(b)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking 'and 2014' and inserting ', 2014, and 2015'.''.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ASSESSMENT OF ISRAEL'S QUALITATIVE MILITARY EDGE OVER MILITARY THREATS.—

(1) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED; REPORTS.—Section 201 of Public Law 110–429 (122 Stat. 4843; 22 U.S.C. 2776 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''an ongoing basis'' and inserting ''a biennial basis''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''QUADRENNIAL'' and inserting ''BIENNIAL''; and

(ii) in the text, by striking ''Not later than four years after the date on which the President transmits the initial report under paragraph (1), and every four years thereafter,'' and inserting ''Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014, and biennially thereafter,''.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(i) the range of cyber and asymmetric threats posed to Israel by state and non-state actors; and

(ii) the joint efforts of the United States and Israel to address the threats identified in clause (i).

(B) FORM.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(C) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that Israel has adopted high standards in the field of export controls, including by becoming adherent to the Australia Group, the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, and the Wassenaar Arrangement control lists, and by enacting robust legislation and regulations for the control of dual-use and defense items.

(b) EXPEDITED LICENSING PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the Secretary of State to undertake discussions with Israel to identify the steps required to be taken to include Israel within the list of countries described in section 740.20(c)(1) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to eligibility for Strategic Trade Authorization).

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period of 3 years or until such time that Israel is included on the list of countries determined as eligible for the Strategic Trade Authorization, whichever occurs first, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on the following:

(i) The current status of negotiations.

(ii) The reasons that Israel has not yet been determined as eligible for the Strategic Trade Authorization.

(B) FORM.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(c) LICENSING TREATMENT AS MTCR ADHERENT.—The President shall direct the Secretary of Commerce to ensure that, subject to the requirements of section 6(l) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(l)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act), Israel is treated no less favorably than other members or adherents to the Missile Technology Control Regime designated in Country Group A:2 in Supplement No. 1 to part 740 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(d) OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.—In carrying out its authorities under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.), the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should consider giving preference to providing insurance, financing, or reinsurance for energy and water projects in Israel.

(e) ENERGY, WATER, AGRICULTURE, AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL TECHNOLOGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to carry out cooperative activities with Israel and to provide assistance to Israel that promotes cooperation in the fields of energy, water, agriculture, alternative fuel technologies, and civil space, where appropriate and pursuant to existing law.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the President is authorized to share and exchange with Israel research, technology, intelligence, information, equipment, and personnel that the President determines will advance the national security interests of the United States and is consistent with the Strategic Dialogue and pertinent provisions of law—

(A) by enhancing scientific cooperation between Israel and the United States; or

(B) by the sale, lease, exchange in kind, or other techniques the President determines to be suitable.

(f) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PILOT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Director of the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized to enter into cooperative research pilot programs with Israel to enhance Israel's capabilities in the following areas:

(A) Border, maritime, and aviation security.

(B) Explosives detection.

(C) Emergency services.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For fiscal year 2014, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Homeland Security—

(A) $1,000,000 to carry out paragraph (1)(A);

(B) $1,000,000 to carry out paragraph (1)(B); and

(C) $1,000,000 to carry out paragraph (1)(C).

SEC. 103. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON CYBER-SECURITY.

It is a sense of Congress that the United States and Israel should take steps and explore avenues to increase cooperation on cyber-security.

SEC. 104. STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY REGARDING ISRAEL'S DEFENSE SYSTEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress—

(1) commends the first phase completion of the David's Sling Weapon System (DSWS) by the Israel Missile Defense Organization and the U.S. Missile Defense Agency, which is designed to provide additional opportunities for interception by the joint United States-Israel Arrow Weapon System (Arrow 2 and Arrow 3);

(2) congratulates the Israel Missile Defense Organization and the U.S. Missile Defense Agency on successfully executing the Arrow 3 flyout of a more advanced interceptor, which will improve Israel's defenses against upper tier ballistic missile threats from nations including Iran;

(3) recognizes that during Operation Pillar of Defense in November 2012, Israel deployed Iron Dome short-range rocket defense batteries to intercept Hamas-launched rockets fired from Gaza—of those rockets that posed a threat to the life of Israeli citizens, 80 to 85 percent were successfully intercepted, saving countless lives; and

(4) agrees that, as stated by former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, ''Iron Dome performed, I think it's fair to say, remarkably well during the recent escalation . . . Iron Dome does not start wars. It helps prevent wars.''.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It should be the policy of the United States that the President, acting through the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, should provide assistance, upon request by the Government of Israel, for the enhancement of the David's Sling Weapon System, the enhancement of the joint United States-Israel Arrow Weapon System (Arrow 2 and Arrow 3), and the procurement and enhancement of the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system for purposes of intercepting short-range rockets, missiles, and other projectiles launched against Israel.

SEC. 105. REPORT ON OTHER MATTERS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States and Israel should continue collaborative efforts to enhance Israel's military capabilities, including through the transfer of advanced combat aircraft, active phased array radar, military tanker-transports, other multi-mission military aircraft, advanced or specialized munitions, and through joint training and exercise opportunities in the United States;

(2) the United States and Israel should expeditiously conclude an updated Memorandum of Understanding regarding United States security assistance in order to help Israel meet its unique security requirements and uphold its qualitative military edge;

(3) the United States should ensure that Israel has timely access to important military equipment, including by augmenting the forward deployed United States War Reserve Stockpile in Israel and by continuing to provide Israel with critical military equipment and spare parts through the Department of Defense's Excess Defense Articles program; and

(4) the United States should continue to support Israel's inherent right of self-defense.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) reviews the progress made toward the actions and efforts identified in the report required under section 6(b) of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–150; 22 U.S.C. 8604(b)); and

(B) provides policy recommendations, if necessary.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) may include a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 106. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to include Israel in the list of countries that participate in the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187) when Israel satisfies, and as long as Israel continues to satisfy, the requirements for inclusion in such program specified in such section.

SEC. 107. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Department of State should continue and, to the furthest extent practicable, increase its coordination on monitoring and combating anti-Semitism with the Government of Israel.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY COOPERATION

SEC. 201. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 917(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''renewable'' and inserting ''covered'';

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''possible many'' and inserting ''possible—

''(A) many'';

(B) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) significant contributions to the development of renewable energy and energy efficiency through the established programs of the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;'';

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking ''renewable'' and inserting ''covered''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking ''renewable'' and inserting ''covered''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) United States-Israel energy cooperation, and the development of natural resources by Israel, are strategic interests of the United States;

''(9) Israel is a strategic partner of the United States in water technology;

''(10) the United States can play a role in assisting Israel with regional safety and security issues;

''(11) the National Science Foundation of the United States should collaborate with the Israel Science Foundation;

''(12) the United States and Israel should strive to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas;

''(13) the United States supports the goals of the Alternative Fuels Administration of Israel;

''(14) the United States strongly urges open dialogue and continued mechanisms for regular engagement and encourages further cooperation between applicable departments, agencies, ministries, institutions of higher education, and the private sectors of the United States and Israel on energy security issues, including—

''(A) identifying policy priorities associated with the development of natural resources of Israel;

''(B) discussing best practices to secure cyber energy infrastructure;

''(C) best practice sharing;

''(D) leveraging natural gas to positively impact regional stability;

''(E) improving energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment technologies;

''(F) technical and environmental management of deep-water exploration and production;

''(G) coastal protection and restoration;

''(H) academic outreach and engagement;

''(I) private sector and business development engagement;

''(J) regulatory consultations;

''(K) leveraging alternative transportation fuels and technologies; and

''(L) any other areas determined appropriate by the United States and Israel;

''(15) the United States acknowledges the achievements and importance of the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation and supports continued multiyear funding to ensure the continuity of the programs of the Foundations; and

''(16) the United States and Israel have a shared interest in addressing their immediate, near-term, and long-term energy and environmental challenges.''.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 917(b)(1) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''renewable energy or energy efficiency'' and inserting ''covered energy''.

(c) TYPES OF ENERGY.—Section 917(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''TYPES OF'' and inserting ''COVERED'';

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) natural gas energy, including conventional and unconventional natural gas technologies and natural gas projects conducted by or in conjunction with the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation, the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation, and the United States-Israel Science and Technology Foundation; and

''(I) improvement of energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment technologies.''.

(d) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—Section 917(b)(3) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''energy efficiency or renewable'' and inserting ''covered''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriations, enter into cooperative agreements supporting and enhancing dialogue and planning involving international partnerships between the Department, including National Laboratories of the Department, and the Government of Israel and its ministries, offices, and institutions.

''(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary may not pay more than 50 percent of the costs described in paragraph (1).

''(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate an annual report that describes—

''(A) actions taken to carry out this subsection; and

''(B) any projects under this subsection for which the Secretary requests funding.

''(d) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CENTER.—The Secretary may establish a joint United States-Israel Center based in an area of the United States with the experience, knowledge, and expertise in offshore energy development to further dialogue and collaboration to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas.''; and

(3) by amending subsection (f) (as redesignated) to read as follows:

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts made available under section 931 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16231), the Secretary is authorized to use $2,000,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this section.''.

(f) TERMINATION.—Subsection (e) of section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) (as redesignated by subsection (e)(1)) is amended by striking ''the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''September 30, 2021''.

TITLE III—OFFSET

SEC. 301. OFFSET.

Section 102(a) of the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–73) is amended by striking ''$1,500,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,487,000,000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of this legislation. This is the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Declaration.

I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and thanking the gentleman from Florida, Mr. TED DEUTCH, for their leadership in authoring this important measure.

Israel's strategic reality has been fundamentally transformed. As it looks to its borders and looks beyond those borders, the threats to Israel are changing, and they are growing. These threats challenge Israel's qualitative military edge and that is its ability to counter and defeat any credible conventional military threat. It challenges it in ways that have, perhaps, never been quite so daunting.

Myself, ELIOT ENGEL, TED DEUTCH, and others, had an opportunity last year to travel to Israel to see the effects, see the efforts, by Israel to counter the rocket attacks that come in from Gaza by Hamas.

I had an opportunity back during the second Lebanon war, during the war with Hezbollah, to actually see the effects in August of 2006 of what was happening with rockets firing into Haifa. On a daily basis, the city was under siege.

There were literally 600 Israelis—Jewish Israelis, Arab Israelis, Druze Israelis—who were victims of these attacks from the communities in Haifa who were in the trauma hospital, and every day, these rockets would rain down.

This was not just the handiwork of Hezbollah and of Hamas that we saw last year—no. This was with rockets provided by Iran—by Iran and Syria.

In the rocket attacks that I saw in 2006, those rockets—every one of them—the cone of those rockets had 80,000 ball bearings, and they would be fired on schools, on homes, on the hospital itself, that was a target. That was done to create the maximum number of civilian casualties.

Well, so it is, in terms of the challenges that Israel faces, again, those challenges now because Iran is supplying the weaponry.

In response, the Congress continues to do everything in our power to support Israel from its security to supporting its economy. That is the intention, Mr. Speaker, of this legislation that Mr. TED DEUTCH and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN have brought before this body. It is a matter of shared values, shared experiences, and shared interests between the United States and Israel.

This legislation will not only expedite the provision of critical security assistance to Israel and require more frequent and detailed reporting on Israel's qualitative military edge, as well as a report on joint efforts to address the other threats—asymmetric threats that Israel faces, but it will also focus on expanding cooperation in areas of mutual interest by supporting a range of joint activities from civil space cooperation to homeland security measures.

Finally, it will dramatically expand our cooperation with Israel on energy production. It will link the two economies in important ways, and that is why I, again, thank ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and TED DEUTCH for bringing this legislation before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in matters being considered in H.R. 938, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013.

I recognize the importance of H.R. 938 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over certain sections of the bill, specifically, section 5(f), I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House. I also ask that you support my request to name members of this committee to any conference committee that is established to consider such provisions.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 23, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 938, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013. I acknowledge that by forgoing action and not seeking a sequential referral on this legislation, your Committee is not diminishing or altering its jurisdiction.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Homeland Security with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 938 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to working with the Committee on Homeland Security as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 938, the ''United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013,'' which the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered reported favorably on January 29, 2014. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 938 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and your agreement to support mutually-agreeable changes to the legislation, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 938 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 938, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 938.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 938, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, and for working with us to incorporate mutually agreeable changes to provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I agree that forgoing further action on this bill does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 938 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Judiciary as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing to you regarding H.R. 938, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013. This legislation was initially referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (among others). The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 938 has been marked up by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Based on discussions that the staff of our two committees have had regarding this legislation and in the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important legislation, I am willing to waive further consideration of this bill. I do so with the understanding that language specifically requested by the Committee will be included in the legislation when it is considered on the floor and that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any future jurisdictional claim of the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Additionally, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this, or any similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee for conferees on H.R. 938, as well as any similar or related legislation.

Further, I ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 938.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for the positive negotiations between our Committees; the result is an improved bill. I look forward to working with you as this important measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2014.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 938, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, and for working with us to incorporate mutually agreeable changes to provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

I agree that forgoing further action on this bill does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 938 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Science Committee as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 938, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, the chairman of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, and Mr. DEUTCH, the ranking member of that subcommittee, for authoring this legislation and for working tirelessly over the past year to further refine some of the provisions.

This legislation comes at a critical time in the history of the U.S.-Israel relationship. On every border, Israel faces instability, at best, and violence and chaos, at worst.

Syria remains engulfed in a horrific civil war that has left more than 140,000 people dead. Israel's neighbors, including Lebanon and Egypt, are plagued by instability.

Iran has not yet abandoned its pursuit of nuclear weapons capability and continues to terrorize the world with its support for violent extremism. Iran is the leading supporter of terrorism around the world.

And, under the threat of rocket fire from Gaza, Israel is now considering new options under a framework for peace with Palestinians and the Arab world. Hamas still controls the Gaza Strip, and their disregard for human life is well known.

The U.S. cannot afford to sit idly by. We must be engaged in each of these issues and support our ally, Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East.

This legislation before us today is critical because it sends a clear and unmistakable message to America's foes: America stands with Israel. Let me repeat that: America stands with Israel.

Now is the time to reaffirm the vital importance we place on the U.S.-Israel relationship and to pursue new ways to improve our partnership at every level. Let me say the relationship between the U.S. and Israel is not a one-way street. It is a two-way street.

We share a love for democracy; we share a love for human rights; and we share a love and understanding that we share things that are so important to both countries. It is not, again, just a one-way street. It is a two-way street.

There is more collaboration between the United States and Israel on everything, each and every day. The relationship deepens, the coordination deepens—coordination in terms of military, in terms of intelligence sharing, in terms of so many other things. Israel is the best ally the United States has, not in the Middle East, but in the world.

Specifically, this bill will build on our robust defense cooperation, increase U.S.-Israel collaboration on cybersecurity, expand U.S.-Israel energy cooperation, and reaffirm our commitment to Israel missile defense programs, which have saved many innocent lives, such as the Iron Dome.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 938, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman emeritus and Middle East Subcommittee chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and, of course, the author of this bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman TED DEUTCH and I introduced the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act because we are committed to the security of our friend and ally in an increasingly volatile Middle East.

Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL have been instrumental in getting this important bill to the House floor today. Today is, indeed, a very significant day in the history of the relationship between the United States and Israel.

This bill takes the already strong bonds between our two countries and makes it even stronger. With over 350 Members of Congress having lent their support to this bill as cosponsors, it is truly a bipartisan measure.

This bill designates Israel as a major strategic partner of the United States and extends U.S.-Israeli cooperation in a variety of areas, including intelligence, homeland security, energy, science, trade, and so forth. It supports U.S. efforts to help Israel maintain its qualitative military edge over its neighbors and its foes.

As Israel faces even more dangerous threats than ever before, particularly now with so much uncertainty and so much violence spreading throughout the region, and as Iran continues to announce advancements on its nuclear program due to this weak interim agreement, Israel needs our support now more than ever.

Passing this bill, Mr. Speaker, will send a strong message to those that continue to seek to harm Israel and to harm the United States. It will show the rest of the world just how seriously we value our friendship with the democratic Jewish state of Israel, not only because Israel has been a true ally, but because we share the same ideals and the same values.

In a time, Mr. Speaker, when there is a worrisome movement to delegitimize Israel, a campaign by some to boycott and divest from Israel, now is the time to lend our unequivocal support to the democratic Jewish state of Israel.

With anti-Semitism on an alarming rise throughout the world, Israel and the worldwide Jewish community need to know that the United States will do everything we can to ensure Israel's continued safety and security.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is the product of a real bipartisan commitment to the U.S.-Israel relationship.

I would like to thank Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for making this bill a priority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and ensuring its consideration on the floor here today.

I would especially like to thank and recognize my colleague, my friend, my fellow Floridian, chairman emeritus of the full committee, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her leadership on this legislation, but not just for that, for her ongoing commitment to the strength of the U.S.-Israel relationship and for standing up, as she always does, in support of people in need in every part of the world. We are so grateful for your work.

The U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act aims to strengthen the ties that bind our two nations and enhance cooperation in multiple ways. The legislation reflects the simple truth—a very simple truth that the U.S. relationship with Israel is bound not only by mutual interests, but it is bound by deeply shared values.

Indeed, the provisions of this bill, H.R. 938, mirror the broad cooperation between the United States and Israel when it comes not only to security, but to trade, research, energy, and so much more.

This bill is, of course, crafted with the heightened security risks that Israel faces every day—with those heightened security risks in mind. The Middle East region is as volatile as ever, and the world must know that our commitment to Israel's security has never been stronger than it is at this moment.

From the threat of daily rocket attacks from Hezbollah, Hamas, and other groups that send rockets at Israel citizens indiscriminately, to the risk of spillover from the Syrian conflict, the growing humanitarian crisis there, and to the existential threat of a nuclear-armed Iran, Israel faces an array of very complex security challenges.

Recognizing these threats, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act includes measures to ensure Israel's qualitative military edge in a tough and all too often hostile neighborhood.

H.R. 938 extends authority for the United States to expand our own forward-deployed weapons stockpile in Israel. This stockpile is critical to maintaining U.S. military readiness in the region and ensuring that our Armed Forces have access to the equipment they need to defend our interests at a moment's notice.

This legislation also reaffirms Congress' support for Israel's right to self-defense by authorizing continued cooperation between the United States and the state of Israel on innovative missile defense programs, like the Iron Dome, Arrow, and David's Sling.

These systems have proven remarkably successful at intercepting rockets and protecting the safety of the Israeli people.

□ 1515

Yet, even as this bill advances the security of Israel, it ultimately serves as a reminder to the world and as a reminder to America of the depth of the United States-Israel relationship. H.R. 938 highlights Israel's enormous contributions to water and irrigation, agriculture, homeland security, and cybersecurity by authorizing further cooperation with the United States in these fields. It significantly expands the breadth of U.S.-Israel cooperation on energy and alternative energy forms, and I would like to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their work on this critical language. The bill also strengthens our trade ties to Israel by initiating a process to include Israel in export license exemptions programs and, lastly, by affirming Congress' support for Israel's inclusion in the Visa Waiver Program.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEUTCH. Despite facing enormous security challenges, our ally Israel has thrived as an open and free society with a vibrant economy, a strong democracy and as a global innovator in agriculture, energy, and countless other fields. The United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act reflects our bipartisan commitment to a safe, to a secure, and to a thriving Jewish State of Israel.

I am deeply moved by the tremendous support for Israel in this Congress, with more than half of its membership signed onto this bill. But why should this be a surprise? The security of the State of Israel is important to our national security. A thriving economy in the State of Israel, with investments made by so many American companies, is important to our own economy. Most importantly, having an ally that shares our values, our commitment to democracy and to the rule of law is something of which the value cannot even be measured.

I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and to send the world a message that our bond with Israel will remain unshakable.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), an esteemed member of our committee but also one who has been extremely focused on ensuring Israel's qualitative military edge.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the opportunity. Of course, you and the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, have always been supportive of me, and I do appreciate that a great deal as we work on these issues together.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 938, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013. This legislation recognizes and enhances the historic and vitally important relationship between the United States and Israel. As the only democracy in the volatile Middle East, ensuring a strong Israel should be the priority of this body and this administration.

Recently, this body passed H.R. 1992, bipartisan legislation that I introduced, along with Congressman SCHNEIDER of Illinois, to modify QME reports to reflect the ever-changing threats that Israel faces. I am pleased that H.R. 1992 was also included in this Strategic Partnership Act.

Specifically, H.R. 1992 shortens the review time of U.S. weapons sales to Israel's neighbors from 4 years to 2 years. In addition, it asks this administration to determine how much of a threat asymmetric and cyber warfare are to Israel's security.

Anyone can look in just the last 4 years at how much has changed surrounding our friend Israel. It is important that we take and lower this time frame so that we are constantly making sure they have a qualitative military edge. This is of vital importance. The administration and this Congress ought to come together, and being a part of this Strategic Partnership Act ensures that along with H.R. 1992.

The Strategic Partnership Act also addresses a number of other important aspects of our relationship, including robust cybersecurity cooperation, the facilitation of increased tourism between the two nations, and the extension of U.S.-Israel energy cooperation.

Peace between Israel and its neighbors is something that has long been sought after. I am pleased that H.R. 938 highlights Israel's missile defense system, the Iron Dome. The Iron Dome gives Israel the ability to protect its citizens and to prevent military escalation.

With this, I want to thank the really incredible work of the chairman of the subcommittee, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DEUTCH for their encouragement in writing this legislation and for being such avid sponsors and avid proponents of our relationship with Israel.

H.R. 938 is an important step. I urge my colleagues to continue their support and to vote ''yes.''

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me again say that this is another example of bipartisan cooperation on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I want to again thank Chairman ROYCE for being such a great partner in ensuring that important legislation like this passes our Foreign Affairs Committee and the floor of the House in a very bipartisan way.

I am proud to support H.R. 938. It reaffirms our mutually beneficial relationship with our great ally, the Jewish State of Israel, at a critically important time. I want to again thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), for authoring this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

When we are speaking of this issue, I think Members should reflect that we are speaking of an Israel that faces from a regime in Iran that actually speaks of wiping Israel off of the map, a regime in Iran that seeks to acquire a nuclear weapons capability and the missiles to deliver nuclear weapons, a regime in Iran that has a proxy called Hezbollah.

I remember a Deputy Secretary of State calling that organization the ''A team'' of terrorism in the world, Hezbollah. Hezbollah is greatly expanding its size and its influence, and it is doing so not only in Lebanon but in Syria, which neighbors Israel. It is an organization that has, probably, some 70,000 rockets by now that are aimed at Israel's population centers. We think of an Israel challenged by the proliferation of al Qaeda-affiliated organizations throughout that region. We think of the ongoing threats from Hamas to the south and the Palestinian Islamic jihad.

Those are severe challenges, but Israel never has been as strong as it is now. Think of Israel's dynamic entrepreneurial culture there. For those who have been to Tel Aviv, it is inspiring—it is unbelievable—the entrepreneurial spirit, the innovative culture. You get a better sense of why Israel is so strong but also a sense of why the bond between the United States and Israel is so great. It is that dynamic economy and society that are building blocks for Israel's qualitative military edge and its relationship with the United States.

The benefits that we get from U.S.-Israel relationships, like the development of the Iron Dome, is very strong. I think that was probably built for 10 percent the price or cost, and now all of our allies are interested in acquiring that Iron Dome; and at the same time, when you think about the Iron Dome, you think of something that we in the United States thought was impossible to develop, but in Israel, engineers did so.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation today stands by our values; it stands by our interests; and it stands by our ally Israel. It is legislation all Members of the House should support.

Seeing no additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

The relationship between America and Israel, which is already extremely strong, will be deepened further by passage of this legislation. H.R. 938 includes a number of important provisions that will expedite cooperation and trade between the U.S. and Israel. These include expedited licensing procedures for items covered under the Missile Technology Control Regime and other arms control regimes, encouraging the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to give preference to providing insurance, financing, or reinsurance for energy and water projects in Israel, and measures to foster research and technology exchanges in the areas of energy, water, homeland security, agriculture and alternative fuel technologies. Both of our nations would benefit from these latter provisions.

To help Israel meet the military challenges posed by short-range and other ballistic missiles, the bill encourages the President to provide assistance to Israel to facilitate the deployment of the David's Sling Weapons System, the enhancement of the Arrow Weapon System, and the Iron Dome System. As my colleagues know, the Iron Dome system has been used multiple times over the last several years to defeat rocket attacks staged by Hamas out of Gaza. As those attacks represent the most imminent danger to Israeli population centers, our continued support for that system is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation and I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. DEUTCH for sponsoring this expertly-crafted and timely legislation.

It is also a substantive bill. It expands our relationship with our closest ally by supporting the Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow-3 missile defense systems, transferring defense items to Israel, pre-positioning more military equipment in Israel that both allies would have available in a crisis, and by expanding cooperation in cyber security, energy, water, homeland security, agriculture, and alternative fuel technologies. All of these are important, and as a package they do a lot to strengthen our partnership with Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out Section 107, the amendment that I proposed at markup and which was accepted by the committee. It states the sense of Congress that the State Department should also increase its coordination with Israel on combating anti-Semitism.

While the State Department is doing excellent work in the fight against the unique evil of anti-Semitism, the government of Israel is going to have an indispensable perspective, experience—including tragic experience—and expertise on the Middle-Eastern security dimensions and implications of anti-Semitic incitement. Our government should be consulting, cooperating, and coordinating with them on this, benefiting from Israeli expertise.

As we see on a sickeningly regular basis, many governments in the Middle East (and elsewhere) propagate anti-Semitic incitement as an official or quasi-official state ideology—the hate that still kills. They do this in order to distract people from their own authoritarian rule and human rights abuses. This constant incitement is a major factor in the security situation in the Middle East. Last February I chaired a hearing at which we heard important testimony from Dr. Zuhdi Jasser on this subject. He made the point that it is not only Jews who suffer from this incitement, but that Muslims suffer too, as Middle-Eastern despots deploy anti-Semitism as one of their principal tools in the subjugation and impoverishment of entire Muslim peoples.

I'd like to put on the record my legislative intent that the State Department's engagement with Israel should include but also go beyond the Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism. In 2004 I offered the amendment that created that office, and so I've followed and supported its excellent work. But this work is too important to be left to one small office—it should and must include the Department of State at the country team level and above.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will add a new security dimension to our efforts to combat the pernicious evil of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is an ugly reality that won't go away by ignoring or wishing it away. Let's cooperate with Israel in this struggle as well.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE, for yielding me time.

And I thank the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for her work on this bill.

H.R. 938 recognizes the longstanding relationship between the United States and Israel and bolsters our cooperation in the area of offshore resources.

This bipartisan legislation expands the scope of an existing grant program to promote research and development for conventional and unconventional natural gas, water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment technologies.

It establishes an Energy Cooperation Working Group with the Israeli government on energy activities. Furthering our dialogue and collaboration on academic innovation and technology advancement will help both our nations leverage energy development.

I commend Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman FRED UPTON and Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN for their sponsorship of H.R. 3677, which has been incorporated into this bill, and for their leadership on this measure.

Both Republicans and Democrats support the United States' partnership with Israel and expanding our cooperation on energy efficiency and development. H.R. 938 would not only help our efforts to achieve energy independence, but also helps the Israeli people achieve stronger national security.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 938, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2126) to facilitate better alignment, cooperation, and best practices between commercial real estate landlords and tenants regarding energy efficiency in buildings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2126

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2014''.

TITLE I—BETTER BUILDINGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Better Buildings Act of 2014''.

SEC. 102. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL AND OTHER BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) COST-EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ''cost-effective energy efficiency measure'' means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides energy savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(3) COST-EFFECTIVE WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ''cost-effective water efficiency measure'' means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides water savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(b) MODEL PROVISIONS, POLICIES, AND BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and after providing the public with an opportunity for notice and comment, shall develop model commercial leasing provisions and best practices in accordance with this subsection.

(2) COMMERCIAL LEASING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection shall, at a minimum, align the interests of building owners and tenants with regard to investments in cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures to encourage building owners and tenants to collaborate to invest in such measures.

(B) USE OF MODEL PROVISIONS.—The Administrator may use the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection in any standard leasing document that designates a Federal agency (or other client of the Administrator) as a landlord or tenant.

(C) PUBLICATION.—The Administrator shall periodically publish the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection, along with explanatory materials, to encourage building owners and tenants in the private sector to use such provisions and materials.

(3) REALTY SERVICES.—The Administrator shall develop policies and practices to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures for the realty services provided by the Administrator to Federal agencies (or other clients of the Administrator), including periodic training of appropriate Federal employees and contractors on how to identify and evaluate those measures.

(4) STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall make available model commercial leasing provisions and best practices developed under this subsection to State, county, and municipal governments for use in managing owned and leased building space in accordance with the goal of encouraging investment in all cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures.

SEC. 103. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

''(b) STUDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

''(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

''(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

''(A) descriptions of—

''(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

''(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

''(iii) policies and best practices to achieve reductions in energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

''(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of available incentives;

''(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

''(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether such measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

''(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

''(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) case studies reporting economic and energy savings returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 423 the following new item:

''Sec. 424. Separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.''.

SEC. 104. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 3) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as Tenant Star, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

''(c) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

''(1) collect, through each Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

''(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by data centers, trading floors, and restaurants; and

''(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption;

''(2) with respect to the first Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey conducted after the date of enactment of this section, to the extent full compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) is not feasible, conduct activities to develop the capability to collect such data and begin to collect such data; and

''(3) make data collected under paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public in aggregated form and provide such data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (d).

''(d) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

''(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which sufficient data is received pursuant to subsection (c), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

''(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop policies and procedures to recognize tenants in commercial buildings that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

''(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (c) and any other appropriate data sources; and

''(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

''(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required by section 424(b) is completed, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 424 (as added by section 3(b)) the following new item:

''Sec. 425. Tenant Star program.''.

TITLE II—GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS

SEC. 201. GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.

Part B of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 325(e) (42 U.S.C. 6295(e)), by adding at the end the following:

''(6) ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) ACTIVATION LOCK.—The term 'activation lock' means a control mechanism (either a physical device directly on the water heater or a control system integrated into the water heater) that is locked by default and contains a physical, software, or digital communication that must be activated with an activation key to enable the product to operate at its designed specifications and capabilities and without which activation the product will provide not greater than 50 percent of the rated first hour delivery of hot water certified by the manufacturer.

''(ii) GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATER.—The term 'grid-enabled water heater' means an electric resistance water heater that—

''(I) has a rated storage tank volume of more than 75 gallons;

''(II) is manufactured on or after April 16, 2015;

''(III) has—

''(aa) an energy factor of not less than 1.061 minus the product obtained by multiplying—

''(AA) the rated storage volume of the tank, expressed in gallons; and

''(BB) 0.00168; or

''(bb) an equivalent alternative standard prescribed by the Secretary and developed pursuant to paragraph (5)(E);

''(IV) is equipped at the point of manufacture with an activation lock; and

''(V) bears a permanent label applied by the manufacturer that—

''(aa) is made of material not adversely affected by water;

''(bb) is attached by means of non-water-soluble adhesive; and

''(cc) advises purchasers and end-users of the intended and appropriate use of the product with the following notice printed in 16.5 point Arial Narrow Bold font:

'' 'IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This water heater is intended only for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program. It will not provide adequate hot water unless enrolled in such a program and activated by your utility company or another program operator. Confirm the availability of a program in your local area before purchasing or installing this product.'.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—The manufacturer or private labeler shall provide the activation key for a grid-enabled water heater only to a utility or other company that operates an electric thermal storage or demand response program that uses such a grid-enabled water heater.

''(C) REPORTS.—

''(i) MANUFACTURERS.—The Secretary shall require each manufacturer of grid-enabled water heaters to report to the Secretary annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters that the manufacturer ships each year.

''(ii) OPERATORS.—The Secretary shall require utilities and other demand response and thermal storage program operators to report annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters activated for their programs using forms of the Energy Information Agency or using such other mechanism that the Secretary determines appropriate after an opportunity for notice and comment.

''(iii) CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall treat shipment data reported by manufacturers as confidential business information.

''(D) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In 2017 and 2019, the Secretary shall publish an analysis of the data collected under subparagraph (C) to assess the extent to which shipped products are put into use in demand response and thermal storage programs.

''(ii) PREVENTION OF PRODUCT DIVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually, the Secretary shall, after opportunity for notice and comment, establish procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes.

''(E) COMPLIANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines under this section that—

''(I) grid-enabled water heaters do not require a separate efficiency requirement; or

''(II) sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually and procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes would not be adequate to prevent such product diversion.

''(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary exercises the authority described in clause (i) or amends the efficiency requirement for grid-enabled water heaters, that action will take effect on the date described in subsection (m)(4)(A)(ii).

''(iii) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section with respect to electric water heaters, the Secretary shall consider the impact on thermal storage and demand response programs, including any impact on energy savings, electric bills, peak load reduction, electric reliability, integration of renewable resources, and the environment.

''(iv) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall require that grid-enabled water heaters be equipped with communication capability to enable the grid-enabled water heaters to participate in ancillary services programs if the Secretary determines that the technology is available, practical, and cost-effective.'';

(2) in section 332(a) (42 U.S.C. 6302(a))—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in the first paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) for any person to—

''(A) activate an activation lock for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

''(B) distribute an activation key for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such activation key will be used to activate a grid-enabled water heater that is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

''(C) otherwise enable a grid-enabled water heater to operate at its designed specification and capabilities with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program; or

''(D) knowingly remove or render illegible the label of a grid-enabled water heater described in section 325(e)(6)(A)(ii)(V).'';

(3) in section 333(a) (42 U.S.C. 6303(a))—

(A) by striking ''section 332(a)(5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)''; and

(B) by striking ''paragraph (1), (2), or (5) of section 332(a)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1), (2), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)''; and

(4) in section 334 (42 U.S.C. 6304)—

(A) by striking ''section 332(a)(5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)''; and

(B) by striking ''section 332(a)(6)'' and inserting ''section 332(a)(7)''.

TITLE III—ENERGY EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Energy Efficient Government Technology Act''.

SEC. 302. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

Subtitle C of title V of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 121 Stat. 1661) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 530. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(2) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'information technology' has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

''(b) DEVELOPMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, each Federal agency shall coordinate with the Director, the Secretary, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop an implementation strategy (that includes best practices and measurement and verification techniques) for the maintenance, purchase, and use by the Federal agency of energy-efficient and energy-saving

information technologies, taking into consideration the performance goals established under subsection (d).

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—In developing an implementation strategy under subsection (b), each Federal agency shall consider—

''(1) advanced metering infrastructure;

''(2) energy-efficient data center strategies and methods of increasing asset and infrastructure utilization;

''(3) advanced power management tools;

''(4) building information modeling, including building energy management;

''(5) secure telework and travel substitution tools; and

''(6) mechanisms to ensure that the agency realizes the energy cost savings brought about through increased efficiency and utilization.

''(d) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish performance goals for evaluating the efforts of Federal agencies in improving the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information technology.

''(2) BEST PRACTICES.—The Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, shall recommend best practices for the attainment of the performance goals, which shall include Federal agency consideration of the use of—

''(A) energy savings performance contracting; and

''(B) utility energy services contracting.

''(e) REPORTS.—

''(1) AGENCY REPORTS.—Each Federal agency shall include in the report of the agency under section 527 a description of the efforts and results of the agency under this section.

''(2) OMB GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY REPORTS AND SCORECARDS.—Effective beginning not later than October 1, 2015, the Director shall include in the annual report and scorecard of the Director required under section 528 a description of the efforts and results of Federal agencies under this section.''.

SEC. 303. ENERGY EFFICIENT DATA CENTERS.

Section 453 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b)(3); and

(2) by striking subsections (c) through (g) and inserting the following:

''(c) STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall carry out subsection (b) in collaboration with information technology industry and other key stakeholders, with the goal of producing results that accurately reflect the best knowledge in the most pertinent domains. In such collaboration, the Secretary and the Administrator shall pay particular attention to organizations that—

''(1) have members with expertise in energy efficiency and in the development, operation, and functionality of data centers, information technology equipment, and software, such as representatives of hardware manufacturers, data center operators, and facility managers;

''(2) obtain and address input from Department of Energy National Laboratories or any college, university, research institution, industry association, company, or public interest group with applicable expertise;

''(3) follow—

''(A) commonly accepted procedures for the development of specifications; and

''(B) accredited standards development processes; and

''(4) have a mission to promote energy efficiency for data centers and information technology.

''(d) MEASUREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall consider and assess the adequacy of the specifications, measurements, and benchmarks described in subsection (b) for use by the Federal Energy Management Program, the Energy Star Program, and other efficiency programs of the Department of Energy or the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(e) STUDY.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Administrator, shall, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act, make available to the public an update to the Report to Congress on Server and Data Center Energy Efficiency published on August 2, 2007, under section 1 of Public Law 109–431 (120 Stat. 2920), that provides—

''(1) a comparison and gap analysis of the estimates and projections contained in the original report with new data regarding the period from 2007 through 2014;

''(2) an analysis considering the impact of information technologies, to include virtualization and cloud computing, in the public and private sectors;

''(3) an evaluation of the impact of the combination of cloud platforms, mobile devices, social media, and big data on data center energy usage; and

''(4) updated projections and recommendations for best practices through fiscal year 2020.

''(f) DATA CENTER ENERGY PRACTITIONER PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall maintain a data center energy practitioner program that leads to the certification of energy practitioners qualified to evaluate the energy usage and efficiency opportunities in Federal data centers. Each Federal agency shall consider having the data centers of the agency evaluated every 4 years by energy practitioners certified pursuant to such program, whenever practicable using certified practitioners employed by the agency.

''(g) OPEN DATA INITIATIVE.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders and the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish an open data initiative for Federal data center energy usage data, with the purpose of making such data available and accessible in a manner that encourages further data center innovation, optimization, and consolidation. In establishing the initiative, the Secretary shall consider the use of the online Data Center Maturity Model.

''(h) INTERNATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders, shall actively participate in efforts to harmonize global specifications and metrics for data center energy efficiency.

''(i) DATA CENTER UTILIZATION METRIC.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders, shall facilitate in the development of an efficiency metric that measures the energy efficiency of a data center (including equipment and facilities).

''(j) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall not disclose any proprietary information or trade secrets provided by any individual or company for the purposes of carrying out this section or the programs and initiatives established under this section.''.

TITLE IV—ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

SEC. 401. ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF BENCHMARKING AND DISCLOSURE FOR LEASING BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENERGY STAR LABELS.—Section 435(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''; and

(2) by striking ''signing the contract,'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

''signing the contract, the following requirements are met:

''(A) The space is renovated for all energy efficiency and conservation improvements that would be cost effective over the life of the lease, including improvements in lighting, windows, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

''(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the space is benchmarked under a nationally recognized, online, free benchmarking program, with public disclosure, unless the space is a space for which owners cannot access whole building utility consumption data, including spaces—

''(I) that are located in States with privacy laws that provide that utilities shall not provide such aggregated information to multitenant building owners; and

''(II) for which tenants do not provide energy consumption information to the commercial building owner in response to a request from the building owner.

''(ii) A Federal agency that is a tenant of the space shall provide to the building owner, or authorize the owner to obtain from the utility, the energy consumption information of the space for the benchmarking and disclosure required by this subparagraph.''.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall complete a study—

(A) on the impact of—

(i) State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies, and any associated building efficiency policies, for commercial and multifamily buildings; and

(ii) programs and systems in which utilities provide aggregated information regarding whole building energy consumption and usage information to owners of multitenant commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings;

(B) that identifies best practice policy approaches studied under subparagraph (A) that have resulted in the greatest improvements in building energy efficiency; and

(C) that considers—

(i) compliance rates and the benefits and costs of the policies and programs on building owners, utilities, tenants, and other parties;

(ii) utility practices, programs, and systems that provide aggregated energy consumption information to multitenant building owners, and the impact of public utility commissions and State privacy laws on those practices, programs, and systems;

(iii) exceptions to compliance in existing laws where building owners are not able to gather or access whole building energy information from tenants or utilities;

(iv) the treatment of buildings with—

(I) multiple uses;

(II) uses for which baseline information is not available; and

(III) uses that require high levels of energy intensities, such as data centers, trading floors, and televisions studios;

(v) implementation practices, including disclosure methods and phase-in of compliance;

(vi) the safety and security of benchmarking tools offered by government agencies, and the resiliency of those tools against cyber-attacks; and

(vii) international experiences with regard to building benchmarking and disclosure

laws and data aggregation for multitenant buildings.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

(c) CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and following opportunity for public notice and comment, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with other relevant agencies, shall maintain, and if necessary create, a database for the purpose of storing and making available public energy-related information on commercial and multifamily buildings, including—

(A) data provided under Federal, State, local, and other laws or programs regarding building benchmarking and energy information disclosure;

(B) information on buildings that have disclosed energy ratings and certifications; and

(C) energy-related information on buildings provided voluntarily by the owners of the buildings, only in an anonymous form unless the owner provides otherwise.

(2) COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS.—The database maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall complement and not duplicate the functions of the Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star Portfolio Manager tool.

(d) INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS.—The Secretary of Energy shall seek input from stakeholders to maximize the effectiveness of the actions taken under this section.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress made in complying with this section.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

The benefits of energy efficiency are something that both the Republicans and Democrats agree on as evidenced by the modest but robust package we are considering today. Reducing waste and consuming less energy are commonsense strategies to cut costs and address U.S. energy demand.

I want to thank Mr. WELCH and Mr. MCKINLEY for their leadership on this energy efficiency bill. Both they and their staffs have worked very hard on this legislation as have the committee staffs, both Democrat and Republican.

The U.S. has steadily improved its energy productivity as a result of advances in technology, driven primarily by private sector innovation. In particular, the industrial and manufacturing sectors have undertaken significant efforts to improve efficiency and reap the resulting economic benefits. The Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2014 supports these ongoing efforts by spurring the use of energy efficiency technologies and processes in the commercial, industrial, and public sectors of our economy. The legislation saves consumers money through lowered energy consumption, helps create jobs, makes our country more energy independent, and will produce associated environmental benefits. Critically, this bill will make the country's largest energy user, the Federal Government, more efficient, thereby saving taxpayer money.

I am delighted that we have this bill on the floor today. I look forward to working with the Members of the body to make sure that we pass this legislation, and I would urge their support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2126, the "Better Buildings Act of 2013." As you noted, there are provisions of H.R. 2126 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

I agree that your decision should not alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with respect to the appointment of conferees or any future claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation, and I will support the appointment of Members of the Committee to any conference committee on such provisions.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2126 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 2126, the Better Buildings Act of 2013, as ordered reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within. the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

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

Chairman UPTON, Chairman WHITFIELD, and Ranking Members WAXMAN and RUSH, I thank all of you for working with us to move this bipartisan legislation today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, I want to particularly thank you for your leadership on the subcommittee.

Thank you as well to my colleague DAVID MCKINLEY for partnering with me on this issue. Mr. MCKINLEY has an extraordinary background as an engineer and small business owner. He has real practical knowledge that has been extremely helpful, and he has brought invaluable expertise to our committee. I am grateful to him, and this whole body should be grateful to him for his partnership.

The bill today also includes some very good ideas advanced by other Members of Congress: Representatives ESHOO, ROGERS, MATHESON, LATTA, and CASTOR. I thank all of them for their leadership on this issue.

Lastly, I want to thank House leaders, especially Majority Leader CANTOR. He and his staff—Steve Stombres—have been enormously cooperative in dealing with some of the thorny problems that arise whenever there is a complicated piece of legislation to be considered. So thank you.

Like Mr. WHITFIELD, I have long believed that energy efficiency is an area in which we have common ground in what is too often a very divided Congress.

Mr. WHITFIELD, I thank you for focusing on that common ground.

Why is it so good?

Because saving energy does three things. It creates jobs. All of the energy efficiency labor is done by local folks who need work. It creates manufacturing jobs because 90 percent of the materials used in energy efficiency are manufactured in this country. It saves money and it improves the environment.

□ 1530

So we can, and do, disagree in this Congress on the causes of climate change and the best fuel mix to meet America's energy demands, but we can all agree that less is more. Whatever your fuel source, if you use less, you save money, and that is good for all of us concerned.

We can also agree that creating demand for American-made energy-efficient products will also create good

jobs. In energy efficiency, our cheapest fuel requires, as I said, labor and manufactured goods that are made in America.

We can also all agree that cutting the energy bills of homeowners, businesses, and the Federal Government—therefore, the taxpayer—is a very good thing.

Mr. Speaker, Vermont, which I represent, has long been a leader in energy efficiency. My home State was the first to set up what was called an energy efficiency utility. That utility, Efficiency Vermont, has done outstanding work for the past 20 years.

Basically, what it acknowledges and understands is that a kilowatt saved is a cost avoided. Last year alone, Efficiency Vermont's work yielded a lifetime customer savings of $206 million for our small State in Vermont.

The Energy Efficiency Improvement Act is an important first step in making America more energy efficient. It includes the Better Buildings Act, also known as Tenant Star, which will drive private sector innovation in energy efficiency.

By the way, again, Mr. WHITFIELD, I appreciate this.

This is a public-private partnership. This is not a prescriptive arrangement. It requires good policy at the Federal level, with cooperation and opportunity-seizing at the private level.

Homes and buildings consume 40 percent of our energy in the United States. It is really huge. In commercial buildings, owners report that tenants consume up to 50 percent or more of the total energy output.

One of the challenges our commercial building owners and developers face has been the issue of split incentives. Building owners and renters are not always on the same page when it comes to energy performance. Part of the problem is that only one party is paying the energy bill. The other part of the problem is that, while we recognize energy efficient buildings through the Energy Star program, we have no similar recognition program for tenant spaces.

Our bill creates a voluntary Tenant Star recognition program for separate spaces in commercial buildings. When we combine Energy Star buildings with Tenant Star rentals, we can optimize energy efficiency in shortened payback periods.

A good example of this synergy can be found in Energy Star-certified Vermont Innovation Center, located in Burlington, Vermont. The Vermont Energy Investment Corporation, or VEIC, has its office in that building. VEIC took aggressive action to optimize the efficiency of its tenant space within the building. It converted the overhead fluorescent lighting to highly efficient LEDs and applied 6 inches of spray foam insulation to the exterior wells.

Making these improvements in an Energy Star building optimized an already efficient tenant space, but VEIC expects to save nearly $11,000 a year in energy savings. Where I come from, that is real money.

However, there is no recognition program for these improvements, and we don't know what else VEIC could be doing to increase energy savings. Under this bill, we will study the best ways to optimize commercial tenant spaces and then recognize those spaces with a new Tenant Star label.

By combining energy efficient tenant build-out with Energy Star buildings, we will double down on a successful program and optimize energy savings in commercial buildings.

In addition to Tenant Star, this legislation includes three other important energy provisions. Again, I thank Mr. WHITFIELD for his leadership in allowing other good ideas to be part of this legislation.

First, it is going to increase the energy efficiency of Federal Government data centers. They are huge energy consumers. Data centers use massive amounts of energy. This legislation will finally begin to address the enormous Federal energy bill for those facilities.

Second, this bill addresses a serious regulatory problem involving large-scale water heaters.

Sometimes we have an argument back and forth about regulations. What I love about this bill, among other things, is we are fixing a problem, not just fighting about it.

It is going to make needed changes to energy efficiency standards for large water heaters that are used in demand response programs. These water heaters act as residential energy storage devices and allow utilities to curb energy demand during peak hours.

So we are giving some of our rural electric cooperatives tools they need to keep the cost and energy demand down.

Finally, the bill will disclose the amount of energy consumed in federally leased buildings and begin benchmarking these buildings.

The Energy Efficiency Improvement Act, comprised of these four components, is an important first step towards energy efficiency, but more work remains. In the coming weeks, I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the McKinley-Welch-Shaheen-Portman legislation, which will establish national model building codes. We also need to pass legislation to encourage performance contracting in Federal buildings and to streamline the Federal green schools project.

Energy efficiency, as Mr. WHITFIELD said, Mr. Speaker, is a bipartisan issue. I am extremely encouraged by the steps we are taking today. I look forward to working with the chairman, ranking member, and House leaders to bring more bills to the floor in the coming weeks.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks. Also, I certainly want to thank Ms. ESHOO of California for the leadership she's had on this position, as well as our chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON.

At this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, today, we continue our pursuit of a true all-of-the-above energy policy as the House considers H.R. 2126, the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act. I am very pleased that this bill combines four individual bipartisan proposals developed by members of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Energy efficiency measures are some of the simplest and most affordable methods to address U.S. energy demand and lower costs, but significant energy efficiency opportunities and challenges certainly remain. This legislative package helps embrace these opportunities and meet many challenges to advance U.S. energy goals.

Using a voluntary, market-driven approach, this bipartisan legislation will help harness new technologies and support private sector innovation to develop more efficient ways of utilizing energy.

H.R. 2126 also seeks to improve Federal energy efficiency, a critical initiative, given that the Federal Government is the Nation's largest user of energy. Utilizing energy savings techniques can significantly reduce the amount of U.S. taxpayer dollars spent on Federal energy costs.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to American energy, everything needs to be on the table: coal, nuclear, natural gas, hydro, wind, solar—you name it, and yes, improving energy efficiency is an important part of the all-of-the-above equation.

The passage of this important energy efficiency bill will help us as we continue to work together on a bipartisan basis in the coming months and years to tackle the many energy challenges facing the Nation. We have a lot of work to do.

Basically, what this bill does is takes four individual bills that we had. One was led by the really good work of Mr. WELCH and Mr. MCKINLEY to establish a Tenant Star program to voluntarily certify within Energy Star, which would promote energy efficiency.

It takes a Whitfield bill on grid-enabled water heaters. I commend Ms. ESHOO and MIKE ROGERS—again, a bipartisan combination—in adding more energy efficient savings technologies in a major way to help us.

It also takes a Castor bill on energy information for commercial buildings.

Together, many of us sat down with the then-chairman of the Senate Energy Committee, Mr. WYDEN, about a year ago on things that we could work on together, and we have proved it with this legislation. These bills had

unanimous support within our committee. We worked together. Ultimately, it is going to help the American consumer and the Federal Government—again, the largest user of electricity—and shows we can get things done.

So we have Mr. WELCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WHITFIELD, MIKE ROGERS, Ms. CASTOR, and also Mr. WAXMAN and his staff, too. I know that he wishes he was on the floor. Together, we really did get this thing worked out in a way that the American public would be certainly very proud of.

I know that we have lost Mr. WYDEN. He has moved to another committee, but I would hope that a strong vote this afternoon would send a pretty good message to the Senate that in fact they can embrace these bills.

A week or two ago, the majority leader said something along the lines of he wanted to pick a number of issues we can work on together and get them out of the way and get them to the President's desk. These are pretty good bills. I would like to think that once we pass these, the new leadership there in the Senate Energy Committee could simply move these bills from the desk and get them to the President's desk in an expeditious way.

So I want to conclude by thanking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for developing this legislation that in fact we are supporting. I would encourage all of my colleagues to stand up for an all-of-the-above energy policy and support passage of the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. I thank my friend and my colleague for yielding. I thank him for the work that he has done, as well as Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. CASTOR, and staff on both sides of the aisle. It feels good to come to the floor to speak on a package of bills that are bipartisan and that are really going to produce something for our country and help move us forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in support of the package of these four bipartisan energy efficiency bills because they are going to save taxpayer dollars. They are very important.

Title III of this legislation is a bill that I authored with Congressman MIKE ROGERS of Michigan to make the Federal Government's IT and data centers more energy efficient. We have been at this for a long time. By requiring Federal agencies to utilize the best technologies and energy management strategies, our legislation will reduce the Federal Government's energy use, save taxpayer dollars, and importantly, set the standard for the private sector.

While we now routinely hear a lot about data centers, that was not the case when we started out examining this issue a decade ago. Back then, I had to explain to colleagues what a data center was. Today, just about everybody understands that data centers are a critical part of our national infrastructure and are found in nearly every sector of our economy.

In 2005, I authored language in the Energy Policy Act that mandated an EPA study relative to energy use and energy costs of data centers. The report was transmitted to Congress in 2007 and served as a driver of both private and public investment in energy efficiency. Based on widespread agreement across government, industry, and academia, the bill before us today requires an update to that 2007 report.

Data centers can be extremely energy inefficient. Experts estimate that most data centers could slash their energy use by 80 to 90 percent. That really takes our collective breath away. There are enormous opportunities in this by simply implementing existing technologies and best practices.

So we can do this. We can get this done.

While several companies in my Silicon Valley district have taken the lead in developing efficient, sustainable data centers, we can do much better across the private sector and the Federal Government.

□ 1545

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

Mr. WELCH. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentleman.

The Federal Government is the Nation's largest landowner, largest employer, and largest energy user, and so we should lead by example in improving the energy efficiency of our own data centers within the Federal Government.

So the bill that Mr. ROGERS and I have embedded in this package requires Federal agencies to do some really rather simple things that are going to lead to terrific outcomes. They need to develop plans to use more energy-efficient technologies and best practices, and require periodic evaluation of Federal data centers for energy efficiency.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member WAXMAN, the staffs from both sides of the aisle, the Members that are part of the legislation that is part of this bipartisan package.

And I also want to salute Paul Beck, who serves on my staff in my office, who has really been the wind beneath the sails of this bill. He has lived and breathed efficiency in data centers day in and day out.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), who is the author of title I of this legislation.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2126.

While there are many differing views in Congress, there is one common ground, and that is energy efficiency. Finding ways to use energy more efficiently is simply common sense.

This legislation will provide this country with a market-driven, voluntary, best practice approach to reduce energy consumption. It is an area where Republicans and Democrats can work together efficiently. That is why PETER WELCH and I have developed a wonderful working relationship and developed an issue on energy that crosses this and other pieces of legislation.

As one of just two engineers in Congress, and having spent nearly 50 years in the construction industry, I understand what steps we need to take to make our buildings more efficient. That is why we brought together a broad coalition of support for this legislation, supported by everyone from manufacturers, restaurants, contractors, labor, environmental groups. Even the gaming industry is supporting this legislation. It is estimated to lower energy costs by over $2 billion and result in reduced carbon emissions by nearly 12 million tons. It helps move our Nation closer to energy independence.

I would like to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for allowing this bipartisan bill to come to the floor, and Congressman WHITFIELD for helping out on all the legislation, as well as Mr. WELCH.

Engineers know how to make buildings operate more efficiently. Maybe our next step would be to make Congress run more efficiently.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is going to take a lot more engineers to get this place operating a lot better, but this was a step.

Mr. WHITFIELD wasn't here when I was bragging on him, Mr. Speaker. You have got that practical knowledge from his year of experience in construction and that engineering background.

But here is the other thing. There is a big debate about carbon emissions. I happen to be someone who thinks it is a very, very serious problem. But if we—even under the Waxman-Markey bill, which passed the House and then did not pass the Senate, with a goal of reduction of 80 percent of carbon emissions by 2050, 40 percent were going to be achieved through energy efficiency. So this is a really big deal.

There are questions about a lot of things on energy policy, but where we do have this common ground with significant leadership on both sides of the aisle, that energy efficiency is an approach that really makes sense, then we can and should do it. So I am very grateful to all concerned in pulling together to take the first really solid step towards embracing an energy efficiency agenda as part of an all-of-the-above strategy on energy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly just to salute the leadership of Representative MCKINLEY and my good friend from Vermont, PETER WELCH, for a bill which does some spectacular

things. Specifically, it really enshrines the idea that the cheapest and cleanest energy that we have is that energy which we conserve and don't use, that we make available for the future.

This—and I draw on my history now of building affordable housing in a green fashion—is a real win-win. It means that people are paying lower utility bills if they employ the methods that will be encouraged by this bill. It means that we are putting less carbon in the atmosphere, and this coming from somebody recently down from Connecticut where we have experienced, in the last several years, climate problems unlike any that we have ever seen. And of course, we are doing the right thing by the future.

This is also, in a challenging time for this Chamber, a remarkable example of Democrats and Republicans working together to achieve something that will benefit not just the people in this Chamber, but will benefit the country and future generations. This is something we should build on. There is so much more we can do with respect to reconfiguring our economy and our industry and our residences so that they are clean and driven by cheap, sustainable, American energy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I close now just as I opened, by thanking Representative MCKINLEY and Representative WELCH for their tremendous leadership and say that I very much look forward to supporting this bill later on today.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we do not have any more speakers, so I would reserve the balance of my time if the gentleman wants to proceed.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELCH. Well, I will just close briefly. I don't believe we have any other speakers.

Again, there are several things here:

One is the wisdom of an energy efficiency policy, less is more; and whether you are consuming oil or solar, if you use less, you are going to save money. It is good for the bottom line;

Second, any energy efficiency means that we are going to keep in the ground for future use any other fuels that we may need down the road;

Third, any energy efficiency requires implementation of energy efficiency retrofits. That is local labor, good jobs, and the use of locally manufactured products;

Fourth, energy efficiency means that we do not have to build more generating capacity in order to generate. That saves money;

Fifth, what it does is it cuts down on carbon emissions. It is all a really good thing.

Then finally, several speakers have referred to Congress, and we all know we have had our challenges here, and it is a function, to some extent, of real debates among the American people that we reflect to some extent. We can't get out of our own way sometimes with some of our rules. But what we know is that, at the end the day, this institution has to be a problem-solving institution that works for the American people. And what we have done here, with Mr. UPTON and Mr. WHITFIELD being the leaders with the responsible positions, is focused on areas where we agree. And they are meaningful areas. It is not a split-the-difference type of deal where we have just shaved so much off that it really is not significant. What we have done is put aside areas where we have real disagreement and haven't reached consensus and then doubled down on that area of efficiency where there is common ground.

We have taken good ideas, whether they have been offered by a Republican or a Democrat, and we have kept disciplined to have this legislation be about efficiency and a policy that is going to work for the American people, and we haven't turned it, either side, into a political Christmas tree that allows us to make some extraneous points. In my view, I think we need to do more of that.

I was very heartened in Congress when we had a budget agreement that was reached with the leadership of PAUL RYAN in the House and Senator MURRAY in the Senate. I was happy we had an appropriations bill that did reflect a lot of give-and-take on both sides, and I was very pleased we had a farm bill. Again, lots of things to debate in that farm bill, but we need a 5-year farm bill for the people.

And now, on energy, we finally pass something that both sides can legitimately be proud of because it is real policy. It is important policy that is going to be beneficial to the bottom line to the American people.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add on the words of the gentleman from Vermont, first of all, once again, just to say how much we enjoyed working with him and the others on this important legislation.

We do firmly believe that the American people will benefit from this. We all recognize that energy is one of the components that goes a long way in determining how competitive America can be in the global marketplace, and any time you can improve efficiency, you improve that competitiveness. So I would urge all of our Members to support H.R. 2126, the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2014.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I urge the House of Representatives to pass this bipartisan energy efficiency legislation, the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2014, that would take a best practices approach to achieving optimal performance levels in commercial buildings and identify energy efficiency improvements in federal government data centers and leased buildings. This piece of legislation will save energy, save taxpayer dollars, lower consumers' energy bills and reduce harmful pollution.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN of the Energy and Commerce Committee and Chairman WHITFIELD and Ranking Member RUSH of the Energy and Power Subcommittee for including my bill, H.R. 3820, a bill to encourage benchmarking and disclosure of energy information in commercial buildings, as Title IV of the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act.

Existing federal law requires benchmarking of federally owned buildings. Benchmarking is a practice that allows building owners to assess the energy use of their buildings and compare their performance to similar buildings. My bill builds on existing law by requiring federally leased buildings to benchmark and disclose their energy usage data, where practical.

Benchmarking helps owners identify buildings that can most benefit from energy upgrades. The federal Energy Star Buildings program has encouraged benchmarking for many years and the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that this program has benchmarked more than 185 million square feet of U.S. commercial floor space, resulting in average energy savings of about 5 percent in these buildings.

My bill requires a benchmarking study for commercial and multi-family buildings. A number of U.S. cities encourage or require benchmarking for large commercial or multi-family buildings. This information helps building owners, purchasers and renters make more informed decisions. This piece of legislation requires the Department of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to conduct a study on benchmarking methodologies so that cities and states can avoid pitfalls and implement best practices.

I hope that passage of the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act marks a period of bipartisan cooperation. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee on solving the nation's energy issues and other pressing matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2126, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–84)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

After 5 years of grit and determined effort, the United States is better positioned for the 21st Century than any other nation on Earth. We have created more than 8 million new jobs in the last 4 years and now have the lowest unemployment rate in over 5 years. Our housing market is rebounding. Our manufacturing sector is adding jobs for the first time since the 1990s. We now produce more oil at home than we buy from the rest of the world. We have cut our deficits by more than half since I took office. And for the first time in over a decade, business leaders around the world have declared that China is no longer the world's number one place to invest; America is.

We have made great progress, but we must do more to rebuild our economy on a new foundation for growth and prosperity. I believe that what unites the people of this Nation, regardless of race or region or party, young or old, rich or poor, is the simple, profound belief in opportunity for all—the notion that if you work hard and take responsibility, you can get ahead. That belief has suffered some serious blows. Over more than three decades, even before the Great Recession hit, massive shifts in technology and global competition had eliminated good, middle class jobs and weakened the economic foundations that families depend on.

Today, after 4 years of economic growth, corporate profits and stock prices have rarely been higher, and those at the top have never done better. But average wages have barely budged. Inequality has deepened. Upward mobility remains stalled. Even in the midst of recovery, too many Americans are working more than ever just to get by—let alone get ahead. And too many still are not working at all.

Our job is to reverse these trends. We need to return to an America where our success depends not on accident of birth, but on the strength of our work ethic and the scope of our dreams. That is what drew our forebears here. Opportunity is who we are. And the defining project of our generation is to restore that promise. It will not happen right away. But we must continue to strive toward that goal.

What I offer in this Budget is a set of concrete, practical proposals to speed up growth, strengthen the middle class, and build new ladders of opportunity into the middle class—all while continuing to improve the Nation's long-run fiscal position.

Earlier this year, thanks to the work of Democrats and Republicans, the Congress produced an agreement that undid some of last year's severe cuts to priorities like education and research, infrastructure, and national security. Recognizing the importance of that bipartisan compromise, the Budget adheres to the spending levels agreed to by the Congress for fiscal year 2015. But there is clearly much more we can and should do to invest in areas like infrastructure, innovation, and education that will create jobs, economic growth, and opportunity. So I am including in my Budget a fully paid for Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative that provides the Congress a roadmap for how and where additional investments should be made in both domestic priorities and national security this year.

We know where to start: the best measure of opportunity is access to a good job. With the economy picking up speed, companies say they intend to hire more people this year. And over half of big manufacturers say they are thinking of insourcing jobs from abroad.

We need to make that decision easier for more companies. Both Democrats and Republicans have argued that our tax code is riddled with wasteful, complicated loopholes that make it harder to invest here and encourage companies to keep profits abroad. Last summer, I offered a proposal to couple business tax reform with critical investments in infrastructure. This Budget includes that proposal, using the transition revenue that will result from a shift to a simpler, more efficient tax code to create jobs rebuilding our roads and bridges and unclogging our commutes and transporting goods made in America—because in today's global economy, first-class jobs gravitate to first-class infrastructure. At the same time, this Budget lays out how my Administration will continue to act on our own to cut red tape and streamline the permitting process for key infrastructure projects, so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.

We also have the chance, right now, to beat other countries in the race for the next wave of high-tech manufacturing jobs. My Administration has already launched four hubs for high-tech manufacturing, where we have connected businesses to research universities that can help America lead the world in advanced technologies. The Budget expands on these efforts by providing funding for five additional institutes, and, through the Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative, supports the goal I announced last summer of creating a national network of 45 of these manufacturing innovation institutes over the next 10 years.

We know that the nation that goes all-in on innovation today will own the global economy tomorrow. This is an edge America cannot surrender. That is why the Budget includes investments in cutting-edge research and development, driving scientific and technological breakthroughs that will create jobs, improve lives, and open new opportunities for the American people. The Budget's Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative will allow us to push our limits even further, supporting additional biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health that will help us fight Alzheimer's, cancer, and other diseases, climate research to develop climate change-resilient infrastructure, and agricultural research that will help increase agricultural productivity and improve health.

We also know that one of the biggest factors in bringing more jobs back is our commitment to American energy. The all-of-the-above energy strategy I announced a few years ago is working, and today, America is closer to energy independence than we have been in decades.

The Budget advances this strategy by ensuring the safe and responsible production of natural gas and cleaner electricity generation from fossil fuels. It creates new incentives to cut the amount of energy we waste in our cars, trucks, homes, and factories. It promotes clean energy with investments in technologies like solar and by expanding and making permanent the tax credit for the production of renewable energy. And it continues to strengthen protection of our air, water, land, and communities, and addresses the threat of climate change. Climate change is a fact, and we have to act with more urgency to address it because a changing climate is already harming western communities struggling with drought and coastal cities dealing with floods. That is why I directed my Administration to work with States, utilities, and others to set new standards on the amount of carbon pollution our power plants are allowed to dump into the air, and why this Budget advances new approaches to address the growing cost and damage from wildfires.

All of these efforts can speed up growth and create more jobs. But in this rapidly changing economy, we have to make sure that every American has the skills to fill those jobs. The Budget therefore invests in new efforts to drive greater performance and innovation in workforce training, including on-the-job training, apprenticeships, and other steps to equip workers with skills that match the needs of employers.

Of course, it is not enough to train today's workforce. We also have to prepare tomorrow's workforce by guaranteeing every child access to a world-class education. That is why the Budget builds on the progress we have made with new investments and initiatives to improve all levels of education, from early childhood through college.

Research shows that one of the best investments we can make in a child's life is high-quality early education. This year, we will invest in new partnerships with States and communities across the country to expand access to high-quality early education, and I am again calling on the Congress to make high-quality preschool available to every four-year-old child. The Budget also includes funding to provide access to high-quality infant and toddler care for more than 100,000 children, and supports the extension and expansion of voluntary home visiting programs.

Last year, I called on the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to

connect 99 percent of our students to high-speed broadband over the next 4 years. This year, the FCC is making a down payment on this goal by connecting more than 15,000 schools and 20 million students over the next 2 years, without adding a dime to the deficit. To ensure students receive the full benefit of this connectivity, the Budget invests in training for teachers in hundreds of school districts across the country.

The Budget also supports redesigning our high schools, helping them partner with colleges and employers that offer the college-level coursework and real-world skills to prepare students for college and careers. And it launches a new Race to the Top competition aimed at closing the achievement gap, so that all children get the high-quality education they need to succeed.

And we are shaking up our system of higher education to encourage innovation, give parents more information, and reward colleges for improving quality and reducing costs, so that no middle class student is priced out of a college education. Last summer, I directed the Department of Education to develop and publish a new college rating system that will identify colleges that provide the best value to students and encourage all colleges to improve. The Budget supports the development of that rating system and provides bonuses to reward colleges that improve educational outcomes for Pell Grant recipients. And to help more Americans who feel trapped by student loan debt, the Budget expands income-driven repayment options, allowing millions the opportunity to cap their monthly student loan payments at 10 percent of their income.

We also must do more to ensure our economy honors the dignity of work, and that hard work pays off for all of our citizens. Americans overwhelmingly agree that no one who works full time should ever have to raise a family in poverty. I have already acted by Executive Order to require Federal contractors to pay their federally funded employees a fair wage of at least $10.10 an hour. The Congress needs to go further and raise the minimum wage for all workers to that same amount. This raise will help families, and it will help the economy by giving businesses customers with more money to spend and by boosting productivity and reducing turnover. The Budget also invests in enforcement efforts to make sure workers receive the wages and overtime they have earned.

There are other steps we can take to help families make ends meet. Few policies are more effective at reducing inequality and helping families pull themselves up through hard work than the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC for families with children lifts millions out of poverty each year and helps about half of all parents at some point in their lives. But as a number of prominent policymakers, both progressive and conservative, have noted, the EITC does not do enough for single workers who do not have kids. The Budget doubles the value of the EITC for workers without children and non-custodial parents, and also makes it available to younger adult workers, so that it can encourage work in the crucial years at the beginning of a young person's career.

We also need to do more to help Americans save for retirement. Today, most workers do not have a pension. A Social Security check often is not enough on its own. And while the stock market has doubled over the last 5 years, that does not improve retirement security for people who do not have retirement savings. That is why the Budget builds on my proposal to create a new way for working Americans to start saving for retirement: the MyRA savings bond. To encourage new savers, MyRA requires a low initial contribution and guarantees a decent return with no risk of losing what you put in. Separately, the Budget also proposes to establish automatic enrollment Individual Retirement Accounts, offering every American access to an automatic savings vehicle on the job.

For decades, few things exposed hard-working families to economic hardship more than a broken health care system. With the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, we are in the process of fixing that. Already, because of the health reform law, more than 3 million Americans under the age of 26 have gained coverage under their parents' plans. More than 9 million Americans have signed up for private health insurance or Medicaid coverage. Because of this law, no American can ever again be dropped or denied coverage for a preexisting condition like asthma, back pain, or cancer. No woman can ever be charged more just because she is a woman. And we did all this while adding years to Medicare's finances, keeping Medicare premiums flat, and lowering prescription costs for millions of seniors. To continue this progress, the Budget fully funds the ongoing implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

We must always remember that economic growth and opportunity can only be achieved if America is safe and secure. At home, the Budget supports efforts to make our communities safer by reducing gun violence and reforming our criminal justice system.

Looking beyond our borders, the Budget responsibly transitions from the completion of our military mission in Afghanistan in 2014 to political and security support for a unified Afghan government as it takes full responsibility for its own future. When I took office, nearly 180,000 Americans were serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, all our troops are out of Iraq and more than 60,000 of our troops have already come home from Afghanistan. With Afghan forces now in the lead for their own security, our troops have moved to a support role. Together with our allies, we will complete our mission there by the end of this year, and America's longest war will finally be over.

In addition to responsibly winding down our operations in Afghanistan, the Budget ensures we maintain ready, modern, and capable defense forces to address any threats we might face, including threats from terrorism and cyber attacks. It funds humanitarian and diplomatic efforts in Syria, supports transition and reform throughout the Middle East and North Africa, and advances our strategic rebalancing toward the Asia-Pacific region. It enhances stability and creates new markets for U.S. businesses with investments in Power Africa and promotes peace and security by supporting global health care and addressing climate change. And it strengthens oversight of intelligence activities and enhances the protection of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel overseas.

The Budget also ensures that we continue to meet our obligations to our troops and veterans who have given so much to our country. To deliver on this commitment, it provides significant resources to support veterans' medical care, help military families, assist soldiers transitioning to civilian life, reduce veterans' homelessness, and reduce the disability claims backlog so our veterans receive the benefits they have earned. It also introduces necessary reforms to our military compensation system, which our uniform military leadership called for, to ensure servicemembers and their families receive the benefits that they have earned while making sure that our military can invest in the training, equipment, and support that it needs.

In addition to making these critical investments, the Budget outlines the steps my Administration is taking to create a 21st Century Government that is more efficient, effective, and supportive of economic growth. Our citizens and businesses expect their Government to provide the same level of service experienced in the private sector and we intend to deliver. The Budget includes initiatives that will lead to better, faster, and smarter services, both online and in-person. It calls on Federal agencies to share services and leverage the buying power of the Government to bring greater value and efficiency for taxpayer dollars. It continues to open Government data and research for public and private sector use to spur innovation and job creation. And it invests in the Government's most important resource, its workers, ensuring that we can attract and retain the best talent in the Federal workforce and foster a culture of excellence.

The Budget does all of these things while further strengthening the Nation's long-term fiscal outlook. Over the last 5 years, we have cut the deficit in half as a share of the economy, experiencing the fastest period of deficit reduction since the demobilization following World War II. The Budget continues this progress, bringing deficits

down as a share of the economy to below 2 percent by 2023 and putting debt as a share of the economy on a declining path.

Although we have seen a notable and significant decline in health care spending growth over the last few years, in part due to the Affordable Care Act, we know that over the long run, the growth of health care costs continues to be our Nation's most pressing fiscal challenge. That is why the Budget builds on the savings and reforms in the health reform law with additional measures to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid and encourage high-quality and efficient health care.

We also know that revenue has to be part of the solution to our Nation's long-term fiscal challenges. Given the aging of our population and the declining ratio of workers to retirees, we will need additional revenue to maintain our commitments to seniors while also making the investments that are needed to grow our economy and expand opportunity. The Budget secures that revenue through tax reform that reduces inefficient and unfair tax breaks and ensures that everyone, from Main Street to Wall Street, is paying their fair share.

Finally, if we are serious about long-term, sustainable economic growth and deficit reduction, it is also time to heed the calls of business leaders, labor leaders, faith leaders, and law enforcement—and fix our broken immigration system. Independent economists say immigration reform will grow our economy and shrink our deficits by almost $1 trillion in the next two decades. And for good reason: when people come here to fulfill their dreams—to study, invent, and contribute to our culture—they make our country a more attractive place for businesses to locate and help create jobs for everyone. The Senate has acted to pass a bipartisan immigration reform bill that is worthy of support. It is time for the House of Representatives to finish the job.

We have made progress over the last 5 years. But our work is not done. This Budget provides a roadmap to ensuring middle class families and those working to be a part of the middle class can feel secure in their jobs, homes, and budgets. To build real, lasting economic security, we also need to expand opportunity for all so every American can get ahead and have a shot at creating a better life for their kids.

None of it is easy. America has never come easy. But if we work together, if we summon what is best in us, I know it is within our reach.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 2014*.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 5 p.m.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE CONSERVATION AND RECREATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 23) to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 23

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Conservation and Recreation Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map consisting of 6 sheets entitled ''Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Proposed Wilderness Boundary'', numbered 634/80,083B, and dated November 2010.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. SLEEPING BEAR DUNES WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore comprising approximately 32,557 acres along the mainland shore of Lake Michigan and on certain nearby islands in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, Michigan, as generally depicted on the map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the ''Sleeping Bear Dunes Wilderness''.

(b) MAP.—

(1) AVAILABILITY.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) CORRECTIONS.—The Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map.

(3) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a legal description of the wilderness boundary and submit a copy of the map and legal description to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(c) ROAD SETBACKS.—The wilderness boundary shall be—

(1) 100 feet from the centerline of adjacent county roads; and

(2) 300 feet from the centerline of adjacent State highways.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness area designated by section 3(a) shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF ROADS OUTSIDE WILDERNESS BOUNDARY.—Nothing in this Act prevents the maintenance and improvement of roads that are located outside the boundary of the wilderness area designated by section 3(a).

(c) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this Act affects the jurisdiction of the State of Michigan with respect to the management of fish and wildlife, including hunting and fishing within the national lakeshore in accordance with section 5 of Public Law 91–479 (16 U.S.C. 460x–4).

(d) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this Act modifies, alters, or affects—

(1) any treaty rights; or

(2) any valid private property rights in existence on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

This bill reflects decades of work, work by local citizens who organized to reject the dictates of the Federal bureaucracy and to protect public access and recreation. At the same time that this bill designates new wilderness, it also provides critical protections for the public's ability to visit and enjoy the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. Let me give you a little bit of background.

In 1981, the National Park Service proposed a general management plan for the lakeshore in Michigan. The plan was so restrictive as to be punitive towards recreation, and it sparked a local backlash. After years of collaboration, a new plan was agreed upon that realigned the wilderness boundaries to restore sensible public access.

This legislation would codify these negotiated changes into law and ensure the continued availability of roads for visitors traveling to remote trailheads, to beaches, to backcountry areas, and to historic areas within this geography. The bill also protects motorboater access to the shoreline. It specifically protects private property rights. It preserves hunting and fishing rights, and it does not expand Federal land ownership or add any additional costs to taxpayers.

As I stated, this effort has been going on for several decades. After the House votes today, this bill will go to the President for his signature in order to become law. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the real

credit for this legislation, even though it is a Senate bill, is owed to our colleague from Michigan, Dr. BENISHEK, for making this happen. He is the lead sponsor of this legislation, or the companion legislation, in the House of Representatives. Dr. BENISHEK has been a persistent and persuasive advocate for this local proposal.

As the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, which oversees this bill, I can state with certainty that it is because of his, Dr. BENISHEK's, bipartisan efforts that this bill will pass the House tonight. He has worked closely with both Republicans and Democrats, especially his senior Senator, Senator LEVIN of Michigan, to make this a reality. Without their personal efforts, today's vote would not happen.

Dr. BENISHEK certainly deserves recognition for this success, and I congratulate him and the people of Michigan, whom he represents, for this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank our chairman from the Natural Resources Committee, and I am proud to be here on behalf of the minority to speak in favor of S. 23, which is a locally driven conservation initiative that will make the management of a national park unit more efficient and will create the first new acres of wilderness enacted into the system since 2009. Adding approximately 30,000 acres of wilderness will protect the special character of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan.

The passage of this bill is going to make a lot of people very happy, and I hope it is a sign of change to come. Congress should not stand in the way of locally driven conservation initiatives, and we look forward to working with the majority to identify more opportunities in which to work together and to move legislation that merits our attention. There are a lot more wilderness bills, monument designations, and wildlife and scenic river bills that the House should consider. We happily support the adoption of S. 23.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), the author of the House legislation which is the companion to what we are voting on from the Senate.

Mr. BENISHEK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of S. 23, the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Conservation and Recreation Act.

As you know, this bill, which passed the Senate by unanimous consent on June 19, 2013, is identical to H.R. 163, legislation I introduced by the same title last January with the full support of the Michigan delegation.

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore is a treasured area of my home district and for the entire Nation. The park has been named America's most beautiful place by ''Good Morning America,'' and over 1 million visitors from around the world come to see the dunes and the surrounding lakes each year.

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore plays a vital role in our State's outdoor recreation economy, which contributes over $18 billion in consumer spending and over 194,000 jobs to the State of Michigan. As Pamela of Lake Township said, ''Sleeping Bear is vital to the economy of northern Michigan. Most of the money earned in this area is during the summer months when tourists from all over the country visit.'' From gas stations to ice cream stands to local hotels, our local businesses look forward to a full and thriving park season each year.

In 1981, Congress determined that wilderness areas should exist within this park, and over 30,000 acres of park have been managed as wilderness since that time. When the National Park Service began to update the proposed map for the first time since 1981, the local residents discovered for the first time that the map included a number of county roads, beaches, and historic sites in this proposed wilderness area.

As you can imagine, local residents in Benzie, Leelanau, and Grand Traverse County were not pleased, and a lengthy public planning period began. Because of the very public local opposition to the original land management plan, the Park Service agreed to go back to the drawing board. They worked together with the local citizens and interest groups, ranging from area businesses to environmental groups. After gathering extensive public involvement, review, and comment, a final general management plan was adopted in January 2009. This plan ensures that all county roads will remain in control of the local governments, and beaches and historic sites will be excluded from the wilderness map.

The bill on the floor here today represents the hard work of these engaged citizens. It has been introduced each Congress, in both the House and the Senate, since 2009. This legislation, like the park, itself, has always enjoyed wide support from the entire Michigan delegation on both sides of the aisle. While we may not agree on every issue, we can agree that our local communities know best when it comes to planning for the future of our parks.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have worked with those who have come before me—from Chairman CAMP, to former Representative Hoekstra, to Representative HUIZENGA and Senator LEVIN—to shepherd this bill through Congress. My goal is simple. Like all of those who love this amazing stretch of shoreline, I want to ensure that those beaches and roads remain open.

I hope everyone will join me in visiting Sleeping Bear Dunes soon. You will get to see how truly blessed northern Michigan is to have this amazing natural wonder.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), another cosponsor of this legislation and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bill offered by my colleague and friend, Mr. DAN BENISHEK of Michigan.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore is not just a Michigan but a national treasure. It is enjoyed by over 1 million visitors from across the State, country, and world each year. In fact, in 2011, Sleeping Bear was voted the ''most beautiful place in America'' by a poll conducted by ''Good Morning America.''

This bill is the product of years of work between members of the public, the National Park Service, and local, State, and Federal officials. It strikes a careful balance between conservation and recreation. In addition to protecting this vital natural resource, the bill ensures that the beaches of Lake Michigan will be accessible to the public and that hunting and fishing rights, as well as boating access, will be maintained.

I hope the rest of the House will join me today in supporting the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Conservation and Recreation Act so that this national treasure can be enjoyed to its fullest now and for many generations to come.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate, we fully support S. 23. I look forward to its passage, and I look forward to one day visiting this beautiful location in Michigan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 23.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH FORK WATERSHED PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2259) to withdraw certain Federal land and interests

in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws and to preserve existing uses, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2259

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''North Fork Watershed Protection Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELIGIBLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''eligible Federal land'' means—

(A) any federally owned land or interest in land depicted on the Map as within the North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area; or

(B) any land or interest in land located within the North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area that is acquired by the Federal Government after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the Bureau of Land Management map entitled ''North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area'' and dated June 9, 2010.

SEC. 3. WITHDRAWAL.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the eligible Federal land is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(2) disposition under all laws relating to mineral leasing and geothermal leasing.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Map shall be made available to the public at each appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section violates the rights of existing leaseholders or prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from taking any action necessary to complete any requirement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) required for permitting surface-disturbing activity to occur on any lease issued before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. EXISTING USES NOT AFFECTED.

Except with respect to the withdrawal under section 3, nothing in this Act restricts recreational uses, livestock management activities, or forest management activities allowed on the date of the enactment of this Act on the eligible Federal land in accordance with applicable law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The legislation before the House today enjoys bipartisan and bicameral support in Congress and the strong endorsement of the affected local communities.

Our colleague, Mr. DAINES of Montana, is the lead sponsor of this bill, and he has championed its action here in the House. I can assure everyone that it is because of his leadership, his commitment and energy that this legislation will pass the House today. Mr. DAINES has put the interests of Montana first and has been willing to work in a bipartisan way, with Republicans and Democrats, to get this bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, the North Fork Watershed Protection Act would codify protections of Federal forest lands in the North Fork watershed from development in accordance with the memorandum of understanding signed in 2010 between the Province of British Columbia and the State of Montana. Very significantly, the bill makes certain in law that existing uses, including public recreation, livestock management, and forest management are protected and not restricted. This bill will ensure that this region stays accessible for most of the traditional activities in this beautiful part of Montana.

Mr. Speaker, in 1988, the Ninth Circuit Court enjoined the Department of the Interior from allowing any activity on issued oil and gas leases in this area. Since then, no oil and gas development has taken place in this area, and several leaseholders have voluntarily relinquished their oil and gas leases within this area. The State of Montana has made clear its desire to partner with British Columbia, as I have mentioned, to protect this watershed. H.R. 2259 would similarly protect the Federal land located within this region.

Again, I would like to recognize the author of this legislation, Mr. DAINES, for his hard work and leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 2259 will protect an important watershed and recreational resource west of Glacier National Park, and we are glad to see it on the suspension calendar. It is a widely supported initiative in Montana that will conserve a treasured landscape that belongs to every American. Some places are just too special to allow short-term commercial considerations to potentially harm their long-term viability.

Stakeholders in Montana identified the importance of the North Fork watershed, an area that supports the recreation-based economy, provides clean drinking water, and allows wildlife to thrive. H.R. 2259 guarantees that this area will not be threatened by unfettered energy development. I support this bill, and I urge its adoption.

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

□ 1715

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the author of this legislation.

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I want to give my thanks to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for his support and leadership in moving this bill through the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly offer H.R. 2259, the North Fork Watershed Protection Act, for consideration in the full House.

This bill is special to Montana for many reasons.

The Flathead River is one of the most cherished waterways in our great State, and our country, for trout fishing. In fact, it is considered a ''red ribbon'' stream. That is Montana's version of a blue ribbon trout stream.

The Flathead is an area beloved by the local community for recreation and supporting the region's forest-based economy.

Last but not least, this watershed is a gateway to one of the crown jewels of the National Park system, Glacier National Park.

Protecting the watershed and ensuring its value extends for future generations has been a task shared by Governors and legislatures of both parties, our neighboring Canadian Province of British Columbia, as well as our local Chambers of Commerce. It is also supported by Montana Senators Max Baucus and JOHN TESTER, and myself. We all support protecting this area for future generations. It makes this bill the first lands legislation supported by the entire Montana delegation in nearly 30 years.

The North Fork Watershed Protection Act protects 430,000 acres along the North and Middle Forks of the Flathead River from mineral development. Eighty percent of leases in this area have already been voluntarily relinquished. The bill explicitly protects the rights of existing leaseholders, and there is no loss in production.

The North Fork Watershed Protection Act represents commonsense resource management. It is the kind of common sense Montanans understand and Washington, D.C., needs more of.

The North Fork Watershed Protection Act ensures the region's current uses—forest management, hunting, fishing, outdoor recreation, quality water supply for local communities, access to gravel for infrastructure maintenance, and livestock grazing—will continue for many generations to come because that is our way of life in Montana.

The North Fork Watershed Protection Act is a key to international agreement between the State of Montana and British Columbia. In fact, in February of 2010, the Province of British Columbia and the State of Montana

signed a Memorandum of Understanding to preclude mineral development along the Flathead. British Columbia completed prohibition of mineral development along the Flathead River in 2011.

The North Fork Watershed Protection Act is necessary to hold up the U.S. end of the bargain and to be a good neighbor. The Canadian province has expended significant resources for the sake of upholding this agreement and strongly supports passage of this legislation so their efforts will be solidified.

The bill also has an unprecedented mix of supporters, from ConocoPhillips, Anadarko, and Chevron, to Ducks Unlimited, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and local chambers of commerce. This unity across diverse stakeholders is reflective of the bill's strong support among Montanans. It is time we get this done.

Montanans have been working toward protecting the Flathead for decades. Senator Max Baucus began work to protect this watershed in his very first year in Congress. That was back in 1974, when he was Montana's Congressman in the House. I am proud to be part of the effort to get it done and across the finish line.

Passage of the North Fork Watershed Protection Act is a major stop towards a commonsense goal that Montanans have worked toward together for decades.

Though Senator Bachus has now retired and is serving in China, the passage of the North Fork Watershed Protection Act will send a strong message to the Senate to get it done.

I urge passage of H.R. 2259, the North Fork Watershed Protection Act.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to reiterate our support for H.R. 2259, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2259, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass 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, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3370

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Repeal of certain rate increases.
Sec. 4. Restoration of grandfathered rates.
Sec. 5. Requirements regarding annual rate increases.
Sec. 6. Clarification of rates for properties newly mapped into areas with special flood hazards.
Sec. 7. Premiums and reports.
Sec. 8. Annual premium surcharge.
Sec. 9. Draft affordability framework.
Sec. 10. Risk transfer.
Sec. 11. Monthly installment payment for premiums.
Sec. 12. Optional high-deductible policies for residential properties.
Sec. 13. Exclusion of detached structures from mandatory purchase requirement.
Sec. 14. Accounting for flood mitigation activities in estimates of premium rates.
Sec. 15. Home improvement fairness.
Sec. 16. Affordability study and report.
Sec. 17. Flood insurance rate map certification.
Sec. 18. Funds to reimburse homeowners for successful map appeals.
Sec. 19. Flood protection systems.
Sec. 20. Quarterly reports regarding Reserve Fund ratio.
Sec. 21. Treatment of floodproofed residential basements.
Sec. 22. Exemption from fees for certain map change requests.
Sec. 23. Study of voluntary community-based flood insurance options.
Sec. 24. Designation of flood insurance advocate.
Sec. 25. Exceptions to escrow requirement for flood insurance payments.
Sec. 26. Flood mitigation methods for buildings.
Sec. 27. Mapping of non-structural flood mitigation features.
Sec. 28. Clear communications.
Sec. 29. Protection of small businesses, nonprofits, houses of worship, and residences.
Sec. 30. Mapping.
Sec. 31. Disclosure.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(2) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The term ''National Flood Insurance Program'' means the program established under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF CERTAIN RATE INCREASES.

(a) REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1307(g) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(g)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''as a result of the deliberate choice of the holder of such policy'' and inserting '', unless the decision of the policy holder to permit a lapse in flood insurance coverage was as a result of the property covered by the policy no longer being required to retain such coverage'' ; and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Administrator shall promulgate such regulations, and make available such rate tables, as necessary to implement the amendments made by paragraph (1) as if it were enacted as part of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 957).

(3) IIMPLEMENTATION, COORDINATION, AND GUIDANCE.—

(A) FACILITATION OF TIMELY REFUNDS.—To ensure the participation of Write Your Own companies (as such term is defined in section 100202(a) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4004(a)), the Administrator and the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall consult with Write Your Own companies throughout the development of guidance and rate tables necessary to implement the provisions of and the amendments made by this Act.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION AND GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall issue final guidance and rate tables necessary to implement the provisions of and the amendments made by this Act not later than eight months following the date of the enactment of this Act. Write Your Own companies, in coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall have not less than six months but not more than eight months following the issuance of such final guidance and rate tables to implement the changes required by such final guidance and rate tables.

(4) REFUND OF EXCESS PREMIUM CHARGES COLLECTED.—The Administrator shall refund directly to insureds any premiums for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program collected in excess of the rates required under the provisions of and amendments made by this section. To allow for necessary and appropriate implementation of such provisions and amendments, any premium changes necessary to implement such provisions and amendments, including any such premium refund due to policy holders, which shall be paid directly by the National Flood Insurance Program, shall not be charged or paid to policyholders by the National Flood Insurance Program until after the Administrator issues guidance and makes available such rate tables to implement the provisions of and amendments made by this Act.

(b) ASSUMPTION OF POLICIES AT EXISTING PREMIUM RATES.—The Administrator shall provide that the purchaser of a property that, as of the date of such purchase, is covered under an existing flood insurance policy under this title may assume such existing policy and coverage for the remainder of the term of the policy at the chargeable premium rates under such existing policy. Such rates shall continue with respect to such property until the implementation of subsection (a).

SEC. 4. RESTORATION OF GRANDFATHERED RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (h); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted as part of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 957).

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENTS REGARDING ANNUAL RATE INCREASES.

Section 1308(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(e)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking '', the chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance under this title for any properties'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''the chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance under this title for any properties'' before ''within any'';

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''the chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance under this title for any properties'' before ''described in'';

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2), as so amended, as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(5) by inserting before paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following new paragraphs:

''(1) the chargeable risk premium rate for flood insurance under this title for any property may not be increased by more than 18 percent each year, except—

''(A) as provided in paragraph (4);

''(B) in the case of property identified under section 1307(g); or

''(C) in the case of a property that—

''(i) is located in a community that has experienced a rating downgrade under the community rating system program carried out under section 1315(b);

''(ii) is covered by a policy with respect to which the policyholder has—

''(I) decreased the amount of the deductible; or

''(II) increased the amount of coverage; or

''(iii) was misrated;

''(2) the chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance under this title for any properties initially rated under section 1307(a)(2) within any single risk classification, excluding properties for which the chargeable risk premium rate is not less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1), shall be increased by an amount that results in an average of such rate increases for properties within the risk classification during any 12-month period of not less than 5 percent of the average of the risk premium rates for such properties within the risk classification upon the commencement of such 12-month period;'';

(6) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated by paragraph (4) of this section), by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''15 percent''; and

(7) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated) by paragraph (4) of this section), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)''.

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF RATES FOR PROPERTIES NEWLY MAPPED INTO AREAS WITH SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARDS.

Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) RATES FOR PROPERTIES NEWLY MAPPED INTO AREAS WITH SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARDS.—Notwithstanding subsection (f), the premium rate for flood insurance under this title that is purchased on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection—

''(1) on a property located in an area not previously designated as having special flood hazards and that, pursuant to any issuance, revision, updating, or other change in a flood insurance map, becomes designated as such an area, and

''(2) where such flood insurance premium rate is calculated under subsection (a)(1) of section 1307 (42 U.S.C. 4014(a)(1)),

shall for the first policy year be the preferred risk premium for the property and upon renewal shall be calculated in accordance with subsection (e) of this section until the rate reaches the rate calculated under subsection (a)(1) of section 1307.''.

SEC. 7. PREMIUMS AND REPORTS.

Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) PREMIUMS AND REPORTS.—In setting premium risk rates, in addition to striving to achieve the objectives of this title the Administrator shall also strive to minimize the number of policies with annual premiums that exceed one percent of the total coverage provided by the policy. For any policies premiums that exceed this one percent threshold, the Administrator shall report such exceptions to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.''.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL PREMIUM SURCHARGE.

(a) PREMIUM SURCHARGE.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1308 the following new section:

''SEC. 1308A. PREMIUM SURCHARGE.

''(a) IMPOSITION AND COLLECTION.—The Administrator shall impose and collect an annual surcharge, in the amount provided in subsection (b), on all policies for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program that are newly issued or renewed after the date of the enactment of this section. Such surcharge shall be in addition to the surcharge under section 1304(b) and any other assessments and surcharges applied to such coverage.

''(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of the surcharge under subsection (a) shall be—

''(1) $25, except as provided in paragraph (2); and

''(2) $250, in the case of a policy for any property that is—

''(A) a non-residential property; or

''(B) a residential property that is not the primary residence of an individual.

''(c) TERMINATION.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall cease to apply on the date on which the chargeable risk premium rate for flood insurance under this title for each property covered by flood insurance under this title, other than properties for which premiums are calculated under subsection (e) or (f) of section 1307 or section 1336 of this Act (42 U.S.C. 4014, 4056) or under section 100230 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4014 note), is not less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) for such property.''.

(b) DEPOSIT IN RESERVE FUND.—Subsection (c) of section 1310A of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017a) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) DEPOSIT OF PREMIUM SURCHARGES.—The Administrator shall deposit in the Reserve Fund any surcharges collected pursuant to section 1308A.''.

SEC. 9. DRAFT AFFORDABILITY FRAMEWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall prepare a draft affordability framework that proposes to address, via programmatic and regulatory changes, the issues of affordability of flood insurance sold under the National Flood Insurance Program, including issues identified in the affordability study required under section 100236 of the Bigger-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 957).

(b) CRITERIA.—In carrying out the requirements under subsection (a), the Administrator shall consider the following criteria:

(1) Accurate communication to consumers of the flood risk associated with their properties.

(2) Targeted assistance to flood insurance policy holders based on their financial ability to continue to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program.

(3) Individual or community actions to mitigate the risk of flood or lower the cost of flood insurance.

(4) The impact of increases in risk premium rates on participation in the National Flood Insurance Program.

(5) The impact flood insurance rate map updates have on the affordability of flood insurance.

(c) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the Administrator submits the affordability study referred to in subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit to the full Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the full Committee on Financial Services and the full Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives the draft affordability framework required under subsection (a).

(d) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—The Administrator may enter into an agreement with another Federal agency to—

(1) complete the affordability study referred to in subsection (a); or

(2) prepare the draft affordability framework required under subsection (a).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide the Administrator with the authority to provide assistance to homeowners based on affordability that was not available prior to the enactment of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 916).

SEC. 10. RISK TRANSFER.

Section 1345 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) RISK TRANSFER.—The Administrator may secure reinsurance of coverage provided by the flood insurance program from the private reinsurance and capital markets at rates and on terms determined by the Administrator to be reasonable and appropriate, in an amount sufficient to maintain the ability of the program to pay claims.''.

SEC. 11. MONTHLY INSTALLMENT PAYMENT FOR PREMIUMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(g)) is amended by striking ''either annually or in more frequent installments'' and inserting ''annually or monthly''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall implement the requirement under section 1308(g) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended by subsection (a), not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12. OPTIONAL HIGH-DEDUCTIBLE POLICIES FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

Section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013)), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) OPTIONAL HIGH-DEDUCTIBLE POLICIES FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY.—In the case of residential properties, the Administrator shall make flood insurance coverage available, at the option of the insured, that provides for a loss-deductible for damage to the covered property in various amounts, up to and including $10,000.

''(2) DISCLOSURE.—

''(A) FORM.—The Administrator shall provide the information described in subparagraph (B) clearly and conspicuously on the application form for flood insurance coverage or on a separate form, segregated from

all unrelated information and other required disclosures.

''(B) INFORMATION.—The information described in this subparagraph is—

''(i) information sufficient to inform the applicant of the availability of the coverage option required by paragraph (1) to applicants for flood insurance coverage; and

''(ii) a statement explaining the effect of a loss-deductible and that, in the event of an insured loss, the insured is responsible out-of-pocket for losses to the extent of the deductible selected.''.

SEC. 13. EXCLUSION OF DETACHED STRUCTURES FROM MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.

(a) EXCLUSION.—Subsection (c) of section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) DETACHED STRUCTURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, flood insurance shall not be required, in the case of any residential property, for any structure that is a part of such property but is detached from the primary residential structure of such property and does not serve as a residence.''.

(b) RESPA STATEMENT.—Section 5(b) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2604(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (14), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and the following statement: 'Although you may not be required to maintain flood insurance on all structures, you may still wish to do so, and your mortgage lender may still require you to do so to protect the collateral securing the mortgage. If you choose to not maintain flood insurance on a structure, and it floods, you are responsible for all flood losses relating to that structure.' ''; and

(2) by transferring and inserting paragraph (14), as so amended, after paragraph (13).

SEC. 14. ACCOUNTING FOR FLOOD MITIGATION ACTIVITIES IN ESTIMATES OF PREMIUM RATES.

Subparagraph (A) of section 1307(a)(1) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(a)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) based on consideration of—

''(i) the risk involved and accepted actuarial principles; and

''(ii) the flood mitigation activities that an owner or lessee has undertaken on a property, including differences in the risk involved due to land use measures, floodproofing, flood forecasting, and similar measures,''.

SEC. 15. HOME IMPROVEMENT FAIRNESS.

Section 1307(a)(2)(E)(ii) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(a)(2)(E)(ii)) is amended by striking ''30 percent'' and inserting ''50 percent''.

SEC. 16. AFFORDABILITY STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) STUDY ISSUES.—Subsection (a) of section 100236 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 957) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(5) options for maintaining affordability if annual premiums for flood insurance coverage were to increase to an amount greater than 2 percent of the liability coverage amount under the policy, including options for enhanced mitigation assistance and means-tested assistance;

''(6) the effects that the establishment of catastrophe savings accounts would have regarding long-term affordability of flood insurance coverage; and

''(7) options for modifying the surcharge under 1308A, including based on homeowner income, property value or risk of loss.''.

(b) TIMING OF SUBMISSION.—Notwithstanding the deadline under section 100236(c) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 957), not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the full Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the full Committee on Financial Services and the full Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives the affordability study and report required under such section 100236.

(c) AFFORDABILITY STUDY FUNDING.—Section 100236(d) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 957) is amended by striking ''$750,000'' and inserting ''$2,500,000''.

SEC. 17. FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP CERTIFICATION.

The Administrator shall implement a flood mapping program for the National Flood Insurance Program, only after review by the Technical Mapping Advisory Council, that, when applied, results in technically credible flood hazard data in all areas where Flood Insurance Rate Maps are prepared or updated, shall certify in writing to the Congress when such a program has been implemented, and shall provide to the Congress the Technical Mapping Advisory Council review report.

SEC. 18. FUNDS TO REIMBURSE HOMEOWNERS FOR SUCCESSFUL MAP APPEALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1363(f) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104(f)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting after ''as the case may be,'' the following: ''or, in the case of an appeal that is resolved by submission of conflicting data to the Scientific Resolution Panel provided for in section 1363A, the community,''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''The Administrator may use such amounts from the National Flood Insurance Fund established under section 1310 as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1310(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) for carrying out section 1363(f).''.

SEC. 19. FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS.

(a) ADEQUATE PROGRESS ON CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS.—Section 1307(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(e)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting ''or reconstruction'' after ''construction'';

(2) by amending the second sentence to read as follows: ''The Administrator shall find that adequate progress on the construction or reconstruction of a flood protection system, based on the present value of the completed flood protection system, has been made only if (1) 100 percent of the cost of the system has been authorized, (2) at least 60 percent of the cost of the system has been appropriated, (3) at least 50 percent of the cost of the system has been expended, and (4) the system is at least 50 percent completed.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in determining whether a community has made adequate progress on the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system, the Administrator shall consider all sources of funding, including Federal, State, and local funds.''.

(b) COMMUNITIES RESTORING DISACCREDITED FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS.—Section 1307(f) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(f)) is amended by amending the first sentence to read as follows: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this subsection shall apply to riverine and coastal levees that are located in a community which has been determined by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to be in the process of restoring flood protection afforded by a flood protection system that had been previously accredited on a Flood Insurance Rate Map as providing 100-year frequency flood protection but no longer does so, and shall apply without regard to the level of Federal funding of or participation in the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the flood protection system.''.

SEC. 20. QUARTERLY REPORTS REGARDING RESERVE FUND RATIO.

Subsection (e) of section 1310A of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017a) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', on a calendar quarterly basis,'' after ''submit''.

SEC. 21. TREATMENT OF FLOODPROOFED RESIDENTIAL BASEMENTS.

The Administrator shall continue to extend exceptions and variances for floodproofed basements consistent with section 60.6 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations, which are effective April 3, 2009; and section 60.3 of such title, which are effective April 3, 2009.

SEC. 22. EXEMPTION FROM FEES FOR CERTAIN MAP CHANGE REQUESTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a requester shall be exempt from submitting a review or processing fee for a request for a flood insurance rate map change based on a habitat restoration project that is funded in whole or in part with Federal or State funds, including dam removal, culvert redesign or installation, or the installation of fish passage.

SEC. 23. STUDY OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Administrator shall conduct a study to assess options, methods, and strategies for making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies through the National Flood Insurance Program.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take into consideration and analyze how voluntary community-based flood insurance policies—

(i) would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches; and

(ii) could satisfy the applicable requirements under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a); and

(B) evaluate the advisability of making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies to communities, subdivisions of communities, and areas of residual risk.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Administrator may consult with the Comptroller General of the United States, as the Administrator determines is appropriate.

(b) REPORT BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains the results and conclusions of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations for—

(A) the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance policies into the National Flood Insurance Program; and

(B) a strategy to implement voluntary community-based flood insurance policies that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities, including the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of levees, dams, or other flood control structures.

(c) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Administrator submits the report required under subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) review the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(A) an analysis of the report submitted by the Administrator;

(B) any comments or recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(C) any other recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to community-based flood insurance policies.

SEC. 24. DESIGNATION OF FLOOD INSURANCE ADVOCATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall designate a Flood Insurance Advocate to advocate for the fair treatment of policy holders under the National Flood Insurance Program and property owners in the mapping of flood hazards, the identification of risks from flood, and the implementation of measures to minimize the risk of flood.

(b) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The duties and responsibilities of the Flood Insurance Advocate designated under subsection (a) shall be to—

(1) educate property owners and policyholders under the National Flood Insurance Program on—

(A) individual flood risks;

(B) flood mitigation;

(C) measures to reduce flood insurance rates through effective mitigation;

(D) the flood insurance rate map review and amendment process; and

(E) any changes in the flood insurance program as a result of any newly enacted laws (including this Act);

(2) assist policy holders under the National Flood Insurance Program and property owners to understand the procedural requirements related to appealing preliminary flood insurance rate maps and implementing measures to mitigate evolving flood risks;

(3) assist in the development of regional capacity to respond to individual constituent concerns about flood insurance rate map amendments and revisions;

(4) coordinate outreach and education with local officials and community leaders in areas impacted by proposed flood insurance rate map amendments and revisions; and

(5) aid potential policy holders under the National Flood Insurance Program in obtaining and verifying accurate and reliable flood insurance rate information when purchasing or renewing a flood insurance policy.

SEC. 25. EXCEPTIONS TO ESCROW REQUIREMENT FOR FLOOD INSURANCE PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(d)(1) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the second sentence, by striking ''subparagraph (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (ii), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(C) in the matter preceding subclause (I), as redesignated by subparagraph (B), by striking ''(A) or (B), if—'' and inserting the following: ''(A)—

''(i) if—'';

(D) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following

''(ii) in the case of a loan that—

''(I) is in a junior or subordinate position to a senior lien secured by the same residential improved real estate or mobile home for which flood insurance is being provided at the time of the origination of the loan;

''(II) is secured by residential improved real estate or a mobile home that is part of a condominium, cooperative, or other project development, if the residential improved real estate or mobile home is covered by a flood insurance policy that—

''(aa) meets the requirements that the regulated lending institution is required to enforce under subsection (b)(1);

''(bb) is provided by the condominium association, cooperative, homeowners association, or other applicable group; and

''(cc) the premium for which is paid by the condominium association, cooperative, homeowners association, or other applicable group as a common expense;

''(III) is secured by residential improved real estate or a mobile home that is used as collateral for a business purpose;

''(IV) is a home equity line of credit;

''(V) is a nonperforming loan; or

''(VI) has a term of not longer than 12 months.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REQUIRED APPLICATION.—The amendments to section 102(d)(1) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(d)(1)) made by section 100209(a) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 920) and by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to any loan that is originated, refinanced, increased, extended, or renewed on or after January 1, 2016.

(B) OPTIONAL APPLICATION.—

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph—

(I) the terms ''Federal entity for lending regulation'', ''improved real estate'', ''regulated lending institution'', and ''servicer'' have the meanings given the terms in section 3 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4003);

(II) the term ''outstanding loan'' means a loan that—

(aa) is outstanding as of January 1, 2016;

(bb) is not subject to the requirement to escrow premiums and fees for flood insurance under section 102(d)(1) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(d)(1)) as in effect on July 5, 2012; and

(cc) would, if the loan had been originated, refinanced, increased, extended, or renewed on or after January 1, 2016, be subject to the requirements under section 102(d)(1)(A) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended; and

(III) the term ''section 102(d)(1)(A) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended'' means section 102(d)(1)(A) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(d)(1)(A)), as amended by—

(aa) section 100209(a) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 920); and

(bb) subsection (a) of this section.

(ii) OPTION TO ESCROW FLOOD INSURANCE PAYMENTS.—Each Federal entity for lending regulation (after consultation and coordination with the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council) shall, by regulation, direct that each regulated lending institution or servicer of an outstanding loan shall offer and make available to a borrower the option to have the borrower's payment of premiums and fees for flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), including the escrow of such payments, be treated in the same manner provided under section 102(d)(1)(A) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended.

(2) REPEAL OF 2-YEAR DELAY ON APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (b) of section 100209 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 920) is repealed.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to supersede, during the period beginning on July 6, 2012 and ending on December 31, 2015, the requirements under section 102(d)(1) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(d)(1)), as in effect on July 5, 2012.

SEC. 26. FLOOD MITIGATION METHODS FOR BUILDINGS.

(a) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4102) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) FLOOD MITIGATION METHODS FOR BUILDINGS.—The Administrator shall establish guidelines for property owners that—

''(1) provide alternative methods of mitigation, other than building elevation, to reduce flood risk to residential buildings that cannot be elevated due to their structural characteristics, including—

''(A) types of building materials; and

''(B) types of floodproofing; and

''(2) inform property owners about how the implementation of mitigation methods described in paragraph (1) may affect risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program.''.

(2) ISSUANCE.—The Administrator shall issue the guidelines required under section 1361(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4102(d)), as added by the amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection, not later than the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CALCULATION OF RISK PREMIUM RATES.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) CONSIDERATION OF MITIGATION METHODS.—In calculating the risk premium rate charged for flood insurance for a property under this section, the Administrator shall take into account the implementation of any mitigation method identified by the Administrator in the guidance issued under section 1361(d) (42 U.S.C. 4102(d)).''.

SEC. 27. MAPPING OF NON-STRUCTURAL FLOOD MITIGATION FEATURES.

Section 100216 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4101b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (v) as clause (vi);

(C) by inserting after clause (iv) the following new clause:

''(v) areas that are protected by non-structural flood mitigation features; and''; and

(D) in clause (vi) (as so redesignated), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''and by non-structural flood mitigation features''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as subparagraphs (B) through (D), respectively;

(B) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(C) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

''(A) work with States, local communities, and property owners to identify areas and features described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(v);''.

SEC. 28. CLEAR COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) CLEAR COMMUNICATIONS.—The Administrator shall clearly communicate full flood risk determinations to individual property owners regardless of whether their premium rates are full actuarial rates.''.

SEC. 29. PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESSES, NON-PROFITS, HOUSES OF WORSHIP, AND RESIDENCES.

Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESSES, NON-PROFITS, HOUSES OF WORSHIP, AND RESIDENCES.—

''(1) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section and semiannually thereafter, the Administrator shall monitor and report to Committee on Financial Services of the House Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Administrator's assessment of the impact, if any, of the rate increases required under subparagraphs (A) and (D) of section 1307(a)(2) and the surcharges required under section 1308A on the affordability of flood insurance for—

''(A) small businesses with less than 100 employees;

''(B) non-profit entities;

''(C) houses of worship; and

''(D) residences with a value equal to or less than 25 percent of the median home value of properties in the State in which the property is located.

''(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that the rate increases or surcharges described in paragraph (1) are having a detrimental effect on affordability, including resulting in lapsed policies, late payments, or other criteria related to affordability as identified by the Administrator, for any of the properties identified in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of such paragraph, the Administrator shall, not later than 3 months after making such a determination, make such recommendations as the Administrator considers appropriate to improve affordability to the Committee on Financial Services of the House Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.''.

SEC. 30. MAPPING.

Section 100216(d)(1) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4101b(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (D)''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (G), respectively;

(3) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following new subparagraphs:

''(A) before commencement of any mapping or map updating process, notify each community affected of the model or models that the Administrator plans to use in such process and provide an explanation of why such model or models are appropriate;

''(B) provide each community affected a 30-day period beginning upon notification under subparagraph (A) to consult with the Administrator regarding the appropriateness, with respect to such community, of the mapping model or models to be used; provided that consultation by a community pursuant to this subparagraph shall not waive or otherwise affect any right of the community to appeal any flood hazard determinations;

''(C) upon completion of the first Independent Data Submission, transmit a copy of such Submission to the affected community, provide the affected community a 30-day period during which the community may provide data to Administrator that can be used to supplement or modify the existing data, and incorporate any data that is consistent with prevailing engineering principles;''; and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, the following new subparagraph:

''(F) not less than 30 days before issuance of any preliminary map, notify the Senators for each State affected and each Member of the House of Representatives for each congressional district affected by the preliminary map in writing of—

''(i) the estimated schedule for—

''(I) community meetings regarding the preliminary map;

''(II) publication of notices regarding the preliminary map in local newspapers; and

''(III) the commencement of the appeals process regarding the map; and

''(ii) the estimated number of homes and businesses that will be affected by changes contained in the preliminary map, including how many structures will be that were not previously located in an area having special flood hazards will be located within such an area under the preliminary map; and''.

SEC. 31. DISCLOSURE.

(a) CHANGES IN RATES RESULTING FROM THIS ACT.—Not later than the date that is 6 months before the date on which any change in risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program resulting from this Act or any amendment made by this Act is implemented, the Administrator shall make publicly available the rate tables and underwriting guidelines that provide the basis for the change.

(b) REPORT ON POLICY AND CLAIMS DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a report on the feasibility of—

(A) releasing property-level policy and claims data for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program; and

(B) establishing guidelines for releasing property-level policy and claims data for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Privacy Act of 1974).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an analysis and assessment of how releasing property-level policy and claims data for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program will aid policy holders and insurers to understand how the Administration determines actuarial premium rates and assesses flood risks; and

(B) recommendations for protecting personal information in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Privacy Act of 1974).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 3370, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Last Congress, overwhelming majorities in the House and Senate, including all of my colleagues from West Virginia, voted for the passage of Biggert-Waters. There was near unanimous agreement that significant reforms were needed for the program, but when the new flood insurance rates were published last fall, I began to hear from, and met with, many West Virginians who were shocked by the increases in their flood insurance bills that had far exceeded the worst-case scenario in CBO's projection. In some cases, their only choice was to spend their life's savings on their flood insurance bills or walk away from their house, ruining their credit.

The bill before us today will make sure the people who purchased a home after the passage of Biggert-Waters, only to see their premiums skyrocket, can stay in their homes. Under this bill, homeowners will see their premiums rise towards an actuarially sound rate, but on a path that is much more affordable.

Additionally, we are taking steps to fix some of the mapping issues in the flood program. Many of my constituents have told me that they are in a Special Flood Hazard Area, despite no evidence of the area ever flooding. These two issues address the core problems of the flood insurance program: unaffordable rates and incorrect mapping.

There is no question that the NFIP is broken. We need to take steps to put it

on solid financial footing, but immediately hitting people with crushing increases in their premiums just because they bought a new home is not the way to do it, and that was never the original intent of Biggert-Waters.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3307, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Today, I am pleased to lead the Democratic Party in delivering this message to the thousands of Americans who are facing unaffordable flood insurance premiums: relief is on the way.

As we committed to many months ago, Democrats have worked to fix this problem from the moment we heard about the unintended consequences of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, because I am the Waters of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act, I felt a responsibility to make sure that we deal with the concerns that were coming to us from our constituents all over this country. The rate increases were unimaginable. So Democratic lawmakers in the House and the Senate took action, spearheading bipartisan legislation that passed the Senate and garnered the support of a majority of the House of Representatives.

Today, we have worked in good faith with Republican leadership to achieve a measure that isn't perfect but that will provide real relief to the thousands of families currently facing unaffordable premiums.

I believe this House measure strikes an important balance, addressing affordability concerns, bringing accountability to FEMA, and protecting the stability of the National Flood Insurance Program. The legislation ends dramatic increases caused by events such as property sales and restores grandfathered rates for those who played by the rules and built their properties according to code.

For families hit by unaffordable premium increases, this bill provides important relief in the form of a refund.

I am proud of the dramatic improvements to this bill that were made by the Democratic Caucus. These include reasonable limitations on rate increases that one property can experience, including those newly mapped into flood zones. We have ensured that when FEMA engages in the process of remapping, it actually works with communities to make sure it is being done accurately. We have made FEMA more accountable by requiring it provide clear and accurate information to anyone who may be affected by a change in policy.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would not have come together without strong support and participation from the Democratic Party. I would like to thank Leader PELOSI and Whip HOYER, as well as Senator MARY LANDRIEU and Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND for their leadership, and the leadership of so many Democratic Members across the country, which was critical to taking this bill over the finish line. I applaud them. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Let me just say a word of thanks to someone very special on this, Mr. ERIC CANTOR, who weighed in and did everything possible to work this out in a way that we could all be comfortable with. I am pleased for the opportunity I have had to work with him. I also thank Mr. GRIMM. We started this out when others believed that we could not do anything about it. Having said all of that, we have come together to do something good for the people of this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM), the author of this legislation and someone without whose hard work we wouldn't be here today.

Mr. GRIMM. Thank you, Chairwoman.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost surreal standing here right now. I almost don't believe that I am about to vote on something that I promised my constituents. It is surreal because I am standing here about to do something that was the reason I ran for Congress—to be able to lead on an issue and solve a problem and come home and tell people we actually got something done that is going to change your life for the better.

I have to say a special thank you to MAXINE WATERS, the ranking member, whom I worked with from the beginning; my dear friend, GREGORY MEEKS; CEDRIC RICHMOND; and Congressman CASSIDY, who helped me write this bill. Without him, I could not have gotten this done. FRANK LOBIONDO has been tremendous, as well as Congressman PALAZZO. ERIC CANTOR has been an absolute champion on this issue.

I just have to say this is truly a collaborative effort.

□ 1730

You cannot have a more bipartisan bill. At a time when there has been gridlock and gamesmanship, we have come together to deal with a very, very important issue because it goes to the heart of what we are here to do: make people's lives a little bit better.

So I just want to say thank you to so many that worked so hard, and I will leave the rest of the time for those of my colleagues to explain some particulars of the bill. Again, thank you so much.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) who has worked so hard on this bill, who serves on the Financial Services Committee and has been intimately involved with it.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Ranking Member WATERS and my good friend, MICHAEL GRIMM, for working collectively to make this bill happen.

You see, it was just 17 months ago that residents in my congressional district, the Fifth Congressional District of New York, and others throughout America were devastated by Superstorm Sandy. Little did they know then that they were about to be hit by another storm.

Then came FEMA with astronomical rate increases to their flood insurance program. Two strikes in the midst of severe recession, and many of them were out.

This bill, today, once we pass it, and once the Senate passes it, it will finally give relief to individuals who were wondering what they were going to do, many whom had to pay already these astronomical rates. Help is on its way. You will get reimbursed.

Many who did not know what the values of their property would be and, if they choose down the road to sell it, whether they would be able to do it. Help is on its way. This bill fixes that.

I congratulate both sides.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is, tragically, going broke. Our national debt, which has skyrocketed under this President, is clearly, by any measure, on a dangerous and unsustainable path, a path that, if unaltered, will leave our children with less freedom, fewer opportunities, and a lower standard of living. That is beyond unfair. That is immoral.

One reason America is going broke is because of poorly designed and costly government-run insurance programs. The National Flood Insurance Program is one such program.

Its chief administrator has already testified that ''the NFIP was, by statute and design, not actuarially sound.'' In fact, the program charges only 70 percent of what its administrators believe they actually need. Perhaps that is why the program is currently $24 billion in the red to taxpayers and has no way to ever repay them.

The NFIP is not financially sound because pretty much every policyholder receives taxpayer subsidies. Some get explicit subsidies because the law prohibits the program from charging a full and fair rate based upon their calculated actuarial risk.

Others receive implicit subsidies because, according to the GAO, the program uses a faulty model that undermeasures flood risk.

At the end of the day, the program forces roughly 96 percent of all Americans to subsidize the remaining 4 percent, regardless of income or need. That means a single mom in Dallas, where I live, who is working hard as a cashier at the Albertsons grocery store may be forced to subsidize the flood insurance for some millionaire's beachfront vacation home. If that is not the definition of unfair, I don't know what is.

To its credit, in 2012, Congress recognized that the government-run flood insurance program was fundamentally broken and unfair. We passed, almost unanimously, the Biggert-Waters Act. It phases out most of the explicit subsidies over the next few years and requires rates to be more closely based on a property's actuarial degree of flood risk.

Now, the first premiums under Biggert-Waters are starting to come due. There is sticker shock, some based on fact, some based on fear.

Clearly, there are many, many, across our Nation who have been unaware of their taxpayer-funded subsidies. There are some who simply can't afford the new premiums, and others who are now having trouble attempting to sell their homes.

This should be addressed by Congress, and that is why, over the last 8 weeks, Chairman NEUGEBAUER and myself have put four different plans on the tables for Members who approached us about making modifications to the Biggert-Waters Act.

We agreed to go slower on reforms and to temporarily cap payments as long as the program would eventually require all property owners to pay the fair amount that they owe and, overall, the program would begin to bring in more income so taxpayers could avoid yet another bailout.

Regrettably, that is not the approach we are debating today. The House bill before us, although technically PAYGO compliant, would postpone actuarially sound rates for perhaps a generation. It would kill off a key element of risk-based pricing permanently, which is necessary if we are to ever transition to market competition.

Finally, it creates brand new subsidies for a program that is already bailout broke.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill isn't any better. It essentially represents a 4-year freeze that is not PAYGO compliant. My fear is that either bill represents a big step backwards from reform and leaves us just a few hurricanes or a few short years away from the next taxpayer bailout.

Either bill will make it incredibly difficult to do what Congress must do, and that is phase out this unneeded, government-run insurance program that fundamentally represents both an unfair and unsustainable middle-income entitlement.

I respect my colleagues who have a different view. I respect my leadership for bringing a bill that may not be optimum to the floor.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we don't protect taxpayers today, how will we ever reform the gargantuan middle-income entitlements that put us on the precipice of a debt crisis?

I, for one, will vote ''no'' on this well-intended but misguided bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), one of the coauthors of the bill that we put together to deal with this issue who has been working very hard on it.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS, and thank you to the Republican leadership who brought this up.

We often hear in this Chamber over and over again a talk of a financial bankruptcy that is plaguing or potentially plaguing our country, and we say it so much so that we start to believe it, and we miss one thing: that we are on the verge of a moral bankruptcy in this country.

When you talk about homeowners who played by the rules, saved their money, bought a piece of the American Dream, and then all of a sudden, years, if not decades later, we come back with a well-intentioned bill but that had unfortunate, unintended consequences that would strip the American Dream and homeownership right from under them, then the question becomes to this Congress: What do you do about it?

I said this before and I will say it again. What real leadership does when they do something and they realize it had unintended consequences, they fix it.

Congresswoman WATERS realized that her name was attached to a bill that potentially would strip homeowners of the American Dream, of the largest piece of investment that you pass on from generation to generation, and she stepped up and said, that is not what we intended. We are going to fix it.

The Republican leadership, Mr. GRIMM, stepped up and said, this is unsustainable—and more than that, it doesn't make common sense.

So both sides came together to produce a bill that would have affordability, stability, and predictability.

We talk about rules all the time, that corporations just want to know the rules so they can play by them. Well, homeowners want to know that too, and homeowners who built to the building codes and the elevations that they were required to do at the time should not come back and be penalized later.

So I just want to, again, congratulate Congresswoman WATERS because people back in New Orleans and in Louisiana today who are celebrating Fat Tuesday and Mardi Gras and having a good time, they can just party a little bit longer knowing that we are here today and we are going to fix this problem that could strip the American Dream away from them.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to H.R. 3370. The National Flood Insurance Program is in trouble. It is in deep debt, and it is putting taxpayers at risk for another government bailout.

The program was added to the GAO's ''high-risk list'' in 2006 and remains there today because of the financial exposure it represents to the American taxpayers. Today, it is over $24 billion in debt, and this number will continue to rise.

Recognizing this, Congress passed the Biggert-Waters Act in July of 2012. The act authorized the flood insurance program for 5 years and included important reforms to get it back on sound financial footing. One of these reforms was the gradual elimination of outdated rate subsidies.

In a rare display of bipartisanship, Republicans and Democrats overwhelmingly supported the notion that risk-based premiums were needed for the program to be self-sufficient and to protect the taxpayers from further bailouts. Over 400 Members of Congress voted for that.

Since then, we have heard concerns from homeowners facing sticker shock from the higher rates. I am sympathetic to those concerns, but I believe there are more responsible ways to address this bill than the bill before us today.

The Financial Services Committee put together four different proposals to address these concerns. The last one included an 8- to 10-year phase-in for rates and nearly a 2-year affordability cap of $5,000. Unfortunately, each one of these proposals were rejected because they fell short of maintaining subsidies indefinitely.

That is unfortunate because maintaining these subsidies hurts everyone in the long run. It hurts taxpayers by putting them on the hook for billions of dollars in subsidies. It hurts the Flood Insurance Program by easing its path toward insolvency. It hurts homeowners by encouraging them to build in areas that jeopardize their lives and their properties.

After more than a decade, if I have learned anything in Congress, it is that the Federal Government does a terrible job of underwriting and pricing risk. Whether it is through subsidies or failures to price risk due to political considerations, the American taxpayers, unfortunately, end up footing the bill.

What is even worse under H.R. 3370 is that the taxpayers will be subsidizing rates that benefit only 1 percent of households. More than 20 percent of the programs policies are heavily subsidized, regardless of need, and of those policyholders, 70 percent go to homes in counties with the highest property values.

While H.R. 3370 may help homeowners facing high rates in the short run, it does them a disservice by not promoting a healthy, stable financial program in the future.

For taxpayers, for homeowners and, ultimately, for the future of the flood insurance, I think we can do better. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 3370.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), who has spent

an awful lot of time working on this issue with all of us.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member. I want to thank Mr. GRIMM and others for bringing this bill forward.

You have heard what the bill does. I will tell you that I want to associate myself with all of the people who support it. I actually want to associate myself with some of the remarks of people who oppose it.

I think that we need to fix the problem of short funding in the flood insurance program, but I don't think we need to do it overnight, and I don't think we need to do it on the backs of middle class people with a hammer.

So I want to fix this. I think this bill is actually a step forward to say we will fix it, but we will take some time doing it to do it right so innocent people don't get hurt.

I also want to take a minute to point out some of the things that are not in this bill that people need to be aware of. This bill does not address people who own vacation homes.

I know that some people think that everyone who owns a vacation home is a multimillionaire Donald Trump. The average income of a second homeowner is about $96,000. The average value of a second home is about $150,000.

Now, you don't see most of these homes on the Home and Garden Network because they are usually on wheels. They are made out of T–111. They are just inexpensive places that people get to bring their families.

Now, most of these homes are not on the shore, but they are, not all of them, but some of them, are in flood plains. We need to take this into account when we continue to address this issue as we move forward.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3370. At the outset, let me thank Congressman GRIMM, Congressman LOBIONDO, and Ranking Member WATERS for the work that they have done in bringing together a true, bipartisan bill to this floor.

The Biggert-Waters bill was well-intended, but there were unintended consequences, and some of those consequences would be absolutely devastating to hundreds, if not thousands, of constituents in my district who were devastated by Hurricane Sandy.

I would just state for the record that these people are not millionaires. They complied with the law, with all the building codes, all the ordinances. They never had any flood damage in their 50, 60 years prior to this—but their homes are devastated. To add to that the incredible increase they will get in premiums for flood insurance would be even the ultimate devastation.

So this bill is absolutely essential. Ironically, it will actually decrease Federal spending over the next 5 years, but it is important that we stand together to help those in need, people who complied with the laws, hard-working, blue-collar Americans who are proud of their homes, proud of their families, and want the opportunity to get back on their feet.

They were devastated once. Let's not allow Congress to devastate them again.

□ 1745

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York, Representative MALONEY, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership and for authoring the Grimm-Waters bill, which I support.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will protect homeowners from drastic premium increases, provide relief to housing markets, and put the flood insurance program on a path to long-term solvency.

The bill will also put a stop to FEMA's reckless implementation of Biggert-Waters. The GAO found that FEMA doesn't even have the information that the GAO said was key to determining a property's actual flood risk; and yet, FEMA has gone ahead with massive premium increases anyway, based on back-of-the-envelope calculations and a shocking indifference to the impact on the middle class families that are suffering across this country because of Hurricane Sandy, many of whom are in my district.

This bill will require FEMA to actually complete the affordability study that was mandated in the prior legislation, so that independent experts can determine the best way to successfully balance the two main goals, consumer affordability and long-term solvency.

This bill would set a hard cap on rate increases at 18 percent a year and will protect families and businesses from the kinds of 500 percent rate increases that they are suffering from now.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on her leadership and Congressman GRIMM. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Grimm-Waters bill.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, our bill is the result of extensive bipartisan, bicameral work over the past year. This bill is both compassionate and fiscally responsible. From the start, my priority has been to ensure that flood insurance remains available and affordable not just in Mississippi, but all across the country. Our bill meets those goals.

Many of the people who are now facing unrealistic, overnight increases followed all the rules. They went to great effort and expense to build back to FEMA standards after storms like Hurricane Katrina.

Congress never intended to punish responsible homeowners, yet that is exactly what FEMA is doing, as it implements the law with flawed maps and procedures.

These actions are threatening individuals and entire communities. I am not talking about wealthy waterfront homeowners. In south Mississippi, I am hearing from teachers, veterans, fishermen, people who work at the shipyards in support of our U.S. Navy, many 100 miles inland.

Our bill holds FEMA accountable. It provides real responsible relief and lasting reforms. I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative LYNCH, who is a member of the Financial Services Committee and is also the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and the Census, and I thank him for his hard work in putting this bill together.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from California for her leadership on this bill. She has been a tiger on this issue, trying to get this right.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) and the Republican leadership, as well as Mr. GRIMM from New York and Mr. RICHMOND from Louisiana who really, I think, without their work collectively, this would not be happening.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act. Over the past several months, I have had the honor of working with my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, to roll back the harmful and unintended consequences of the original Biggert-Waters Act.

This legislation that we take up today is a culmination of a lot of efforts by a lot of individuals, as well as the activism on the part of our constituents.

I have had an opportunity to attend some rallies and meetings in my district with over 1,000 people attending, where the concerns and the fears of my constituents were brought forward in great volume.

H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, will do a number of things. One, it reinstitutes or expands the grandfathering provisions in section 4 from what they were in the previous bill.

A very important provision here, section 18 allows reimbursements for successful appeals. Now, what that will do is, if FEMA incorrectly—as they have in many cases—if they put homes in a flood zone incorrectly and a homeowner appeals that, they get the money that they expended for that appeal, for the surveying and technical assistance they need.

In addition, section 24 provides for a flood insurance advocate to actually work on behalf of homeowners to make sure that they get the full and meaningful appeal that they deserve and also that they understand what the flood mapping process requires.

More fundamentally, this bill is an example of what we can achieve when Congress works together, and I honestly hope that we will build on this spirit of bipartisan cooperation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this critical bill.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this legislation, and we are about to do something tonight that doesn't happen around here very often. We are going to do a bipartisan effort that has common sense and fiscal responsibility, something that we ought to be doing more often.

This is an issue maybe that doesn't affect everyone, but if you are from a district where your constituents have had their lives and their dreams ripped apart—first by Superstorm Sandy and then by the miserable implementation of a flood insurance policy that was well-intended, but not put together—how do you go back and say you are not going to fix it?

This gives us an opportunity to give them hope for the future, to give them a chance to rebuild. 16 months later, I have still got constituents who aren't able to get back into their homes. How do you tell them they are going to have such an outrageous increase on their flood insurance, which will force them to throw their hands up and give it up?

Congress is doing the right thing tonight. We need to follow through on this, have it changed, and understand that this is the approach for the future.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative PASCRELL, and I thank him for his input on this bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, it must be very painful for people to watch this when affected—whether you are on a river or whether you are on the ocean—because it is painful to see that some of the people who are opposed to this bill also voted ''no'' on the Sandy relief, so they are being consistent anyway.

After Sandy, many of my constituents in towns such as Moonachie and Little Ferry are now experiencing a second blow from skyrocketing flood insurance rates. In particular, the home sale trigger has resulted in drastically higher flood insurance rates for prospective home buyers, putting a wet blanket on real estate markets in flood-prone areas.

The bill before us today contains some very important changes. It provides immediate relief to homeowners by repealing the home sale trigger and reducing the rate of possible increases. I am hopeful that we can revisit flood insurance reform in a way which will provide relief to second homes and small businesses.

Although these are important first steps, I know we can do better, and I thank all those who contributed to this legislation.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, one of the champions of this bill.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3370.

First let me say this affects almost all Americans. On this map, you can see, if there is a color, there is a chance that you are affected, and Chairman HENSARLING pointed out that Dallas is a hot spot of red.

That is a place where the woman he referred to will benefit because of this reform, and I will say that all Americans will because it is our job, in Congress, to protect the American citizen from agencies implementing laws in ways which are not sustainable.

The flood maps that FEMA has been using have questionable actuarial calculations, and there have been unrealistic rate increases.

The bill before us today, which I worked closely in developing with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM) and others, to strike the right balance, takes into consideration both fiscal solvency and consumer affordability.

First, the bill is paid for. It is paid for, and the funds will go into the NFIP reserve fund, so in the future, there will be money in the till, should there be another disaster.

Secondly, I will say that, if we don't do this, the National Flood Insurance Program will enter into a death spiral. CBO estimates that for every 10 percent increase in premiums, 1.4 percent of the subscribers drop off. If people are getting 2,000 percent premium increases, they will all drop off, which puts it into a death spiral.

I would say this is actually the fiscally responsible thing that puts the program on a glide path to actuarial soundness and, in the meantime, benefits Americans across the way.

A broad coalition of Republicans, Democrats, and Realtors have worked hard on this. I would like to thank Neil Bradley in Leader CANTOR's office; from my staff, Chris Gillott; and Richard Hoffman in Representative GRIMM's office, for a lot of tremendous work.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The Florida delegation, both Democrats and Republicans, has been absolutely magnificent in helping to get us to this point, and I thank Representatives CASTOR, HASTINGS, BUCHANAN, and all of those from the Florida delegation for all of the work they have done.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on behalf of families all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge all of our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 3370 that will fix this flood insurance debacle.

A year and a half ago, a bill was passed here in the House to address the solvency of the flood insurance trust fund. That was the right thing to do. Unfortunately, it had serious unintended consequences that families and businessowners and Realtors all across this Nation have been dealing with.

But I am heartened here today because, even though this Congress has an unfortunate reputation for not addressing the challenges that face families all across this country, we are going to come together here today to address a very important financial issue for families.

I would like to thank my colleagues from Florida, Congressman HASTINGS, Congressman BILIRAKIS, Congressman NUGENT, Congressman BUCHANAN, and all of our delegation for fighting, standing together to work for them. I urge all of our colleagues here today to do the same.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a great advocate for this bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation sponsored by my good friend from New York, Congressman GRIMM. It will provide relief for homeowners struggling to keep their homes. It will ensure that all participants in the program are treated fairly, and it will eliminate an untenable financial burden during these tough economic times.

Some allege this bill will solely benefit the rich in beachside mansions. Middle class retirees and those on fixed incomes are the ones who are suffering from rate increases of $10,000 or more. They are the ones who risk losing their homes.

If Congress fails to pass this bill, we will risk destroying all the reforms made to the National Flood Insurance Program. We cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation, a solution that addresses a long-term issue and helps people immediately, and I thank Representatives WATERS, CASSIDY, and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO for their leadership on this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Representative GARAMENDI, who has been advising us that we really do have to make changes to the National Flood Insurance Program, and I thank him for his work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, and I thank Congresswoman WATERS and Mr. GRIMM for their work.

This is desperately needed. There is a lot to be said, and a lot more work will go into this before this becomes law, but it is a major step forward.

One example: Isleton, California, in my district, in a zone that was mapped with 100-year flood protection, was downgraded by the Army Corps of Engineers and is now a high hazard area. Last year, it cost $700 a year for the flood insurance. This year, it is $7,000, which is about twice the mortgage on that $115,000 house. It is not workable.

We are seeing, across my area, insurance premiums of $10,000, $25,000. This bill would stop that, move things back,

give us time to deal with what is the fundamental problem in flood insurance, and that is the catastrophic coverage, which has to be spread out across the Nation.

□ 1800

More to be worked on, good progress, good bill. Let's vote it out of here and get this thing solved.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) for his hard work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, flood insurance has been devastating to people in Florida. It has been in my region. I have done multiple town halls. It has gone up not 10 or 20 percent but 1,000 percent, 500 percent. Businesses can't sell their businesses. So this bill will bring some immediate relief. It also brings some certainty so people—because the market today is frozen, it will bring some certainty to people so they can buy and sell their homes.

Also, as the cochair of the Florida delegation, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle because it is nice once in a while where we can work together to get something done for the American people.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon, Representative BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy. I have a slightly different perspective. The problem isn't FEMA. The problem is that Congress has not appropriately dealt with these issues over time.

I have spent 10, 15 years now working on flood insurance reform. This is not the last word. We are kicking the can down the road. We are putting a surcharge on other people. We are grandfathering in some of the properties that are going to get these subsidized rates and transferring it. But this money is going to run out. It is going to have to be reauthorized.

With all due respect, I think we need to look at the big picture. We have got to look at the big picture, not keep putting people back in harm's way, subsidizing people, and blaming FEMA because we don't adequately fund them and, of course, we don't want them to accurately map. We go gunnysack when that happens.

I had reservations at the time that this was too abrupt. But I am concerned that we are retreating too much on the reforms that had been made earlier, and it is going to be hard to get back, of course, until the bubble bursts, which it will.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, next I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), a great advocate for this bill and for his State.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a flood insurance program that is broken. In fact, 18 different times in the last 5 years the National Flood Insurance Program has either expired or nearly expired because of all of the flaws and disagreements within Congress. And yet the result of that was that Biggert-Waters law of 2012 that is now being implemented in a way that is unworkable for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think if you look at what American families expect, they expect a flood insurance program that is both sustainable and affordable, and these two are not mutually exclusive. In fact, what we are achieving with this bill that is on the floor today will accomplish both. It will make the program sustainable for the future with real reforms, reforms that can actually be implemented in a way that will allow the program to move forward and pay for itself. In fact, this bill is fully paid for.

It also allows it to be done in a way that families can afford to pay their flood insurance premiums, because sending somebody a $10,000- or $20,000-a-year bill on a $200,000 house that never flooded is not an actuarially sound rate; it is a death sentence. Federal law should not be implemented in a way that literally forces millions of people out of their homes who played by the rules.

So what we are bringing to the floor today is an actual solution to a problem. This is not some delay. It is a real, long-term solution that pays for itself within the program with real reforms that allow people to move forward with a flood insurance program that will be sustainable and ultimately lead to a private market where you don't just have FEMA to go to, you can actually have private options as well for families. I urge its passage.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, a member of the Financial Services Committee.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation.

Sixteen months ago, Hurricane Sandy battered New York City. Even today, efforts to rebuild continue. However, because of unforeseen consequences in previous flood insurance laws, many of the businesses, families, and homeowners affected by this storm may be hit again, this time by a flood of rising insurance premiums.

Because of how the law is structured, over 26,000 New York City homeowners and businesses will see their annual flood insurance premiums increase at least 25 percent. In some cases, people who previously paid $430 annually could see their rates rise to $5,000 or even $10,000—an unsustainable amount.

Today's bill will address these unintended consequences of last year's reforms. By eliminating the property transfer trigger, buyers and sellers will now have peace of mind.

Mr. Speaker, we all want to ensure the National Flood Insurance Program is solvent, but we must do it in a way that does not harm those who have already suffered enough.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from West Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I am very proud and very pleased about this bipartisan effort to fix a serious problem in this country. As a matter of fact, we should all be pleased because it is said by the media and others that we cannot work together. This is a time when we can demonstrate that we really do care about the citizens of this country and we recognize the problems that were created by the Biggert-Waters bill.

I said earlier that my name was on that Biggert-Waters legislation, and I certainly worked in a bipartisan effort to try and do the right thing, and, of course, some day we would like to move all of these subsidies to actuarial rates.

We have unintended consequences in Biggert-Waters, and we have set out to fix them. So I want you to know that Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mrs. CAPITO all have worked very hard to make sure that we addressed the concerns of our constituencies.

Let me tell you, with this bill we are removing certain rate increase triggers, the reinstating of grandfathering, lower rate increases, refund of excess premium charges to homeowners, affordability study and framework; added to that, working with the bill that the Republicans brought to the floor and Democrats added to it, individual property rate increase caps, affordability goal, rate increase protection for newly mapped properties, mapping protections, consumer protections, protections of small businesses, nonprofits, houses of worship, and residences.

Mr. Speaker and Members, again, this is a bill that will address the concerns and the outcry of our constituents, some of whom were experiencing 500 and 600 percent rate increases. I tried to work with the chairman, and I was disappointed that Mr. HENSARLING saw differently. He does not support this bill, and he said so. Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. HENSARLING said they had come up with other ways to deal with it. I never saw any of that. Nobody ever tried to relate to the fact that I was outreaching to try and get Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and others who had a different opinion to come and work this out and do what we could for our constituents.

So, I am very pleased that we had Members on the opposite side of the aisle who insisted that their constituents deserved protection and that they

deserved support. Working with their leadership and Mr. CANTOR working with our leadership, with the Democrats on this side of the aisle, we have come up with something that is extremely important and effective.

Now, I must say to both sides of the aisle, we have continuing work to do. This is not a permanent fix on this. What I discovered was none of us knew enough about FEMA. We have been crying for years about remapping. We don't really know how it works. We don't know the discretion that they have in making some of these decisions. We have got to spend the next few years really learning FEMA, how it works and how it makes decisions. We should never get into this kind of a situation again because we simply have allowed them to do what they do without us being involved. They don't report to us on a yearly basis, as I would like to have them do.

So this is an opportunity for us not only to fix this problem at this time but to focus on the fact that we have got oversight responsibility that we have got to carry out to make sure that we are dealing with these issues in a way that makes good sense.

So, again, I am very proud, and I am very pleased with this bipartisan effort. I welcome the opportunity to have been able to work with some Members from the opposite side of the aisle that I had not worked with before. I think I learned a lot about them, and they learned a lot about me. I am so thankful that our leadership gave me the latitude to say go and do everything possible working with the opposite side of the aisle to get this problem fixed. So they have not only supported me, but they have supported all of the Members on our side of the aisle who have said to them that this may be one of the most important fixes that we will do this year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for her hard work on this and Mr. GRIMM, Dr. CASSIDY, and all the speakers we have had today here on both sides. We can work together to fix a definite problem, but I think we need to kind of reflect back on how did we get to this problem. We were trying to fix a bigger problem, the $24 billion hole that the Flood Insurance Program has created because of mismanagement and not looking at it correctly.

Over 400 of us voted for that bill. So we did not realize at the time the data that we were given by FEMA gave us a certain ceiling that certain folks' premiums could rise, and as we have heard today from everybody, Republicans and Democrats, no matter where you live in the country, some of the premium escalation has just been incredible. So I am proud that we are working together.

I mentioned West Virginia. We flood a lot in West Virginia. We have got a lot of hills and hollows. Richard in St. Albans came to me in October of last year. He had just bought a home before they put the new FEMA rates into effect. He thought he was going to be paying a little over $1,000 in his flood insurance program on a $150,000 house. Guess what? $14,000 was the rate that he was going to have to pay. He said:

> I am just going to walk away. I will get foreclosed on. This is my dream home.

So for Richard, that is why I think all of this is important today, and for all the other Richards out there across the country who have had sticker shock, who haven't been able to cope, who have been very upset about this and wondering, Is anybody really going to help me here?

So what I think we have learned today is whatever the scenario is, whether you are in a mountain situation by a river or if you are in an urban area in New York or if you are in Florida, that these problems were deep, expensive, and discouraging, and people were unable to understand a way out. I think that is what we are giving them today.

Many of the reforms that were built into the first Biggert-Waters bill still remain. We are refining those to make sure they make common sense. We are making sure that folks around the country can afford the homes that they have bought with the flood insurance and then get them on a glide path towards the sustainability of not just their home but also the program in general.

So I am proud of the efforts that all of us working together have had here today. I would like to encourage the other body to pass this. It is not going to work unless we get the Presidential signature that we need to make sure that we get the real relief that people need and deserve.

So with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this bill reauthorizing the hopelessly indebted, unworkable, unfair and failed federal flood insurance program.

The National Flood Insurance Program is hopelessly in debt, over $25 billion in fact, due to the fact that politics are responsible for setting rates, not actuarial cost. Because of this many Americans across this nation are paying rates far below what actual risk would dictate in the marketplace while others, including many who I represent, are being forced to pay into a program that they do not need or want to help subsidize lower rates for other favored groups whose risk is far greater.

In fact, over the life of the federal flood insurance program the people of my state have paid multiple times more in premiums than has been paid back in claims.

That is wrong. And this problem is expanding across the nation as the flood insurance program sinks deeper into debt.

This problem reminds me of the "risk corridors", also known as the insurance company bailout, included in Obamacare.

This Obamacare provision would be used to provide a federal taxpayer bailout to private insurance companies when premiums paid by beneficiaries do not supply enough money to pay claims.

How is the flood insurance program any different? Some have their premiums kept artificially low and then federal taxpayers are asked to pick up the tab when those areas eventually flood.

I think the "risk corridor" included in the flood insurance program is just as wrong as the one included in Obamacare.

Both Obamacare and the National Flood Insurance Program are proof that the federal government is a bad insurance company.

That is why I have continually submitted legislation to bring about a responsible end to the federal flood insurance program and allow for the creation of a private marketplace based upon actual risk.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this terribly flawed bill and in finding a better way forward that brings about the end of the national flood insurance program.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Homeowners Flood Insurance Affordability Act, which removes some of the unintended consequences from the Biggert-Waters law that would increase flood insurance premiums on my constituents. This bill would repeal the premium hikes and would reinstate "grandfathered" rates for properties that were remapped into higher-risk areas.

In my own district following Superstorm Sandy, the changes in flood projections brought on by the storm will hit my constituents with higher flood insurance premiums—some as high as $10,000 extra per year unless Congress acts to mitigate the hike.

I think we can all agree that we want to address the fiscal concerns faced by the National Flood Insurance Program—but these steep, immediate rate hikes are not the way.

This is a bipartisan bill that offers immediate protection to my constituents from financially devastating flood insurance premium hikes. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act (HR 3370), and would like to thank Mr. GRIMM and Mr. LOBIONDO, all our colleagues from New Jersey, and the Republican leadership for working together to bring this much-needed legislation to the Floor.

After Superstorm Sandy devastated the Northeast, our communities rallied, coming together to help friends and neighbors recover and rebuild. While progress has been made, some shore towns and the families who live along our coast are still struggling. Thousands of homeowners are working to rebuild their properties, and their lives—and the difficulties they continue to face cannot be overstated.

The coming rate hikes will have a chilling and dramatic impact on these communities, and mitigating the consequences for homeowners along the shore is a necessary step in the recovery effort.

At the start of this year, over 80,000 flood insurance policies were in force in Monmouth, Ocean and Mercer Counties in my Congressional District. The exploding cost of flood insurance—a program that many have paid into for years—threatens to roll back much of the progress made, and once again leave homeowners looking for answers.

The bill on the floor today makes targeted and necessary reforms and will prevent massive premium increases from hitting homeowners who simply cannot afford them—and cannot find a buyer to take them on, leaving them stranded and without a solution. Many cannot afford the recommended mitigation measures that may or may not reduce their premiums, creating a further environment of uncertainty.

Accordingly, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act slows the rate of increase that was included in the 2012 Biggert-Waters reform bill, allowing homeowners to remain in their homes and plan accordingly to continue flood insurance policies.

While not perfect, this bill will provide relief and stability to these homeowners and their communities while bringing reform to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). It also provides a mechanism for enhanced community participation in the flood mapping process and increases transparency by making information publicly available to impacted parties.

Further, HR 3370 will provide individualized assistance by establishing a flood insurance advocate to help homeowners and towns obtain information and fair treatment during the mapping process. After hearing from hundreds of families, particularly in Monmouth and Ocean Counties, who are simply looking for information on how they will be impacted by changes to the flood mapping process, I am pleased that this important provision was retained in the final bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are NFIP-related issues that still must be resolved—such as ensuring proper and accurate flood mapping—but this bill is an important step in the right direction and will help mitigate the rate shock that many of my constituents are facing.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3370, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1815

YORK RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2197) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2197

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''York River Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION FOR STUDY.

Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(__) YORK RIVER, MAINE.—(A) The York River that flows 11.25 miles from its headwaters at York Pond to the mouth of the river at York Harbor, and all associated tributaries.

''(B) The study conducted under this paragraph shall—

''(i) determine the effect of the designation on—

''(I) existing commercial and recreational activities, such as hunting, fishing, trapping, recreational shooting, motor boat use, bridge construction;

''(II) the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and

''(III) the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities; and

''(ii) identify—

''(I) all authorities that will authorize or require the Secretary to influence local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal land if designated under this Act;

''(II) all authorities that the Secretary may use to condemn property; and

''(III) all private property located in the area studied under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORT.

Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(__) YORK RIVER, MAINE.—The study of the York River, Maine, named in paragraph (__) of subsection (a) shall be completed by the Secretary of the Interior and the report thereon submitted to Congress not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this paragraph.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2197 authorizes the National Park Service to study 11.25 miles of the York River in the State of Maine for possible inclusion into the Wild and Scenic Rivers program.

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 was intended to put a development freeze on rivers to preserve their ''free-flowing'' characteristics. Although no immediately apparent risks to the river necessitating Federal designation have been identified, proponents of the study explained that they would benefit from the expertise of the National Park Service and its interaction with the surrounding community.

Due to a number of very real concerns that have arisen through prior designations, this bill includes several commonsense provisions aimed at better informing local property owners and communities about the full effects and impacts of a wild and scenic designation.

The National Park Service will be required to consider the effect of designation on commercial and recreational uses, such as hunting and fishing and boating. The study must also look at the impact on construction and maintenance of energy production and transmission.

Furthermore, H.R. 2197 requires the Federal Government to identify all existing authorities that could be utilized to condemn private property. We want property owners to know how much power the government will be given so they can form an educated opinion as to whether they should participate in or support a Wild and Scenic Rivers designation.

Finally, the bill will require the Federal Government to identify those authorities that compel it to become involved in local zoning. While Federal designation of the York River clearly has an appeal to the local advocates supporting this legislation, it is important for the community to be aware that the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires local zoning to conform to the dictates of the Federal act.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would note that this exact legislation passed the House last Congress, but because the Senate failed to act on it, it is being considered once again in this Congress.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very happy to stand in support of my bill, H.R. 2197, the York River Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Act, and I want to start by thanking Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and tonight Mr. HASTINGS for their support in reporting this bill out of committee in September. I thank them and former Congressperson, now Senator MARKEY's help in passing this bill last Congress. I very much appreciate their persistence and their willingness to help get this bill passed and into law. I know the people of Maine will appreciate their commitment, too.

This bill was really proposed by the folks back home, the same people who live and work around the York River and who care deeply about it. This bill would allow organizations working around the York River to partner with the National Park Service to conduct a study that would provide the information that is vital to making smart decisions about the future of the York River and its communities.

I have heard from small business owners, community groups, State and local government, local and national land trusts, fishermen, hunters, school representatives, and historical and environmental conservationists, and all

agree that continuing to benefit from the river depends on recognizing and protecting its important and unique qualities.

There are many unique features of the York River and the ecosystems surrounding it, and I will talk about those in a minute, but I want to start with a little history.

The first English settlers came to the York River nearly 400 years ago—but there is archaeological evidence along the shores of European settlers who were here even earlier. Before anyone came from Europe, the Abenaki Indians named the river ''Agamenticus,'' which means ''little cove beyond the hills.''

When I last visited the York River, I spoke with members of the local community about the importance of the river to the people today, to the economy, and to the wildlife of the York River watershed. The river is home to important and rare species, including the Maine endangered box turtle and the threatened harlequin duck.

The salt marshes of the York River watershed serve as a nursery ground for nearly 30 species of fish that are vital to the Gulf of Maine ecosystem. The York River is a place where children are learning in an outdoor classroom. Students from nearby school districts gather data from the river for classes and to inform community decisions about the environment and the economy.

Maybe the most important factor is that many of the hardworking people in this part of the State depend on the York River to support their jobs. The York River is a place where people go to work. Commercial and recreational fishing operations depend on excellent water quality and reliable access to the waterfront. Farmers in the York River watershed grow pumpkins, potatoes, and other produce that help keep Maine communities healthy.

People travel to the York River to explore and appreciate its natural character and its incredible history, and while doing so, they invest in the surrounding communities.

The work of community groups has already resulted in considerable progress, but the York River needs additional protection so this vital resource is not overwhelmed by increasing development. In order to move forward to a future that protects the most important aspects of this waterway and the jobs and the communities that depend on it, it is vital to connect these communities with the information they need. That is the goal and hopefully the eventual outcome of this important piece of legislation.

My bill is widely supported in Maine, and I look forward to it being favorably considered today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to just point out that I have the privilege of chairing the House Natural Resources Committee, and the nature of that committee is such that we deal with a lot of important pieces of legislation, but pieces of legislation that are kind of parochial in nature with regard to a particular State. We have right now some 50 bills, both Republican and Democrat bills that have passed this House, many of them on suspension, that are still awaiting action in the Senate. In fact, this legislation—similar legislation passed the Congress last time and didn't go anywhere in the other body, and so here we are back one more time. I only mention that because we can't be the only House that passes legislation. It has to be both Houses in order to get something to the President.

I certainly hope that this legislation after two times will finally get through and the study can commence and we can proceed with looking at whether a designation would be in order.

With that in mind, let me talk a bit, because I mentioned this earlier in my remarks. What I am saying here regarding Wild and Scenic is in many ways applicable to wilderness designations. We passed a bill earlier today by voice vote that designated a wilderness area in Michigan. In both of those cases, what is common with both of them is that we have seen since the Wild and Scenic designation law passed and since the wilderness law passed, we see this especially in the Western part of the United States, that when these areas are designated either Wild and Scenic or wilderness, what happens is areas around them become de facto wilderness or de facto Wild and Scenic which many, many times imposes on private property rights.

Now we have experienced that more in the West than what my colleagues have in the East, and my colleague from Maine expressed, rightly so, this has very, very broad support. I am sure it does; they have worked very hard on it. The danger in the future is, if taken to the extreme, you could have, unless we had within the study—you could have some pressures on private property rights. We think that is sufficiently important to put that in the study so that those who will be affected know about it.

I hope the outcome is such that everybody believes, fine, we can work with whatever restrictions come up. That is the precise reason, Mr. Speaker, why when we look, and I say ''we,'' being a Member from the Western part of the United States, when we look at these designations, it becomes pretty darn rigid even when you have acts of natural disaster.

With that in mind, let me tell you about something that happened in my old district prior to redistricting. There is a wilderness area in the northern Cascades. A lot of people visit it; it is a wonderful place. But to access that from the Eastern part of the United States, you have to go up a lake; it's the only way to get there. Then you have to traverse some 10 or 20 miles to the wilderness area, and the only way to get there is by a road. Well, the road—nature washed out that road many times several years ago. It is called the Stehekin Road. The community up there has been trying to rebuild that road.

Now, what does this have to do with wild and scenic and wilderness. Well, I mentioned that sometimes these things become so rigid that you can't affect something that needs to be done. Unfortunately, the road was right on the border of a wilderness area. So naturally, when you are going to rebuild it, you have to go through a wilderness area. ''No, no,'' say all the national groups. Not the local groups, not the people who are affected, but all the national groups. ''No, you can't build this road.'' So we are now in the third Congress. The last two Congresses, we passed bills to address this issue, but we have not been able to succeed because, as I mentioned earlier, we have to go through the Senate.

I only use this as an example of how national groups with a wilderness designation, and it has happened with wild and scenic designations, have unintended consequences on the community.

This legislation says within—within—that study, we need to find out what these potential impacts could be. That is why we put that in this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to say to Mr. HASTINGS, I really do appreciate the work you have done in your committee, the bipartisan activity in your committee, and truly for your assistance in bringing this bill to the floor. I know you are preparing to retire, and I wanted to wish you the best on whatever journey happens next in your life, and thank you for your long service to your State and to the rest of us in Congress. You have been a wonderful colleague to work with. Thank you very much for that.

Representing Washington State, while we are at opposite ends of the country, I think many of the concerns you have raised and that your constituents have raised, given the fact that you have a tremendous amount of open land, you have a tremendous amount of coastal shore land, you deal with some of the same issues that those of us who reside in Maine do, and I appreciate you bringing that perspective to this bill and to the many bills you have worked with.

I would just add in speaking about this particular program, it was really a wonderful experience for me when the many residents of this community, as I mentioned earlier, from all diverse walks of life, some of them were farmers and some of them were fishermen who depend on the river, some who care deeply about the history, but all of them came together, people who

hadn't necessarily had the opportunity to work together before, but realized this is a very important concern, and that this particular river has enormous impacts. Because this river is in the southern part of my district, which means it is close to the southern border of Maine, it is surrounded by a very developed part of our State, although not much is that developed in Maine. We are one of the most rural States in the country with only 1.3 million people, so we are not a particularly overdeveloped State, but this is part of the southern part of the State, where there is a lot of activity going on, and people were concerned even more so because they wanted to make sure that when visitors come to our State, when residents decide to make it their home, we can count on the fact that there will be this part of the river and the area around it that will be looked at very closely when thinking about future uses and how to make sure that it is always there for those people who depend on it for jobs, for the fishing industries that are so critically important, and for the communities that care deeply about its history and about the activities that go on there. That is part of what has made this bill so particularly important to our State. I am extremely grateful to everyone on the committee who worked to help us bring it to the floor.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her kind words, and I support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the York River Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2013.

I want to thank my friend and colleague, Representative PINGREE, for her leadership on this bill.

A healthy York River is important to the economic and environmental vitality of Southern Maine. The river is used daily by fishermen and recreational boat users, and its beauty is a significant part of the tourist economy that is so integral to Southern Maine. The river is an important home for wildlife, providing a home to more than 100 waterbirds and 28 species of fish.

This important legislation would create a study to determine whether or not the York River and its tributaries should be included in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Program. The study would help evaluate current and future demands on the river, and determine whether or not extra federal protection is necessary to keep the river strong and healthy.

Individuals, businesses, and wildlife depend on the York River. We must keep it strong and healthy for years to come.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2197.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1830

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3370, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 488, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass 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, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 306, nays 91, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—306

Amodei
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)

NAYS—91

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Blumenauer
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Camp
Carter
Chabot
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Culberson
DeFazio
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Hall
Hensarling
Higgins
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Jordan
Joyce
Kline
Lamborn
Lucas
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Waxman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—33

Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Coble
Crawford
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Ellmers
Fincher
Gosar
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
Labrador
Lankford
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rush
Schwartz
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Stockman
Veasey

□ 1856

Messrs. FRANKS of Arizona, BRIDENSTINE, KLINE, ISSA, and BACHUS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mses. McCOLLUM, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. HUFFMAN and HUNTER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF VENEZUELA AS THEY PROTEST PEACEFULLY FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 488) supporting the people of Venezuela as they protest peacefully for democratic change and calling to end the violence, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—393

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—36

Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Coble
Crawford
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Ellmers
Fincher
Gohmert
Gosar
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
Labrador
Lankford
Lofgren
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rush
Schwartz
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Stockman
Veasey

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''Supporting the people of Venezuela as they protest peacefully for democracy, a reduction in violent crime and calling for an end to recent violence.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today, the fourth day of March 2014, I was unable to cast votes on the following recorded votes. My flight from Chattanooga, Tennessee was delayed due to mechanical issues. Had I been present, on rollcall vote No. 91, H.R. 3370, I would have voted ''no;'' on rollcall vote No. 92, H. Res. 488, I would have voted ''aye.''

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3370, HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 3370, the Clerk be authorized to make the corrections now at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 6, strike ''promulgate such regulations, and''.

On page 4, line 12, strike ''Iimplementation'' and insert ''Implementation''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3826, ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118, SUSPENDING THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE PENALTY LAW EQUALS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 113–373) on the resolution (H. Res. 497) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the individual health insurance mandate, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FLOOD INSURANCE BILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014.

Over the past decade, the National Flood Insurance Program has bordered on insolvency, and today it is over $24 million in debt. Congress, in 2012, passed the Biggert-Waters Act, which created much-needed reforms to the program that were designed to more accurately reflect insurance risks and create fiscal solvency. The law mandated that the Federal Emergency Management Agency perform an affordability study before transitioning to the newly weighted system, which they failed to do and has led to devastating flood insurance premium increases.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who think we should do nothing and let government mismanagement ruin the economic health of our communities. We cannot run away from pressing challenges. To the contrary, we must correct this policy failure in a manner that strikes a balanced solution without adding one dime to the Federal deficit.

H.R. 3370 enables Congress to develop a long-term solution that protects local economies and holds government accountable.

RECOGNIZING GABBIE ST. PETER AND ALICE WILLETTE

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a minute about two very special young girls from Waterville, Maine.

Gabbie St. Peter and Alice Willette both celebrated their eighth birthdays last month and are in the second grade at the George J. Mitchell Elementary School. Since their birthdays are just a day apart, they decided to have a joint birthday party. But instead of presents, these two extraordinary girls asked their friends to bring the items most in need at their school's food pantry.

This amazing act of generosity and community spirit came straight from Gabbie and Alice themselves. There was never a suggestion from a parent or a teacher to do this. They planned it all themselves.

I would have to agree with their teacher, Sherril Saulter, who said these two girls have some of the biggest hearts she has ever seen. Their compassion and generosity is inspiring, and I want to recognize and thank these two emerging leaders from Maine, Gabbie St. Peter and Alice Willette, for recognizing not only that no one in their community should go hungry, but also that they have the power to effect change.

THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1836, 178 years ago, the Republic of Texas was born with the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence. The last paragraph on the sacred document reads:

> We, therefore, the delegates with plenary powers of the people of Texas, in solemn convention assembled, appealing to a candid world for the necessities of our condition, do hereby resolve and declare, that our political connection with the Mexican nation has forever ended, and that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, Sovereign, and independent republic, and are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to independent nations; and, conscious of the rectitude of our intentions, we fearlessly and confidently commit the issue to the decision of the Supreme arbiter of the destinies of nations.

May God always bless and never forget the Republic of Texas.

□ 1915

CONGRATULATING SCHENECTADY GREENMARKET ON THEIR 5-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Schenectady Greenmarket on their 5-year anniversary. In the half-decade since they opened their doors to the Capital Region of New York, the Schenectady Greenmarket has worked to prove that our economy and nutrition benefit when we eat local and buy local.

Schenectady Greenmarket continues to find ways to bolster public health by providing farm-to-table meals to our friends and neighbors in the Capital Region and, most recently, partnering with MVP Health Care to build a healthier, more nutrition-focused community.

I had the privilege of attending Schenectady Greenmarket's 5-year anniversary last Sunday, and was pleased to see firsthand the good work and services this nonprofit organization provides our area.

I applaud the many farmers, producers, vendors, certainly musicians, volunteers, and staff who make the Greenmarket successful.

Again, I congratulate Schenectady Greenmarket on their anniversary, and I look forward to celebrating many more milestones to come.

PRESERVING ACCESS TO SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tonight the House passed legislation addressing an issue that is near and dear to my heart and very important to Michigan involving Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park.

For years, there has been a back and forth between the community surrounding Sleeping Bear Dunes and the National Park Service over the best way to make sure that this pristine treasure is accessible to the public.

I have personally been involved in this process for over a decade, and I am glad to see my friend and colleague, Dr. DAN BENISHEK, who now represents the area, pick up the legislative torch that my friend Pete Hoekstra and I—we introduced bills to protect the Sleeping Bear Dunes, and Dan has finally been able to take it across the finish line.

This bipartisan and bicameral solution ensures that beaches will remain open, public roads can be improved, hunting and fishing will continue to be allowed, and private property rights are actually protected.

Tonight's legislative achievement would not be possible without the hard work and tireless efforts of local citizens, local business owners, and local advocacy groups such as the Coalition for Access to the Lakeshore.

I look forward to President Obama signing this much-needed piece of legislation and the benefits that there will be for the visitors to the park, the local residents, and small businesses throughout northern Michigan.

Most importantly, let's see Sleeping Bear Dunes preserved for generations to come.

COAL-FIRED POWER UNIT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, later this month, in the State of Wyoming, a coal-fired power unit is going to shut down production for the very last time. This is going to happen 10 years before its useful life has diminished.

This is happening because of Federal regulations. This is inexpensive, abundant, coal-fired power which serves the

people of this country being cut down 10 years before the useful life of this plant is spent. This is a travesty of Federal regulation which will cost the American people more than it should for their own power.

You are going to be hearing more about this later this month from me, Mr. Speaker. This is not the last word.

DEEPENING THE SAVANNAH RIVER

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in Georgia, 352,000 jobs are related to the Port of Savannah. It is a major export facility exporting 62 percent of the goods that go through there.

We would have even more jobs if we deepened the Savannah River from 42 to 47 feet. In fact, the payoff, the cost-benefit analysis is a dollar spent and a $5.50 return. Yet, after 14 years and $41 million worth of study, Congress, the bureaucracy, just barely has said let's go forward.

Congress, in January, signaled that we had had enough; cut the red tape, get the project moving, and classified it as a project under construction.

The President and Vice President have repeatedly said they support the project, yet, to my shock, and those of us in Congress, in their budget, which just has come out, they have not funded this important job-creating project. I do not understand it.

I am astounded by an administration who claims to say this is the year of action. Why would they not move forward on deepening the Savannah River?

Three hundred and fifty-two thousand jobs are related to this, cost-benefit analysis of 1 to 5.5. Yet, the administration continues to dither.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the nuclear energy sector. Not only do nuclear power plants provide affordable reliable energy, they also provide many quality, high-paying jobs and are the backbone of many communities.

My district is home to a nuclear plant in Clinton, Illinois, that employs nearly 700 people. Nuclear energy is a secure energy source that plays a vital role in a responsible all-of-the-above energy policy. It is the biggest provider of reliable, efficient clean energy, and it provides on-demand energy 24/7.

The recent record cold temperatures in the Midwest show the importance of energy diversification. Many of my constituents saw steep increases in their electric bill.

While pipes froze and transportation became difficult because of iced roads and bridges, nuclear power remained consistent. I worry that things could have become worse if nuclear power wasn't able to fill the gaps where needed.

This is why I stand here today in support of nuclear energy and all of my constituents and the hardworking taxpayers of Clinton and Central Illinois.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for this opportunity to delve into what is a major piece of our work here in Washington, and that is the budget and the appropriation process.

Today is one of those very, very important days in the process of government. Today the President delivered to Congress his proposed budget. It is required by the Constitution. George Washington did it, and every President since that time has done it every year, and today, we have President Obama's budget before us.

I want to spend a few moments on that budget, together with my friend from New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO and our East-West show. So we have got California and New York here.

I would like to start off by kind of framing my own work and how I think we really need to approach what we do here.

This is from Franklin Delano Roosevelt during the Great Depression, and he laid out this test. It is on the Roosevelt Memorial here. It is etched into the granite stone there. It says: ''The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.''

It is how I like to frame the issues, and I think we can frame the President's budget that way, and also, this way:

Those of you that have seen us here on the floor, Mr. TONKO and myself, we often and usually talk about this issue of Making It in America, rebuilding the great American middle class by rebuilding the manufacturing sector of America.

Twenty years ago, actually 24 years ago, it was about 20 million, 19-plus million Americans were in that manufacturing sector. They were making everything from wine to automobiles and jet planes and even computers. Then we lost it. Maybe 11 million right now.

We are beginning to see the rebuilding of the manufacturing base, and along with that, we will see the American middle class rise up once again and be able to support their families, be able to take care of those things like food and shelter and education.

These are the seven ways that we talk about this. The President's budget picks up many of these, and I want to just focus on some of them tonight. My friend, Mr. TONKO, will pick up the energy piece.

In the President's budget, there are these key sectors, tax policy, education, research, infrastructure. Let's start at the bottom and work to the top.

The President has proposed a $305 billion, 4-year transportation program for the United States. Now, anybody that has driven today here in the East Coast or in the West Coast knows that we have gridlock, we have transportation problems of all kinds.

So the President comes forward with this major initiative, really, a significant increase in what we have done in the past. He wants to focus it, first, on repairing what we already have, the potholes, the bridges that have fallen down and others that might, saying let's get to that.

He then goes about building the more modern transportation systems that we need, expanding our highway program, but also the rail systems, the inner city rail, the inter-city rails, and the street cars and other kinds of mass transportation systems; very, very important.

He proposes how we pay for it. He says, we ought not give the oil companies, the Big Four, a $5 billion annual tax break, literally giving them our money at the gas pump, but also giving them our tax money in unnecessary subsidies.

He has other proposals in this part of the budget so that this would be fully paid for. That is the infrastructure piece.

One of our colleagues here on the floor just a few moments ago was talking about deepening the Savannah River port. Yes, we ought to do that, and the other ports. We know the Panama Canal is going to be widened, and when it is widened, we are going to have larger ships, deeper draft. We need to deepen our ports.

That is an infrastructure project, and the President's budget directly focuses on that.

Why is this important for individuals?

Because these are jobs, these are American jobs in construction, and if we will couple it with one more thing that I have proposed, and that is that these taxpayer programs buy American-made equipment so that the steel for the bridges, the concrete, so that the trains, so that the other things that will be part of this infrastructure, the pumps and all that goes with rebuilding the levees and the sanitation systems and the water system, that they be American-made equipment and supplies.

In doing that, we not only put people to work on the infrastructure projects, but we, once again, make it in America, and we rebuild the American manufacturing.

I would like now to turn to my colleague, Mr. TONKO, who wants to pick up a special piece of this, the energy piece in the President's budget.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you Representative GARAMENDI, and thank you for introducing on this House Floor some of the concepts that have been presented by the President in his budget presentation to Congress.

Certainly, I have been waiting with great anticipation as to what the energy portion of this budget might look like. Why?

Because I think it is a cornerstone. Energy policy, energy resources are those cornerstones of rebuilding our American economy, to grow the economy, and to strengthen the prospects out there for job creation in the private sector by creating that partnership, public-private partnership where the private sector will grow those jobs.

Also, I am curious because of my past roles as energy chair, the energy committee chair in the New York State Assembly, a role that I held for some 15 years, and also my leadership in NYSERDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, prior to my coming to Congress.

Now sitting on Energy and Commerce as a committee assignment, I have great, great interest in where the President wants to take us on the energy issues, and I am very favorably impressed by some of the down payments that he wants to make.

Certainly, with the $2.3 billion that he is offering for the Department of Energy in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, that effort, I think, is going to launch us into a new series of innovation that allows for job creation and a reduced cost of electricity and, certainly, a drawing us down on this gluttonous dependency on fossil-based fuels as the cornerstone of our energy economy.

□ 1930

So I think that this effort will, within EERE, the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Office, provide for that growing effort to promote efficiency. That ought to be our fuel of choice. This investment allows us to accept that notion and then, also, to work on efforts that will enable us to focus our efforts out there that are required for energy.

Renewable energy, no fuel costs with the sun, the wind, the soil, the water, that is part of our environment. Utilizing that in a way that generates electricity and does it in a benign way is a very strong cornerstone advanced by the President in this effort.

And also, the $4.2 billion that he brings forth in efforts to provide for innovation and to create new outcomes for energy purposes not only with efficiency and generation, but the transmission of that energy supply and looking at efforts to expand and make permanent the production tax credits that are so important for renewable energy in this country, so those are two good, very valuable investments.

Let me then just highlight a few others that I believe will be a progressive outcome, if we are to accept this notion here in Congress. One would be to address a clean energy research program, and the President does that with a major down payment for clean energy research.

He also addresses the Advanced Research Projects Agency in the energy capacity, acronymed out as ARPA–E. It mimics DARPA from the Defense Department, and what it does is commit a very laser-sharp focus on research as it relates to innovation in the energy sector.

Will all those outcomes be successful? Perhaps not. In fact, the character—the quality of research is that failure can be the down payment to success. So where the failure will be realized, we will retest, we will recommit our energies to fine-tune and come forth with the success stories that are required.

ARPA–E, in its short 5 years, has proven to be a very valuable investment in energy innovation. The President makes a major investment in his budget for ARPA–E. I was just with over 2,000 representatives from the ARPA–E network who came to town—came to Washington to discuss the future of the program.

I am impressed with the leadership, coming both in EERE and ARPA–E in the Department of Energy, and the President acknowledges that—recognizes it by making these commitments in his budget.

And finally, if I might, Representative GARAMENDI, I will talk about the advanced fuels agenda, where $700 million will be invested in the transportation sector, so that we have advanced fuels. We need to be weaned off of this gluttonous dependency on fossil fuels.

So these are very promising investments suggested by the President and the administration, those that will take us into a cutting-edge, new millennium sort of thinking that enables us to continue with that pioneer spirit in this country, which has always guided us and lifted us out of tough economic times.

I am encouraged by these commitments and look forward to the budget work that we need to do here in the House of Representatives and working with our partners in the United States Senate, but I think the President has set a good tone.

He has ushered in some good thinking, and he is looking at a new wave of energy concepts that will guide this Nation in job production, in sound energy policy, and will have benign impacts on our environmental resources. As stewards of the environment, I think that is important for all of us.

So I thank you for leading this discussion this evening, and I am impressed with the energy portion, so I thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO, and thank you for your years of service in the area of energy and for moving this entire program forward.

I think there is another very, very important piece of this, and that is that the climate is changing. The climate is changing. We know that the greenhouse gases have passed the 400 mark, which was thought to be the point of no return.

Hopefully, that is not the case, but we do know that, in the President's budget, he goes after this issue of climate change with the kind of programs that you talked about, about the programs supporting renewable energy, making permanent the energy tax credits for renewables, which is very, very important in my district.

I have a major wind farm that starts and stops, depending upon whether the production tax credit is renewed here in Congress. Right now, it is stopping, and that is a major part of the potential energy that we need.

The President talks about an all-of-the-above strategy, and yes, we ought to do that. One of those strategies is a natural gas strategy, which is now replacing coal in our power plants and, when properly managed—that is, methane doesn't leak—it is clear that we will reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by that strategy. There are many, many different pieces to this. You spoke so well to it.

I want to just pick up a couple of others very, very quickly, and it is a part of this Make It In America, particularly the manufacturing. The President proposes that we create more advanced manufacturing hubs.

These are innovation hubs. There are several in the United States. He wants to put more of these out there. They have coupled the research with the manufacturing, and that allows for the advancement here.

He also does one thing that is very important in this, and that is the education and the reeducation of our workers and our students. I was at an extraordinary manufacturing facility in Yuba City over the weekend, and they make bearings.

I am not talking about these little ball bearings that you find in small appliances and the like. We are talking about bearings that are huge. These weigh several tons. They are the bearings on a shaft in a hydroelectric plant, maybe 2 or 3 feet in diameter.

I had no idea this existed there, and the one thing they wanted me to know was that they cannot find skilled machinists that are able and capable of doing that work.

In the President's budget, he has a major program to train and retrain the workers of tomorrow, men and women that will do not only the computer work, but also men and women that are capable of becoming the machinists of tomorrow, so that we are able, in America, to produce these very extraordinarily important, unique pieces of equipment, like the shafts, the turbines, and in this case, the bearings that are so important to make those things work.

So there is this whole complex in the President's budget—education, early childhood education, going after climate change with energy, going after infrastructure—as we talked about earlier.

There are many more pieces of this puzzle, and as we come back in the future, I want us to pick up each individual piece, talk to the American public about what is in the President's budget, and hopefully persuade our Republican colleagues to go along with this pro-growth deficit reduction budget that the President has proposed.

I think, with that, I will turn it over to you, and if you don't have any more comments, we will call it a night.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, just in closing, I would state that three very important underpinnings to a modern economy—a transitioning economy, one that drives innovation—would be the investments in research, the investments in infrastructure, the investments in education; and we begin to see that in this budget.

I think the efforts here are a good challenge and a charge to this Congress to respond accordingly. That will lift us into a cutting-edge thinking that enables us to compete effectively in what is a worldwide race, as it relates to clean energy innovation and high tech.

We need these investments in order to be strong. We won the global race on space back in the sixties because we committed to winning that race, and that was just against another nation, Russia.

Now, there are dozens of nations competing to be the kingpin of the international economy. The President rightfully sees that as the opportunity for this Nation to invest accordingly, so that we can move forward; and again, with his efforts in advanced manufacturing, with the NNMI, the manufacturing initiative, there is great promise there.

That gives you a very sharp focus on specific needs of manufacturing, developing those sorts of intellects and human infrastructure, workforce development, that will give us that cutting-edge technology.

I strongly support the NNMI initiative in the budget that the President had introduced last year. I think it shows us to be in an advanced sort of thinking and is giving manufacturing a shot in the arm. Our best days in manufacturing lie ahead. We need to invest so as to make that possible, and this budget does that.

So I thank you very much, and I look forward to many more discussions on the budget as we go forward in the ensuing weeks.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO, for being such a leader on these issues.

As I was about to turn around to the Speaker and sign off, I realized I had left off a major piece of the infrastructure. We have a major drought in California, and we know that for California to be able to address this issue in the future, we are going to have to prepare by building reservoir capacity.

Well, I am not supposed to speak directly to anybody on the floor, but we are going to be putting forth a series of bills to build reservoirs in California. That is another critical piece of the infrastructure.

It may be the pipes. It may be the plumbing. It may be the sanitation system. But we desperately need to store water in California, not only in surface storage, but also to store that water in the underground aquifers.

If we do that, when the droughts which come occasionally to California, as they have in the past, we will be prepared to deal with them because we will have set aside the water that we needed.

Somebody asked me about this a few days ago, and they said: Well, why do we need to do that? Well, people will just consume it.

I said: Not if they listen and read Exodus in the Bible. It is there—7 years of good, 7 years of bad. You had better put it aside during the 7 years of good.

So that is what we intend to do. We will be introducing legislation later this week on building one of the major reservoirs in California.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will look to you and say that I look forward to working with you on these projects, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 5.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 5, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4869. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2013 to September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4870. A letter from the Director, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the first annual report for Minority Depository Institutions Annual Report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4871. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2012 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4872. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting Third Report to Congress, January 2014, Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Activities, Progress, and Plans: September 2010 to August 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4873. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Construction Permit Program Fee Increases; Construction Permit Regulation of PM2.5; Regulation 3 [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0552; FRL-9903-94-Region 8] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4874. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Allen, Greene, Vanderburgh, Warrick, and Vigo Counties; 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0414, EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0424, EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0425, EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0432; FRL-9906-50-Region 5] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4875. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Telluride [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0833; FRL-9906-35-Region 8] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4876. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4877. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4878. A letter from the Chair, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled, ''Evaluating Job Applicants: The Role of Training and Experience in Hiring''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4879. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program Report for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7201(e); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4880. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a recommendation modifying the authorized total project cost of the

Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4882. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2014-13] received February 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4883. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — March 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-8) received February 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4884. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Safe Harbor for Disregarded Entities Under Section 108 (Rev. Proc. 2014-20) received February 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4885. A letter from the Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for WTO and Multilateral Affairs, Office of the United States Trade Representative, transmitting the Administration's Annual Report on Subsidies Enforcement, pursuant to the Statement of Administrative Action of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4886. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Several Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0041] (RIN: 0960-AH61) received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4887. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a letter regarding the selection of the next Director of Legislative Affairs; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

4888. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a letter regarding a new research program; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3189. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture; with amendments (Rept. 113–372, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 497. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the indiviAal health insurance mandate (Rept. 113–373). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 4137. A bill to prohibit assistance provided under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families from being accessed through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card at any store that offers marijuana for sale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOWDY (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 4138. A bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DENT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4139. A bill to promote United States economic growth and job creation and strengthen strategic partnerships with United States allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD (for herself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4140. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide per diem payments to eligible entities for furnishing care to dependents of certain homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 4141. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into enhanced-use leases for excess property of the National Cemetery Administration that is unsuitable for burial purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4142. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to prohibit the use of benefits to purchase marijuana products, to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to prohibit assistance provided under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families from being accessed through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card at any store that offers marijuana for sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WOLF, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4143. A bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen intercountry adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 4144. A bill to amend the provisions of title 46, United States Code, related to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 4145. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the dependent care credit to take into account expenses for care of parents and grandparents who do not live with the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4146. A bill to amend the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4147. A bill to direct the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Deputy Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Economic Opportunity to submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of representatives a report regarding the information technology of the Department that is used in administering the educational benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON OF TEXAS (for himself, Mr. COLE, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.J. Res. 111. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 498. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of March 2, 2014, through March 8, 2014, as ''School Social Work Week''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 4137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 4138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts. In addition, each House of Congress may determine the rules of its proceedings under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 4139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:

H.R. 4140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8, ''Congress shall have Power To Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 4141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is constitutionally appropriate pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 (the Spending Clause).

The Supreme Court, in South Dakota v. Dole (1987), reasoned that conditions and limitations on funds were constitutional and within the power of Congress under the Spending Clause.

Thus, conditioning receipt of federal funds in order to direct appropriate spending goals and purposes are constitutionally permissible. As long as the spending is on ''the general welfare'' (i.e. national in scope) and the condition is clear, and related to the program being funded, the limitation is constitutional.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 4143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 4144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3,

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 118: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 279: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 411: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 445: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 460: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 479: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 494: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 543: Mr. ISSA, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 597: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 627: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 647: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 702: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 755: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 792: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 822: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 867: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 938: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1015: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1179: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1225: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1239: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1249: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 1250: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1313: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1318: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1354: Mr. MICA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1500: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1505: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1518: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1573: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1599: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1616: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1726: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1750: Mr. KING of New York and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1798: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1812: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 1915: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1975: Mr. ENYART, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2012: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2028: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2053: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2079: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2143: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2291: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2324: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2364: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2413: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2452: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2468: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2479: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2500: Mr. LANCE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2548: Mr. DENT, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2575: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2791: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2847: Mr. COHEN and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2882: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2917: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2932: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 2939: Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and

H.R. 2939: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2945: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2996: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 3040: Mr. PETERS of California and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3077: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3116: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3240: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 3303: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3330: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 3361: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 3374: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3384: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 3461: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 3482: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3485: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 3505: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3529: Mr. LONG, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3530: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3537: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3548: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3571: Ms. ESTY and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3576: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3635: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 3641: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3658: Mr. COBLE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 3670: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3708: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3723: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3740: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3747: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3775: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3833: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3854: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3864: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. REED.
H.R. 3877: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3930: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MICA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3956: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3991: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3997: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4006: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 4012: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 4016: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4031: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 4035: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4041: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4058: Mr. REED and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4075: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4076: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4079: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 4091: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 4092: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4093: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4094: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4118: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 4120: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4121: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4128: Ms. KUSTER.
H.J. Res. 25: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.J. Res. 110: Mr. MULLIN.
H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. ENYART, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 136: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 283: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 456: Mr. POLIS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H. Res. 476: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Res. 488: Mr. MICA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The amendment filed to the Committee Print for H.R. 2824 by me does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. DAVE CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4118, ''Suspending the Individual Mandate Penalty Law Equals Fairness Act,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.